



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 21, 2015

No. 114

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord of the harvest, we continue to seek You, for we desire to do Your will. You, O God, are our light and salvation, so we refuse to be afraid.

As our lawmakers strive to walk uprightly, provide them with a harvest of truth, justice, and integrity. May they cultivate such ethical congruence that their rhetoric will be undergirded by right actions. Lord, keep them aware of Your continuous presence, as they find fullness of joy in doing Your will. Show them the path to life, as Your truth brings them to a safe harbor.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Republican leader will be here shortly. I have gotten word he is not going to be here right now, so I am going to proceed.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. REID. This past weekend, Republican Presidential hopeful Donald Trump did what he did best: He said

something dishonest and really distasteful. In speaking about the senior Senator from Arizona, he mocked Senator JOHN MCCAIN, mocked his service in the Vietnam conflict. He went so far as to say JOHN MCCAIN was not a war hero.

JOHN MCCAIN and I came to the House of Representatives the very same day, both new Members of the House. He was representing a district in Arizona and I my district in Nevada. We are neighbors. We served together in the House. We came here to the Senate at the same time. He is one notch ahead of me in seniority in this body because the State of Arizona has more people than Nevada. That is how seniority is determined, among other ways.

JOHN MCCAIN was a naval pilot and comes from a family who served our country admirably in the military for decades—his grandfather and his father. On one of his first missions to Vietnam, JOHN MCCAIN was shot down and badly injured—broken back and arms. He was very badly hurt. He was placed in a Vietnamese concentration camp, where he spent almost 6 years. About half of that time was in solitary confinement, and many days and weeks of that were spent being punished, tortured, and rebreaking parts of his body that had been broken.

JOHN MCCAIN, to me, is a hero. He is a person who has represented this country admirably in the Congress. He was a Republican nominee for President. America knows JOHN MCCAIN. I personally have some disagreements on policy on an occasion or two with JOHN MCCAIN, but we have never disagreed about our relationship. My relationship with Senator MCCAIN is one where I have great admiration for him, for his strength of character, and for his moral courage in Vietnam.

In the aftermath of these remarks about JOHN MCCAIN, Republicans have been falling all over themselves to criticize Donald Trump. But it makes

me wonder: Where were all these same Republicans when Mr. Trump slandered millions? It was only a month ago that Trump said:

When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists.

That is his quote.

When Trump insulted the Senator from Arizona, a Member of his own party, Republicans could not denounce him fast enough, but when Trump called immigrants "rapists," there was nothing but silence—nothing but silence. There is an ugly truth behind that silence, and it is this: When it comes to immigration policy—and, frankly, most other policy—there is no meaningful difference between the Republican Party and Donald Trump. Consider the facts on just this one issue. Trump rejects a pathway to citizenship for the undocumented. Instead, he favors a system of merit that creates a road to legal status. He has never ever said two sentences defining that.

We have heard before the same kind of talk from Republicans, those running for President—I think we have 16 of them now.

Jeb Bush rejects the pathway to citizenship. He claims to support a pathway to legal status but "not necessarily citizenship."

Scott Walker rejects a pathway to citizenship. He said, "If somebody wants to be a citizen, they need to go back to their country of origin."

The junior Senator from Texas also rejects a pathway to citizenship. He said, "I think that it is likely that there could be some bipartisan solution to those who are here illegally if a path to citizenship were taken off the table."

Governor Chris Christie rejects a pathway to citizenship, too. He said it is "an extreme way to go."

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S5179

Trump wants to terminate President Obama's Executive actions on immigration, tearing apart millions of families and deporting about 800,000 DREAMers. We have heard that before, too.

Jeb Bush also wants to repeal President Obama's Executive actions. On FOX News, on the "Hannity" show, he said he would "repeal Obama's executive amnesty." That is a quote.

The junior Senator from Texas also wants to terminate the President's Executive actions. Here is what he said: "If I am elected president, the very first thing I intend to do on the first day is rescind every single unconstitutional or illegal executive action from President Obama."

Governor Chris Christie is actively opposing the President's Executive actions. In fact, his State joined a lawsuit challenging President Obama's actions.

The junior Senator from Florida also rejects President Obama's Executive actions that keep families together. Senator RUBIO's spokesperson told one news outlet that "immigration executive orders won't be permanent policy under [a Rubio] administration."

These are the facts. When it comes to immigration policy—and, as I mentioned, sadly, most other policy issues—there is no daylight between Donald Trump and the rest of the Republican field.

While the rest of the Republican Presidential hopefuls may not engage in the same repugnant rhetoric, make no mistake—they are all on the same page as Donald Trump.

If I ask each Republican running for President "Name one difference between your immigration policy and Trump's immigration policy," given recent history, there will be a deafening silence.

When Trump insulted MCCAIN, Republicans couldn't denounce him fast enough, but when Mr. Trump called millions of hard-working immigrants rapists and murderers, there was nothing but silence. Maybe this is because none of the Republicans running for President can name a single way in which they disagree with Trump's policies on immigration.

In the meantime, Democrats will continue to fight to pass comprehensive immigration reform, just as we did more than 2 years ago. We will continue to fight Republican piecemeal legislation that criminalizes immigrant communities—whole communities—and we will continue to fight for families who are constantly being scapegoated by today's Republican Party.

MEASURE DISCHARGED AND
PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S.J.
RES. 19

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2159(i) and section 601(b)(4) of Public Law 94-329, S.J. Res. 19 is discharged and placed on the calendar, 45

days of the review period having elapsed, not including time spent in adjournment pursuant to S. Con. Res. 19.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what are we doing the rest of the day?

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each until 12:30 p.m., with the time equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OVERTIME PAY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I believe that real, long-term economic growth is built from the middle out, not from the top down. Our government, our economy, and our workplaces should work for all of our families, not just the wealthiest few. But across the country today, millions of workers are working harder than ever without basic overtime protection.

That is why I am so proud to come to the floor today to express my strong support for the Obama administration's new proposal to restore overtime protections for millions of workers and families. Not only is this the right thing to do, but it is good for our economy.

I wish to share a story of a man named Paul who lives in Massachusetts. As reported in the Boston Globe, Paul worked very hard at a discount retail store to provide for his family. Each week he was working 72 hours, on average. On one particular stretch, he worked for 40 days in a row without a single day off, but his employer didn't pay him one extra dime for the work he did beyond 40 hours a week.

That is fundamentally unfair. And Paul, believe me, is not alone. There are so many workers like him in States across the country, and these workers feel as though they have been left behind in this economic recovery. They need government policies on overtime protections to catch up.

In 1938, Congress recognized the need to set a standard for the 40-hour workweek. By law, when workers put in

more than 40 hours a week, their employers had to compensate them fairly with time-and-a-half pay. But those protections have eroded over the past several years. In today's economy, many Americans feel as though they are working more and more for less and less pay, and in many cases, they are. A salaried worker can be asked to work 50 or 60 or 70 hours a week and never see a dime of overtime pay. One of the main reasons is because overtime rules are severely out of date.

Right now, if a worker earns just a little more than \$23,000 a year, he or she does not qualify for time-and-a-half pay. That salary threshold is much too low today. In fact, the current salary level is less than the poverty threshold for a family of four. Workers should not have to earn poverty wages to get guaranteed overtime protection. That salary threshold has only been updated once since 1975.

Back in the mid-1970s, 62 percent of the American workforce was covered by overtime rules. Today, just 8 percent of our salaried workers have overtime protection, and big corporations have used these outdated overtime rules to their advantage. They force their employees to work overtime without paying them fair time-and-a-half pay. That, of course, is good for a big corporation's profit margin. But as the Union-Bulletin in Walla Walla, WA, editorialized a few weeks back, these workers are "working, paying taxes, raising families, and often suffering due to the long hours."

But unlike so many of the challenges we face here, there is a solution to this, and it doesn't require congressional action. Last week, the Department of Labor proposed to raise the salary threshold from about \$23,000, which is what it is today, to just over \$50,000 a year. That will restore overtime protections for millions of Americans.

This, by the way, is especially important for parents. Think about what this would mean for a working mom who right now works overtime without getting paid for it. By restoring this basic worker protection, she can finally work a 40-hour workweek and spend more time with her kids. Or, if her employer asks her to work more than 40 hours a week, she would have more money in her pocket to boost her family's economic security. That is so important for strengthening our middle class today.

Now, I do want to keep working to improve the proposed rule. I believe the Department of Labor should also update what is known as the duties test. For workers who make more than the salary threshold but still do what is called blue collar work, the duties test is designed to ensure that they get overtime protections. But today that duties test is out of date.

Under the current law, big corporations can exploit the duties test to avoid paying their workers time-and-a-half, and I believe that needs to change. When workers put in more