

of S. 843, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 1714

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1714, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the Multiemployer Health Benefit Plan and the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes.

S. 1831

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1831, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 2216

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2216, a bill to provide immunity from suit for certain individuals who disclose potential examples of financial exploitation of senior citizens, and for other purposes.

S. 2551

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2551, a bill to help prevent acts of genocide and mass atrocities, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States civilian capacities to prevent and mitigate such crises.

S. 2595

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2595, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 2867

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2867, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to establish an Office of the Advocate for Small Business Capital Formation and a Small Business Capital Formation Advisory Committee, and for other purposes.

S. 2895

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2895, a bill to extend the civil statute of limitations for victims of Federal sex offenses.

S. 3021

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3021, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize

the use of Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to pursue independent study programs at certain educational institutions that are not institutions of higher learning.

S. 3034

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3034, a bill to prohibit the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from allowing the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions contract to lapse unless specifically authorized to do so by an Act of Congress.

S. 3065

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3065, a bill to amend parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to invest in funding prevention and family services to help keep children safe and supported at home, to ensure that children in foster care are placed in the least restrictive, most family-like, and appropriate settings, and for other purposes.

S. 3198

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3198, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans.

S. 3244

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3244, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to clarify the treatment of pediatric dental coverage in the individual and group markets outside of Exchanges established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3304

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3304, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to improve the Veterans Crisis Line.

S. 3374

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3374, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced excise tax rate for portable, electronically-aerated bait containers.

S. 3391

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3391, a bill to reauthorize the Museum and Library Services Act.

S. 3405

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 3405, a bill to transfer certain items from the United States Munitions List to the Commerce Control List.

S. 3407

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3407, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to facilitate assignment of military trauma care providers to civilian trauma centers in order to maintain military trauma readiness and to support such centers, and for other purposes.

S. 3414

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3414, a bill to condition assistance to the West Bank and Gaza on steps by the Palestinian Authority to end violence and terrorism against Israeli citizens.

S. 3449

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3449, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a program for labeling cultural property of Iraq or Syria legally entering the United States.

S. RES. 432

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 432, a resolution supporting respect for human rights and encouraging inclusive governance in Ethiopia.

S. RES. 535

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 535, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the trafficking of illicit fentanyl into the United States from Mexico and China.

S. RES. 536

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 536, a resolution proclaiming the week of October 30 through November 5, 2016, as "National Obesity Care Week".

S. RES. 579

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 579, a resolution recognizing the 40th Anniversary of the first class of women admitted to the Coast Guard Academy.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 3460. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide certain limitations on the designation and use of national monuments; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3460

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Local Community and Sportsmen Input in Monuments Act”.

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION AND USE OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS.

Section 320301 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “The President may, in the President’s discretion,” and inserting “Subject to subsection (e), the President may”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) CONSULTATION AND APPROVAL REQUIRED BEFORE DESIGNATION.—No national monument may be designated under subsection (a) until—

“(1) each county, borough, parish, or equivalent unit of local government within and adjacent to the boundaries of which the proposed national monument is to be located—

“(A) has been consulted with respect to the designation; and

“(B) has approved the designation; and

“(2) the Governor and legislature of each State within the boundaries of which the proposed national monument is to be located has approved the proposed national monument.

“(f) RESTRICTIONS ON USE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any national monument designated under subsection (a) shall be open to hunting, fishing, other forms of recreation, grazing, and other historic or traditional uses in accordance with applicable law, unless the Secretary concerned closes all or a portion of the national monument to 1 or more of those uses, in accordance with the purposes of this chapter.

“(2) REVIEW PERIOD.—The Secretary shall not impose any restriction on hunting, fishing, grazing, wildlife management, or other historic or traditional uses at a national monument designated under subsection (a) until the date of expiration of an appropriate review period, as determined by the Secretary, providing for, with respect to the proposed restriction, the concurrence by applicable State wildlife management agencies, public input, and approval by Congress.”.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 3464. A bill to provide incremental increases to the salary threshold for exemptions for executive, administrative, professional, outside sales, and computer employees under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; read the first time.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, Senate offices have been hearing about something called the overtime rule on a daily basis. We are hearing about it from colleges, universities, Boy Scout troops, church camps, other nonprofits, employers, and employees who don’t like to be suddenly considered employees who punch a timecard.

Today, I would like to talk about action that Congress can take to change the effect of the overtime rule the administration issued that will go into effect in December unless we do something.

The Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. LANKFORD, and the Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS, introduced legislation that would delay for 6 months the implementation of the rule. I cosponsored that legislation and I fully support it.

Yesterday, the House of Representatives passed a bill with that same language which would delay for 6 months the implementation of the rule. That would be my preferred solution.

Today I am introducing another piece of legislation that addresses the problems with the overtime rule that I hope will gather more bipartisan support. A similar bill was introduced in the House by Democrat Representative KURT SCHRADER of Oregon and is cosponsored by 10 Democrats and 7 Republicans. My hope is that when we come back in November, Senators on both sides of the aisle will have heard from their Boy Scout troops, from their colleges and universities, from their restaurants, and from their employees, who say: Wait a minute, this overtime rule makes no sense the way it is being implemented. Do something in November to change its negative effect on our country.

I am introducing a bill today with the cosponsorship of Senator COLLINS of Maine, Senator LANKFORD of Oklahoma, Senator SCOTT of South Carolina, and Senator FLAKE of Arizona that will protect America’s nonprofits, churches, colleges, and communities from the effect of the administration’s overtime rule that will go into effect on December 1 unless we act.

When we talk about employers that will be affected by overtime, we are talking about Operation Smile, which is a charity that funds cleft palate operations for children. Operation Smile says this rule may cost them at least 3,000 surgeries a year. The effect of this rule may mean 3,000 children won’t have surgeries each year for cleft palates because of the cost of this regulation.

We are talking about the Great Smoky Mountain Council of Boy Scouts. That is my home Boy Scout council where I grew up and where I live. They are telling me the new rule will result in about \$100,000 in annual costs because during certain seasons employees staff weekend camping trips, which mean longer hours. That is what you do in Boy Scouts, Mr. President—you go on camping trips. And they are not 8-hour trips most of the time. If you are going to start saying they have to pay overtime to Scout masters and others you are going to have fewer boys and girls having a chance for Scouting.

Senator ISAKSON of Georgia spoke on the floor about a phone call he received from the pastor at Johnson Ferry Baptist Church in Marietta, one of the largest Baptist churches in Georgia. That church provides daycare, early childhood development, and sports activities at Vacation Bible School, a 24/7 program for underprivileged kids in

the Atlanta area. Under the overtime rule that goes into effect in December, a camp counselor for their Vacation Bible School will have to be paid overtime for many hours of the day when they are with the children, even if they are sleeping. So this rule could price the Johnson Ferry Baptist Church out of the business of providing Bible school church camp for underprivileged children.

So there will be fewer cleft palate operations, fewer Scouting opportunities, and fewer church camp opportunities for underprivileged children.

Here’s what I mean by the overtime rule:

Hourly workers in this country are usually paid overtime, but salaried workers generally don’t earn overtime unless they are making below a threshold set by the Labor Department and required by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Today that threshold is a little over \$23,000. This new rule issued by the Obama administration just 4 months ago raises the threshold from just over \$23,000 to over \$47,000 all at once on December 1. In other words, in 3 months it will double. This is a 100-percent increase and on December 1, employers will have had only about 6 months to prepare for this, reclassify employees, put time clock systems in place, adjust workers’ schedules, and find new revenue to pay for all of this. It has thrown small businesses and colleges into a panic in the State of Tennessee. One poll released this month found that 49 percent of business owners were not aware of the rule that goes into effect in 3 months.

The legislation I am introducing today would stretch out over 5 years the administration’s increase in the salary threshold for overtime pay. I have not met many people who don’t believe the threshold ought to go up. I have not met many people who think that it ought to be doubled in 6 months and automatically increased every 3 years, or that it should jump so high and all at once.

On December 1, under the legislation I am introducing, it would still increase significantly—from \$23,660 to \$35,984. This is about a 50-percent increase. This bill would modify a rule that many believe goes too high and too fast and will result in employers, nonprofits, colleges, and others cutting workers’ hours and limiting their workplace benefits and flexibility, as well as costing students more in tuition.

If there is one subject I hear about on the Senate floor, it is Senators from both sides of the aisle saying college costs are too high. Yet the independent colleges and the public colleges of Tennessee have written me and they have detailed how the cost of this rule will have the effect of raising tuition by hundreds of dollars per student. So how can you go around complaining about college tuition increases on the one hand and on the other hand issue a rule that raises college tuition by hundreds of dollars in thousands of schools?

My bill will do four things:

No. 1, it will modify the rule so that it is phased in over 5 years rather than all at once on December 1. Most people I talk to think it ought to go up, just as I have said, but they do not think it ought to go up all at once. There is no need for that, so phase it in over 5 years.

No. 2, make a significant increase on December 1, but then prohibit an increase in 2017 to give employers and employees an opportunity to adjust while our independent government watchdog—the Government Accountability Office, the GAO—studies the impact of the rule on American workers after the first year of implementation. So what I have said is that on December 1, the threshold goes up 50 percent, and then for 1 year it doesn't go up at all while the GAO studies the impact of that increase on colleges, church camps, businesses, workers, and others.

No. 3, it would clarify that the administration does not have the authority to automatically increase the overtime threshold, which is currently set to occur automatically every 3 years, starting in 2020.

No. 4, it would require a study of the rule's impact after the first year of implementation. If the study finds the impact is negative, the bill will exempt certain employers from future increases—nonprofits, including churches, colleges, and universities; State and local governments; many Medicaid and Medicare eligible facilities, such as nursing homes or facilities serving individuals with disabilities.

These are employers who can't just raise prices. They are dependent on tax dollars or on charitable donations. And if they are in trouble because of this rule, our communities will lose critical services—surgeries for cleft palates, Scouting opportunities, church camps for underprivileged kids, and others.

This is not a partisan proposal. My bill is very similar to a bill introduced by House Democrat KURT SCHRADER of Oregon and cosponsored by 10 Democrats and 7 Republicans. So my hope is that our Democratic colleagues will take a look at this bill and say that this is a reasonable, bipartisan proposal to apply more common sense to the overtime rule when it comes to the employees, employers, and nonprofits that serve our country.

Without these bills, on December 1, the salary threshold for overtime pay will more than double, from just over \$23,000 to over \$47,000. Representative KURT SCHRADER, a Democrat, when he introduced his bill, said the following:

Since the Department of Labor's immediate phase-in date was announced, we've heard from business owners and their employees who are worried about implementing this increase overnight. Without sufficient time to plan for the increase, cuts and demotions will become inevitable, and workers will actually end up making less than they made before.

Democratic Representative SCHRA-
DER has 10 Democrats as cosponsors,

including Congressman JIM COOPER from my State of Tennessee, who said:

I am hearing from lots of Middle Tennesseans who are worried about how this new rule will affect them. The overtime rule hadn't been adjusted in years and needed updating. But it's good to make commonsense changes and add flexibility so the rule works for all businesses and workers can actually have a chance to get ahead. We don't want to see lost hours or shifts in job responsibility.

I congratulate Senator COLLINS of Maine and Senator LANKFORD of Oklahoma for the legislation they introduced to delay the overtime rule's effect for 6 months. I support that bill, and I am glad the House of Representatives last night passed that bill, but I am also introducing this alternative for those in the body—especially my Democratic friends—who might not be willing to delay the implementation of the overtime rule, who believe it should go up, who believe it should go up as high as the President has proposed but not as fast as the President has proposed, and who believe the rule has created a problem for nonprofits, such as the Boy Scouts, or surgeries for cleft palates or church camps. I hope they will seriously consider the proposal I have made today, along with Senators COLLINS, LANKFORD, SCOTT, and FLAKE.

Over the next 5 weeks between now and the election, we will all be home. We will have a chance to see our Boy Scout leaders. We will have a chance to see our doctors and visit our churches. We can go by our colleges and ask how much this is going to raise the tuition at Maryville College, the University of Tennessee, the University of Wyoming, or wherever we may be. And if the fact is that most Americans feel that to impose this salary threshold on December 1 is too high and too fast, there will be two alternatives when we come back. One is to delay the rule for 6 months, and the other is to raise the threshold just as high as the President proposed but do it over 5 years. Take half of the increase in the first year, no increase the second year, and exempt nonprofits, state and local governments, and many Medicare- and Medicaid-eligible facilities if they are negatively affected. This is similar to the commonsense proposal that Congressman COOPER talked about, that 11 Democrats as well as 7 Republicans have signed on to in the House, and that I hope will have serious consideration here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I wish to join Senator ALEXANDER in discussing this overtime rule.

As he mentioned multiple times, Senator COLLINS and I dropped a companion bill here in the Senate that was passed in the House that delays the overtime rule's implementation by 6 months. As he also mentioned, I am most certainly a cosponsor of his bill as well. That is another approach, and, quite frankly, we are all looking for different approaches to be able to ac-

complish something that needs to be done and needs to be done immediately; that is, to address a regulation which has been put in place that can have serious, I believe, unintended consequences but most certainly serious consequences across our economy.

That is not an accusation that this administration wants to be able to damage the economy, wants to be able to damage small businesses, or wants to be able to damage universities and nonprofits. But I believe absolutely that is what is occurring. I am concerned, though, that the administration seems to have been deaf to the message that has come up over and over again from many of us in the Congress to be able to highlight that these are serious issues. Have you evaluated them?

The Small Business Administration even has real concerns that the data they presented to the Department of Labor was not used, and the advocate for small businesses within the Department of Labor is challenging the Department of Labor to say: Why didn't you use the data that we provided to be able to evaluate this?

There are a lot of questions about how the regulation itself was promulgated or what the end goal is, but let me tell you what the real consequences are on the ground. I will give a couple of hypothetical situations, and then I will go into some practical ones.

Right now, a single mom with a couple of kids at home is able to telecommute into work a couple of days from her particular job as maybe a sales marketing manager. She can be in the office for 3 days, telecommute a couple of days, save child care costs, and this gives her some flexibility. Under this rule, those same places would not typically allow someone to telecommute because they have to see exactly the hours that someone is working. So she would have to physically be present in the office every day so the work hours could be tracked, removing that flexibility and causing her increased child care costs and actually moving her to more of a situation where she is in a more structured environment, less suitable for her kids.

I will give another thought on this. What if we reach into a situation that many of us face as many of the millennials now leaving college are going into the workforce, well-trained, well-equipped, wanting to get an assistant manager's position or wanting to be able to work into a salaried position. It will be much more difficult for those individuals coming out of college now to land a salaried position because, overall, companies around the country that are hiring don't want to hire salaried positions anymore; they want to be able to hire hourly people. So it will be tougher for the generation coming out of college right now to be able to land in those early management positions.

Is that a hypothetical situation? No. I would say it is already occurring. It

is already happening around the country. When I was home in August, traveling around the State, this overtime regulation was the No. 1 question that came up when I talked to any business owner, any business person, any manager. The first thing they raised was the coming overtime rule, both in its complexity and in trying to figure out how to be able to actually implement this into the cost of their business. The conversations were already occurring with employees where they were moving someone from a salaried position to an hourly position, and their employees hated it because they liked working to a spot where they were in a salaried position.

During the August time period, I had a conversation with a youth pastor at a church. That youth pastor said they had left a conversation with their pastor just a couple of days before in which their pastor said: You are going to have to start documenting your hours—each hour that you are actually working with kids, even your time at home that you are preparing a Bible study to actually teach the kids—because we can't afford for you to go over 40 hours.

This is someone who feels a calling to be able to work with students, and literally their pastor has to tell them: I know you want to help. You can't help more than 40 hours. Most youth pastors don't go into youth ministry because they anticipate getting wealthy in it. They go into it because of a sense of calling and passion to be able to help students. This regulation is telling that person: Turn down your passion to work with the next generation. You are limited in what you can actually do, and, if you choose to volunteer beyond that, you put your employer, that church, at risk.

The Osage Nation—their HR folks, William Scott Johnson, said this:

I'm an HR professional at the Osage Nation and am concerned about the impact that changes to the overtime regulations will have on my organization and employees. NAFOA has heard from tribal governments who are concerned the use of a single national salary threshold would adversely affect already limited revenues, especially for tribes in rural areas.

From the YWCA battered women's shelter:

I'm a human resource (HR) committee member at the YWCA Battered Women's Shelter and am concerned about the impact that changes to the overtime regulations will have on this nonprofit organization and employees. All employees make less than \$50,000 except top management. The impact of this new legislation could be catastrophic for payroll as employees will have to be moved from exempt to non-exempt status simply due to the salary base being proposed.

The Counseling & Recovery Services of Tulsa, Oklahoma, wrote me:

I am the executive human resource (HR) professional at Counseling & Recovery Services of Oklahoma, a nonprofit community mental health center, and am concerned about the impact that changes to the overtime regulations will have on my organization and employees. As a nonprofit, our

agency is clinical staffing heavy; thus, about 80% of our workforce . . . will be impacted. The costs to meet the proposed regulations are expected to be in the 100s of thousands [of dollars] and will have a devastating impact to the community mental health industry overall.

I received a note from a small business owner in Edmond, right in my hometown. They said:

The proposed changes will require us to make significant changes [in the way we do business]. If the proposed salary threshold moves forward, we will be forced to change all our employees to hourly, which will result in the elimination of our bonus program. Our salaried managers make a significant amount of their income based on performance bonuses. Calculating bonuses for employees that have potential overtime is extremely complicated, labor intensive and opens up a huge liability risk if miscalculations occur.

One of the universities in my State wrote me and said about this rule:

Essentially, it would turn millions of dollars of professional, salaried jobs into hourly positions overnight, resulting in limited flexibility for workers and increased costs for colleges, universities, other nonprofits and public-sector employers that operate on very tight budgets as we attempt to keep the cost of education as low as possible for constituents.

We do not disagree that overtime rules need to be updated to ensure the law remains relevant for today's workforce. But we're deeply concerned about the unintended consequences of a massive increase in such a narrow implementation window which will impose serious hardships on our students, employees and institutions.

Last week, I met with leadership of the Department of Labor in a hearing. We discussed this exact issue. I talked about nonprofits and what a unique dynamic they really are. Nonprofits actually raise money based on their low administrative costs. They can tell donors: The money that you give will get directly to the individuals who need it most because our administrative overhead is low. This overtime regulation will increase their administrative overhead and will make it harder for them to raise money.

When I raised that issue to the Department of Labor, the officials of the Department of Labor told me: We understand that, so we met with the leadership of some of the nonprofit foundations around the country and told them that they should donate more to be able to cover the increased costs.

That has to be one of the most out-of-touch statements I have ever heard from someone in the Federal Government. In shock, my response was to say: Do you know how many hundreds of thousands of nonprofits are in the country? You met with a few foundations and told those foundations that they should donate more to be able to cover, when almost every church and almost every small nonprofit around the country that deals with mental health, that deals with domestic violence shelters are not tapping into big, massive foundations. They are individuals within communities that donate, and they anticipate their donations are going to help those of greatest need.

The people who work in those nonprofits are most often volunteers, but the very few numbers of individuals within the nonprofits who are paid salaries make a meager salary because they choose to—because they have a passion for the work of helping in domestic shelters or helping at a church or helping reach out to people who are in poverty or helping with a clothing shelter or a food pantry. Now you are forcing those organizations to dramatically increase salaries, which will dramatically decrease services to those in greatest need across our country.

I am astounded that the administration believes they can talk to a few people in a few foundations and just tell them: Donate more, and that will fix this. There aren't more donors to just donate more.

There are real needs in a lot of communities around the country. Small business owners that I have spoken to of late all tell me about the complexity of this. It is not just a matter of every employee. There is a tremendous number of exemptions as they work through the process. They want more time, and they don't like the cost increase. They don't like what this is doing to their relationships within their businesses, and they do not like telling salaried employees: I'm sorry, you're going to have to move to hourly.

All of this headache was created by an administration that knew all of this in advance. The letters that I read earlier—those letters that were written to me I presented to the Department of Labor a year ago. The Secretary of Labor assured me they would take those things into account. We have seen the final rule. I can assure you, they were not taken into account.

As tuition goes up in universities, this administration needs to stop complaining about the high cost of tuition in higher education because this overtime rule will directly increase the cost of tuition in every university in the country.

On the day the final rule was proposed, the first text message I received about it was from a university president who texted me and said: Don't blame me next year when tuition goes up. There is no way I can stop it now.

I responded back to him: Don't blame me for this overtime rule. This is not one we put in statute. This is one the administration created.

All of us want to see workers protected. All of us want to see things happen well in the United States. But the way this rule was implemented, the short period of time in the implementation, the size of the salary increase, and the few exemptions that are put into place have created an incredibly toxic effect for business across the country, whether it is a large business, medium business, small business, university, nonprofit—and I haven't even mentioned local government, which will be forced to raise taxes to be able to cover the cost of this. All of them

are dramatically affected, and all of them are affected in a short period of time.

This is why Senator COLLINS and I proposed a bill that lines up with what the House has already passed to say: Delay this 6 months. Most businesses are just trying to figure out what in the world they do with this and how they handle the implementation. Delay it for 6 months.

I would say there is a tremendous amount we have to deal with on top of just the delay, but at a minimum let's delay it. There is no reason it has to go into effect right now, and it directly harms our economy in the days ahead.

These are serious issues. I hope the administration will take them seriously and understand the effect on the coming economy. I am very well aware that this administration will be out of office when most of the economic effects will be felt. But the economic effects will most certainly be felt by this economy, and the long-term effects for those individuals graduating from college right now, trying to land their first job in management, will be even tougher based on this one rule. There is no reason to do that to the next generation of leaders. There is no reason to raise tuition in every college. There is no reason to do this rule right now. I would challenge it to be readdressed and, at a minimum, to be delayed for 6 months.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I join my colleagues to call for action to prevent the version of the overtime rule that the U.S. Department of Labor finalized this past May from going into effect on December 1. I want to commend Chairman ALEXANDER, Senator SCOTT, and Senator LANKFORD for their leadership in this area.

Federal regulations can impose unexpected and costly requirements on small businesses, educational institutions, and nonprofit organizations. The new U.S. Department of Labor rule on overtime pay is a prime example that could harm the very workers it intends to help, cause small businesses to curb hiring, and force universities and colleges to either raise tuition or cut programs.

The new rule will double the annual salary threshold from \$23,660 to \$47,476 for mandatory overtime, effective December 1.

While it is time for a reasonable update in the threshold, doubling the threshold overnight and with so little time for employers to prepare will have negative consequences. I have spoken with small businesses, educational institutions, and nonprofit organizations across Maine, and it is clear that this huge and sudden increase in the threshold is far too much and too fast. Rather than producing bigger paychecks, this new rule is likely to produce reduced hours, benefits, and flexibility for Maine workers.

Many small employers in Maine have told me that they do not have the margins to pay overtime to salaried em-

ployees earning up to \$47,476. Some will have to shift their employees to hourly positions. Formerly salaried employees used to flexibility in their work schedules will have to track closely each hour they work each week, instead of being able to leave work to pick up a child at school without worrying about the impact on their paycheck.

The new rule is also a problem for those seasonal businesses in Maine that make an effort to keep their employees on the payroll all year round. In the summer and fall, these employees often work for more than 40 hours a week, but in the winter and spring, they usually work far fewer than 40 hours a week. The current system allows them to have a constant, consistent year-round salary that they can count on. The new overtime rule would upend that and result in many workers being moved from salaried to hourly positions or even being let go during winter months. This will make it harder for workers to make ends meet and harder for employers to retain high-quality employees.

Although the regulation is touted as a means of boosting employees' pay, a study commissioned by the National Retail Federation found that most employees would see no change in net pay. Instead, many employees would see their hours reduced to avoid overtime, while others would see their base wages, benefits, or bonus pay decreased in order to offset the added payroll expense.

Moreover, the National Federation of Independent Business, a leading voice for small business, has noted that the new overtime rule would particularly hurt small businesses in rural areas. The Maine Department of Labor believes that the rule would have a disproportionate economic effect on Maine businesses, where salaries and the cost of living are not as high as in other regions of the country. For instance, the cost of living in Bangor is roughly 37 percent lower than in Washington, DC. While \$47,476 might seem like a reasonable threshold for an employee living in a high-cost area like Washington, DC, it is the equivalent of a salary of more than \$74,000 in Bangor.

Businesses are not alone in their concern. Nonprofit organizations are also struggling with the impact on their workers and those whom they serve. The executive director for Habitat for Humanity in greater Portland states that the "new overtime rules will so drastically change our current compensation obligations that we may no longer be able to give our workers the benefits, schedules and other incentives that drew them to us in the first place." And he notes that "services to those in need will be reduced and organizational funding will decline as resources are spent on overhead instead of programs."

Indeed, nonprofit organizations would be among the hardest hit by this rule. Cutbacks in essential services are predicted by the Salvation Army,

youth services providers, home health care services, and blood centers throughout the country.

In addition, higher-education groups nationwide are urging the Department of Labor to take a more measured approach. When the final rule was published last spring, Molly Corbett Broad, the president of the American Council on Education, noted that "requiring such a dramatic and costly change to be implemented so quickly will leave many colleges with no choice but to respond to this regulation with a combination of tuition increases, service reductions, and, possibly, layoffs."

She went on to note that those harmed by the new rule will include "a wide array of non-faculty employees—from athletics coaches and trainers to admissions recruiters and student affairs officers—whose work is not well suited to hourly wage status and who will face diminished workplace autonomy and fewer opportunities for flexible work arrangements and career development."

This is not a theoretical concern. The University of Maine system would face an estimated \$14 million increase in annual operating costs if it restructured employees' pay to maintain the exempt status of these workers. To avoid changes in its salary structure that could force tuition increases or threaten university services, Maine's University System is conducting an arduous and costly position realignment that could still result in an increase in annual labor costs.

The overtime threshold has not been increased in a number of years and should be raised, but doubling virtually overnight and with so little time for employers to prepare will be extremely costly and damaging to small businesses, universities, nonprofit organizations, and so many other segments of our Nation's economy and our society.

That is why I am a cosponsor of the resolution of disapproval of this rule introduced by Chairman ALEXANDER and Senator SCOTT's Protecting Workplace Advancement and Opportunity Act, which would ensure a balanced approach to updating Federal overtime rules by requiring that any new regulation on overtime consider the impact on small business and nonprofits, differences in geographical regions, and impacts on lower-wage industries, startups, and workers.

Today I am joining Chairman ALEXANDER in introducing legislation that would phase in a more reasonable increase to the overtime threshold over five years. I am also cosponsoring another bill introduced today by Senator LANKFORD that would delay the effective date of the new rule by 6 months, from December 1, 2016, to June 1, 2017, to allow more time for Congress to work on this issue.

The flurry of bills on this topic is indicative of just how much concern there is about the potential harm this rule could inflict on the very workers it intends to help, on small businesses,

on students, on nonprofits, and on countless others.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in rejecting this onerous and ill-advised rule.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 590—COMMEMORATING 100 YEARS OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES PROVIDED BY PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 590

Whereas on October 16, 1916, Margaret Sanger, her sister Ethel Byrne, and their activist friend Fania Mindell opened the first birth control health clinic in the United States in Brooklyn, New York, a groundbreaking and revolutionary act for women at that time;

Whereas their clinic was founded on the idea that women should have the information and care they need to live strong, healthy lives and fulfill their dreams;

Whereas Margaret Sanger in 1922 incorporated the American Birth Control League and in 1923 opened the first legal birth control center in the United States, the Birth Control Clinical Research Bureau, two organizations that would later merge to become Planned Parenthood Federation of America;

Whereas leading up to 1916, the two most common causes of death for women of childbearing age in the United States were tuberculosis and complications from pregnancy and childbirth;

Whereas over the past 100 years, gains in access to birth control, safe and legal abortion, and other reproductive health services have improved and transformed the lives of women, men, and young people in the United States and around the world;

Whereas for the past century, Planned Parenthood has helped lead massive changes in women's health and civil rights and has empowered millions of women, men, and young people worldwide to make informed health decisions, transforming the way they live, love, learn, and work;

Whereas Planned Parenthood has been at the forefront of fights for social change, including when the executive director of Planned Parenthood League of Connecticut challenged a law preventing the distribution of birth control, leading to the landmark 1964 Supreme Court ruling in *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 379 U.S. 926, which finally allowed married women across the country to have legal access to birth control;

Whereas Planned Parenthood health care providers and staff have played important roles in increasing access to safe and legal abortion, and have successfully advocated for measures that increase access to birth control, including the Affordable Care Act requirement that private insurance plans provide coverage for birth control with no out-of-pocket costs;

Whereas many leaders, including those in the domestic and global reproductive health,

rights, and justice communities, have worked alongside Planned Parenthood in accomplishing these achievements;

Whereas breakthroughs in women's health care, such as the legalization and expanded availability of birth control, have been named one of the biggest economic advancements for women in the past 100 years;

Whereas changes in women's access to reproductive health care have led to cultural shifts: in the United States, women are now nearly half the workforce, the sole or primary breadwinners in 40 percent of homes, and more than half of the college students;

Whereas from the single Brooklyn clinic in 1916, Planned Parenthood has grown to approximately 650 clinics across the United States, with partners in a dozen countries in Africa and Latin America;

Whereas today Planned Parenthood proudly provides high-quality, affordable health care, with 90 percent of services provided being preventive health care for women, men, and young people;

Whereas Planned Parenthood is the largest provider of sex education in the United States;

Whereas an estimated 1 in 5 women in the United States have been to a Planned Parenthood clinic for care at some point in their lives, and, for many people, a Planned Parenthood clinic may be the only place they can turn to for health care;

Whereas in a single year, Planned Parenthood clinics provide sexual and reproductive health care, education, information, and outreach to 2,500,000 women, men, and adolescents in the United States and almost 2,000,000 women, men, and young people globally through its global programs and partnerships, and over 72,000,000 people visit Planned Parenthood's website;

Whereas in the past 10 years, Planned Parenthood has nearly doubled services for male patients and expanded services for LGBTQ communities; and

Whereas Planned Parenthood's commitment to offer care and resources has grown over the past century and is stronger than ever as it enters into its second century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the wide-ranging preventive services that Planned Parenthood Federation of America doctors, nurses, and staff provide every day to patients across the United States;

(2) recognizes that Planned Parenthood is a safety-net provider that reaches medically underserved people who are critically in need of compassionate care;

(3) declares that Planned Parenthood should not be defunded, attacked, or discriminated against for their role as a vital women's health care provider across the country; and

(4) affirms that Planned Parenthood remains an essential thread in the fabric of society, and it will be key in the next century to assisting millions of women, men, and young people in accessing the health care they need and deserve, no matter who they are or where they live.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, Congress has just passed a funding measure that will prevent a shutdown at the end of this week. As headlines across the country noted as the debate over this bill played out, it was delayed partly due to partisan attacks against women's health and one provider in particular—Planned Parenthood—that were shoehorned into the debate once again.

Colleagues, this year Planned Parenthood turns 100 years old. You can-

not look at the last 100 years and deny that monumental progress has been made with respect to women's health and rights—thanks to strong allies like Planned Parenthood. But that progress is what some members of this body want to roll back.

When the first Planned Parenthood opened in 1916, it was illegal for women to get information about how to prevent a pregnancy. It is not surprising that at the time, one of the leading causes of death for women in the United States was complications from pregnancy and childbirth.

From the get-go, Planned Parenthood said that women in America have a fundamental right to information about their reproductive health and access to care. It was about the right of all women to a healthy life and the pursuit of happiness.

In 1965, Planned Parenthood Connecticut fought and won the Supreme Court decision that made birth control legal for married women.

In 2010, Planned Parenthood was at the front lines of the battle, along with a lot of us here in the Senate, to ensure that birth control would be covered under the Affordable Care Act.

Today, an estimated one in five women in America has been to a Planned Parenthood clinic for care at some point in her life. Eight out of ten Planned Parenthood patients live in or near poverty. As tough as it is for them to make ends meet, Planned Parenthood is a place they can turn to for important medical care from a provider they trust.

Planned Parenthood at 100 years old has racked up some impressive points on the scoreboard. Each year Planned Parenthood provides educational programs to 1.5 million people. Planned Parenthood has doubled the number of health services it provides to men and has led the way in expanding access to health care for LGBT Americans. It has more than 650 health centers across the country and served two and a half million women and men last year.

In my home State of Oregon, more than 70,000 Oregonians are served by 11 Planned Parenthood centers. I know firsthand from visiting with Planned Parenthood officials throughout Oregon in Portland, in Lane County, in central Oregon, how important these centers are to the health care of Oregonians.

Planned Parenthood is at the heart of the revolution in women's health care over the last 100 years. It is the first place millions of American women turn to for health care—women from Portland, OR, to Portland, ME.

Here are some of the services Planned Parenthood provides: birth control and counseling; pregnancy tests; prenatal services; HIV tests; safe, legal abortion services; breast cancer screenings; HPV vaccinations; cervical cancer screenings and prevention; ovarian cancer screenings; PAP tests;