



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

No. 32

## Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 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.

We acknowledge today, O Lord, Your power, mercy, and grace. We need Your power, for the challenges we face require more than human wisdom and strength. We need Your mercy, for we transgress Your law and fall short of Your glory. We need Your grace, for we cannot offer anything to merit Your favor or gain Your love.

Empower our Senators for today's journey. Lord, give them confidence to draw near to You, that they may find grace to help them in this time of need. In an unstable world, where freedom lovers are challenged to live courageously, guide our lawmakers to be models of courage. May they send the right signals to an unstable and dangerous world.

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 MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.R. 240.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 5, H.R. 240, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday President Obama took the extreme step of vetoing good American jobs. He sided with partisan extremists and powerful special interests over the middle class.

It says a lot about the priorities of this administration. But if the White House thinks this is the end of the new Congress's push for American jobs, it is wrong. I will soon have more to say about this and what the Senate plans to do.

For the moment, the Senate is focused on overcoming another extreme idea: the Democrats' Homeland Security filibuster to defend Executive overreach.

Many Senate Democrats led their constituents to believe they would do something about the kind of Executive overreach President Obama referred to as "unwise and unfair" and ignoring the law. Those are the words of the President of the United States. We have since heard excuses from Democrats to cover for their refusal to do so. But the time for excuses has now passed. Democrats will soon have another chance to prove they were serious.

Later this week, the Senate will consider a bill from the senior Senator from Maine that is about as reasonable as you can get. Obviously, President Obama was right to refer to the kind of overreach he took in November as ignoring the law. Senator COLLINS' sensible bill focuses simply on preventing the most egregious example of Executive overreach from taking effect. It is as simple as that.

The Collins bill is not tied to funding of DHS, either. So there are no excuses

left. Democrats should join us in voting for this commonsense legislation.

In the meantime, we have offered Democrats a chance to prove they were serious about something else, and that is funding the Department of Homeland Security.

It is really something to watch Democrats vote and block funding for this Department one day and then hold a hypocritical press conference the next. Democrats need to end their weeks-long filibuster of Homeland Security funding and end it right now.

We have continually offered them sensible opportunities to do so. Yesterday, we offered them yet another. But it will require their cooperation to achieve.

The dual-pronged approach I have outlined—allowing the Senate to stop unwise and unfair overreach on the one hand and to fund DHS through the fiscal year on the other—is a sensible way forward, but it can't be achieved without cross-partisan cooperation.

The onus continues to be on the Democratic Party to keep the Department of Homeland Security funded. Democrats can fund DHS now—not by holding more hypocritical press conferences but by ending their senseless filibuster and cooperating across the aisle.

That is what Americans expect. That is what Democrats can finally work together with us on to get done now.

### 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 for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1085

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we are in morning business with permission to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

#### WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, when I reran for the Senate in 2010, there were two major issues that dominated the campaign and that continue to dominate the discussion and debate in the Senate postelection. One was the Affordable Care Act, now called ObamaCare, which was pushed through without any bipartisan support. There was a lot of concern among the American people about the impact this would have on their lives. That was an issue of intense discussion and debate during that campaign.

The second was the plunge into debt at a level Americans had never seen before in the history of the country. It took nearly 200 years, from the beginning of our Nation until 1981, to reach the \$1 trillion debt mark. That is a lot of governing. That is a lot of growth of America. But we were essentially on a path—including expenditures for war and so forth—that didn't take us deeply into debt relative to our gross domestic product.

All of a sudden, in 2010, there was the revelation that debt held by the public was rapidly nearing the \$10 trillion mark—a tenfold increase in less than 30 years. It took 190 plus years to get to the first \$1 trillion and only 30 years to add ten times that amount. That was a hot topic of debate during the 2010 election. During that election, the American people came out in significant numbers and said: Get to Washington and do something about this.

In the background, a debt clock was ticking away, and not only on my website but clocks around the country at different times, and people were astonished at how fast those numbers were churning.

That led to a pretty intense effort on the part of both parties and on the part of many organizations. I can remember Simpson-Bowles—a former Chief of Staff of President Bill Clinton along with a former distinguished Senator from Wyoming, a Republican and a Democrat together—Simpson-Bowles. The public was getting behind this—a \$4 trillion, over 10 year fix to the problem. It was pretty dramatic, yet there was a lot of momentum for it. That was shot down, unfortunately, by the President when it was presented.

Following that, we had the Gang of 6, a bipartisan effort, and the Joint Committee on Deficit Reduction—the group of 12, 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans working diligently to try to put something together, along with outside organizations, to fix the debt. There were any number of these—the Domenici Rivlin task force—proposals that were worked on together in a bipartisan

way, realizing that as the debt was continuing to accumulate it was going to have major negative consequences to the future of our children and grandchildren and perhaps even our own generation.

We stand here today, having gone through all that—the Vitter committee, which I was a part of; eight of us agreeing with the President, with no staff and no press, closed room, months and months and months of negotiation—only once again to come up short. Ultimately, we sacrificed so many things we thought we needed to do just to get something going. But once again it was shot down in the end by a President who really wasn't willing to accept even the provisions he had proposed in his budget proposal that was publicly proposed. We took those and said: Can we at least do these, Mr. President? You have announced this is your initiative. But it was a no go.

Well, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I then tried to work with various agencies. They all had to come before us to make their requests known for the coming year. I asked them: Do you have a plan B in place? What do you mean plan B? What is plan B all about?

Plan B is the fact that mandatory spending is running away with our budget and the available amount of money for your discretionary spending is shrinking every year. So what is your plan B in terms of having less money available, whether it is for health care, for education, for building roads? All of the discretionary issues that fall under the discretionary spending that we are in control of, we no longer have control of. That is shrinking and you are going to have to do more with less. And I asked that they provide a plan B before they could get my clearance in terms of supporting their requests.

They never came forward. No, we have to stay with what the President's budget is and so forth. So here we are now, over \$8 trillion more than where we were in 2010, and an \$18 trillion-plus deficit.

Everyone knows this is unsustainable. Everyone in America knows we are careening toward insolvency, with an inability to cover even some of the most basic functions of government.

I talk to agencies about a policy of triage. I suggested they separate out what they absolutely essentially have to do and we will fund it. Then part B is what they would like to do if they had the money to do it. Part C is their asking: Why are we doing that in the first place or that program is long past its need, its existence or it hasn't worked. Let's start there, with part C, and let's get rid of excess spending that has no real function going forward or it is duplication or fraud or waste or whatever.

That leads me now to this poster. I have kind of gone from acting like the

President's Chief of Staff to the co-chair of the "go big guy" in terms of what we need to do. We can't go there, but maybe we can go a little. And we are all the way down now to what I call "waste of the week."

Let us at least identify those things that the Government Accountability Office and the Congressional Budget Office have identified as those things we know don't work, that we know are a waste, that we know are duplication, and let's see if we can get at least some start in terms of dealing with this debt.

Senator Coburn took the lead on that in the last several sessions of Congress. We are going to miss him because no one can do it better than he did in pointing out and really embarrassing a lot of us in asking: Why are we funding that? I am not trying to take his place. But I did, with my staff, come up with the idea to at least let our colleagues know—those who say we can't cut a penny more, we have cut too much—that, yes, we can cut more. We can at least do something to address this debt or have money to offset a needed funding program.

So we are going to inaugurate "waste of the week" today. In its debut, I will go back to something I tried to amend when we were addressing the unemployment insurance issue. Ultimately, I was not able to offer the amendment thanks to the majority leader's filling of the tree and not allowing any amendments. I made a big stink about it. I didn't understand why we could not at least take that up.

So waste of the week this week is the cost to the taxpayer for those in the safety net receiving Social Security Disability Insurance or unemployment insurance and getting checks from both agencies.

Now, if you can prove to the appropriate government agency that you can't work, you can be eligible if you go through the process for Social Security Disability Insurance. But if you go to the Social Security Disability Insurance agency and make your claim, you can't then go to the unemployment insurance agency and say you can't work, that you can't find work, that you are able to work but that you need to get that check from that agency. What has been documented now is the fact that there are very significant numbers of people who are gaming this issue and receiving checks from both agencies.

Either you can work or you can't work. You are eligible for one safety net program or the other, but not both. That totals \$5.7 billion of duplication.

My amendment that I had offered under the unemployment insurance extension in the last Congress was simply to say you can't do both, and we are going to put procedures in place so we can find out who is doing both.

One would think this would be pretty simple, even in the paper age, but we are in the digital age. I don't understand why the people administering