

people of other States and not his own State. Why would I, as a Senator from Michigan, push so hard for these tax credits in the Affordable Care Act that my own constituents wouldn't qualify for but people in other States would? That makes no sense whatsoever. The legislative intent here is crystal clear.

So we have this bizarre situation where colleagues across the aisle are asking the Court to strike down the tax cuts and raise taxes on millions of their own constituents.

My belief on this issue is the same as it was 5 years ago when I pushed the tax credits through the Finance Committee: The right to get those tax credits has nothing to do with where you live in the United States of America; it has to do with whether you need health care for yourself and your children. If you are an American, then you deserve the opportunity to receive these tax cuts that will make health care affordable for you and your family. Whether you get your plan through a State exchange or through the Federal Government, it doesn't matter. That was intent of the law when we wrote it; that is how the law has worked since the marketplace opened; and that is how it should continue into the future.

Finally, I want to make it absolutely clear that the bill authored by the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON, is not a repeal-and-replace plan; it is a Trojan horse that would completely destroy the health care law that is currently providing medical care for over 16 million Americans in our country. Experts tell us it would lead to a death spiral, where rates would go up so high that only sick people would be willing to pay the premiums, making insurance completely unaffordable for American families. It would let your State decide what health benefits are essential to your family, meaning a family in Iowa could have completely different protections from someone living a few miles away in Minnesota. It puts an expiration date on the tax credits that make health coverage affordable. Conveniently enough, though, it extends the tax cuts until after the 2016 election. And there is the real danger that when the guarantee of these tax cuts expires in September 2017, they will not be renewed. By putting that expiration date after the election, it is clear that this bill's first priority isn't finding a way to make health care affordable; its priority is delaying a massive tax increase until after the election. The priority is to win an election first and dismantle affordable health care coverage second.

My hope and, frankly, my prayer is that the Court recognizes what I know to be true: that the language of this law is consistent with the original intent, which is clear from the very first words of the law, title I, page 1. Here is what it says: "Quality, Affordable Health Care for All Americans"—not Americans in some States and not others, all Americans.

It is my deep hope that the Court ruling will allow us to lock in affordable

health care coverage for good. Then we can move on and spend our time more productively, focusing on how to make a good law even better for families, communities, businesses, and providers. I hope that will be the opportunity we will have.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Wyoming.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF DOUGLAS J. KRAMER TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 145, and that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that following the disposition of the nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Douglas J. Kramer, of Kansas, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Douglas J. Kramer, of Kansas, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session. The Senator from Wyoming.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I rise today to speak about the growing burden of Federal regulations and the need to rein in the creation of new rules and the expansion of existing rules. The regulatory burden in 2014 is reported to be nearly \$2 trillion, and the Federal Register last year came out to nearly 78,000 pages of new rules and regulations. This chart shows that 78,000 pages of regulations is all too common, especially for this administration,

where regulatory overreach has become normal, and the size of the Federal Register has topped 80,000 pages for 4 out of the 6 years of the President's time in office. With this administration, we are seeing a high-water mark of regulations that are drowning American families and businesses.

The flood of regulations has been getting bigger every year for the past 2½ decades under administrations from both parties. We can't afford to keep piling on these rules. The economic burden of Federal regulations is clear. One study estimated that the regulatory burden in the United States cost more than \$1.8 trillion in 2014 and was bigger than the GDP of India.

My second chart puts this in perspective: Only the 10 largest economies are bigger than the U.S. regulatory burden all by itself.

This burden is real. Some studies have estimated the regulatory drag on economic growth in the United States to be as high as 2 percent per year over the last 6½ decades. An annual report from the Competitive Enterprise Institute also noted that in 2014 regulations cost the average household nearly \$15,000. A study by the Small Business Administration found that regulations increase costs by more than \$10,000 per employee.

The fact that we cannot afford this burden is just as clear. Economic growth in the first quarter shrank by seven-tenths of 1 percent. If we get a growth of 1 percent, it increases the revenue, without raising taxes, to the United States by \$300 billion. That is according to the Congressional Budget Office. According to the President's budget person, it would increase it by \$400 billion. Imagine what a seventh-tenths loss costs us.

Complex regulations are costly and time-consuming, especially for small businesses. Small business owners and their employees have to take on dozens of different responsibilities to make their business work. They have to be compliance experts now, and that takes time and resources away that they need to put toward growing their business and succeeding. I have spoken to many businesses in Wyoming that have stopped measuring their permitting applications in pages because it is easier to measure them in feet.

Businesses are struggling in this regulatory environment because they can't make long-term plans for investments. They don't know what new regulation might come out next month that will change their entire business model. And the problem with complex permitting and regulatory requirements is not just the cost that existing businesses have to bear; it also comes as a cost in businesses that don't even get started because the Federal Government has placed a mountain of paperwork between their idea and success.

The rush of regulations by this administration is clear. President Obama's administration has issued