(A) the proposed funding for any Federal restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year, including any planned interagency or intra-agency transfer, for each of the Federal agencies that carry out restoration activities;

(B) to the extent that information is available, the estimated funding for any State restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year;

(C) all expenditures for Federal restoration activities from the preceding 2 fiscal years, the current fiscal year, and the succeeding fiscal year;

(D) all expenditures, to the extent that information is available, for State restoration activities during the equivalent time period described in subparagraph (C); and

(E) a section that identifies and evaluates, based on need and appropriateness, specific opportunities to consolidate similar programs and activities within the budget and recommendations to Congress for legislative action to streamline, consolidate, or eliminate similar programs and activities within the budget;

(2) a detailed accounting of all funds received and obligated by each Federal agency for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years, including the identification of funds that were transferred to a Chesapeake Bay State for restoration activities;

(3) to the extent that information is available, a detailed accounting from each State of all funds received and obligated from a Federal agency for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years; and

(4) a description of each of the proposed Federal and State restoration activities to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year (corresponding to those activities listed in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1)), including—

(A) the project description;

(B) the current status of the project;

(C) the Federal or State statutory or regulatory authority, program, or responsible agency;

(D) the authorization level for appropriations;

(E) the project timeline, including benchmarks;

(F) references to project documents;

(G) descriptions of risks and uncertainties of project implementation;

(H) a list of coordinating entities;

(I) a description of the funding history for the project;

(J) cost sharing; and

(K) alignment with the existing Chesapeake Bay Agreement, Chesapeake Executive Council goals and priorities, and Annual Action Plan required by section 205 of Executive Order 13508 (33 U.S.C. 1267 note; relating to Chesapeake Bay protection and restoration).

(b) MINIMUM FUNDING LEVELS.—In describing restoration activities in the report required under subsection (a), the Director shall only include—

(1) for the first 3 years that the report is required, descriptions of—

(A) Federal restoration activities that have funding amounts greater than or equal to $300,000; and

(B) State restoration activities that have funding amounts greater than or equal to $300,000; and

(2) for every year thereafter, descriptions of—

(A) Federal restoration activities that have funding amounts greater than or equal to $100,000; and

(B) State restoration activities that have funding amounts greater than or equal to $100,000.

(c) DEADLINE.—The Director shall submit to Congress the report required by subsection (a) not later than September 30 of each year.

(d) REPORT.—Copies of the report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations, Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations, Environment and Public Works, and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply beginning with the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR FOR THE CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be an Independent Evaluator for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, who shall review and report on—

(1) restoration activities; and

(2) any related topics that are suggested by the Chesapeake Executive Council.

(b) APPOINTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of submission of nominees by the Chesapeake Executive Council, the Independent Evaluator shall be appointed by the Administrator from among nominees submitted by the Chesapeake Executive Council with the consultation of the scientific community.

(2) NOMINATIONS.—The Chesapeake Executive Council may nominate for consideration as Independent Evaluator a science-based institution of higher education.

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator shall only select as Independent Evaluator a nominee that the Administrator determines demonstrates excellence in marine science, policy evaluation, or other studies relating to complex environmental restoration activities.

(c) REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of appointment and once every 2 years thereafter, the Independent Evaluator shall submit to Congress a report describing the findings and recommendations of reviews conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON NEW FUNDING.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act.

The bill (S. 1000), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The bill (H.R. 5069) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VITTER. Did that unanimous consent agreement cover both bills?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. VITTER. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT S. ADLER TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION—Continued

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time in any quorum calls be charged equally to both sides.

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

Mr. WARNER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TAX EXTENDERS

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I wish to spend a few minutes today to discuss the ongoing saga of the 2014 tax extenders package.

Getting this legislation passed through the Senate has been quite an ordeal from the outset. As my colleagues will recall, the Finance Committee reported its tax extenders package in April and a few weeks later progress stalled on the Senate floor when the Senate majority leadership refused to allow votes on any amendments.

After that time—which was in mid-May—the tax extenders sat somewhat in limbo, although both sides acknowledged the desire to get something passed during the lameduck session, if not before.

The Finance Committee extenders package, if my colleagues remember, extended 55 expired or expiring tax provisions for 2 years without making any of them permanent.

The House took a different approach which was to make certain important tax provisions, such as the R&D tax credit, for example, permanent, bringing more certainty to American businesses, families, and individuals.

Over the past several weeks, negotiations have been ongoing in the hopes of producing a bill that combined the Senate Finance Committee's package with the approach taken by the House.

I am generally hesitant to publicly comment about what happens behind closed doors in negotiations; but, on the other hand, much of what happened next has already been printed in the media. That being the case, I don't feel too awkward discussing the recent turn of events that has brought us to where we are now with the tax extenders.

Last week, before the Thanksgiving holiday, the Speaker's office and the Senate majority leader's office were very close to reaching a deal on a tax extenders package—one that would have included all of the provisions from the EXPIRE Act, which is the Senate Finance Committee-reported tax extenders bill, as well as a number of permanent tax extender provisions.

This emerging deal would have been a reasonable compromise between Republicans and Democrats and between the House and Senate approaches to this matter. It was not the legislation I would have written, but as a compromise taking place in a Congress that is, for the time being, still divided, it was likely the best both parties could hope for.

As I said, we were on the cusp of a deal last week, and then something strange happened. On Tuesday, the White House caught wind of the potential deal—even though the terms had not yet been finalized—and issued a veto threat. How often does that happen? How often does the President issue a veto threat on potential deals still under negotiation? How often do we find that extraordinary threat ratified by people who are involved in the negotiations? As I said, this was not a Republican wish list being negotiated. House Republicans were willing to make a number of tough concessions in order to get a deal across the finish line.

For example, the deal would have made permanent the American opportunity tax credit—a provision that first came into law in the Democrats' partisan 2009 stimulus bill and has been a high priority item for Democrats. It would have also made the State and local sales tax deduction—which is a high priority for a number of congressional Democrats—permanent. And it would have rolled over the tax extenders that expired during 2013—including many that most Republicans do not support—for another 2 years.

These were major concessions and, to its credit, the House was willing to make them in the interests of a bipartisan agreement.

More importantly, the deal was supported by the Senate majority leader who, the last time I checked, was a Democrat. Yet the deal wasn't good enough for the President and for the more liberal Members of the Senate, or should I say the Senate Democratic Caucus. Apparently they weren't willing to take yes for an answer. Instead of compromising even a little bit, President Obama issued his veto threat and has been rallying Democratic Senators against the proposed deal, or at least that is what I have been told. As a result, it appears unlikely that a deal on the tax extenders package will be reached in this Congress. Instead, the most likely scenario appears to be that the Congress will pass a 1-year referendum of tax extenders that have already expired.

Short of not passing anything at all, this is surely the worst of all possible worlds. Rather than the certainty that would come with making some of the more prominent individual tax extenders permanent, families, individuals, and businesses will have to once again put long-term plans on hold in hopes that Congress can get its act together the next time around.

This is bad news for middle-class families. This is bad news for individuals. This is bad news for job creators. And this is bad news for those of us hoping the government will improve the way it does business any time in the near future.

We all know the makeup of the next Congress will be different than it is now. I don't mean to be too presumptuous, but I think it is safe to say the President and his liberal allies are unlikely to get a better tax deal in the next Congress than the one the Senate Democratic leadership had been negotiating up until the last week. I commend the Senate Democratic leadership for its work on that matter. I commend the House leadership and congratulate them for doing the same thing.

Do any of my Democratic colleagues who came out against the proposed deal really think their prospects are likely to improve next year? I have to ask because, quite frankly, this recent turn of events is mind-boggling to me.

In the end, I think the only conclusion that makes sense is that this line of attack—the President's veto threat—and liberal opposition to the potential extenders deal is more about politics than about policy. It is about the President's strategy of following an electoral rebuke of his policies by tacking even further to the left. And it is about congressional Democrats' efforts to pander to their liberal base at the expense of good government.

I hope I am wrong about this, but as I said, there is not another logical explanation that I have heard. I hope the White House and its Senate allies will prove me wrong and come to the table with an offer that reflects a genuine compromise with the House.

I think the events of this past week have demonstrated divisions in the Democratic Party, and that those divisions are causing real problems. Once again, we had the Senate majority leader in the room and ready to make a deal, only to be undercut by the President and his liberal allies in the Senate. I find that very unfortunate. I commend the Democratic majority leader for trying.

Of course, at the end of the day, I suppose none of us should be surprised at what has happened. After all, President Obama is not particularly known for being business friendly or placing his focus on job creation, which is sorely needed in this country. Whether it is crippling environmental regulations—which we are now seeing come to the forefront in dramatic terms—or whether it is labor policy or health care, the President has demonstrated that he is all too willing to put his political ideology above the needs of our economy.

Make no mistake, the proposed tax extenders deal—the one the President scuttled with his veto threat—was all about job creation. It would have made the research and development tax credit, small business expensing, and other provisions permanent, giving certainty to the business community, paving the way for more investment, and paving the way for more jobs in our society.

The President's latest gambit on the tax extenders is just a series in a long line of instances where politics has trumped job creation. Still, as one who has been willing to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I can't help but be disappointed.

But make no mistake, things are about to change around here and we will have an opportunity to right this ship. I just hope we will have a lot of Democrats who are willing to help us. We need to focus on an agenda that will actually grow our economy. We need to focus on an agenda that will actually create jobs. And we need to focus on an agenda that will empower the American people. That is going to be the focus of this new Congress.

Once again, the President and his allies here in the Senate missed a big opportunity to address some of their party's priorities with the tax extenders legislation. It is difficult to imagine that they will have another bite at the same apple in the next Congress. Absent a deal, we are now left with only one option: a 1-year extension that will likely be passed by the House this week. Once again, a 1-year extension is not a great deal for families, individuals, and businesses, but it is far better than letting these provisions lapse entirely. Indeed, if we do nothing, we run into a series of problems, including a delayed filing season, which means millions of delayed refunds for Americans who count on them. In addition, doing nothing would essentially amount to a tax hike on millions of people and businesses.

Consequently, I plan to vote in favor of the 1-year extension, unless, of course, my colleagues on the other side finally come to their senses and allow a better deal to be had.

I don't understand this kind of leadership in this country. I don't understand why the President does some of these things. I don't understand why the left just can't take an offering to them that was much better than what we are going to get. The majority leader knew it.

Republicans have been tough on the majority leader. I have been here for years. I care for him. I think it is a tough group of people to manage, just as they are on our side as well. It is a tough job. Frankly, I think the deal he worked out should have been followed. It would have given the President much of what he wanted initially, anyway. It would have brought us together one more time, and it would have been a wonderful thing.

It would have made the end of the year—the work we are doing—much more satisfying and acceptable. It would have been a good prelude to next year of our working together—something that this body needs really badly.

I want to commend the distinguished majority leader, Senator REID, for the work he tried to do. I want to congratulate him. I want to congratulate the Speaker of the House for being willing to work on this.

I think it is unfortunate we are at this point in these negotiations, where we are going to have a 1-year extension. It is not going to be anywhere near where we had negotiated with the majority leader and had negotiated with the House. There are parts of the negotiated bill that I wish I could have changed. But, we had come a long way.

I want to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of our committee. I don't think he had much confidence at first that we would put our original extenders bill through the committee. At least he didn't express it to me.

I said: Let's do it, and we did. Even with the parts that I wish weren't in there and the parts he wished weren't in there, it was a classic bipartisan compromise by two sides who feel very, very deeply about all these issues—each and every one of them.

I think the work that Senator REID, the distinguished majority leader, and the Speaker had done was not only a step in the right direction but it would have been something most all of us would have been quite pleased with. I commend them for their work.

I am disappointed with where we are. I hope we can solve these problems in the future. I will be working as hard as I can to bring about bipartisan efforts in that regard.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EPA REGULATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Last Wednesday Americans all across the country were preparing for Thanksgiving. They were traveling. Many of them were going to visit friends and family and places around their communities, their State or the country.

What did the Obama administration do when it thought nobody was actually paying attention? It snuck out a huge new regulation that imposes job-crushing environmental restrictions.

Politico ran an article on it later that day. The headline was: ''The most expensive regulation ever. Obama rolls out a major EPA rule.''

Why would the President do that? Why would he put out a major rule from the Environmental Protection Agency, affecting millions of Americans, and do it right before a holiday?

If these regulations were such a good idea, we would think the administration—as the administration claims it is a good idea—would put it out in a way that people would be paying attention.

I want to know why the administration did this in a way to hide the regulations from the American people. President Obama didn't say a word about it that day. Instead, he pardoned a turkey. The turkey got a better deal than the American people did last week. They are the ones who are going to be paying for the President's expensive and destructive regulation.

Here is what is happening. The Environmental Protection Agency has proposed a new rule that would dramatically slash the limits of ground-level ozone. The rule runs 626 pages. Then we add on the appendix—over 500 additional pages.

Here is what the Wall Street Journal had to say about the new rule. They had an editorial on it Friday with this headline: ''Highway to the Danger Ozone.'' It says: ''Like so many other such rules, this one twists decades-old air pollution laws to restructure the U.S. energy industry and gradually ban fossil-fuel-fired power.''

We have fossil fuel-fired power gradually being banned as this administration tries to restructure the U.S. energy industry.

It says: ''Coal is the first target.'' The article also adds: ''But natural gas is next.''

The current limit on ozone is 75 parts per billion. The Environmental Protection Agency wants to cut that number down to as little as 70, 65, even 60 parts per billion.

The Agency estimates that the new rule could cost nearly $17 billion every year—$17 billion a year in costs. Most of the country would fail to meet Washington's tough new standards if they were in place today. As much as 95 percent of the country would be unable to comply with the new regulations if they go down to 60 parts per billion.

States, counties, and cities would have to curb their energy production and limit manufacturing. That will mean far less economic growth and fewer people working. It will raise the cost of everyday living, and it will destroy middle-class jobs. There is no question about it.

This rule will undermine energy reliability. It will stall manufacturing investment, and it will smother economic opportunity for middle-class families.

It costs too much, and there is very little benefit. It doesn't matter to the extreme environmentalist wing of the Democratic Party who support it.

The Obama administration is once again turning a deaf ear to Americans—the people who want Washington to focus on jobs. That is what we saw in the election earlier this month. The people of this country want the administration to focus on jobs.

The administration claims its tough new rule will lead to new health benefits. What about the health damage done to people who lose their jobs because of the rule?

In March 2012 the Committee on Environment and Public Works Subcommittee on Clear Air and Nuclear Safety issued a report titled ''Red Tape Making Americans Sick.'' It is a new report on the health impacts of high unemployment.

According to the testimony and scientific research that was reviewed by the subcommittee, unemployment caused by excessive regulation—such as the new ozone rule—increases the likelihood of hospital visits, illnesses, and premature deaths. That raises health care costs. It hurts the health of children and the well-being of families. The Obama administration doesn't want to hear it and certainly doesn't want to talk about it.

Bipartisan majorities in Congress have rejected the President's energy policies. Senate Democrats wouldn't even bring up his cap and trade plan for a vote in this body.

What does the President do? Does he learn the lesson that the American people don't want his enormously expensive, job-crushing policies?

Does he listen to the voters in the most recent elections—people who sent a clear message they weren't happy with the direction the country is headed? No, not President Obama—he goes ahead and does it anyway.

People are concerned about jobs. They are concerned about the economy. The President is focused, though, on making it tougher for the private sector to create jobs and tougher for the economy to grow. He purposely is going around the American people and their representatives in Congress and taking this drastic step on his own. Why? Because he knows even Democrats in Congress do not support him.

So what are the Democrats who control the Senate right now going to do about it? If history is any indication, they are not going to do anything. Democrats in Congress are going to just roll over and accept another destructive policy by President Obama. That is what they did with the health care law—a terrible law. Democrats in Congress pushed it through anyway because President Obama told them to do it. NANCY PELOSI was the Speaker of the House at the time. She said: First you have to pass the bill before you get to find out what is in it. Well, now even Democrats are admitting it was a bad idea as they are learning more and more what is in this bill for which they voted. The senior Senator from New York said the other day that the health care law ''wasn't the change we were hired to make.'' He said, with the economy in bad shape, it was a focus on ''the wrong problem.'' That is from a Senator who voted for the health care law. Well, today the Senator is right when he says it was a focus on the wrong problem.

With this new ozone regulation, the President is still focused on the wrong problem. He should still be looking for ways to grow America's economy, not ways to tie it up with more redtape.

President Obama has made the wrong choice time and time again, adding more regulations, more rules, more bureaucracy. He continues to push extreme policies he knows the American people reject. The President is using unelected and unaccountable czars to go around Congress and the public. His latest Executive action shows his Presidency is failing and floundering.

President Obama is not even waiting to try to work with a Republican Congress or when Republicans take the majority in January. He is acting on his own right now. Well, in January Republicans in Congress will listen to

Americans and focus on the priorities of the American people. We will hold the Obama administration accountable for its destructive overreach. We will listen to people who are struggling under Obama's redtape and suffering because of it. We will do everything possible to stop this legislation and help Americans have better job opportunities in the future.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IMMIGRATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about the President's Executive order on immigration. I have been listening to my colleagues, both here and on the other side of the Capitol, and I rise in amazement. It is almost incredulous that our Republican friends are against the President taking the same action Presidents Reagan and George H.W. Bush took to defer deportation to solve a critical problem that we all know exists in the country—a problem that impacts millions. When President Obama exercises the same Executive authority—the same—they are on the air, on television, on talk shows, on Twitter, fear-mongering, calling it illegal, calling it amnesty, a constitutional crisis. Where was all of that when Presidents Reagan and Bush did it?

They hold hearings in the House titled ''Open Border: The Impact of Presidential Amnesty on Border Security,'' which is a little ridiculous because we have more border security under this administration than we have had in the history of the United States. As a matter of fact, we spend more on border enforcement and immigration enforcement than we do in all of the other Federal law enforcement entities combined—combined.

The Republicans threaten to sue the government or even shut it down. The irony of that is laughable because a shutdown over conducting background checks and collecting taxes from undocumented immigrants would only cost current taxpayers billions of dollars.

Certainly it would cost them billions of dollars if it is anything like the last shutdown that Republicans forced. So double standard? Absolutely. It is the very definition of ''double standard.''

On immigration reform, our Republican friends—particularly on the other side of the Capitol—have become the poster children for double standards. On the one hand, they know the political ramifications of the demographic reality. On the other, they refuse to catch up with history and fix our broken immigration system. They are sailing against the headwinds of history, and now they want to prevent the President from pulling them to shore, saving them from their own immobility, their own inaction. They are also sailing against the headwinds of what the American people want. In poll after poll we have seen that the American people want to fix our broken immigration system, and that which the Senate passed—and I was honored to be one of the Group of 8 who put it together 1½ years ago—and passed with an overwhelming bipartisan vote, still has the highest rating among the American people. It has been sitting in the House of Representatives for the last 1½ years.

A new Gallup poll shows that the President's approval rating among all voters has not gone down since the Executive action announcement was made, as some predicted it would, but, rather, it has increased 5 percentage points among all voters since early November. In my view, any action—Executive or otherwise—is movement in the right direction and it is what America expects of its leaders.

Americans are expecting someone to act, someone to tackle the difficult issues, and immigration, particularly for our House colleagues, seems to be a very difficult issue they can't tackle. It is not difficult for me, and it is not really difficult for most Americans who believe in the power of common sense, not for those who believe in the need to secure our borders, to secure the country, to promote economic opportunity, and preserve our history as a nation of immigrants and that core value of family values.

I cannot recall anyone coming to this floor and praising inaction, praising the President for not having done enough on a matter of consequence, but that is exactly what our Republican colleagues are doing, once again standing squarely on the wrong side of history—in fact, on the wrong side of their own history—invoking the double standard and claiming what is right for their party's Presidents is wrong for this President. History, however, is a funny thing. You can choose to ignore it, but eventually it catches up with you, and it has finally caught up with my Republican colleagues.

I repeat what I have said all along: The antidote to Executive action is passing immigration reform. Let's be clear. Regardless of how big or how bold the President's announcement may be, a permanent legislative solution continues to be our ultimate objective. Administrative relief will not grant anyone legal status or citizenship, but it will clear the way for many to come out of the shadows, register with the government, pass a criminal background check, get a work permit, and pay taxes as the rest of us do.

Because of the President's Executive action, the nature of who is eligible is really people who have U.S. citizen families here. It will prevent needless deportations and give a chance at a better life to those who want nothing more than to keep their families together. We are talking about millions of hard-working people who—right now many are exploited, creating downward pressure on the salaries and wages of all Americans by virtue of that exploitation. We have an opportunity to change that. I would rather know who is here to pursue the American dream versus who is here to do us harm, but I can't know that unless I get people to come forward and go through a criminal background check.

If our Republican colleagues are so concerned about getting immigration policy right, if they are so concerned about the President overstepping his authority, which is the same authority Republican Presidents have used, they can exert their own authority and push our bipartisan bill over the finish line with one vote—one vote in the House of Representatives.

The President himself has said he acted because there is a cost to waiting—a cost measured in the thousands of parents of U.S. citizen children who are deported, husband and wives who are separated from their U.S. citizen spouses, and the economic consequences.

I know there are some who suggest: Let's wait until the next Congress. Let's wait and see. Give them a little time. If not, we will act.

This is the same Republican Party—particularly in the House of Representatives—that blocked immigration reform in 2006, 2007, 2010, 2013, and 2014 despite a strong bipartisan bill here. So if they wish, they can join us at the negotiating table with their own proposals and their own solutions because doing nothing and maintaining the status quo is no longer an option. That is precisely why they didn't want the President to follow through on what he told them. He waited on Executive action. He gave them advance notice. He said: I want you to act, but if you don't act, eventually I will have to act.

Now let's look at what my Republican friends find so objectionable. To put it simply, the administration is creating a new deferred action for parental accountability, a program that provides deferred action on a case-by-case basis to undocumented parents of U.S. citizens or lawful permanent residents—those who were present in the United States on November 20 of this year, those who have continuously lived in the United States for 5 years, since January 2010, and are not an enforcement priority—and also is expanding the program that already exists for DREAMers by expanding the age content.

This isn't amnesty because amnesty means you did something wrong and you are forgiven and get whatever you want. Amnesty means you get something for nothing. First of all, these people have no pathway to becoming a permanent resident or citizen under the President's Executive order. Secondly, their only opportunity is not to be deported, assuming they can pass a background check and pay their taxes.

As a result of the President's order, more people will go to the southern border to protect it, more people will pay taxes who may not be paying them now, more families will stay reunited, and more people who are in the shadows will come forward and go through a criminal background check. I would like to know who those people are, and I would like to make sure they don't have a criminal background. More criminals and felons will be deported because now it will be a priority to deport those individuals. What is wrong with that set of circumstances?

So this is temporary relief as the Congress hopefully comes together on a more permanent basis.

In my State of New Jersey, approximately 137,000 parents of U.S. citizens and legal permanent residents will benefit from the new action. About 67,000 will benefit from the new program on children. That is an estimated 204,000 people in New Jersey who can come out of the shadows and contribute to the community and the economy. These are moms and dads, good people, hardworking people who can register with the government, pass a background check, get a work permit, pay taxes, take care of their families, and no longer fear deportation.

The fact is, because of the President's Executive action, more felons will be deported, more resources will go to our border, more families will stay together, and more people will pay taxes. These are all good things.

The Council of Economic Advisers has found that over the next decade the range of Executive actions announced by the President will increase our gross domestic product by up to 0.9 percent, it will reduce the Federal deficit by $25 billion through increased economic growth, and it will raise the average wages for U.S. workers by 0.3 percent.

The Executive action the President has taken and the Republicans have criticized will increase the productivity of our workforce. How? By allowing those—from undocumented immigrants to spouses of highly skilled H–1B visa holders—to be part of the formal economy and match the skills they have with the skills needed by entrepreneurial startups that they often create.

By the way, that is a fraction of the economic benefits of what we did here on a bipartisan basis that has been sitting in the House of Representatives for the last 1½ years. The Senate bill we passed, according to the Congressional Budget Office—the nonpartisan scoring division of everything we do here—will increase the gross domestic product of the United States by over 3 percent in 2023—less than 9 years—and 5.4 percent in 2033, which is an increase of roughly $700 billion in 2023 and $1.4 trillion in 2033. It will reduce the Federal deficit by $197 billion over the next decade and another $700 billion between 2024 and 2033. That is almost $1 trillion in deficit spending which can be lifted from the backs of the next generation of Americans by giving 11 million people a pathway to citizenship. What do we ever do that we pass that grows the economy, reduces the deficit, and creates more jobs for all Americans? Very little. The immigration bill which the Senate passed and which has been pending in the House does all of that in addition to securing our border.

So let's be clear. The President's Executive actions are only temporary steps. Only Congress can finish the job. Deferred action is an act of prosecutorial discretion, but it is not a path to citizenship or a permanent solution. The fact is that we have waited and waited. In the absence of any Republican action in the House on immigration reform, the President has used the power he has available, which other Presidents have used as well. If the Republicans are concerned about an Executive action, they should use their own power to pass immigration reform—either the Senate bill or their own vision of what comprehensive reform is.

For those who question the legality of this, I would simply say there are three letters—one before the Executive action and two after—from law professors and former general counsels of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and chief counsels of USCIS. They say the President has the authority. He is on sound legal footing.

So we are tired of waiting for Republicans to say yes to something—yes to taking action that is in the interest of millions in this country who expect leadership, expect action, expect progress, expect cooperation, not confrontation and obstruction. Millions of families are tired of waiting. The Nation is tired of waiting for Republicans to catch up with history—in this case, with the lessons of their own history.

Let's invite our Republican friends to invoke the memory of Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush and for once commend this President for following their lead in this, doing what is right by the Nation and doing what is right by our taxpayers, doing what is right for our security and doing what is right by our families.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote originally scheduled for today at 4 p.m. be delayed until 4:10 p.m., and that notwithstanding rule XXII, following the vote on cloture on Calendar No. 1069, Burrows, the Senate proceed to vote on cloture on Calendar No. 1067, Lopez; further, that if cloture is invoked on either of these nominations, that at 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning, Wednesday, December 3, 2014, all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order upon which cloture was invoked; further, that following these votes, the Senate proceed to vote on cloture on the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 1036, Hale; 1037, Kearney; and 1038, Pappert; further, if cloture is invoked on any of these nominations, that at 3 p.m. tomorrow, all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order upon which cloture was invoked; further, that there be 2 minutes for debate prior to each vote and all rollcall votes after the first vote in the sequence be 10 minutes in length; further, with respect to the nominations in this agreement, that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF NANI A. COLORETTI TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Coloretti nomination.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to express my support for the consideration of the nomination of Nani Coloretti to be the Deputy Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD.

Ms. Coloretti has a distinguished history of public service; she currently is the Assistant Secretary for Management at the U.S. Department of Treasury, a position she has served in since 2012. Prior to joining the U.S. Treasury, Ms. Coloretti assisted setting up operations at the newly created Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, serving as the Acting Chief Operating Officer. Additionally, from 1999 to 2005, Ms. Coloretti served as director of policy, planning and budget for the San Francisco Department of Children, Youth, and their Families, as well as budget director to San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom, where she managed the implementation of San Francisco's $6.2 billion annual budget.

Ms. Coloretti received a B.A. in economics and communications from the