

Maybe there are people in this Congress that want more regulations, not less, and they would like to write them into law and affirmatively vote them in.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that idea of sunseting all regulations—10 percent a year for 10 years incrementally—is coupled with the idea of sunseting any new regulation, also, at the end of 10 years and requiring an affirmative vote on any regulation before all new regulations of any kind.

Doing so then restrains the executive branch of government and makes the legislative branch of government responsible to the people.

Our regulators that are writing these rules will know that, if they write a rule that is egregious to the people, the people that have not been heard from the executive branch of government, when they go into the office of, say, the EPA and they press their case to Gina McCarthy, for example, and her people, they don't have a motive to listen because they are insulated from the accountability to the people.

If they knew that those same individuals that are aggrieved by the proposed regulation can come to visit their Member of Congress and press their demand on their Member of Congress, they have to know that that Member of Congress will come forward, come down here to the floor of the House of Representatives and offer an amendment to strike those regulations or amend those regulations so that it is acceptable to we, the people. That is a vision to restrain an overgrowth of the executive branch of government, Mr. Speaker.

I advocate that as one of the things to consider, but neither do I think that I have all the good ideas. There are 435 Members of the House of Representatives and 100 Members of the Senate. There are good ideas that come into every one of our offices from the 750,000 or so people that each of us represent.

With the ideas that come from the public, if we sort them in the fashion envisioned by our Founding Fathers, if we limit the overgrowth of the executive branch of government, we take the responsibility back to us, it will press on us, Mr. Speaker, the kind of changes that are good for the people in this Republic, that are good for the responsibilities of the Members of the House and of the Senate. We can take America, and we can take America onwards and upwards to the next level of our ascending destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence and your attention.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SAVE CHRISTIANS FROM GENOCIDE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to call my colleagues' at-

tention and the attention of the public to the legislation I have proposed.

The bill number is H.R. 4017. This act is the Save Christians from Genocide Act. I would ask my colleagues to consider cosponsoring this legislation. A number have already done so.

I would ask the public to make sure that they know that their Congressperson knows exactly what is going on with H.R. 4017 and that they would hope that their Member of Congress would also be a cosponsor of the bill.

By calling your Congressman's office, I am sure the Members of Congress will be very happy to hear your opinion. Many Members of this body need to know that their constituents support the Save Christians from Genocide Act, H.R. 4017.

What this legislation does is set a priority for immigration and refugee status for those Christians who are now under attack, targeted for genocide in Syria, Iran, Iraq, Libya, and Pakistan.

Genocide is taking place. Mass murder is happening. Christians have been targeted for slaughter and elimination by radical Islamic terrorists in the Middle East. We have to acknowledge that or millions—not just hundreds of thousands—of Christian brethren will die.

Another group, the Yazidis, have also been similarly targeted, and my bill covers those people as well, although they are not Christians.

The greatest threat to our country today is radical Islamic terrorism. So it should not be a difficult decision on the part of our President or the people or the public or this body to decide that we are going to do what we can to save Christians who have been targeted for slaughter by those very same forces who are now the greatest threat to our own security. However, what we have is not just a foot dragging, but a negative response from this administration.

Our President has been unable to defeat or even to turn back the onslaught of radical Islamic terrorism. Yes. I have to admit this President was dealt a pretty bad hand. Things were not good when he took over in the Middle East.

I think the mistake the United States made—it is clear that, when we sent our troops into Iraq, we did indeed break a stability that has caused us problems. It was a bad situation at that time when our President became President.

Well, this President has turned a bad situation into a catastrophe. We have almost lost—and with our President's policies, we would have lost—Egypt to radical Islamic terrorism.

Our President supported the Muslim Brotherhood leader of Egypt, a man named Mohamed Morsi, who was at that time President of Egypt during the early years of this administration.

President Obama went all the way to Egypt in order to give a speech, standing beside President Morsi to the Muslim people of that region.

What it was was basically an acceptance of the Muslim Brotherhood, which people now know is the philosophical godfather to all of the radical Islamic terrorist movements that now slaughter Christians and threaten the peace and stability of the world.

Our President encouraged them in the beginning, feeling, if we did, again, treat someone nicely, they will respect you.

What happened? Moderate regimes and, yes, regimes in the Middle East that were not democratic, were less than free, have been replaced with radical Islamists who mean to destroy the Middle East and turn it into a caliphate, radical Islamic terrorists who conduct terrorist raids into Western countries, radical Islamic terrorists who murder people in Turkey, in Russia, in San Bernardino.

This is what has happened since this President took over and reached out with the hand of friendship and understanding to those who would become the radical Islamic terrorists of that region and, I might say, a threat to the entire world, including the people of every city in the United States.

□ 1915

Had Egypt been left the way that the President wanted it to be, had we instead not supported the effort by the Egyptian people to rid themselves of Morsi and his government at the time when Morsi was trying to destroy their supreme court and their court system, at a time when Morsi was trying to establish a caliphate that is totally rejected by the Egyptian people, had our President been able to support General el-Sisi, perhaps the revolution could have happened peacefully. But, instead, Morsi was removed by General el-Sisi when he tried to betray the Egyptian people.

Today General el-Sisi now has been elected by a landslide in Egypt. And General el-Sisi—now President el-Sisi—has done everything he can to try to find a way to reconcile between Islam and the other faiths, of not only the region but the world.

President el-Sisi is the only leader, the only President of Egypt ever to go to a Coptic Christian church and help them celebrate Christmas. This was an incredible act on his part. He also went to the Muslim clerics and personally pleaded with the leadership of the Muslim faith in Egypt and in that part of the world, pleaded for a rejection of the radicalism and pleaded for a rejection of those people who would commit acts of violence on others and try to repress the freedom of religion of other people.

President el-Sisi begged and pleaded for the Egyptian clerics, the Muslim clerics to come out strongly for respect of other people's faiths, respect of freedom of religion and tolerance toward others. When have we ever had a leader like that? Our President resented him because he overthrew a man who was in the Muslim Brotherhood who was trying to lay the foundation for a caliphate of terrorists who would have

tried to attack the entire Western world.

So what did General el-Sisi get for being this courageous person? What did General el-Sisi get from us, from our President because he now basically saved Egypt, but not only Egypt—because had Egypt become a radical terrorist state—the entire Middle East would have fallen. It would have been totally out of control. And General el-Sisi stepped up.

What did he get from our President because of that? He got a feeling that our President really didn't like him. He got the feeling, not only the feeling, but he got rejection on those requests that he made for support from the United States, legitimate requests of how he could have weapons systems that would help him defeat the same radical Islamic terrorists that are murdering our own people and conducting murderous terrorist acts throughout the world.

At that time, I might add, they were also conducting mass murders of Christians and of other people of other faiths in the Middle East, burning people to death, taking people out and sawing their heads off and doing this in a very public way, capturing young women, raping them en masse because they are Christians or some other faith than Islam.

Yes, we needed to confront that at that time. But, instead, when General el-Sisi needed help, what did he get? I went to Egypt several years ago, and General el-Sisi pleaded: We have F-16s that we need to combat this threat. We need spare parts for our tanks. He pleaded with us: We need these things or we can't police the desert areas on both sides of Egypt where these radicals are beginning to try to establish some kind of an uprising and some kind of a conflict that is hard to get at. So they need helicopters, they need the spare parts for their tanks, and they need their F-16, airplanes as well.

So I came back and I put together, along with several of my other colleagues, the Egyptian Caucus. The Egyptian Caucus is nothing more than a group of probably 20 of us who are trying to do our best to see that the radical Islamists do not take over Egypt and that General el-Sisi is successful in reaching out to the moderate Muslims and trying to create goodwill between people of faith who are people of goodwill and should be working together and rejecting the radical terrorists that now threaten the whole world and threaten the region.

So we are trying to help el-Sisi. He is the point man. I came back a year later, and I talked to General el-Sisi. Well, did you get your spare parts? Well, did you get the F-16s yet? No. Did you get spare parts for the tanks you mentioned? No. Well, did you get those Apache helicopters? He said: Yeah, we got the Apache helicopters, but the defensive systems needed to send Apache helicopters into a combat zone were not included, so we can't use them.

Now, what I just described to you is not something that just happened by bureaucratic happenstance or somebody forgot to send the paperwork out. This was the policy of the Obama administration. I have worked in the White House and seen how these games are played. They are looking at el-Sisi as an enemy, and they are trying to play games with him, making sure his helicopters didn't have the equipment needed to do their job, and that the F-16s didn't come and the spare parts didn't come.

Finally—after 2 years, I might add—I went back a year later, and finally they had arrived, after we had raised hell in this body and the American people had their say that people like el-Sisi and other moderate people, like Abdullah in Jordan and people like that who are moderate in their religious beliefs. They are moderate people, and they believe in giving people of other faiths respect and tolerance. These are the type of leaders we should be siding with.

I might add that General el-Sisi has worked with Israel. He has gone out of his way to make sure there isn't war between Israel and Egypt. What could be better than a man who is reaching out, asking for tolerance among all faiths, a man who reaches out to a country where they have been at war before and is trying to say: We will never be at war again, we will work together to build a better world. That is what he is doing. But that is what our President is trying to undermine.

Our President basically has been unable to use the words "radical Islamic terrorism." We keep saying that. That is why right after the Benghazi fiasco, that is why immediately when they started talking about: Oh, these weren't really terrorists who murdered our Ambassador, it was all caused by a movie that had been shown, and it just enraged these Muslim people and a demonstration got out of hand, and that is when they went in and murdered our Ambassador. Do you remember that?

I remember hearing it four or five times. The very first time that I heard it, I said: That is a lie. Everybody who knew what was going on, that is what struck them, our government was lying to us in order to protect what? And, I might add, our Secretary of State then, Hillary Clinton, when she was confronted with that lie—and finally by the time we confronted her with it, it was clearly a lie—she said: Well, what difference does it make whether it was a radical terrorist group or whether it was some people who were demonstrating against a movie? What difference does it make?

I will tell you what difference it makes. The difference it makes is that you are sending a message to radicals who murdered our Ambassador that they have gotten away with it, and we are going to wink and nod and let them get away with it. We are not going to challenge them. We are not going after

the terrorist murderers. We are not even giving them credit or making them accountable for it. We are going to blame it on somebody else so the American people won't get mad and insist that we do something against it.

So, yeah, that was what the administration was trying to tell us. This is the same administration, as I say, that can't get itself to help General el-Sisi, who has saved us from the horror story of having Egypt turned into a radical Islamic terrorist camp. And now we can't even tell the American people that their Ambassador has been murdered by radical Islamic terrorists.

In fact, those words, "radical Islamic terrorists" have not been uttered. I would challenge the President tonight, not including this in a list of long things, but just get up and say one sentence specifically about "I reject radical Islamic terrorism, and the radical Islamic terrorists of the world have to know that." We haven't heard that from him. We haven't heard that from him at all. Give me the quote.

By the way, I think he did use the phrase in passing saying Christian terrorists and radical Islamic terrorists and blah-blah. No, that is not it. Let's have a condemnation of radical Islamic terrorism. But, no, we haven't been able to do that.

That same President, then, at a time when the situation is spiraling out of control because these terrorists are flooding the Middle East and various countries—whether it is Syria, Iraq, and those parts—this area is becoming so unstable that if we do not do something to save the people there who are under attack in two ways, number one, those people who are there, like the Kurds, like the Sunnis in the Anbar Province who are anti-ISIL, like General el-Sisi and Abdullah of Jordan, we have to make sure we help them. That is the first thing we have to do.

But the second thing we have to do is make sure we do what is morally right when it comes to those people who have been targeted to be slaughtered. We are talking about a genocide that is existing. We know that the Christian communities have been targeted for extinction by a mass slaughter being conducted by radical Islamic terrorists. Those people who have been targeted deserve to come to the United States.

Number one, our government needs to help those who are fighting ISIL. Number two, our government needs to make sure that those people who are targeted for genocide can find safe haven here instead of bringing healthy, young Muslim men from that area and letting them come into the United States, letting them flood into Europe rather than those people, those Christians who are being targeted.

I went up to Munich and took a look at one of these refugee camps. We all have seen this, video after video of young, healthy Muslim men by the hundreds of thousands pouring in to Western Europe. We don't know how many of them are terrorists. But here

is the point. If those young men don't like radical Islam and this terrorism, they should be back in their home country fighting it.

If they do like radical Islam, they certainly shouldn't be permitted into the Western democracies. The same is true in the United States. We should not be permitting—and our President has been, I would say, not doing the job that we have been expecting him to do to protect our interests when it comes to the people who are flooding into our country, whether they are radical Islamic terrorists or whether they are just people coming in from the Middle East who we haven't checked out yet enough. And, of course, we have hundreds of thousands, and, yes, millions of people who have come here illegally—we don't even know who they are—who have swarmed across the border.

This President talks about amnesty, talks about giving children who have come here illegally free education and health care, the DREAM Act, et cetera. What do you think this does? This encourages hundreds of thousands or millions of people to come here.

The trouble is, when there is a flood, we don't know if in that group of hundreds of thousands and millions of people in the last few years, how many of them have been terrorists. Do you really believe that our enemies, that these people who slaughter innocent people, these people who are rampaging through the Middle East, raping thousands of young girls because they are Christians, you think that they would care about lying to come here and they would refrain from coming here because they would have to cross the border and break the law? We don't know how many of them are here, but they are here. It is the President of the United States who is at fault.

We should have had a system of coming into our country a long time ago that handled refugees and handled people with legitimate immigration status, and everyone that would come here from the Middle East should have been vetted that way.

I was briefed, along with my colleagues, on the vetting process. Top level people in this government admit that they have not been able to really verify the things that the people claim is their background.

I would suggest and I would insist, there is legislation here as well that is pending that I am a cosponsor of that insists on a lie detector test for everybody that comes here, at least from that region.

□ 1930

We could ask them five questions, like: Have you ever advocated violence for your religion? Do you believe in sharia law or the Constitution? That is all we have to do, just take an extra 5 minutes. We haven't even done that.

We have millions of people here. Maybe 10,000 of them have animosity toward us or are here to try to shoot

people like they did in San Bernardino, right in our own area. Innocent people were just slaughtered.

I went to Paris. These kids were in a dance club and these guys came in and just massacred them. They kept shooting at them for minutes at a time. They loaded their guns again.

This is what we are up against. It is evil. And this administration, this President can't use the words "radical Islamic terrorists."

Well, I ask my colleagues today to please join me in cosponsoring my legislation, H.R. 4017. It does this. At the very least, we can try to save those Christians in Yazidi cities that have been targeted for genocide.

And how we do it is this. You have a certain number of those on refugee status, a certain number on immigration status coming from these five countries that I mentioned in the Middle East. These are the areas where the Christians are the most under attack. What my bill simply says is that Christians and these Yazidis who have also been targeted for genocide are going to get priority. They deserve to be on the top of the list. They deserve priority long before these healthy, young Muslim men who want to come here. And then we will let them in. We will, of course, vet them, make sure we know who they are, and they will get the priority.

Now, the President made a statement—he didn't use the number of my bill, but he talked about it—and said: Well, we don't believe in that. That is discriminating because of religion. It is a religious test. We don't do religious tests in America.

Are you kidding? We cannot prioritize what we do to make sure that what we are doing is helping the person who is most in danger? Is a life-guard in some way showing disrespect in not helping those other people in the water by going out and saving someone who is drowning?

This isn't discrimination. This is a prioritization of the people who are under attack and will be slaughtered. This intellectualism will result in what, if we accept the President and this administration saying, "Oh, you can't prioritize for Christians?"

By the way, he doesn't seem to have any trouble prioritizing for anybody else, but it is very clear that he won't let us prioritize for Christians who are targeted for genocide. No, I reject that totally. It is not racism.

We had another incident like this in our history. In 1939, there was at least one boatload of Jews that made it to the United States. They prayed and pleaded with us to let them in. At that moment, Nazi Germany was in the process of picking up the Jews and putting them in concentration camps.

These people got away with their families and they came here. And what did we do? We turned them back. We turned them back for the same reason. Oh, if we let you in, it is a special favor to you. These people were targeted for

genocide, and we let them go back. Many of them died in these Nazi concentration camps. Let's not do that again.

I would ask my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring my bill, H.R. 4017, the Save Christians from Genocide Act. Join me and we will send a message to the world that, yes, we are still the same good-hearted people that we have always claimed to be but have not always met that standard.

Today we deserve to stand up and be the champion of the type of values that I am talking about. That is what our Founding Fathers had in mind. America was the refuge of the world. America was the shining city on the hill that inspired the whole world. But we weren't cowards. We weren't someone who undermined some person in his country who is fighting an evil force like General el-Sisi. No, our Founding Fathers made sure that those people who are struggling for a better world had our support.

By the way, let me just note that I worked on speeches for Ronald Reagan. I was Reagan's speechwriter for 7 years in the White House. I was actually researching one of his speeches, and I came across the fact that a man named Kossuth, from Hungary, came to the United States and was pleading for help for the Hungarian people who were then in an uprising against the Austro-Hungarian Empire and were fighting for their freedom. He was there in the Midwest giving speeches and trying to get the American people to support him. I read a couple of his speeches.

Then I noted that in Springfield, Illinois, right after his speech, the town liked him. He was a freedom fighter. But they passed a resolution at their meeting that said the United States is a noninterventionist power and we should not get involved overseas, something like that.

Kossuth was still in town. He read the newspaper account of it. And when the word got out that he was so in despair that the people of the United States would say such a thing and side with the oppressor through their inaction, when the people heard about this, they called a second meeting.

In the second meeting, they passed a resolution saying that while we don't want to send our military forces all over the world—which is still a good idea—we will support those people who are struggling for freedom throughout the world. We will open up our arsenals. We will give them what they need to defeat the forces of tyranny that oppress them. That second resolution, then, was passed and was signed by the people of Springfield, Illinois; and in the last phases, I might add, one of the people who signed that document was one A. Lincoln.

I will tell you this about that speech of Mr. Kossuth. That speech ended with:

And we do this and we make this commitment so that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this Earth.

Lincoln was there in that room when that speech was given, and he later united the people of the United States with that thought from that man, that freedom fighter overseas.

There are people who are struggling for their freedom. There are people who are struggling for their existence. We do not have to send American military boys to fight the fight that they should be fighting for themselves. But at the very least, we must give them the support they need to defeat the evil forces in the world that would slaughter them, slaughter their families, and come after us next.

That is what the war with radical Islam terrorism is all about. They are at war with us, and they mean to kill our families and they mean to push Western civilization out of the history books of the world in the future. They want it to be a radical Islamic world, and they will kill all of us to get it.

Now, that is not all of the Muslims. I agree with our President that we should not say all Muslims are this way. After all, General el-Sisi is a Muslim; Abdullah of Jordan is a Muslim.

The people that we need on our side to defeat radical Islam are the moderate Muslims of the world. I think at least 80 percent of the Muslims of the world are moderate and would want to be our friends. We need now to recognize that that segment of Islam is now a threat to our safety, our well-being.

This is an historic moment. We can either meet this challenge or we will lose. But the most important thing, no matter what we do, if our President doesn't want to send troops there, fine, but at least let us ensure that history will record that we saved those Christians who were targeted for the genocide of this evil force that was expanding in that part of the world. Shame on us if we do not.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 4017. I ask the people of the United States to let their Congressmen know that they expect them to support honorable and noble and moral stands like this. It is not discrimination. It is prioritizing towards those people who have been targeted for genocide. Nothing could be better for our soul than to help those who have been so targeted.

I ask that my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A Bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2306. An act to require the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to undertake re-mediation oversight of the West Lake Landfill located in Bridgeton, Missouri; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition, to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for a period to be subsequently determined

by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 515. An act to protect children and others from sexual abuse and exploitation, including sex trafficking and sex tourism, by providing advance notice of intended travel by registered sex offenders outside the United States to the government of the country of destination, requesting foreign governments to notify the United States when a known sex offender is seeking to enter the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4188. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2152. An act to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to encourage the efforts of countries in sub-Saharan Africa to develop an appropriate mix of power solutions, including renewable energy, for more broadly distributed electricity access in order to support poverty reduction, promote development outcomes, and drive economic growth, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 4, 2016, at 10 a.m.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

U.S. CONGRESS,
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,

Washington, DC, February 3, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 304(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act ("CAA"), 2 U.S.C. §1384(b)(3), requires that, with regard to substantive regulations under the CAA, after the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance ("Board") has published a general notice of proposed rulemaking as required by subsection (b)(1), and received comments as required by subsection (b)(2), "the Board shall adopt regulations and shall transmit notice of such action together with a copy of such regulations to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate for publication in the Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses are in session following such transmittal."

The Board has adopted the regulations in the Notice of Adoption of Substantive Regulations and Transmittal for Congressional Approval which accompany this transmittal letter. The Board requests that the accompanying Notice be published in the House version of the Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses are in session following receipt of this transmittal.

The Board has adopted the same regulations for the Senate, the House of Represent-

atives, and the other covered entities and facilities, and therefore recommends that the adopted regulations be approved by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

All inquiries regarding this notice should be addressed to Barbara J. Sapin, Executive Director of the Office of Compliance, Room LA-200, 110 2nd Street, SE, Washington, DC 20540; (202) 724-9250.

Sincerely,

BARBARA L. CAMENS,
Chair of the Board of Directors,
Office of Compliance.

FROM THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF REGULATIONS AND
SUBMISSION FOR APPROVAL

Regulations Extending Rights and Protections Under the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") Relating to Public Services and Accommodations, Notice of Adoption of Regulations and Submission for Approval as Required by 2 U.S.C. §1331, the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, as Amended ("CAA").

Summary:

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, PL 104-1 ("CAA"), was enacted into law on January 23, 1995. The CAA, as amended, applies the rights and protections of thirteen federal labor and employment statutes to covered employees and employing offices within the legislative branch of the federal government. Section 210 of the CAA provides that the rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodations established by Titles II and III (sections 201 through 230, 302, 303, and 309) of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §§12131-12150, 12182, 12183, and 12189 ("ADA") shall apply to legislative branch entities covered by the CAA. The above provisions of section 210 became effective on January 1, 1997. 2 U.S.C. §1331(h).

The Board of Directors, Office of Compliance, after considering comments to its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("NPRM") published on September 9, 2014 in the Congressional Record, has adopted, and is submitting for approval by the Congress, final regulations implementing section 210 of the CAA.

For further information contact: Executive Director, Office of Compliance, Room LA 200, John Adams Building, 110 Second Street SE, Washington, D.C. 20540-1999. Telephone: (202) 724-9250.

Supplementary Information:

Background and Summary

Section 210(b) of the CAA provides that the rights and protections against discrimination in the provision of public services and accommodations established by the provisions of Titles II and III (sections 201 through 230, 302, 303, and 309) of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §§12131-12150, 12182, 12183, and 12189 ("ADA") shall apply to specified legislative branch offices. 2 U.S.C. §1331(b). Title II of the ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of services, programs, or activities by any "public entity." Section 210(b)(2) of the CAA defines the term "public entity" for Title II purposes as any of the listed legislative branch offices that provide public services, programs, or activities. 2 U.S.C. §1331(b)(2). Title III of the ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability by public accommodations and requires places of public accommodation and commercial facilities to be designed, constructed, and altered in compliance with the accessibility standards.

Section 210(e) of the CAA requires the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance to issue regulations implementing Section 210. 2 U.S.C. §1331(e). Section 210(e) further states that such regulations "shall be