

their visas. Some crossed the border illegally. Others were brought here by their parents when they were only children. I recited 2 days ago one example in Las Vegas: a 7-month-old when she came here, carried on her father's shoulders.

But regardless of how they got here or why they lack the proper documents, these 11 million people play a crucial role in our economy and a vital role in our communities.

That was proven last night at 5 o'clock when the Congressional Budget Office—this nonpartisan arm we look to for direction of what things cost and do not cost here on Capitol Hill with our legislation—issued a statement yesterday that this bill that is on the floor today certainly is good for the economy. As I will say a couple times during my brief remarks here, it is going to, over the next two decades—what is left in this one and the next decade—reduce the deficit in America by almost \$1 trillion.

Of course, as we have said here previously to getting the report from CBO, this legislation is good for the economy and good for security. That is a good package.

These 11 million people need a pathway to get right with the law. The commonsense, bipartisan reform proposal before the Senate will help them do just that. It will reduce illegal immigration by strengthening our borders, it will fix our broken legal immigration system, and it will crack down on unscrupulous employers who provide an incentive to come here illegally and take, in many instances, tremendous advantage of these people who are desperate.

This measure that is now on the Senate floor provides a route to earned citizenship—earned citizenship—for 11 million people who are already here. Some have been here for a long time. The process for them is not easy. They do not go to the front of the line. They go to the back of the line. But they at least are in the line. They will have to work, pay taxes, stay out of trouble, and work on English.

This legislation will also recognize that the alternative to earned citizenship; that is, deporting 11 million people, is simply not sensible. We do not have the money. We cannot do it fiscally and we cannot do it physically, and that is for sure.

Detaining and deporting every unauthorized immigrant would cost more each year than the entire budget for the Department of Homeland Security. And not only is mass deportation impractical—not to mention cruel—it is the wrong approach for our economy—again, a trillion-dollar reduction in our deficit if we pass this bill, which we will here in the Senate.

Immigration reform that includes a roadmap to citizenship will boost our national economy. I repeat, and increase our security.

Helping 8 million immigrants who are already working—of the 11 million

who are here, they are working, some, as we heard from Roxanna, in jobs that are not that great, but they are working. As she says, they are already working. They need to get right with the law. And it will mean billions of new revenue for our country. It will mean every U.S. resident pays his or her fair share.

That is one reason an overwhelming majority of Americans support the legislation that is on the floor—not 51 to 49—an overwhelming number of Americans, Democrats, Independents, and Republicans.

But immigration reform is not just an economic issue. It is a moral issue. This bipartisan proposal will allow immigrants to stay with those they love, with their U.S. citizen children in many instances, siblings and spouses. It will allow Genaro to stay with his American wife.

This is Roxanna's final plea to me in this letter that she wrote:

I pray that you would open your hearts to the millions like me. . . . All we ask is a chance [at] a pathway to citizenship and the peace of mind to live our lives as meaningful citizens of this great country.

Her country, my country, our country.

I urge all my Senators on this side of the aisle, as we say, and the Republican Senators to keep her wish, her prayer—a prayer and a wish she shares with 11 million human beings who are here in America today. This prayer, this wish, should be in all of our minds and in our hearts the next few days.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

OBAMACARE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, last year President Obama was asked about the lessons he has learned from his first term. Instead of focusing on errors in judgment or policy, he seemed to indicate that he needed to do a better job—just a better job—of telling “a story to the American people.” In other words, the policy was just fine, and if Americans did not get it, it was because they had a listening problem. Well, that is an attitude that has come to define this administration.

I would say that is why folks will be rallying on the Capitol grounds today. They, like a growing number of Americans, are losing faith in government. They think it is working against them, not for them. And for good reason.

Let's take ObamaCare. This law has been pretty unpopular for several years now. It is not as though the American people have not been exposed—probably overexposed—to the arguments on both sides of the issue. ObamaCare must have been discussed hundreds of thousands—maybe even millions—of times over the past few years. That in-

cludes political debates, more speeches than any of us care to count, issue ads both pro and con, and—guess what—Americans still do not like the idea of ObamaCare, not because they are unable to understand or because they have not “seen the right messenger.” It is because most of them like their health care plan and want to keep it. It is because they do not want to pay more to the health insurance companies. And it is because they do not think the law is going to work as promised.

Yet the Washington Democrats' explanation for ObamaCare's enduring unpopularity still seems to be that the law is too complicated for their constituents to understand, and the Washington Democratic solution seems to be not to actually change the policy but to spend millions in a campaign-style PR—PR—blitz.

So the news flash would be this: If you still do not think Americans are able to understand a law you passed more than 3 years ago, then there is something wrong with the law, not with the American people.

Instead of going around the country trying to convince Americans why they are wrong, the administration could actually listen for a change. I think they should start over on health care and embrace the types of commonsense, step-by-step reforms that would actually lower the cost. I am not holding my breath that is going to happen.

So at a minimum they need to at least do this: The President, members of his Cabinet, and the congressional Democrats—congressional Democrats who voted for this law—need to get out and explain to Americans what is headed their way. Do not feed them the sunny picture painted in the ObamaCare ads the President's campaign team is already running but actually explain the reality of the situation to them. For instance, Americans need to know about the coming wave of premium hikes. We have already seen projected double-digit increases in some States. They need to know we are likely to see even more Americans lose the health care they want to keep, just like the thousands of Californians who will probably have to look for new plans after Aetna pulled out of the individual market in their State, almost certainly because of ObamaCare. They need to know they could lose their jobs or see their hours cut or struggle to find work in the first place. In fact, a recent survey showed that about 70 percent—70 percent—of small businesses say the law will make it harder for them to hire. Americans need to know all of these things because they need to prepare for them.

It is supremely unhelpful when the President claims that those who already have health care will not see changes, as he did just a few weeks ago. He knows that is not what many experts are saying. He owes it to the country to be frank about that. So it is time to get off the campaign trial, call

off the PR spinmeisters, put down the communications plan. It is time to level with the American people.

Senate Rules

Mr. MCCONNELL. It has been over 140 days now since we settled here in the Senate the issue of the Senate's rules. We settled it conclusively not only this January but actually January 2 years before that. What happened this January is we had an extensive bipartisan discussion about what rules or standing orders we might change. In the wake of that discussion, we passed two rules changes and two standing orders.

The majority leader said—well, this is what he said 2 years ago:

I agree that the proper way to change the Senate rules is through the procedures established in those rules, and I will oppose any effort in this Congress or the next to change the Senate's rules other than through the regular order.

That was in January of 2011. What he said back in 2011—and the reason I put that up even though that was a previous Congress—he said either this Congress or the next Congress, the Congress we are in now.

This January, I said to the majority leader:

I would confirm with the majority leader that the Senate would not consider other resolutions relating to any standing order or rules this Congress unless they went through the regular order process?

That was this January, just a few months ago, a little over 140 days.

The majority leader said:

That is correct. Any other resolutions related to Senate procedure would be subject to a regular order process, including consideration by the Rules Committee.

Now, that is not ambiguous. That is not ambiguous at all.

So the reason I and my colleagues have been talking about this repeatedly is that this is a huge institutional issue. The naive notion that somehow you can break the rules of the Senate to change the rules of the Senate for nominations only was laid out by Senator ALEXANDER yesterday in which he suggested a hypothetical series of measures that, if I were in the job the majority leader is currently in a year and a half from now, would be a very appealing agenda to my side, things like repealing ObamaCare, things like national right to work, things like opening ANWR.

Now, I would say to my friends on the other side, that is not something they would be very excited about, but in American politics things change. There is a tendency, when you are in the majority, to be kind of arrogant about it and to think the rules of the Senate are unnecessarily inconvenient to what you are trying to achieve.

Well, the Senate was designed from the very beginning—George Washington was actually asked during the Constitutional Convention: What do you think the Senate is going to be like?

He said: I think it is going to be like the saucer under the tea cup. The tea is going to slosh out of the cup, down to the saucer, and cool off.

In other words, they anticipated that the Senate would not be a place where things happen rapidly.

Written right into the Constitution is advise and consent. Advise and consent. The Senate has a role to play, for example, on nominations—which seem to be the fixation of the majority at the moment even though there is no evidence whatsoever that this administration has been treated poorly with regard to either executive branch or judicial nominations, no evidence at all. This is a manufactured crisis. Nevertheless, they seem to be focused on nominations. What do my friends in the majority think “advise and consent” means? Apparently they think it means “sit down and shut up. Do what I say when I tell you to.” I do not think that is what the Founding Fathers had in mind.

So there are a number of reasons we should not go down this road:

No. 1, the majority leader gave his word. Your word is the currency of the realm in the Senate. That ought to end it right there.

No. 2, do not assume you could just sort of surgically break the rules of the Senate to change the rules of the Senate for nominations only.

No. 3, I think it would be appropriate, since the American people change their minds from time to time about whom they would like to be in the majority of the Congress, to think about the consequences when the shoe is on the other foot.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we obviously are talking about immigration this week and last week and next week. I am one of those who, after many years working on this subject, hopes we are successful in passing what I believe is good, credible immigration reform.

I have come to the conclusion, like many Americans, that the status quo is

simply unacceptable. I have talked a little bit about some of the bodies in unmarked graves that I witnessed myself in Brooks County, TX, where under the current broken system people come across the border from faraway lands only to die trying to get into this country and are buried in unmarked graves in places like Brooks County.

I met with a young woman who was prostituted after having been brought into the United States from Central America, and she worked in a Houston nightclub, where she was basically held as an indentured servant or slave because she knew she was vulnerable to deportation. So the person who brought her there and put her in that situation knew they had the power to keep her quiet and not disclose what was happening, while she was living a horrific existence.

Those are just a couple of examples why I believe our system is broken and neither serves our economic interests nor represents our American values. So I want a good solution. But it is not just what happens here in the Senate. That is not the end game. The end game is what happens when this bill goes to the House and once the House and the Senate get together in a conference committee and reconcile the differences between those two bills to see if we can actually get a bill which reflects our values and which represents our economic interests, things such as recruiting the best and the brightest minds from around the world to stay here in America and to create jobs here.

Those are some of the positives in the underlying bill that we need to preserve, but there are other issues we need to fix. That is what I want to talk about right now.

Last night the Congressional Budget Office released its long-awaited report on the underlying bill, the so-called Gang of 8 immigration bill people have heard so much about. The report, as usual, is a blizzard of numbers and estimates and projections, but here are two I want to talk about in particular, which you see reflected on this chart.

I think this is going to be a shocking revelation to most people who thought this bill would actually fix our broken immigration system.

If you will look behind me, it says: The number of new unauthorized immigrations in the United States by 2033 with the passage of the underlying bill, 7.5 million; without it, 10 million.

So what we see reflected in the Congressional Budget Office, which is the “coin of the realm,” the “gold standard”—whatever you want to call it—around here, love it or hate it, and we all find ourselves on different sides depending on the issue, but the gold standard, the Congressional Budget Office, says this bill will not fix the underlying problem.

In other words, despite all of the promises and perhaps I might say the hopes and the dreams and the good intentions of the authors of this underlying bill, this bill will have only a