

such as this forward and sending it to the President for his signature, hopefully we will start a growing trend of doing that, and this will be the beginning, and not the end, of our discussions and hopefully our productivity when it comes to criminal justice reform.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I come to the floor, and I have been trying to get time to do this, because I stand here in amazement that after the Republicans took over on January 6—after they won big in November and they took over the Senate on January 6—it took them 1 month to threaten a government shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. Unbelievable. It took them 1 month to get into a situation where we are threatened with a shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. It is unbelievable to me because we know the threat of terrorism that is all around us, and playing politics with this is absolutely uncalled for.

Why did they do that? They did that because the President under his authority said we shouldn't deport immigrants who were raised in America. That is what they didn't like.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak for up to 10 minutes.

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

Mrs. BOXER. With terrorists all around us, Republicans are playing politics with the critical funding for the Department of Homeland Security and threatening a shutdown. It took them exactly a month in power to do that because they didn't like the fact that the President, who is in line with Presidents of both parties, issued an Executive order. By the way, President Obama has issued the fewest number of Executive orders in the history of any President. I never heard one Republican complain when Ronald Reagan did a number of Executive orders or George Bush did Executive orders, all on immigration. And I have those, for the record. But they didn't like this. I guess they would rather deport these DREAMers.

One of my colleagues said they are more scared of the DREAMers than they are of ISIL—a joke. What are they afraid of? Some child who was brought here at 3 years of age, went to school, is holding down a job, doing great? Those are the people the President's

Executive order is affecting. They are in my State, they are in Texas, they are in Arizona, they are all over the country. If there is anyone swept up in that who is not a good citizen, they don't get to have this benefit, which, by the way, does not include citizenship. It just says action on your deportation is deferred.

I would say to anyone within the sound of my voice, if anyone from your family ever came here from another country, think about what they are doing. Think about what they are doing.

It will cost billions of dollars to deport these students. Then, by the way, they don't take up an immigration bill. If the status quo prevails, you are talking about deporting 11 million people. You have got to be kidding. We had an independent analysis done by USC which shows how important it is to resolve this immigration issue, and what a boon it is to our society if we do so.

Well, the Republicans are stomping their feet. They never said anything when Ronald Reagan issued an Executive order on immigration. They never said anything when George Herbert Walker Bush did it. They never said anything before. But when this President does something that I think is very wise to make sure we keep these young people here, they threaten to shut down the Department of Homeland Security.

Now let's talk about what that means. You would stop command-and-control activities at the Department of Homeland Security headquarters. You disrupt important programs that protect weapons of mass destruction and train local law enforcement. You force critical frontline personnel such as Border Patrol agents to work without pay.

Now maybe my colleagues would like to work without pay. Go for it. Most of us need our pay to live. Imagine the Border Patrol agents and TSA agents who work every day to support their families—they don't get paid.

It would jeopardize the safety of my constituency. During the last fiscal year California received over \$200 million in crucial grant money that enabled State and local authorities to respond to national security threats and prepare for natural disasters. The Republicans are putting this crucial funding in jeopardy.

Let's be clear: Even if they back off their threat to shut down the government by shutting down Homeland Security, if they back off and say, well, let's just fund it at last year's level, let me tell you, we will not see those safety grants.

Last year, Texas, for example, received \$105 million from these grants. You cannot go home and tell your Governor, too bad, we are stepping out. You step up. It doesn't work like this. We are one Nation under God. We have to protect our people.

I will tell you what else is threatened. Even if they back down and let

the government stay open but they fund it at last year's level, firefighting grants such as the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response Grants Program would be delayed. These programs are vital to California. We have a nearly year-round fire season. Last year California firefighters received \$20 million in fire grants that allowed fire departments all over our State to purchase necessary equipment.

Let me tell you, I have been to fire scenes I will never forget where we have lost firefighters. They need equipment that saves their lives. They are so great, but the wind changes and they find themselves in a canyon, and if they don't have the right equipment—horrific results.

We also received \$50 million in SAFER grants last year that allowed fire departments to hire and train firefighters. Sometimes you are in a situation and if you haven't been trained on how to respond, it puts your life and other lives in jeopardy.

Other States such as Ohio received a total of \$33 million in fire and safety grants last year.

I have to say, this kind of threat, after what we saw the last time Republicans threatened a shutdown, makes no sense at all. We need a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill. When I say that, I hope people understand I don't mean scouring the bill. What I mean is keep extraneous issues off the bill. We all have our pet peeves. Listen, a lot of people don't like the fact that the DREAMers are staying here. They want to deport them. Introduce the bill to deport the DREAMers, bring it to the floor—have at it.

I will talk about what it would have been like for me, whose mother was born in Europe, and it took her a while to get her naturalization papers, if she was ripped out of my life. You know, I thought we had family values around here. We need a clean bill.

If you want to deport all the undocumented people—11 million—who are living in your communities and a lot of times fearful, that is a position you can defend. Defend it. Explain why we should spend billions deporting these people. Put up your solution. Don't try to kill a bill by holding it hostage to your demands.

We had an immigration bill this past year. It was terrific, it was bipartisan. Let's go for it. Let's go for it again. Let's have a debate. Oh, no. They are in power for 30 days and they are already threatening a government shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. I tell you, this is no way to run the greatest Nation in the world.

These programs are critically important and are we going to turn our back on those who keep us safe?

TSA officers would not be paid during a DHS shutdown. The agency that seized a record 2,212 firearms last year from passengers' carry-on luggage (of which 83% were loaded)—would be

doing their important work keeping the traveling public safe without pay.

And communities that are relying on federal FEMA funding to help them get back on their feet, after disasters have shattered their lives, will have to wait to be reimbursed during a shutdown.

California emergency officials expect slowdowns in ongoing disaster recovery operations like the RIM Fire and Napa Earthquake.

By failing to pass a clean DHS funding bill, we're putting the safety of our cities and our citizens at risk. The United States Conference of Mayors agrees—they are urging us to pass a clean DHS bill to keep our cities functioning.

Unless Republicans stop catering to their extreme Tea Party wing, critical programs that protect us from terrorists will be undermined or frozen just weeks after the horrifying attack in Paris and evidence that our enemies are willing and able to launch cyberattacks against us.

Republicans would rather tear families apart than provide critical funding for the homeland security infrastructure that was built following 9/11. It's clear that Republicans hate DREAMers more than they hate ISIS.

The Republicans' extreme anti-immigrant amendments would have a chilling effect on the Latino community, instill fear of deportation for victims of domestic and sexual violence, and subject DREAMers, who are peacefully contributing to our economy and community, to deportation and exploitation. These are young men and women who have been living in the U.S. since they were children and came here by no fault of their own. They consider themselves just as much a part of the fabric of their communities—and this country—as their classmates and peers.

Specifically, the Republican amendments would prevent the implementation of President Obama's DACA initiatives, which would enable many unlawfully present young people who came to the United States as children to apply for "deferred action," a temporary relief from removal not permanent immigration status—and work authorization.

It would also prevent the implementation of President Obama's DAPA initiative, which would enable the parents of U.S. citizens or green card holders who have lived here for years to apply for deferred action and work authorization as long as they pay fees, have not been convicted of a serious crime, and submit to a background check.

It would prevent ICE from using its expertise to set immigration enforcement priorities, to focus on the most serious public safety threats, as it has done for years.

It would put domestic violence survivors in danger by taking away their ability to stay in the United States and obtain the help that they need and ensure that the perpetrators of this violence are punished.

DACA and DAPA will strengthen community policing, improve community safety, and help more immigrant women come forward sooner to protect their children and themselves from domestic violence. Immigration law already provides abused women an opportunity to apply for protection. Why would we want to potentially curtail these protections from the women and children who need them the most?

Specifically, President Obama's Executive Actions on Immigration will improve California's economy with an \$11.7 billion increase in GDP over the next 10 years, by giving California a boost in productivity from up to 1.5 million more people who could pay taxes and contribute to the state's economy.

This will increase the average wages of U.S. born workers across the country by \$170 a year and raise the Nation's gross domestic product by up to \$90 billion over the next decade by expanding the labor force and giving immigrant workers the flexibility to seek new jobs.

Let's come together. We had a really good meeting of the minds in a lovely setting last week, and a lunch. We agreed these differences are not personal and it is fine that we have them. I don't mind. That is healthy in a society. We want to have differing views. That is what makes everyone in our country feel represented. The fact that I have certain views and the Presiding Officer may have a different view is fine. What isn't fine, in my view, is using your views to hold the Department of Homeland Security funding hostage. Too much is at stake.

This Chamber is empty. We are not doing a darn thing. We even have Republicans on our side and saying, no, this is not the right way to go.

Why don't we do this: Why don't we fund the Department of Homeland Security—it went through the entire process—and then make an absolute commitment, which the Republicans have the ability to do, to take up immigration reform. Then let's debate it. Let's hear why some of my friends on the other side want to deport the DREAMers. Let's find out why they don't want to do much about keeping families together. That is fine. Let's debate it. Let's move on. But let's not hold hostage the Department of Homeland Security funding to some ideological debate on immigration, which should stand on its own and have the focus it deserves.

Frankly, I hope we will begin with these unanimous consent requests—I won't do it today because I haven't warned anybody I want to—but fulfill the Department of Homeland Security and then immediately go to immigration reform where we can hash it out and become the deliberative body we are supposed to be.

Nobody is here. We are not doing anything right now, because we are stopped dead because of this dispute that has nothing to do with homeland security, in my view.

The American people agree across the board on this. You shouldn't attach irrelevant legislative matters on a funding bill. They have a funding bill. They have a job to do. In this case it is protecting Americans from terror, OK? That is over here, and over here is a very legitimate debate on immigration policy, and one that deserves the full time of this United States Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a document entitled "Executive Grants of Temporary Immigration Relief, 1956–Present" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### EXECUTIVE GRANTS OF TEMPORARY IMMIGRATION RELIEF, 1956–PRESENT

1956 (Eisenhower) Paroled orphans for military families who wanted to adopt them; 1956–1958 (Eisenhower) Paroled Hungarians who escaped the Soviets; 1959–1972 (Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon) Paroled Cuban asylum seekers who fled the Cuban revolution; 1962–1965 (Kennedy, Johnson) Paroled Chinese who fled Hong Kong; 1975–1979 (Ford, Carter) Paroled Indochinese from Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos; 1976 (Ford) Extended Voluntary Departure for Lebanese; 1977 (Carter) Temporarily suspended expulsion of immigrants who were being deported because of an error by the State Department; 1977–1982 (Carter, Reagan) Extended Voluntary Departure for Ethiopians; 1977–1980 (Carter) Paroled Soviet refugees; 1978 (Carter) Extended Voluntary Departure for Ugandans; 1979 (Carter) Extended Voluntary Departure for Nicaraguans; 1979 (Carter) Extended Voluntary Departure for Iranians; 1980 (Carter) Extended Voluntary Departure for Afghans; 1980 (Carter) Paroled Cubans and Haitians during the Mariel boatlift.

1981–1987 (Reagan) Extended Voluntary Departure for Polish after martial law declared in Poland; 1987 (Reagan) Directed the Immigration and Naturalization Service not to deport Nicaraguans and to grant them work authorizations if they demonstrated a well-founded fear of persecution, even if they had been denied asylum; 1987 (Reagan) Deferred deportation for unauthorized children of noncitizens who applied to legalize; 1989 (Bush Sr.) Deferred deportation for Chinese nationals following Tiananmen Square; 1989 (Bush Sr.) Paroled Soviets and Indochinese, even though they were denied refugee status; 1990 (Bush Sr.) Formalized Deferred Enforced Departure for Chinese nationals following Tiananmen Square; 1990 (Bush Sr.) Deferred deportation of unauthorized spouses and children of those legalized under the immigration reform law; 1991 (Bush Sr.) Deferred deportation of Persian Gulf evacuees after the Kuwait invasion; 1992 (Bush Sr., Clinton) Deferred deportation of some El Salvadorans, even though their Temporary Protective Status had expired; 1994 (Clinton) Paroled Cubans into the U.S.; 1997 (Clinton) Deferred deportation for Haitians in the U.S. that were here prior to 1995; 1997 (Clinton) Deferred deportation to noncitizens who might gain relief under the Violence Against Women Act.

1998 (Clinton) Suspended deportations to El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua after Hurricane Mitch; 1999 (Clinton) Deferred deportation for Liberians; 2002 (G. W. Bush) Expedited naturalization for green card holders who enlisted in the military; 2005 (G. W. Bush) Deferred deportation for foreign academic students affected by Hurricane Katrina; 2006 (G. W. Bush) Enabled Cuban doctors conscripted abroad to apply

for parole at U.S. embassies; 2007 (G. W. Bush) Deferred deportation for Liberians whose Temporary Protective Status had expired; 2009 (Obama) Deferred deportation for Liberians; 2009 (Obama) Extended deferred deportation to widows and widowers of U.S. citizens and their unmarried children under 21; 2010 (Obama) Allowed parole-in-place to spouses, parents and children of U.S. citizen members of the military; 2010 (Obama) Paroled Haitian orphans being adopted by U.S. citizens; 2011 (Obama) Extended deferred deportation to Liberians; 2012 (Obama) Deferred action for childhood arrivals (DACA); 2013 (Obama) Revised parole-in-place policy to spouses, parents and children of members of the military; 2014 (Obama) Expedited family reunification for certain eligible Haitian family members (HFRP).

Mrs. BOXER. With that, I yield back my time.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:42 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 20 minutes each.

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

#### DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the impending exhaustion of the disability trust fund administered by the Social Security Administration.

The Social Security system contains two important programs. One is the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance—or OASI—Program, often referred to as the retirement program. That program provides income to insured workers and their families at retirement or death, based on their payroll tax contributions to the OASI trust fund. The other is the disability insurance—or DI—program, which provides income to insured workers who suffer from a disabling condition, based on their payroll tax contributions to the DI trust fund. Unfortunately, both trust funds face trillions of dollars in unfunded obligations.

Each trust fund is legally distinct, although they have been commingled in the past into an imaginary fund labeled the “OASDI trust fund” or mingled with the General Fund.

Reserves in the DI trust fund are projected to be exhausted sometime late in calendar year 2016, after which beneficiaries face benefit cuts of around 20 percent. The DI program alone faces unfunded obligations over the next 75 years of more than \$1.2 trillion. Reserves in the OASI trust fund are projected to be exhausted in 2034, after which retirees and their survivors face benefit cuts of around 25 percent. The retirement program alone faces unfunded obligations of around \$9.4 trillion over the next 75 years.

Financial operations of the OASI and DI trust funds are overseen by a board of trustees composed of six members. Four of them serve based on their positions in the Federal Government, and two are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Currently, Treasury Secretary Lew, Labor Secretary Perez, HHS Secretary Burwell, and Social Security’s Acting Commissioner Colvin serve on the board. This is not what anyone would consider a band of fiscal hawks. Yet, in their most recent report, these trustees—who are, once again, high-ranking officials in the Obama administration—urged Congress to take action “as soon as possible to address the DI program’s financial imbalance.” Those are pretty clear words. Those are not the words of any Republican trying to manufacture a crisis. They are not the words of any Republican trying to hold anyone or anything hostage, as some of my friends on the other side have claimed. Rather, they come from Obama administration officials who, in their roles as trustees, are forced to acknowledge reality.

I want to take this opportunity to once again urge the administration and my colleagues—particularly those on the other side of the aisle—to begin to work with me to find solutions that will at least begin to chip away at the known financial imbalances in the DI trust fund so that we can prevent the coming benefit cuts.

Last year, in a Finance Committee hearing on the DI program, I made clear my willingness to work with anyone in Congress or the administration to examine options and ideas about the DI program before the DI trust fund becomes exhausted. Indeed, I have been trying for years to get the administration to engage on this issue. Unfortunately, to date I have heard nothing from the administration and very little from my friends on the other side of the aisle about this issue. What I have heard is fearmongering about supposed Republican plans to slash benefits or engineer a false crisis or hold beneficiaries hostage. I am not exaggerating; those are the very words they have used.

In budget after budget, the President has all but ignored Social Security in general and the DI program in particular. The President’s budgets generally only include calls for more administrative funding for the Social Security Administration or the occasional idea for an experimental trial.

After years of my asking the administration to engage on the DI program’s financial challenges, the President quietly inserted his policy position on DI just recently. With his fiscal year 2016 budget, we finally learned that the President supports a “stand-alone reallocation” of incoming tax receipts away from the retirement trust fund over to the disability insurance trust fund. Oddly, one of the objectives appears to be to make a reallocation so that both the disability and the retirement trust funds become exhausted in the same future year, which, according to the budget, is 2033.

Needless to say, having a joint trust fund exhaustion as a target does not solve any fundamental financial problem facing the long-run financial challenges of Social Security. Moreover, it takes away any urgency for Congress to improve the disability program now, before it becomes harder to do so down the road.

By stand-alone reallocation, the administration means that it wants to shift funds from the retirement fund to the DI fund with no accompanying policy changes of any kind—no change in overall payroll taxes, no change in benefits, no substantive changes in program integrity aside from the persistent call for more mandatory administrative funds, not even a study.

There have recently been many misconceptions and misstatements about the idea of a reallocation in general and a stand-alone reallocation in particular.

The last time Congress made a reallocation from the retirement trust fund to the DI trust fund was in 1994. At that time, Social Security trustees wrote the following about the reallocation and the DI trust fund:

While the Congress acted this past year to restore its short-term financial balance, this necessary action should be viewed as only providing time and opportunity to design and implement substantive reforms that can lead to long-term financial stability. . . .

Unfortunately, those reforms never came. And now, also unfortunately, the President wants to tell the American people the same story: Punt now to provide time for later action.

In addition, the financial challenges facing Social Security are very different from past trust fund account reshuffling, including the one in 1994. The public trustees of the Social Security trust fund wrote just last year:

The present situation is very different from that of 1994. . . . The DI Trust Fund’s impending reserve depletion signals that the time has arrived for reforms that strengthen the financing outlooks for OASI and DI alike.

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle say that we have had many reallocations between the DI and OASI trust funds in the past and that it is just ordinary housekeeping or a technical change. It is something we do all the time, they say, so there is nothing really to see here.

True, there have been trust fund reallocations in the past—sometimes