

Republicans used to complain all the time about meeting deadlines for doing the budget resolution, but this year they just aren't doing one. Even district court nominations supported by Republicans seem too hard for this group to accomplish. It appears the Senate will fail even to have a hearing on the President's Supreme Court nomination. It seems that Senate Republicans still need to learn how to do their job.

MERRICK GARLAND NOMINATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate Republicans are making history but for all the wrong reasons. The Republicans' obstruction of President Obama's Supreme Court nominee, Merrick Garland, is the first of its kind in Senate history. Never before has the Senate categorically refused to consider a Supreme Court nominee solely because the vacancy occurred during an election year. As each day passes, the Republicans set some new mark for gridlock.

For example, in the post-World War II era, the average time between a Supreme Court nomination and the nominee's first hearing was 29 days. Today is the 33rd day since Merrick Garland's name was put forward by President Obama. Already we are 5 days past the average.

The longest a nominee has been forced to wait for a hearing was 82 days. That was President Eisenhower's nominee, Potter Stewart, who was confirmed at a later time. Republicans vow every day that there will be no hearing. So they are well on their way to eclipsing the 82-day mark.

While that achievement may earn the Republicans a slap on the back from the Koch brothers and Senator McConnell—who, by the way, is the proud “guardian of gridlock,” as he says—Americans take no pleasure in this record-setting obstruction. Instead, Americans want Republicans in the Senate to do their job and give Merrick Garland a hearing.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it has been almost 3 years since the Senate passed comprehensive immigration reform. Senate Democrats worked with a handful of Republicans to craft a good, fair, comprehensive immigration reform bill that passed with strong bipartisan support. Then we watched as Speaker Boehner capitulated to the tea party radicals and refused to allow a vote on the floor. It would have passed overwhelmingly.

To his credit, President Obama saw Republicans' inertia on immigration reform and decided to act. He told us in his State of the Union Address that he was tired of waiting around for Republicans to do things, so he had to do it himself, and that is what he has done.

Using his Executive authority under existing law, he worked to fix the sys-

tem to prioritize enforcement resources on those who actually pose a threat to our national security and public safety. On November 20, 2014, President Obama ordered a series of Executive actions that increased border security and ensured greater accountability throughout our immigration system.

One aspect of President Obama's Executive actions was the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents Program. The program provided temporary deportation relief for parents of U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents, if they meet three basic requirements. No. 1, they have to be in the country for at least 5 years; No. 2, they must register with the government; and No. 3, they must pass a criminal background check. Today, there are over 5 million children—all U.S. citizens—who are eligible for this program.

President Obama also expanded the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival Program, helping to protect DREAMers, the undocumented children who were brought to the United States at a very young age. To date, over 700,000 DREAMers have been protected—12,000 in Nevada alone. Not only were these Executive actions the right thing to do, they were also smart investments. Nevada will benefit from about a \$3.5 million-a-year increase in State and local tax revenues. Nevadans will see an increase in earnings of more than \$1 billion over 10 years. Together these programs will help grow America by \$230 billion over the next 10 years, but now this progress is being threatened.

Shortly after President Obama's announcement, a politically motivated lawsuit was filed by the Texas attorney general and joined by Republican Governors and attorneys—not all of them but a lot of them. The Texas attorney general won a preliminary injunction temporarily blocking both programs. This came from a single judge.

The U.S. Supreme Court agreed to consider the case and today it heard oral arguments. They were good. I thought it was an extremely sound, deliberate argument. I think the Justices—most of them—had questions that went to the heart of what the issues are, standing and other things. A decision to overturn the President's actions would put many families with U.S. citizen children at risk of deportation and prevent the Department of Homeland Security from doing its job of focusing on criminals and other threats to national security and public safety.

In Nevada alone, President Obama's Executive actions stand to help 50,000 people. Those are 50,000 Nevadans who should not be separated from their families.

The U.S. Supreme Court must do the right thing and recognize President Obama's authority. That is why I joined 38 other Senate Democrats and 186 House Democrats in filing an amicus brief with the Supreme Court,

making clear that Congress granted the Department of Homeland Security broad discretion in enforcing our country's immigration laws. What the President did was both lawful and it was necessary. He helped target limited enforcement resources. It is also what every other President since Eisenhower has done, including Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush. Instead of litigating the President's lawful actions, Republicans should work to fix the immigration system in Congress. By working with Democrats to pass immigration reform, they would render the President's Executive actions unnecessary.

I hope the Supreme Court decides in the administration's favor. I think they will, even though the Court is short a member. I hope these Executive orders are implemented to bring hard-working families out of the shadows, but our Nation would be far better off with a permanent solution. Our Nation would be far better off with a bipartisan, comprehensive overhaul of our Nation's immigration laws.

My friend the assistant minority leader has been at the forefront of these immigration issues. The DREAM Act is something he put forward 15 years ago. I admire the work he has done on this. I think he has kept this issue alive, when a lot of Republicans wanted it to go away. He has been helpful to the people of Nevada—people who don't know his name and will never ever see him, but we have 12,000 DREAMers whose lives have been changed forever, and we hope the same will happen to their parents.

Mr. President, would the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2015

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 636, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 636) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell (for Thune/Nelson) amendment No. 3679, in the nature of a substitute.

Thune amendment No. 3680 (to amendment No. 3679), of a perfecting nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority whip.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me first thank the minority leader, Senator REID, for his kind words about the DREAM Act, which I introduced 15 years ago.

This was a piece of legislation that came about because a mother called my office in Chicago. Here was her family story.

She brought her two kids to America from Brazil. They actually started off in Korea, but they came through Brazil and came to Chicago—mother, father, and two kids. The father had the ambition of starting a church. There are a lot of Korean churches around Chicago and around the country, and his dream was to start a Korean-American Church. His dream never came true. He continued to pray and read the Bible, but he didn't work much. It was up to mom to go to work.

She went to work in a dry-cleaning establishment in Chicago. If you have been around the great city I am honored to represent and go into a dry cleaners, most of the time Korean families are running them. They are working around-the-clock, and are the hardest working people imaginable.

Mom went to work in the dry cleaners and the kids struggled because there wasn't much money coming in. One of their girls, Tereza, heard about a program in Chicago called the MERIT Music Program. It is a program that is available for low-income families of kids in public schools. The lady who left the money for it said to give them instruction in musical instruments and help them buy the instruments.

Tereza Lee heard about this when she was a little girl and decided to sign up for it and to practice the piano. Well, guess what. She turned out to be a prodigy. She was amazing. For her the MERIT Music Program was like an opening to another part of the world she had never seen. She participated in recitals. Sometimes they told me they had to give her a key to the Merit music offices because she wanted to stay and practice until late at night. It was tough for her getting through high school. She tells the story, when she was interviewed in the local press, that sometimes she didn't have a lunch to take to school or any money to buy food. She would wait until the other kids left, and she would go through the wastebasket and look for food they had left behind. That is how tough it was. But because of her skill at playing the piano, she was given an opportunity. She was accepted into the Juilliard School for music in New York and at the Manhattan School of Music conservatory to pursue the piano. She was that good.

When she and her mom started filling out the application, they reached that point where it said this: What is your nationality? What is your citizenship?

Her mom said: Tereza, I don't know. We came here on a visitor's visa way back when you were 2 years old, but I never filed any papers for you.

She said: Mom, what are we going to do?

Her mom said: We are going to call DURBIN's office.

So they called the Senate office. We looked into it. The law in the United

States was very clear for 17-year-old Tereza Lee. She had to leave the United States for 10 years and apply to come back in—leave for 10 years. She came here at the age of 2. She did not do anything wrong.

She did everything right. She finished high school, against the odds. She developed a talent, against the odds. She was accepted at one of the best music schools in America, and our law very clearly said: Leave; we don't want you. If you want to try to come back in 10 years, that is your business.

I don't think that is right. That is why 15 years ago I introduced the DREAM Act. It said: If you are one of those kids brought here under the age of 16, have finished high school, and have no serious criminal issues, we are going to give you a chance. Go to college or join the military and we will give you a path to ultimately getting to the back of the line but becoming a citizen of the United States—the DREAM Act.

When I introduced this bill to solve Tereza Lee's problem, I used to give speeches about it all around Chicago. A funny thing would happen. When I would finish the speech and go back to my car, sometimes at night, there would be somebody waiting by my car. As I got closer, it turned out to be a very young girl, usually, maybe with her friend.

They would wait to make sure no one was around. The young girl would say to me: Senator, I am one of those DREAMers. I am undocumented. My mom and dad are scared to death that they are going to be deported, and then I will be deported. I hope you can pass this.

Well, time passed. We called the bill on the floor and called it in the House. We have never been able to make it the law of the land. Sadly, the reality is that there are probably 2.5 million young people living in America who would qualify under the DREAM Act to be given a chance to become legal—2.5 million.

What happened to Tereza Lee? I have to finish that story. She ended up going to the Manhattan School of Music. Two families stepped forward—families that had befriended the Merit music program in Chicago. I know one of them well. They said: This girl is too good. We can't waste her talent. We will pay for her education.

They did so out of pocket. She did not qualify for any Federal assistance because she is undocumented. So Tereza finished school and played in Carnegie Hall. Now she is about to complete her Ph.D. in music. She is living in Brooklyn, NY. She is a mom with a little girl. She married an American musician so she is legal—finally. That is her story. Thank goodness this determined young girl stuck with it. We have to stick with it too.

The people who want to turn away these 2.5 million DREAMers ought to take a minute to meet them—just to meet them and to understand what it

is to be a young person in America going through all the challenges of adolescence and all of the challenges that might be brought to you in your community or by our family and knowing in the back of your mind that at any moment, someone can knock on the door and tell you that you have to leave this country and that you are not here legally.

They do it, and they fight every single day for a chance and a dream so that someday they will become part of the only country they have ever known. These are kids who, just like the Senate a few minutes ago, got up every day in the classroom and pledged allegiance to that flag, the only flag they have ever known. They do not view themselves as Mexican or Korean. They view themselves as Americans.

The question is this: How do we view them? Do we view them as an asset to America or do we view them as a problem—a problem that should be thrown away and deported? You are listening to the Presidential campaign. We all are. I am not going to go into detail about some of the terrible things that have been said, but I just wish some of the haters, some of the people who want to turn on these young people, would meet them. Come and meet them. Hear their stories.

I think even the hardest, coldest heart would be moved by them. Across the street—you can see it through the window—is the Supreme Court building. It was about 12 years ago that we decided to do something in the Senate that I thought was a great idea. Every 2 years, when there is a new class of Senators, we have a dinner with the Justices of the Supreme Court. We do it at their place. It is right across the street. We line up in the entryway there—the beautiful marble entryway. There are tables set up, each of us sits at a table with one of the Justices.

I can remember one of the early times I went over there. I shared the table with another Senator, Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia, a legendary Member of the Senate and former President pro tempore of the Senate. He served here for decades and carried the Constitution around in his breast pocket. In his great days he could recite poetry nonstop. He was a real believer in the Senate. He wrote the history of the Senate, one that probably will never be matched. I shared a table with him in the Supreme Court for one of these dinners.

I said: Isn't this a beautiful building?

He said: It sure is.

I said: How often do you get over here, Senator Byrd?

He said: This is my first time.

I said: You have been in the Senate for 40-plus years, and this is your first time? Why?

He said: Well, it is a separate branch of government. We must respect them. They had never asked me to come over.

Well, I see it a little differently. I go across that street because, yes, it is a separate branch of government, but it

is one that we should understand and respect, as I hope they understand and respect Congress on this side of the street. So this morning I did. I went over for an argument before the Supreme Court. There was a huge mob out in front of the Supreme Court because the case that was being considered is one that affects millions of lives in America—*Texas v. United States*.

The question is this: What are we going to do with people like Tereza Lee, whom I just described earlier. You see, what happened 6 years ago is that I joined with Republican Senator Richard Lugar of Indiana and wrote a letter to President Obama saying: If the Congress is not going to change the law to make it possible for these young people to stay in this country, would you issue an Executive order that allows them, at least on a temporary basis, to stay in the United States?

Within a year or two, the President agreed to do it. He created what is known as the DACA Program. It basically says that young people like Tereza Lee, whom I described earlier, can step forward, identify themselves to our government, submit themselves for criminal investigation, and pay a filing fee of around \$500, I believe it is. If they do, they will be given the right to stay in the United States on a temporary renewable basis for 2 years or 3 years.

That is what DACA is all about—so that young people can pursue their lives at least with the understanding that for a few years, they don't have to worry about that knock on the door. Oh, if they get a job, they have to pay their taxes. If they go to college, they are not going to get a penny from this government. We don't help them pay for their college education.

The President did it. I applauded him for doing it. So far, 700,000 young people just like Tereza Lee have signed up for protection under DACA. We estimate that the total universe of young people eligible is about 2.5 million. So the President attempted to extend the DACA Program. He said: We need to address the problem with their parents. Many of these parents have children who are U.S. citizens and legally in the United States, but they are undocumented and subject to deportation.

So the President said, in what is known as DAPA: The parents of these kids can come forward, submit themselves to a criminal background check with fingerprints and all, pay a filing fee of around \$500, and then they will be allowed, on a temporary, renewable basis, if they keep their noses clean, to work in this country.

If they are going to work in this country, they have to pay their taxes. Well, that is what the President suggested. As soon as he made these two proposals to extend DACA and to create this other program for the parents, a lawsuit was filed. It was led by the State of Texas, and 25 other States, I believe, joined. That is the case before the Supreme Court today.

Before I get into the details of that case—and I want to say a word about it on the floor this afternoon—let me say one other thing. What Senator Byrd told me about not going across the street was not only respect for that institution of the Supreme Court, but as a Senator he was basically saying that we need to respect their right to be above politics. We want to make certain that that branch of government is above politics, that they apply the law and interpret the Constitution in a nonpolitical way.

Sometimes I read their decisions and think they have gone political on us. But the goal is to make sure they are preserved from becoming political. This morning, when I went before the Supreme Court, I did not face nine Justices, only eight. Antonin Scalia, who passed away a few weeks ago, created a vacancy that has not been filled. Why has the Senate failed to fill this vacancy on the Supreme Court? Because within hours of the untimely death of Justice Scalia, the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, who was here a few moments ago, announced publicly: We will not fill this vacancy on the Supreme Court.

That is important to remember. It is the first time in the history of the United States of America—the first time in the history of the Senate—that the Senate is refusing a hearing for a Presidential nominee to fill a vacancy on the Supreme Court. It has never happened before—never.

Oh, the Republicans argue: Well, if the shoe were on the other foot, I am sure you Democrats would do exactly the same thing. I call their attention to the year 1988. Republican President Ronald Reagan, with a vacancy on the Supreme Court, submitted the name of Anthony Kennedy to the Senate. A Republican President was filling a vacancy on the Supreme Court, and he submitted the name of his nominee.

The Senate, then controlled by the Democrats, gave Anthony Kennedy a hearing, a strong vote, and sent him over to the Supreme Court. So when the shoe was on the other foot, we did not play politics. But now we are. So I faced eight Justices over there as that argument was made this morning. I thought to myself: If they end up in a 4-to-4 tie—and that can happen—it will be chaos and confusion across America, with different courts and different districts having different interpretations of the same law.

How did we get into this mess? Because the Republican majority in the Senate has decided: We are not going to appoint anyone to fill this vacancy. Their argument is this: Let the American people speak to filling this vacancy in the Presidential election. Let them decide whether it will be a Democrat or a Republican President filling this vacancy.

There might be some value to that argument if President Obama, in the last election, when he was running for reelection in 2012, had been running for

a term of 3 years. You can argue then that this fourth year he was not entitled to be President. But you know what. It turns out that he was running for a 4-year term. It turns out he won by 5 million votes. It turns out that when it comes to being Commander in Chief and President of the United States, he has all the powers vested in him by the Constitution, even in the fourth year. Isn't that amazing—4 years as the President? That is what the American people decided, but only to be overruled by the Republican majority in the Senate.

Sorry, Mr. President, they say, you only get 3 years. Maybe we give you 3 years and 2 months, but you sure don't have the right to try and fill a vacancy on the Supreme Court, even though the Constitution explicitly says in article II, section 2: The President shall appoint a nominee to fill a vacancy on the Supreme Court. Their argument is that you may think you are President when it comes to the Supreme Court, but the Senate Republican majority thinks otherwise.

I sat down with Merrick Garland. He is the proposed nominee to fill this vacancy. He is chief judge of the D.C. Circuit Court, which is a high position in the judiciary. He was born in Illinois, so I come to his nomination with some prejudice, but he is an extraordinary person.

People have said: Well, why didn't the President choose a woman? Why didn't the President choose an African American? Why didn't he choose a Hispanic? Why didn't he choose someone from India? Why did he choose this man?

I think he chose him for an obvious reason: He is clearly qualified. Even Republican Senators have said nice things about him publicly. Many of them have said they refuse to even meet with him, will not even sit in the same room with him. Some have agreed to, but many have said no. Senator MCCONNELL said: I won't meet with him because he is not going to get a hearing and he is not going to get a vote.

It is time for us to fill that vacancy. It is time for us to accept our constitutional responsibility and show respect for the document we all swore to uphold and defend when we took the oath of office. It is time to fill that vacancy and put nine Justices on the Supreme Court to avoid the uncertainty, confusion, and chaos which might otherwise emerge.

I wish to say a word about the case before the Court this morning. This was a case—*United States v. Texas*—a legal challenge, as I mentioned earlier, to the President's immigration policy, filed by 26 Republican Governors. I believe this lawsuit has no legal merit. It is driven by political hostility toward President Obama and his immigration policy.

I was proud to join an amicus brief signed by 39 Senators on our side of the aisle and 186 House Democrats in support of the administration's decision

on immigration. The President is on very solid ground in this case. I am hoping and confident that the Supreme Court will rule in his favor.

As an initial matter before the case proceeds, the States that filed this lawsuit have to show they will be harmed by the President's immigration policy. Otherwise, they really don't have any standing to sue. It turns out that exactly the opposite is true. The President's policy allowing people to work here on a temporary basis under his Executive orders will create a huge benefit to the American economy.

Over the next 10 years, in the State of Texas alone—and they brought the lawsuit; at least started it—the President's immigration action would increase that State's gross domestic product by more than \$38 billion and increase the earnings of all Texas residents by \$17.5 billion. They argue that the President's immigration policy would cost the State of Texas money. It turns out that exactly the opposite is true.

Even if the States have standing to sue, the Supreme Court repeatedly has held that the Federal Government has broad authority to decide questions of immigration. Justice Anthony Kennedy, appointed earlier, wrote the opinion for the Court striking down Arizona's controversial immigration law. Listen to what he said:

A principal feature of the removal system—

Removal of people who are not eligible to be in the United States—

is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials. . . . Discretion in the enforcement of immigration law embraces immediate human concerns. Unauthorized workers trying to support their families, for example, likely pose less danger than alien smugglers or aliens who commit a serious crime.

This administration's immigration policy is not just legal, it is smart and realistic. The President has said simply: We should prioritize. We have limited resources. We can't deport all those who are here undocumented. If we are only going to deport some, let's pick those who are a danger to the United States.

The President has focused on those who have been convicted of serious crimes or pose a threat to our security. And shouldn't he? As Commander in Chief, shouldn't that be his highest priority, to make sure anyone who is a danger to the United States is gone? He knows he can't deport all even if he wished to, so he focuses on those who may be a danger to the United States—prosecutorial discretion. The Department of Homeland Security only has enough funding to deport a small fraction of undocumented, so the President wants to focus the limited resources on those who could do us harm. That is just common sense.

At the same time, the President said that we should not waste our resources on deporting young immigrant students who grow up in this country, such as Tereza Lee, whom I mentioned

earlier, or tear apart families by deporting the parents of U.S. citizens. The President's policy is focused on deporting felons, not families—criminals, not children.

In November of 2014, President Obama established this program, DAPA, Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents. Under DAPA, undocumented immigrants who have lived in the United States for more than 5 years and have American children would be required to come forward, register with the government, pay a fee, go through a criminal background check and a national security background check, and pay their taxes.

If the government determines these parents have not committed any serious crimes and don't pose any threat, this Executive order says: On a temporary, renewable basis, they will not be targeted for deportation.

President Obama also expanded the DACA Program for children, as I mentioned earlier, at the same time. Why did he do that? Because for years Republicans in Congress have refused to consider legislation to fix our broken immigration system.

On the floor of the Senate on June 27, 2013, I joined a group of seven other Senators—four Democrats and four Republicans in total. We had worked for months to construct a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration bill. We had to give a lot. There were things in that bill which I didn't like at all and things which some of the Republican Senators didn't like, but it is the nature of legislation and compromise that that happens.

We brought the bill to the floor for a vote after a lengthy markup in the Senate Judiciary Committee, and dozens of amendments had been offered. The Senate passed comprehensive immigration reform legislation on June 27, 2013, 68 to 32—more than 2 to 1. That bill would have strengthened border security, protected American workers, and established a tough but fair path to citizenship for 11 million undocumented immigrants who were then currently living in our country.

What happened to the bill after it passed the Senate? I take you back to how laws are made and your civics course. It went across the Rotunda to the House of Representatives, which was under Republican control. The majority in the House of Representatives refused to call the bill, refused to even bring it to the floor for a debate, and refused to offer any substitute. They did nothing—nothing, despite our broken immigration system. In the face of this, the President was left with no choice.

For the good of the American people, he used the authority given him as President to try to make some reforms to our immigration system. The Center for American Progress has studied what the President proposed, and they say that over the next 10 years, if these two programs—DACA and DAPA—were

passed, the gross domestic product for my home State of Illinois would increase by \$15 billion and the earnings of Illinois residents would increase by almost \$8 billion. Could your State use that—more economic activity, more people paying taxes to the Federal Government and to your State? Virtually every State could use that.

It is unfortunate that these bills have been blocked by the Senate, and now they are trying to block them in the Supreme Court.

I see Senator CORNYN is on the floor, and I will close by telling a story about another DREAMer. I have done this quite a few times. My staff has done a lot of work on it. I thank them all for it. These stories really say a lot more than I ever could in a speech. They tell us what was at stake before the Supreme Court of the United States this morning.

This attractive young woman is Vasthy Lamadrid. Her family came to the United States from Mexico. She was 5 years old. They came here with nothing. They moved into a home with four other families, so a lot of the kids slept in the same room.

Despite their poverty, Vasthy felt safe and excelled in school. Math was her best subject. She had nearly perfect scores on standardized tests. English was tough, but then she discovered a series of books called "Goosebumps." If you have kids or grandkids, I bet you have heard of that one. She became an avid reader and mastered the English language.

By middle school, Vasthy was placed in the gifted program. That is where she discovered her love of engineering. She was a student in the Engineering Pathway at Bioscience High School, where she received the Young Entrepreneurs Award, made the principal's list every semester, and played tennis. She was an active volunteer, working with such groups as Girls For Change, CompuGirls, E-Tech, Hospice of the Valley, and St. Joseph's Hospital. Vasthy also helped younger kids in her neighborhood by tutoring them in math and tennis.

Vasthy went on to attend Arizona State University. Because she is undocumented, she didn't qualify for a penny of government assistance, and she had to pay out-of-State tuition despite the fact that she had lived her entire life in the United States, in Arizona.

Then something extraordinary happened. Counting on the generosity of the American people, Vasthy decided to crowdfund her college education. She shared her life story online and asked people to contribute to help her pay her tuition. Well, it worked. She is currently in her second year of college. In the first semester, she made the dean's list with a 3.79 GPA in the Ira Fulton School of Engineering.

Thanks to DACA—the Presidential Executive order—she is able to support herself. She has also made time to continue to volunteer for a club called

STEM Academy mentoring young children. She volunteers with the Arizona Immigration Refugee Service as an English teacher. As a result of her volunteer work, she has decided she wants to become a science teacher. Can we use more science teachers in America? You bet.

This is what she said in a letter she wrote:

DACA signifies to me a chance to show that I belong here—that inside I am an American. It represents an opportunity to show that my parents' sacrifice was worth it. I love this country and want to one day become a citizen and continue to give back to the community. I don't need that journey to become a citizen to be easily given to me, but I'd hope that the journey is fair.

Vasthy and other DREAMers have so much that can give to America.

I don't understand the Republican Party when it comes to the issue of immigration. We are a nation of immigrants. My mother was an immigrant to this country. I am a first-generation American and proud of it. It is my honor to serve and represent a great State like Illinois. I know what her journey was like. She was brought here at the age of 2 from Lithuania. I know what her early life was like as she struggled to try to make sure there was food on the table, first for her mom, sister, and brother, and then ultimately for her own family. That is my family's story, but it is a story that is repeated over and over again.

There is something in the DNA of immigrants who are willing to risk everything in this world to go to a country where they don't even speak the language because they know they will have an opportunity here, and they bring something with them. That is why they light up the scoreboard in Silicon Valley with all of these new inventions and new corporations with thousands of employees that make us an economic success in many fields. That is why we should think twice about those who condemn immigrants in this Nation of immigrants.

I am confident the Supreme Court will uphold the President's immigration actions. Then I hope, after they have done this, that the Republicans in Congress will finally decide to return to the table and work on a bipartisan basis for comprehensive immigration reform.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am always impressed with the distinguished Democratic whip and his eloquence, but he is telling the American people that we have to choose between being a nation of immigrants or a nation of laws. The fact is, we don't have to make that choice; we can be both. But we can't do it when we have a President who simply believes he can do an end run around the U.S. Constitution.

In fact, according to Pew, about 3.5 million people could claim the benefits of the President's unlawful Executive action, receiving work permits, driver's

licenses, and Social Security numbers. While we are a compassionate country, we are a nation of immigrants, that is not the kind of decision the Constitution gives to a single political actor, even if he is the President of the United States.

So there is a right way and a wrong way. And I realize the distinguished Democratic whip believes that just because they can't get what they want when they want it, the President can then resort to this end run, but thankfully that is not the view of the courts. The U.S. Federal district court in Brownsville, TX, issued an injunction against the President's Executive action. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed that injunction, and now the Supreme Court of the United States heard arguments in the case this afternoon.

This is really more than just about immigration. This is whether, under the doctrine of separation of powers, the Constitution we have lived under for 175 years gives the President unilateral authority without the approval of Congress, the elected representatives of the people, and in flagrant disregard for the laws that are already on the books.

The heart of the case the Court heard today is about stopping a President who said: I have a pen and I have a phone. And even though the American people have given Republicans a majority in both Houses and obviously forced the President to deal with a Republican conference to come up with consensus legislation, the President said: Forget that. I am not about trying to achieve bipartisan consensus on anything. If I don't get what I want, I am going to jam it through the system and hope the courts don't stop me. So it is not just about immigration, it is about the Constitution itself.

There are perhaps 22 different times, by my count, where the President of the United States acknowledged he didn't even have this authority. I remember in a speech he gave to La Raza, an interview he gave on Univision, the President denied he had the authority, which now, miraculously, our Democratic friends think is clear-cut under the law. How can that be? It cannot be.

I remember specifically being at a meeting where the President invited the leadership of both the House and the Senate to the White House after the 2014 election. Many may recall that leading up to that point, there had been a lot of rumors about the President issuing an Executive action, but he had not done so. I remember specifically sitting there in the White House with some of my colleagues from the House and the Senate, where then-Speaker Boehner said to the President: Please, Mr. President, don't do this. Don't poison the well. Don't make it impossible, by such a polarizing action, for us to build consensus on the building blocks of immigration reform where we could actually agree.

I remember Majority Leader McCARTHY making the same comment. I joined in and reiterated the same point. The President, defiant, told us he was going to go ahead and do it.

There are a lot of conversations people are having today across the United States. I had some of those earlier today during some visits with people who were just wondering how to explain the political environment in America today. What I tell them is that this seems unprecedented in my experience. People are so angry. People are so scared. People are frightened and worried about the next generation. And for the first time in my memory, parents are doubting whether their children will enjoy the same sorts of freedom and prosperity that we enjoy today. That is a tragedy.

My parents were part of the "great-est generation." My dad was a B-17 pilot in the Army Air Corps, even before the Air Force came into being. On his 26th bombing mission over Nazi Germany, while he was flying in the 8th Air Force out of Molesworth, England, he was shot down and captured as a prisoner of war for 4 months. Fortunately, that was toward the tail end of the war. Even though he was injured in his parachute jump—not seriously, as it turned out, although he had some disability associated with that later in life—he managed to survive that and even survived an appendectomy by a fellow prisoner of war when he had appendicitis in a POW camp. It is amazing.

I always thought my dad had nine lives. Even though he passed away at the very young age of 67, he survived countless occasions when surely he could have lost his life, including those occasions of jumping out of a burning B-17 plane over Germany and an appendectomy in a POW camp at the hands of a fellow prisoner of war.

The reason my parents and all of our parents sacrificed so much and risked so much and worked so hard is that they believed in the promise of America—the promise that exists only when the law is respected, when people in high office are bound by and obligated to and held accountable to the same laws that govern the most humble among us. That is what America is all about—a country where people, if they work hard and play by the rules, can achieve their dreams. I think that is the reason America seems so polarized today. People have sort of jumped outside the usual paradigm of political calculation where you are a liberal or you are a conservative or you are somewhere in the middle. People have sort of jumped that track, and we are seeing something entirely different on the left and on the right. I think the reason is, in part, because of a President who believes he is not bound by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

People are frightened because they have seen over the last 7 years—even though the President was stopped legislatively after the Affordable Care Act

was passed and after Dodd-Frank was passed and then stopped by the electorate giving the Republicans a majority in the House and in 2014 a majority in Senate—that this President will not be stopped by the voters. That is the determination he made, and this Executive order is exhibit 1 because he said: I don't care what the voters think. I don't care what the American people think. I don't care what the Constitution says. I don't care that what Congress says should be the law of the land. I am going to do it the way I want to do it. Frankly, that is scary stuff when you are talking about the Commander in Chief, the leader of the free world, and the sort of power that goes along with that.

Rather than heed the warning—or I would really call it the plea of leaders in the House and the Senate after the 2014 election—the President decided to go around Congress and try to essentially change the law, giving work permits to people who were illegally present in the country, giving them driver's licenses, even giving Social Security numbers to an estimated 3.5 million people. How can the President do this when Congress is deadlocked? Well, he did it. And that is a question the Supreme Court is going to have to decide.

At the time, the President called it a middle-ground approach. He is a master of rhetoric. The problem is the facts belie his words. The fact of the matter is this was a constitutional scorched-earth tactic. And more than anything else, it eroded public confidence in Congress's ability, working with the White House, to get anything constructive done in the area of immigration.

The Acting President pro tempore is, of course, from the great State of Oklahoma, and he went to school in Texas. He understands what I understand: We have a large Hispanic population in Texas—about 38 percent. But we are a very diverse State. Many people are surprised when I tell them the third most commonly spoken language in Texas today is Vietnamese—Vietnamese. Can you believe that? We also have a large Indian American population.

We are a very diverse State, and the main reason for that is we still represent that land of opportunity that America used to be, where people can come, work hard—those of modest means, with little on their backs and maybe nothing in their pockets—and achieve something and live the American dream. So I resent, I really do resent, the distinguished Senator from Illinois trying to tell us the President was only trying to do something that was good for Texas. He doesn't have a clue. In fact, if we were to follow the policy choices of the leadership in Texas, the country would be a heck of a lot better off when it comes to taking advantage of our energy resources, when it comes to taxes, reasonable regulation, and a willingness to try to ac-

commodate those who invest capital and create jobs. To me, that is the single biggest difference between where I live in Texas and what I see across our country and what is coming out of Washington, DC. There seems to be an attitude here in Washington of how many more obstacles, how many larger impediments can we place in the way of those who invest the capital and those who are creating the jobs and still expect the American dream to be alive.

Believe me, we have tested it. The Obama administration has tested it, and what it has produced is disaster. It has produced a health care system that, rather than making health care more affordable, has made it more expensive, has caused people who liked their coverage to give up their coverage only to buy something that had a deductible that has, in essence, made them self-insured. It has created stagnant wages. It has created stagnant economic growth.

There are not a lot of problems we have in this country that couldn't be mitigated, made better, if we just saw our economy growing again, instead of the sort of anemic and flatlined growth we have seen since 2008.

My predecessor in the Senate, Mr. Phil Gramm, has a Ph.D. in economics from Texas A&M University. He has made the point that, historically, what you see after a recession like the one we saw following the fiscal crisis in 2008 is a V-shape recovery. In other words, you hit the bottom and you bounce up and you grow quickly because basically you have worked the problems out of the system. But what we have seen since 2008 is a U-shaped recovery, if you could even call it that. It is pretty close to flat, where the economy is growing at less than 2 percent, which is not fast enough to keep people fully employed. And we still have—although the unemployment rate has dropped down, we still have the smallest percentage of people participating in the workforce that we have had in the last 30 years. Many people have simply given up, retired early, or made other arrangements. This is a serious matter.

The Supreme Court heard arguments today. We know there are currently eight members of the Supreme Court. I heard the distinguished Democratic whip complain about the fact that we have decided to allow the voters to choose in November the President who will make the choice to fill the Scalia vacancy. Well, the fact of the matter is, it is simply too important to allow President Obama, given his penchant for lawlessness and usurpation of constitutional authority—to give him the chance to stack the Supreme Court in favor of a Court that would likely rubberstamp his actions and those of future Presidents for the next 25 years.

The hypocrisy is rich, listening to our Democratic colleagues. These are the folks who invented the judicial filibuster. They invented the judicial fili-

buster. They did that when President George W. Bush was President. As controversial as the nomination of Clarence Thomas was, I believe he was confirmed with 52 votes—not 60 votes but 52 because nobody dreamed back then that Senate rules would allow the minority party to insist on 60 votes to confirm a President's appointee.

We know that after the election where the Democratic majority lost that majority, in a lameduck session they jammed a number of appointees onto the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in an effort to pack that court to match the ideological picture they wanted. Again, this is the second most important court in the Nation, which they believed would be more inclined to rubberstamp the overreaching by the Obama administration.

We are all familiar with the Biden speech in 1992 when, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, he suggested it would be perhaps inappropriate to confirm a Presidential nominee in the waning days of that President's term.

We saw the Harry Reid speech in 2005, where he said it is the President's prerogative to appoint, but the Senate is not obligated to grant consent to that nomination. Actually, I agree with Senator REID back then, but not today, when he has taken the exact opposite approach.

Then there is Senator SCHUMER, the heir apparent to the Democratic leadership in the Senate, who said, in 2007, 18 months before George W. Bush left office: I think there ought to be a presumption against confirmation.

To listen to my Democratic colleagues complain about the decision we have made to let the voters vote for the President who is going to fill that vacancy and to watch them—well, it looks like crocodile tears to me, and it smells like hypocrisy.

As we have said, the Supreme Court of the United States heard arguments today in a case brought by the State of Texas and other States that would otherwise be compelled to grant work permits, issue driver's licenses and Social Security numbers to people illegally present in the United States who did not comply with our laws. I am confident the Court will find that the States have suffered real harm from the standpoint of the constitutional notion of standing; in other words, you have to have standing before you can sue. Basically, it means you have to show real or potential harm if the Court doesn't act. I am confident the Court will find standing.

But the Court will do one of two things. Either the Court will affirm by being split 4 to 4 or all eight Justices could write in favor of the Fifth Circuit decision to let the injunction stand or, if the Court deems that this issue needs to be held over until the Court has all nine members, after the first of the year, that is a decision the Court can make.

This is a very important issue, and I am glad the Court is taking it up. We

need to know—we need to know whether we remain a nation of laws as well as a nation of immigrants. The whole idea our Democratic colleagues have foisted on us that somehow we have to choose between those two is a false choice. It is a false choice. We are both. We aren't one or the other. America has always been made better by people who have risked coming to the United States because they weren't satisfied with what they had or where they lived, but the day we begin rewarding people who do this in disregard of the laws is the day we begin to no longer be a nation of laws, and that is a legacy and a treasure we should not squander.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Nebraska.

TAX REFORM

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise to discuss an issue of importance for Nebraskans and Americans all across this country; that is, the need for comprehensive tax reform.

It is no secret the current Tax Code is overly complex and outdated. Any American can tell you how frustrating it is to file a tax return. Our Tax Code is riddled with deductions, exemptions, credits, exclusions, preferences, and loopholes that make it nearly impossible for anyone without a degree in tax law to understand.

At the same time, we should recognize that some progress has been made. Thanks to the work of Chairman HATCH and members of the Senate Finance Committee, many important updates to the Tax Code were made permanent at the end of last year. In particular, increasing the deduction limit and making permanent section 179 of the Tax Code was an important step. This section allows small businesses to deduct from their taxes certain depreciable business assets. My constituents told me annual uncertainty about whether section 179 would be renewed made it very difficult for them to plan, to invest, and to grow their businesses. Making this provision permanent reduced the ambiguity that had plagued Nebraska's small business owners and operators.

Although we have made some progress in reforming the Tax Code, there is more work to do for the American people. I believe tax reform should focus on several principles, including competitiveness, simplicity, and economic growth. At nearly 40 percent, the United States has the highest combined corporate tax rate in the developed world. This is stifling job growth, hurting families, and compelling businesses to move overseas. Any comprehensive plan should seek to lower this rate to a competitive level, one that will not only encourage current businesses to stay but also incentivize new businesses to set up shop.

Another goal of comprehensive tax reform should be to simplify the Tax Code. Families and businesses spend billions of hours every year in com-

pleting their taxes. A disproportionate share of this burden is shouldered by many small businesses. Many of these are family businesses, and they don't have the resources to easily comply.

Creating a tax system that is simple and efficient will reduce administrative and compliance costs. A simple tax system will also increase transparency, allowing Americans to fill out their taxes accurately while preventing fraud and lost revenue. Perhaps most importantly, any plan to reform the Tax Code—well, it must spur economic growth. Inaction on reforming the Tax Code is delaying needed growth in GDP, jobs, and investment.

When I was first elected to the Senate, I thought my colleagues and I would immediately take up two issues to restart our economy, grow jobs, and help all American families: tax reform and reducing the overburden of government regulations. After all, it is pretty obvious these are two issues we can reform that would have a positive impact on our economy. We see regulations become ever more burdensome, and they continue to depress our economy, stifle innovation, and hurt our families.

Major tax reform has not happened. We continue to chip away, but I believe now is the time we step up and be bolder. We must make the necessary reforms to our tax system to give Americans confidence in our future. We need to help put more money back in the pockets of hardworking Americans and allow them to spend money on the goods and services they choose and that they need.

It is my hope my colleagues will join me in continuing this discussion and that this dialogue then will eventually result in action, in comprehensive tax reform that truly benefits Nebraskans and the American people.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CHINA'S ALUMINUM INDUSTRY

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, over the last few decades, China has used market-distorting subsidies and industrial policies to repeatedly prop up their own industries and rip off American jobs. Steel, tires, solar panels—the story plays out again and again. Too often China's economy is not run by the markets; it is run by government committee. So even though its own State Council has called out the problem of severe excess capacities, China clings to the same old tired and destructive policies. Today I want to address what is happening now with China's huge overcapacity of aluminum.

The amount of aluminum Chinese smelters are churning out has gone up by more than 1,200 percent in a decade

and a half. In 2000, they produced 2.5 million metric tons. In 2015 China produced 32 million metric tons. When you create a glut of aluminum production the way China has, you send the markets into turmoil and you do enormous harm to American workers.

I spoke last week at a public hearing held by the U.S. Trade Representative and the International Trade Commission about how the overproduction of steel in China is an urgent and immediate threat to steel jobs here in our country. While China's steel mills are churning out more steel than ever, American steel towns are suffering or worse. Thousands of jobs nationwide have been lost just in the last year. Even though one-third of all steel produced today has no buyer, China keeps adding and adding to the glut by producing more steel.

The same story is played out in the case of primary aluminum. There is a huge overcapacity in China that, once again, is driven by market-distorting government policies. It has unleashed a chain of events that can end in economic devastation across this country. Global aluminum prices have already plummeted, undercutting our American companies. Between the start of 2011 and this upcoming June, the lights will have gone out at nearly two-thirds of the aluminum smelters in the United States. More than 6,500 jobs—good American jobs—will have been lost. You can bet that sooner or later the damage will ripple downstream through the entire aluminum industry, which employs three-quarters of a million Americans either directly or indirectly.

In my judgment, the United States is badly in need of a safeguard against this economic tidal wave. That is why I have chosen to stand with my friend Leo Gerard, president of the United Steelworkers, and the steelworkers. They filed a petition for relief under section 201 of the Trade Act of 1974 today. Without an immediate economic bulwark, the United States is in danger of losing thousands of good family-wage jobs across our country.

It is my view that the administration should act in this case as soon as possible to defend our workers and our businesses from economic ruin. The United States and our trading partners must ramp up the pressure on China to stop overproduction, and our trade enforcers have to take on the trade cheats and use every single trade tool in the toolbox, including the ENFORCE Act, the Leveling the Playing Field Act, and the other measures my colleagues and I on the Finance Committee fought to get signed into law over the last year.

I firmly believe workers in Oregon and across this country can compete with anybody in the world, but the United States cannot afford to sit idly by and watch China's destructive policies cause our aluminum industry to be wiped out. As the steelworkers have pointed out repeatedly, enough is

enough. Leo Gerard and those steelworkers are standing up and fighting back, and I am honored to stand with them.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, in a few moments, we will be voting on ending debate on H.R. 636, and that will allow us to proceed to a vote on the bipartisan Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act of 2016. I wish to urge my colleagues to support that motion to end debate.

The legislation we are considering is not just any FAA reauthorization. This bill is the most pro-passenger and pro-security FAA reauthorization in recent history. Travelers are frustrated, and this bill contains commonsense reforms to make travel safe and secure and more passenger-friendly.

For over 2 weeks on the Senate floor now and before that in the Commerce Committee, where I serve as chairman, we have been working hard to thoughtfully develop this bill and to allow for robust debate. For instance, there are drone safety provisions in the bill, including a pilot program to deploy technology to intercept drones near airports. These provisions are obviously intended to prevent accidents like the one that happened outside the Heathrow Airport this weekend, where a drone hit an approaching plane.

We developed this provision and others in the bill through an open process that allowed every member of the committee to contribute and help write the bill. Last year, we held six hearings on topics that helped inform our bill, and at the committee markup last month alone, we accepted 57 amendments, 34 of which were sponsored by Democrats and 23 by Republicans. On the Senate floor, when it was reported out and taken up, we added 19 amendments, 10 from Democrats and 9 from Republican Senators. The resulting bill is one we can be proud of, and both sides of the aisle have commended us for our inclusive process. When there have been differences, we have been able to find ways to address or set those aside for later so the progress on the legislation could move forward.

Even at this late hour, we have worked constructively to assemble a possible managers' package of more than two dozen additional amendments that we would like to adopt by voice vote prior to final passage. Yet, even if that is not possible, I commit to those Senators whose amendments we stand prepared to accept that I will work to address their concerns as we engage with our colleagues in the House of Representatives.

Now it is time to conclude our work on the bipartisan FAA bill that I introduced a long ways back, along with my friend and ranking member, Senator BILL NELSON, and our Aviation Subcommittee leaders, Senators KELLY AYOTTE and MARIA CANTWELL.

The bill includes reforms benefiting the traveling public, and we shouldn't let them down. Let's vote yes on the motion to end debate and start moving these historic reforms forward.

As I mentioned, I have a list of 26 amendments that we would like to clear—amendments offered by both sides. It is a package we could adopt. We have a couple of objections to doing that. If the Members who have put forward those objections would be willing to release those objections, we would be able to get another 26 amendments adopted, many of which have been offered by colleagues, as I said, on both sides and many of which contain measures that I think will make the bill even stronger and make it a product we can all be proud of as it moves over to the House of Representatives. There, I hope it will receive consideration and action and ultimately end up on the President's desk.

The FAA bill is legislation we have to do on a fairly routine basis around here. This authorization will stand for about 18 months. There are a number of important considerations that need to be addressed that this bill not only acknowledges but addresses. As I mentioned, those considerations have to do with drone safety, which is an increasingly important issue in our economy and one where we need to make sure we have the right rules of the air, if you will, in place so that we preserve and ensure that safety is the No. 1 factor as we continue to see the increased research, development, and deployment of drone technologies in ways that have tremendous commercial application. As I said, it also includes a lot of passenger protections which are very consumer-friendly in terms of passengers who travel on a regular basis with the airlines. So those are things as well that we need to address in this legislation.

We enhanced the bill by amendment when it came to the floor with a couple of safety provisions that we think are critically important, particularly in light of what has happened of late with the attack in Brussels and a number of other attacks we have seen, where we have had aviation insiders involved, if you will—particularly the Metrojet airliner that crashed not that long ago and killed 224 people. There are a number of safety provisions that help address some of those concerns. As I said, we expand the TSA precheck program to limit the number of people who are in areas outside secure areas—outside the perimeter, so to speak—where they are more vulnerable to these types of attacks.

These are all included in this legislation. So from an aviation security standpoint, this bill includes the most

comprehensive security measures we will have adopted in nearly a decade. As I said before, from a passenger-friendly standpoint, according to a columnist at the Washington Post, this is one of the most passenger-friendly FAA reauthorization bills we have seen literally in a generation. So these are reasons why this bill needs to move forward.

I hope my colleagues here in the Senate, when the vote comes here in a few minutes, will cast a vote in support of ending debate and allow us to move forward to a vote on final passage, which will enable this legislation to move forward to the House of Representatives and I hope ultimately to the President so he can sign it into law and put many of these provisions in place that would be good for our country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, today, I wish to pay tribute to Sarah Root, a young woman from Iowa who just graduated from college with perfect grades. She was devoted to her family and friends and had a bright future, but she was taken from this earth too soon.

I want to express my sympathies to Sarah's parents and acknowledge Michelle Root, Sarah's mother, who is watching today. She will be testifying tomorrow before the House Committee on the Judiciary at a hearing titled, "The Real Victims of a Reckless and Lawless Immigration Policy: Families and Survivors Speak Out on the Real Cost of This Administration's Policies."

The hearing will focus on how the Obama administration's failed immigration policies allow thousands of criminal aliens to roam free.

Michelle Root will share her personal story about the loss of her daughter and how someone in the country illegally was able to walk free and abscond from authorities after fatally hitting her daughter's vehicle on graduation night.

Sarah was 21 years old and had just graduated from Bellevue University with an interest in pursuing a career in criminal justice. In the words of her family, "she was full of life and ready to take on the world." According to a close friend of hers, Sarah was smart, outgoing, and dedicated to her friends and family. She embodied the words: "live, laugh, love."

The day Sarah graduated, she was struck by a drunk driver in the country illegally. The alleged drunk driver was Edwin Mejia, who had a blood alcohol

content of more than three times the legal limit.

The driver was charged with felony motor vehicle homicide and operating a vehicle while intoxicated on February 3.

Bail was set at \$50,000, but he was only required to put up 10 percent. So, for a mere \$5,000, the drunk driver walked out of jail and into the shadows.

This case has shed light on the breakdown between the Federal Government and State and locals. It has also been a terrible example of why the President's policies don't work, and how they are having a dire effect on American families like the Root family.

Under President Obama's Priority Enforcement Program, a person in the country illegally will only be detained or removed in a few limited circumstances. The administration hides behind these so-called "priorities" to ensure that a vast majority of people in the country are not removed. Some say that nearly 90,000 illegal immigrant criminals were released in 2015 because of this policy.

The administration's policies result in tragedies like Sarah's.

A smart young lady who had a bright future was struck by a drunk driver who entered the country illegally, and was turned over to a brother who was also in the country illegally, while awaiting his immigration court date.

After the accident, local law enforcement apparently asked the Federal government—specifically U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—to take custody of the driver, but the Federal government declined. ICE refused to place a detainer on him. An ICE spokesman stated that the agency did not lodge a detainer on the man because his arrest for felony motor vehicle homicide "did not meet ICE's enforcement priorities."

The driver made bond and absconded, never showing up for his hearings and required drug tests. It is difficult for the family to have closure since the man is nowhere to be found. It is unknown if he is still in the United States or if he has fled to his home country of Honduras.

Sarah Root is one of many victims who have been harmed or killed because of lax immigration enforcement and the notion that drunk driving isn't always a public safety threat.

Even though this tragic accident happened in the heartland of America, this is a border security problem. The driver of the vehicle that killed Sarah entered the country illegally.

Every day, people are illegally entering the country, being removed, entering again, and committing more crimes. Illegal re-entries are happening because there are no consequences. That is what happened in Kate Steinle's death. And, that is why we need to move on Kate's law.

That bill would deter people from illegally re-entering by enhancing pen-

alties and establishing new mandatory minimum sentences for certain individuals with previous felony convictions.

The Obama administration cannot continue to turn a blind eye to drunk drivers, sanctuary communities, and people who ignore our laws, overstay their visas, or cross the border time and again.

I am still waiting for answers from the Obama administration on this case, and many more. There are many unanswered questions.

How many more people have to die? How many more women and young people are going to be taken from their family and friends?

Things have got to change. The President must rethink his policies and must find a way to ensure that criminal immigrants are taken off the streets. The Obama administration should try enforcing the law, instead of its priorities, for the sake of the American people.

I want to wish Michelle Root the best of luck while she is in Washington this week, and send my thoughts to her father who is trying to find justice back home.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The Senator from Ohio.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I rise today to echo the sentiments shared by our senior Senator from Iowa, CHUCK GRASSLEY. Tomorrow morning, one of my constituents, Michelle Root, will be testifying before the House Judiciary Committee about the loss of her beautiful young daughter, Sarah Root. As a mother of three daughters myself, I cannot begin to fathom the pain and anguish Mrs. Root is experiencing.

Earlier this year, 21-year-old Sarah Root was killed by a drunk driver. That driver, Edwin Mejia, was allegedly drag racing with a blood alcohol level more than three times the legal limit when he crashed into the back of Sarah's vehicle.

Edwin Mejia is also an illegal immigrant. After causing the death of an American citizen and being charged with motor vehicle homicide, one would think he would clearly meet U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement's so-called enforcement priorities. But no, citing the administration's November 2014 memo on immigration enforcement priorities, ICE declined to lodge a detainer and take custody of Mejia. During a recent Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee hearing, ICE Director Sarah Saldana actually suggested that ICE neglected to issue a detainer because at the time they were contacted, Sarah Root was seriously injured, not dead.

How twisted and convoluted has our immigration system become that an illegal immigrant who, while driving drunk and drag racing, hits and either seriously injures or kills an American citizen is not considered a priority for deportation?

In fact, only after a floor speech, multiple letters, and hearing questions

from Senators from Nebraska and Iowa, as well as media attention and concerns raised by the Root family, did ICE finally acknowledge that they should have taken Mejia into custody. It should not take all of those actions for ICE to determine that an illegal immigrant who kills an American citizen should be removed from our country.

Tragically, after ICE declined to file a detainer against Mejia, he posted a \$5,000 bond, was released, and has since disappeared. This is so despite the fact that he had a history of skipping court dates related to prior driving offenses.

A few weeks ago, I spoke with Sarah's dad, who told me that before they could even lay their daughter to rest, Mejia was released. This is truly an injustice, and we must do everything we can to ensure that we get answers in this case and prevent a similar tragedy from being replicated elsewhere.

While America has been and always will be a nation of immigrants, we are also a nation of laws. It is a privilege to live in this country, and anyone who comes here illegally and harms our citizens should without question constitute a priority for removal. For ICE to decide otherwise is baffling.

In recognition of their clear mistake, they have since listed Mejia on their "most wanted" list and acknowledged they should have taken him into custody.

The photograph of Sarah behind me was taken as she celebrated her graduation from Bellevue University with a 4.0 GPA and a bachelor's degree in criminal investigations and prepared to begin a bright future. The next day, she was killed.

While nothing can bring Sarah back, her family and friends deserve clear answers as to why Mejia was allowed to flee. This tragedy further underscores the administration's failed immigration enforcement priorities and should serve to spur renewed discussion about their so-called priorities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, there are a lot of people in this country who work very, very hard. We are known in this country as a people who work hard.

Montanans are no exception. We have some of the hardest working folks I know who live in that great State. Whether it is a farmer preparing the spring crop or a fishing guide preparing for the upcoming tourist season, my constituents know what a long day's work looks like. In fact, many of my constituents work two jobs so they can put food on the table and a roof over their head and can save for their kid's college education. These folks don't wake up in the morning and say: Hey, I think I will take the year off and just sit it out.

That is why it is no surprise that when I went home for the March recess, Montanans were overwhelmingly disgusted with the majority's decision to refuse to do their job. Constituent after constituent asked me what the heck we were doing back here. Local editorial boards even chimed in.

The Billings Gazette, my State's largest newspaper, tore the majority to shreds, saying that those who crow about making Washington work better are intentionally sabotaging the system, making it work worse.

The Montana Standard, in "Butte, America," accused Senators of "shirking their constitutional responsibilities" and denounced their tactics as "a pretty shoddy way to do business."

If that wasn't enough, the Bozeman Daily Chronicle described the crusade as "nothing but an abdication of responsibility and another example of the kind of playground-level obstruction that has soured so many Americans on Congress and contributed to the divisive meltdown in the race to the GOP nomination for President."

Now here we are. It has been 33 days since Judge Garland was nominated to the Supreme Court—33 days and counting. Yet there are no hearings in sight, no chance for the American people to have their voices heard through their elected representatives, no chance to ask tough questions of the nominee.

This week we will hear the majority leader talk about regular order with respect to appropriations bills. But if regular order is good enough for appropriations bills, it is good enough for a Supreme Court nomination.

The bottom line is this. The American people are as frustrated as I am. They are fed up with the obstructionism, and they want Congress to do its job.

So let's have a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee, and then let's have a vote in the Senate. As the Montana Standard says, anything less than that is "a pretty shoddy way to do business."

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.

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

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

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, in about 8 minutes we are going to start the vote on a motion for cloture, moving forward on the FAA bill. We have had a lot of debate about this. It passed with very little objection in the Commerce Committee. We have a package of 26 amendments, all of which have been cleared. We hope that can go as a separate amendment, almost like a managers' package. They are all non-controversial.

I am quite encouraged that we are making a number of reforms in the

FAA that I have spoken about at length and that the chairman of the committee, Senator THUNE, has spoken about at length. It is a good bill. Its previous adoption on a motion for cloture was something like 94 to 4. So you see where we are going.

Then we will get into conference with the House, although it is my understanding they have not passed their bill. They passed it out of committee, but they have some controversial things. Hopefully, they will get it out, and we will be able to come to terms and get this reauthorization of the FAA, which we had to extend in a short-term reauthorization, because the clock is ticking. So I just wanted to share that with the Senate.

PROTECTING THE MANATEE

Now, Mr. President, since we have some time and no Senator is seeking recognition, I want to tell the Presiding Officer about a creature we have in Florida. We have lots of interesting creatures. There are things that come in that are like alien species, such as the Burmese python that they estimate—the Superintendent of Everglades National Park has estimated that there may be as many as 150,000. They got one 15-foot female, and she had 54 eggs in her. So you see how prolific they are.

You cannot find them. The only way you can really find them is if there is a cold snap, because they will come out of the water, out of the river of grass where they are so exquisitely camouflaged. In a cold snap, they will come out of the water and up to the tree islands. Of course, you have seen some of those monsters—18 footers.

Well, they had another critter that we have, because in Florida we do have alligators. Lo and behold, you may have seen this alligator. This alligator was 800 pounds and 15 feet long. He had been in a lake that was created in a cattle pasture, and he had been eating cows, so he had plenty of food. Well, this alligator, of course, is a critter that is native to Florida. It is the crocodile that is imported.

You can tell the difference between an alligator and a crocodile because the alligator has a rounded snout and the crocodile has a pointed one. All of this is to tell you we have another critter that is the most loveable critter, and we have had it on the endangered list. This is the animal called the manatee; some people call it a sea cow.

These adorable creatures breathe air but live in the water. They have little flippers and a big body. Of course, they have these lovable faces. They have been endangered primarily because of boat propellers cutting them up. So we have had a serious effort at reducing the speeds of boats to a slow idle in manatee areas to protect them.

They also get bothered by cold water. When there is a cold snap, they will migrate to warmer water. Pollution is another cause of the manatee being endangered.

There has been a comeback. Around 20 years ago, there were only 1,200 of

them in the world. That population has grown upward to 6,000.

Here is the point: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service wants to take them off the endangered list and put them into a lesser category. Those of us who want to protect these critters don't want them to come off the endangered list. If I had thought enough in advance, I would have brought a picture of a manatee. They are the most loveable critters. You can get in the water, you can swim with them, and you can feed them. When you feed them a pellet of food, they nibble like a horse nibbles sugar out of your hand—all of this under water.

They are the most adorable critters. They love to be rubbed on their tummies. They love fresh water. In a brackish water system, where you can take a fresh water hose, they will come up and just drink the water, and then they will roll over so you can spray them underneath their flippers.

Thank goodness they have rebounded, but there is a lot more to rebound. So, I wanted to share our crusade—our efforts to try to keep the manatee on the endangered list and to protect them.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 3680

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, amendment No. 3680 is agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3679, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, amendment No. 3679, as amended, is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 55, H.R. 636, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Daniel Coats, Lamar Alexander, Bob Corker, Roger F. Wicker, Orrin G. Hatch, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, Kelly Ayotte, John Thune, Mike Rounds, Roy Blunt, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, John Barrasso, Johnny Isakson, James M. Inhofe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on H.R. 636, as amended, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator

from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. DURBN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 89, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 46 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Alexander	Franken	Murphy
Ayotte	Gardner	Murray
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Bennet	Grassley	Perdue
Blumenthal	Hatch	Peters
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Boozman	Heitkamp	Reid
Brown	Heller	Roberts
Burr	Hirono	Rounds
Cantwell	Hoeven	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Schatz
Cardin	Isakson	Schumer
Carper	Johnson	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Cassidy	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Cochran	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Lankford	Sullivan
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Corker	Manchin	Thune
Cornyn	Markey	Tillis
Cotton	McCain	Udall
Daines	McCaskey	Vitter
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Enzi	Merkley	Whitehouse
Ernst	Mikulski	Wicker
Feinstein	Moran	Wyden
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—5

Boxer	Portman	Rubio
Lee	Risch	

NOT VOTING—6

Blunt	Cruz	Sanders
Crapo	Flake	Toomey

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote, the yeas are 89, the nays are 5.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Hawaii.

UNITED STATES V. TEXAS

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, today the Supreme Court heard oral arguments in *United States v. Texas*. This case is a challenge to President Obama's Executive actions to prioritize U.S. immigration enforcement.

In 2012, the President used his legal authority to establish the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, or DACA. DACA has given nearly 700,000 undocumented young people the opportunity to come out of the shadows to pursue their dreams through education and jobs.

In 2014, again acting within existing legal authority, the President announced an expansion of the successful DACA Program. He also created a new Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents Program, or DAPA. DAPA allows the undocumented parents of U.S.-born and legal permanent resident children, the majority of whom are U.S. citizens, to

stay in this country with their families.

Together, the expanded DACA and DAPA were expected to enable nearly 5 million people to come out of the shadows without fear of deportation. Unfortunately, Texas and 25 other States have challenged the President's authority to issue these Executive orders, resulting in the Supreme Court hearing today.

Hundreds of DREAMers, Muslim students, and activists from California, New York, New Jersey, and elsewhere rallied on the Supreme Court steps this morning. I spoke with them and heard their stories and their hopes that the Supreme Court would make the right decision in support of the President and the millions of DACA and DAPA families. Many carried signs and stickers that read "Keep families together." Keeping families together is at the crux of the President's Executive orders—families like that of Gabriela Andrade, who, as a teenager, fled violence in Brazil and settled in Texas before coming to Hawaii. While Gabriela's sister and parents were granted visas through a lottery system, Gabriela fell through the cracks. Until President Obama announced the DACA Program, she lived in fear of being separated from her entire family. She said:

DACA pulled me out of limbo and gave me a life again. It allowed me to go back to school to pursue a bachelor's degree in political science, to volunteer with several local organizations.

Today, Gabriela is an advocate for DREAMers like herself. President Obama's DAPA and expanded DACA Programs would help thousands of families like Gabriela's who want to stay together and be contributing members of our communities without the daily fear of deportation. To tear undocumented parents away from their children and put these U.S.-born children in foster care is unconscionable. To deport people who were brought here when they were very young—to essentially tear them away from the United States, the only home and country they have known—is also unconscionable.

These young people would be facing insurmountable odds, and I can certainly relate to some of the challenges they face. When I was almost 8 years old, my mother, brothers, and I legally immigrated to the United States. When we first arrived in Hawaii, we certainly struggled. I had to navigate the public school system without speaking a word of English. My mother worked low-paying jobs with no job security, and we struggled to make ends meet. But we took strength in being together as a family.

However, in addition to facing the kind of challenges my whole family faced when we first arrived in this country, DACA and DAPA families live in constant fear that they will be ripped apart through deportation. These families and children have been

living in limbo for over a year while the legal challenges work their way through the system, through the courts.

In addition, *United States v. Texas* is also pushing DREAMers who are eligible for the original DACA Program, which is not being challenged, further into the shadows.

Singai Masiya, who heads the Aloha DREAM Team in my home State and is a DREAMer himself, told my office that DACA-eligible people in Hawaii stopped applying for DACA. Why? They are afraid that if the Court rules against President Obama's Executive actions, their application information will be used to deport them. This is a real fear in our communities.

United States v. Texas not only affects the lives of the more than 7,000 DACA- and DAPA-eligible Hawaii residents, it affects our economy. Over 10 years, DACA, DAPA, and expanded DACA are projected to provide a \$276 million cumulative increase in Hawaii's State gross domestic product. The Center for American Progress also projects that, over 10 years, DACA, DAPA, and DACA expansion would provide a \$136 million increase in the combined earnings of Hawaii's residents. However, in order to see these economic benefits, the Justices of the Supreme Court must rule on the side of DREAMers and the DAPA families. My hope is that the Supreme Court rules that the President is well within his legal authority in expanding DACA and DAPA and allows these Executive actions to be implemented.

I note, however, that Executive actions, important as they are, are not enough. The President himself has called on Congress to fix our broken immigration system so that 11 million undocumented people in our country can come out of the shadows and live and work openly.

It has been almost 3 years since the Senate passed bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform. I call upon Congress to do our jobs and enact fair, humane, and sensible immigration reform—recognizing that we are, indeed, a country of immigrants. That fact is at the very root of our strength as a nation.

Mr. President, I yield back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 12 noon on Tuesday, April 19, the Senate vote on passage of H.R. 636, as amended; further, that following the disposition of H.R. 636, as amended, the Senate resume

consideration of S. 1012, the Energy Modernization Act, as under the previous order; that following disposition of S. 1012, as amended, if amended, but not prior to Wednesday, April 20, the cloture motion with respect to the motion to proceed to H.R. 2028 be withdrawn and the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 2028, the energy and water appropriations bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUDGET ACT ENFORCEMENT DETAILS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, Public Law 114-74, included an instruction to the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget to file allocations, aggregates, and budgetary levels in the Senate after April 15, 2016. Today, I wish to submit the required filing found in that act.

Specifically, section 102 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 requires the chairman to file: No. 1, an allocation for fiscal year 2017 for the Committee on Appropriations; No. 2, an allocation for fiscal years 2017, 2017 through 2021, and 2017 through 2026 for committees other than the Committee on Appropriations; No. 3, aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2017; No. 4, aggregate revenue levels for fiscal years 2017, 2017 through 2021, and 2017 through 2026; and No. 5, aggregate levels of outlays and revenue for fiscal years 2017, 2017 through 2021, and 2017 through 2026 for Social Security.

The figures included in this filing are consistent with the discretionary spending limits set forth in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 and the most recent baseline from the Congressional Budget Office, CBO. CBO's last baseline was released on March 24, 2016.

In addition to the update for enforceable limits above, section 102(c) of the act allows for the matter contained in subtitles A and B of title IV of S. Con. Res. 11, the fiscal year 2016 congressional budget resolution, to be updated by 1 fiscal year. Pursuant to this authority, all reserve funds available to the Senate in title IV of last year's budget resolution are updated and available for use.

For purposes of enforcing the Senate's pay-as-you-go rule, which is found in section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21, the fiscal year 2008 congressional budget resolution, I am resetting the Senate's scorecard to zero for all fiscal years.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables detailing enforcement in the Senate be printed in the RECORD.

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

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017—PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974 AND SECTION 102 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 1974

(\$ Billions)			
	Budget Authority	Outlays	
Appropriations:			
Revised Security Category Discretionary Budget Authority ¹	551.068	n/a	
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority ¹	518.531	n/a	
General Purpose Outlays ¹	n/a	1,181.800	
Memo:			
Subtotal	1,069.599	1,181.800	
on-budget	1,064.120	1,176.252	
off-budget	5.479	5.548	
Mandatory	1,018.836	1,006.323	

¹ The allocation will be adjusted following the reporting of bills, offering of amendments, or submission of conference reports that qualify for adjustments to the discretionary spending limits as outlined in section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO SENATE COMMITTEES OTHER THAN APPROPRIATIONS—PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974 AND SECTION 102 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2015

(\$ Billions)			
	2017	2017–2021	2017–2026
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry			
Budget Authority	133.326	654.992	1,326.950
Outlays	121.522	602.813	1,227.781
Armed Services			
Budget Authority	162.573	866.345	1,881.840
Outlays	162.554	862.324	1,878.407
Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs			
Budget Authority	23.973	114.120	214.810
Outlays	1.767	– 6.507	– 44.043
Commerce, Science, and Transportation			
Budget Authority	19.605	97.564	200.873
Outlays	14.226	78.209	153.228
Energy and Natural Resources			
Budget Authority	4.033	22.689	45.474
Outlays	3.875	23.019	46.064
Environment and Public Works			
Budget Authority	45.086	220.077	424.157
Outlays	2.593	12.994	25.832
Finance			
Budget Authority	2,276.978	13,076.286	31,139.783
Outlays	2,261.358	13,047.872	31,097.877
Foreign Relations			
Budget Authority	36.313	163.870	312.459
Outlays	30.758	149.512	296.865
Homeland Security and Government Affairs			
Budget Authority	139.899	743.132	1,605.694
Outlays	138.184	730.863	1,571.460
Judiciary			
Budget Authority	30.054	90.554	164.524
Outlays	16.069	94.016	171.897
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions			
Budget Authority	17.155	91.885	180.246
Outlays	15.792	90.782	186.736
Rules and Administration			
Budget Authority	0.065	0.332	0.664
Outlays	0.036	0.200	0.429
Intelligence			
Budget Authority	0.514	2.570	5.140
Outlays	0.514	2.570	5.140
Veterans' Affairs			
Budget Authority	102.652	550.283	1,227.001
Outlays	108.093	557.484	1,233.278
Indian Affairs			
Budget Authority	0.469	2.053	4.484
Outlays	0.829	3.038	5.263
Small Business			
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000
Outlays	0.000	0.000	0.000
Unassigned to Committee			
Budget Authority	– 844.465	– 4,648.714	– 10,722.295
Outlays	– 835.231	– 4,607.534	– 10,646.215
TOTAL			
Budget Authority	2,148.230	12,048.038	28,011.804

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO SENATE COMMITTEES OTHER THAN APPROPRIATIONS—PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974 AND SECTION 102 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2015—Continued

(\$ Billions)			
	2017	2017–2021	2017–2026
Outlays	2,042.939	11,641.555	27,209.999

Includes entitlements funded in annual appropriations acts.

BUDGET AGGREGATES—PURSUANT TO SECTION 311 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974 AND SECTION 102 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2015

(\$ Billions)			
	2017	2017–2021	2017–2026
Spending:			
Budget Authority	3,212.350	N.A.	N.A.
Outlays	3,219.191	N.A.	N.A.
Revenue:	2,681.976	14,498.308	32,350.752

N.A. = Not Applicable.

SOCIAL SECURITY LEVELS—PURSUANT TO SECTION 311 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974 AND SECTION 102 OF THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2015

(\$ Billions)			
	2017	2017–2021	2017–2026
Outlays	805.365	4,609.710	11,047.979
Revenue	826.094	4,438.985	9,738.619

PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE SENATE

(\$ Billions)		Balances
Fiscal Years 2016 through 2021		0
Fiscal Years 2016 through 2026		0

CALLING FOR RENEWED ATTENTION TO BOKO HARAM

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I wish to bring renewed attention to the continued violence perpetrated by Boko Haram against women and children.

It has now been 2 years since the horrific kidnapping of 279 school girls in Nigeria. In the aftermath of this brazen attack, Senator MIKULSKI and I, joined by the other women in the Senate, strongly advocated for the imposition of sanctions on Boko Haram, and the international community responded by doing just that. We were grateful for Secretary Kerry's swift action to get this done at the United Nations, and Boko Haram is now subject to a complete asset freeze, travel ban, and arms embargo.

In addition, the Senate unanimously passed legislation that I authored to require a comprehensive, 5-year strategy to combat Boko Haram at the end of last year. Next week, I am sending a letter signed by many of the cosponsors of this legislation to our colleagues in the House of Representatives, urging them to take up this important measure.

Nevertheless, Boko Haram has continued to wage its relentless war on innocent civilians in Nigeria and throughout the Lake Chad Basin since it declared its allegiance to ISIS last year. More women and more girls have been kidnapped. Although some of the