

are doing their thing. I know we have funding issues a week from this Friday that we have to address. I know immigration is an important issue that we need to confront, but do not forget about disaster relief. We have to get it done for the people out west in California, the people in Texas, the people of Florida, the people of Puerto Rico, and for our fellow Americans who were hurt by the hurricanes this season and the fires of 2017.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, as we continue the debate on the issue of immigration as it relates to providing a permanent solution to those young immigrants who benefited from the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, the scope of this debate has expanded to include other issues.

Some of these issues are directly related to the DACA issue, including persistent concerns on our southern border, like improving barriers and border access roads, providing hiring and retention incentives for Customs and Border Protection personnel to ensure that all locations on the border remain secure. Other things being debated, like changes to legal immigration levels, truly need their own debate.

Some appear to have seized on this as an opportunity to push forth an agenda aimed at limiting the future flow of legal immigration. Before this idea gains any steam, we have to fully discuss and debate its potentially enormous impact on our economy. It is easy for some to see unemployed Americans and point to immigrants as a scapegoat. To suggest that every immigrant who passes through our borders represents a job being pried from the hands of an American citizen is far-fetched, at best.

After taking the time to actually examine the facts, the shortsightedness of this thinking is exposed. For example, cleaving the number of new legal immigrants by almost 50 percent—which is what the White House proposal appears to envision over time—would initially reduce the overall rate of economic growth in the United States by an estimated 12.5 percent when compared to currently projected levels through 2045. This is because labor force growth is one of the most important factors tied to economic growth. More troubling, these changes in legal immigration would come just as the aging U.S. population increases our dependence on a growing workforce.

Some have suggested that legal immigrants represent some sort of drag on government resources. In fact, the National Academy of Sciences estimates that the average immigrant contributes, in net present value terms, \$92,000 more in taxes than they receive in benefits over their lifetime.

We can only expect these numbers to increase as we move to a kind of merit

or employment-based system. I should note that in the bipartisan approach in 2015, we did restrict the number of family-based visas. I think it was from a total of 75 percent of legal immigration, we moved it down to 50 percent from family-based visas. At that same time, what we did was reallocate those visas to merit-based or employment-based visas so we wouldn't have an overall drop in legal immigration.

To look into the future of what happens when the philosophy of limiting legal immigration takes hold, we need to look no further than the current economic struggles Japan is having. In a timely piece by Fred Hiatt in the Washington Post this last Sunday, he points out that Japan's population of 127 million is forecast to shrink by one-third over the next half century. The increase in lifespans coupled with a decrease in fertility is projected to lead to near-stagnant economic growth, reduced innovation, labor shortages, and huge pressure on entitlements and pensions in Japan.

These disastrous realities facing Japan are the direct result of that nation's historically low level of immigrants. As Hiatt astutely points out, "You can be pro-growth. You can be anti-immigration. But honestly, you can't be both."

Legal immigration policy is complicated, but it is important, and it is worth debating this reform on its own. There may be a strong appetite for merit-based immigration, but rather than drastically cutting legal and necessary immigration flows, we need to work together to provide a way for the best and brightest to make it to the United States, both for their benefit and ours.

Let's not be lured into thinking that legal immigration is some kind of simplistic zero-sum game that can be easily reformed without consequence. During the last administration, many of us rejected the new normal of low economic growth driven by overregulation and irrational tax policy. It would be a supreme irony if we were to fix those anti-growth fiscal and regulatory policies only to counteract them with immigration restrictions that affect our workforce.

Let's give this important and complex issue the time for discussion, analysis, and debate it deserves and not shoehorn it into a DACA fix.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

THE BUDGET

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I cannot help but note that the fiscal year began October 1 last year. Four months have passed. That is 122 days since the start of the fiscal year, and we still don't have a budget deal to allow us to finish the fiscal year 2018 appropriations bills. That is 122 days, and the Congress has not done their job.

Recently, President Trump has taken to Twitter. He has accused Democrats of holding up funding for our troops.

Well, the idea that Democrats are holding up defense spending doesn't pass the laugh test. I mean, last July—7 months ago—I called for bipartisan budget negotiations, something we have always done in the past. As the vice chairman of Appropriations, I put forward a proposal that would increase defense spending by \$54 billion and would increase nondefense spending by an equal amount of \$54 billion. Basically, what we did when Senator MURRAY and then-Congressman RYAN worked out the budget agreement. We did that years ago based on parity. The proposal was responsible, it was reasonable, and it was based on parity. It was something we have done for years. It would have fully funded President Trump's budget request for our military, but it would also have provided much needed relief from the damaging effects of sequestration that we have seen on both sides of the ledger, defense and nondefense.

But instead of trying to reach a bipartisan budget deal to allow us to finish our spending bills on time, the Republican leadership, which controls the agenda, had other priorities. They spent the last 7 months trying to repeal healthcare for millions of Americans and rolling back important consumer protections. They cut environmental and workplace protections, protections for women in the workplace, and they passed budget-busting tax cuts that primarily benefit big corporations and the wealthiest Americans. As a result of doing that, the funding for our troops, as well as for key domestic priorities, has been left to limp along under four continuing resolutions.

Yesterday, the Trump administration—and I wonder if they have actually looked at the President's budget—accused Democrats of holding defense spending hostage over arbitrary demands for lower priority domestic programs.

I am curious. What are the domestic programs the Trump administration considers a lower priority? Do they consider the services for our veterans that are lacking around this country—do they think helping our veterans is a lower priority? What about the funding to combat the opioid epidemic? Every single State represented by every single Senator here, Republican and Democrat alike, in every corner of our country, has been hurt by the opioid epidemic. Is the Trump administration saying that is a lower priority? How about investments in education for our Nation's children? Is that a lower priority? Is disaster relief for our communities that have been devastated by hurricanes—there are so many—a lower priority? What about replacing our crumbling bridges all across the country before people start dying in record numbers? Is that a lower priority?

The President puts before us a false choice, and it makes me wonder if he is actually seeing the budget his administration proposes. There is no reason we

can't fight for and fund both our military and other domestic programs. It is not an either/or choice. It has never been an either/or choice, whether we have had a Democratic or Republican administration.

One thing we do know is that operating under four continuing resolutions is no way to govern. I think it is time to get serious about reaching a deal.

Later today, the House is going to pass another Defense appropriations bill that will exceed the budget caps by \$73 billion, and they don't even know where it will be spent. But if you don't have a budget deal to raise the caps, this would be a false promise to our military because that funding level would trigger a sequester. It would force a 13-percent across-the-board cut on defense programs. It is not a serious bill; it is a messaging bill.

There are those who are going to tout it on the floor of the House, saying: Look what we are doing to raise it. Will they at least take a moment to say that it actually cuts our defense programs 13 percent across the board? I asked the Secretary of Defense what he thinks about that. He says it would be a disaster.

What we are doing is we have been substituting sound bites for substance. I think we are past the time for that kind of messaging.

The budget and the appropriations process are where we set our priorities as a nation and where we put those priorities into action. That has been our policy here in the Senate under Democratic and under Republican leadership for decades. Instead of doing this basic job, Congress and the President have put the Federal budget on perpetual autopilot, so it never gets done. It comes up, we talk about it, and it doesn't get done. It comes up again, we talk about it, and it doesn't get done. The can has been kicked down the road over and over again.

It makes me think of "Groundhog Day." We are coming up on Groundhog Day. Well, it is "Groundhog Day," plus a sequel, plus another sequel, plus another sequel and yet another sequel. Well, that may have been a funny movie, but this is real life for over 300 million Americans, and 100 Americans are entrusted to make their lives better.

Kicking the can down the road and playing "Groundhog Day" is corrosive and damaging to our Nation and to the American people in countless ways.

Certainly, my experience with a Republican administration and a Democratic administration, many times in the majority in this body and many times in the minority in this body—one thing I have learned, and many of my Republican colleagues tell me the same thing, is that you can't govern by continuing resolution. It is easy. It means you don't have to do your work. But neither the military nor our country can properly function under sequestration. They can't function if we don't do our jobs.

This week, we are taking another recess after this afternoon. I wish we would just stay here and get these bills passed. I am willing to. Vermont is a very nice place to be this time of year—great skiing, lovely place. I have kids and grandkids there, but I will stay here if it means we can get the appropriations bills passed, get us off this corrosive, wasteful continuation of a continuing resolution and sequestration.

The continuing resolution expires on February 8. That is 9 days from today. It is up to the Republican leadership in both Chambers to get serious about striking a bipartisan budget deal. I believe there is something we can do. Talking with both Republican and Democratic Senators, I think we could have a budget deal that would get 60 votes in the Senate. We could raise the caps. We could take care of defense but also take care of a lot of priorities we hear about when we walk down Main Street in the towns and cities we represent. These aren't people who have a partisan attitude; they just want to see the government work.

The States that have suffered from hurricanes and flooding want to see us help them as a nation. If their community is devastated by opioids, they want to see us do something about it. They would like to see the Federal Government do something about stopping the millions of opioids flooding into this country illegally from China. They are not coming across the wall; they are coming from China through the mail, through the post offices we all have in our communities.

Let's start to look at the real threats to America. You don't do it by sound bites; you do it by substance and hard work. There are many Senators on both sides of the aisle who are willing to do that hard work. We have unbelievably talented staff from both Republicans and Democrats who have been working very hard to get us there. Let's start doing that. Let's stop looking for the sound bite. Let's start looking for the substance. I am ready to. I have talked with key Members of both parties about this. It can be done.

I felt honored the other day when Senator Robert Dole, one the titans of this body—a Republican, a conservative Republican—asked me to be one of the two Senators to speak when he received the Congressional Gold Medal. We had a chance to chat first about how we used to do it. Without sounding like the old-timer talking about the good old days, what we would do is the Republicans and Democrats—key Members of both parties—would sit down and we would work something out because we could take each other's word for it. We set aside political posturing, and we did what was best for the country.

Senator Dole joined with Senator Moynihan—a conservative Republican and a liberal Democrat—and they saved Social Security. Senator Dole joined with Senator George McGov-

ern—again, a conservative Republican and a liberal Democrat. As a result, millions of children were fed, others were fed, hungry people were fed in this country and in other countries. What a great humanitarian gesture. Both Senator Dole and Senator McGovern fought in World War II. Both had a distinguished military career. Senator Dole was severely injured. Senator McGovern volunteered to fly many, many missions beyond the number he was required to, even though so many planes in those missions were being shot down. But they came back and said: OK. We did that. Now what are we doing for the people we fought to save?

We should listen to people like that. We should listen to them. We would be a better Senate, we would be a better country if we did.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I wish to speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise today on this 13th day of January to call out this body, the body of the U.S. Senate, for its dereliction of duty. Enough is enough. We need a long-term budget bill for all of America, including my home State of Montana, because that is what Americans expect because it is our job.

It has been 122 days since Congress has failed to pass a budget. What makes this even more egregious is the fact that we haven't done anything but continuing resolution after continuing resolution. There is no certainty in that. And even if we passed a long-term budget deal, it isn't even for that long of a term—through the end of this fiscal year, which is when it needs to be done by.

For the last 122 days, Congress has left community health centers, small business owners, America's families, Montana's families without the certainty of a long-term budget. During that time, Congress has instead settled for four short-term, crisis-funding bills that don't do what is necessary and that provide more uncertainty and more chaos.

I have heard a lot of folks say that government needs to be run like a business. There is no business that would put off what it is doing just because it is convenient. In my real life, I am a farmer. I know that you have to plan. I know that you can't go from month to month with uncertainty ahead of you because if you do, you will end up in a situation where it will put you out of business. You have to be able to

plan, whether it is for the seeds you buy or equipment maintenance or anything else in agriculture. It is the same way in any business, and by the way, it is the same way in government.

Unfortunately, the norm has been a month of funding in continuing resolutions, or 3 weeks, instead of coming to a point where we can fund things until the end of the fiscal year, which will give folks certainty, whether it is the military or our southern border or community health centers.

Why do I bring this up? It is because fully 10 percent of the citizens of Montana depend on community health centers for access to their healthcare. It is in some cases the only source of healthcare for these folks. I have had listening tours and roundtables and over a dozen different public meetings on healthcare over the last year, and I can tell you that these facilities are critically important.

So who cares? Why should we worry about that, because we have a continuing resolution. Why? Because these folks right now, if you go talk to them in the State of Montana and I think in any other State in the Union, they will tell you they are not sure whether they will keep their doors open. That does not provide the kind of certainty they need and the kind of access to healthcare folks in our country need, and Montana is no exception.

We cannot continue governing from crisis to crisis. Montana deserves better. America deserves better. We need a budget that goes to the end of the fiscal year, that provides the kind of certainty and security the American people elected us to do. Congress simply needs to do its job.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

HONORING DEPUTY MARSHAL CHRISTOPHER HILL

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about two separate matters. The first is a very painful and difficult topic, but I feel it is important to address.

I wish to recognize, acknowledge, and honor the heroic life and legacy and sacrifice of one of Pennsylvania's finest: Deputy U.S. Marshal Christopher Hill.

On January 18 of this year, Deputy Hill was shot and killed while he was apprehending a fugitive in Harrisburg, PA. Christopher Hill lived in York, PA. He was only 45 years old. He was a husband and the father of two young children. He dedicated his life to serving and protecting first his country and later his community. He was an 11-year veteran of the U.S. Marshals Service. He was a former U.S. Army Ranger who had been deployed to Somalia. In 2014, Deputy Hill was one of the deputy marshals who helped capture a notorious cop killer in Pennsylvania, Eric Frein, who was the subject of one of the largest and longest manhunts in recent history throughout rural Pennsylvania.

The fact is that day in and day out for a very long period of time, Chris-

topher Hill put his life on the line for the rest of us. He did it as an Army Ranger in Somalia. He did it as a deputy U.S. marshal. I had the privilege of attending the memorial service for him recently. It was extraordinary to hear one after another of the people whom he had served with in various capacities speak about a truly extraordinary individual, a guy who was by all accounts humble and modest but absolutely dedicated with a passion to his family, to his community, and to his country.

Sometimes it is easy for us to forget the risks and sacrifices that are being taken by the men and women who wear various uniforms that represent the various organizations that defend and protect us. But I want to say to the people of Pennsylvania and to the family of Christopher Hill that we are never going to forget the bravery and the sacrifice and the service he provided for all of us.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, another topic I wish to touch on this afternoon is a much happier topic; that is, the extraordinary consequences we are already seeing of the tax reform we passed just about a month ago.

Yesterday, I had a chance to tour a small- to medium-sized company in the eastern part of Pennsylvania—Easton, PA, which is where they are located. Sussex Wire is the name of the company. They have a very sophisticated technology whereby they take wire, and without heating it and without grinding it, they use a process that turns it into the shape and form that their customers require. It is a very sophisticated process. They can crank out tremendous volumes.

This relatively small business—I think they have 55 employees—is doing very well. It is manufacturing in Pennsylvania, in America. As a direct result of the tax reform we passed, their tax burden has been diminished, and that has, in turn, allowed them to speed up the hiring of five or six new workers—five or six people who don't have a job today, but they are going to have a job soon because Sussex Wire is hiring. Right now they are out looking for the folks who are going to expand their workforce, expand the ability of this terrific company to do even more.

The tax reform is also accelerating their ability to purchase new equipment. The new equipment they buy allows them to do more work more productively. It allows their workers to produce more of the little tools and devices that they produce. When workers produce more, when they are more productive, they can earn more income, and that is exactly what is happening at Sussex Wire. This is before we have had the opportunity to have all of these investments actually take place.

I am thrilled at how quickly we are seeing tangible benefits for the people I represent as a result of this tax reform.

Of course, it is not just Sussex Wire; it is happening all across America. It is

happening certainly all across Pennsylvania, and I hope we will hear about some of the examples tonight when the President gives his State of the Union Address.

At latest count, there are over 3 million American workers who have already gotten an increase in their compensation. Their employers have provided them either a pay raise or a bonus or a contribution to their pension plan or some combination of those things precisely because these businesses have more free cash flow as a result of lower taxes. Three million workers from almost 300 businesses, and since the last time I came to the floor and spoke about this phenomenon, there have been many more Pennsylvanians benefitting from this.

The employees of Home Depot, at 70 locations across Pennsylvania, are benefiting. Those employees—thousands, I suppose, altogether—are receiving \$1,000 each.

FedEx, which has a huge presence in Pennsylvania, has announced \$200 million in raises, \$1.5 billion in new investment in distribution hubs, and another \$1.5 billion that they are contributing to their employees' pensions.

PPG in Pittsburgh, PA, is spending \$50 million in new capital projects, in part because the Tax Code treats that investment better than our Tax Code used to, and it is encouraging more of this investment.

H&K Equipment in Coraopolis in western Pennsylvania is increasing its investments by 15 percent this year, again in response to this tax reform.

The Wall Street Journal reported over the weekend that manufacturing investment is already going up. It is already increasing. This is going to be very beneficial. First of all, it helps all the workers who produce the equipment in which companies are investing. Secondly, someone needs to operate this equipment, so when a company goes out and buys a new piece of equipment, new machinery, there is the job security or the new job being created for the person who operates it. Thirdly, there is the enhancement in productivity, which allows for higher compensation.

This is all happening at a time when our unemployment rate is relatively low. It is at an alltime record low for African Americans. It is low generally by standards of recent decades. This means that demand for more workers is going to translate into upward pressure on wages. I think we are already seeing it. It is very, very encouraging, and it is just a tremendous success for our workers.

I was very confident that this would be among the constructive consequences of our tax reform, but I will confess that I didn't realize it would happen so quickly. This is great news for Pennsylvanians, and it is great news for Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.