

success of these innovators are determined.

Over the last few years, we have been debating the future of the Web, and that is because broadband companies have tried to leverage what is to be established as a two-tier Internet—those with fast lanes because of their ability to pay more and slow lanes for those who can't pay more.

I believe the President did the right thing. He called on the FCC to make the right decision when it comes to the Internet and protecting it from cable companies who want to overcharge or slow down connections. The FCC seems to be willing to make the right call, by protecting consumers and the Internet, under a new order which, just like a utility, would give consumers the ability to be protected from bad service or exorbitant fees. At this point in time, that is what we need to do to protect consumers.

According to the news reports, Chairman Wheeler will announce a plan to use the FCC authority in the most comprehensive way to protect Net neutrality, prohibit pay-to-play fast lanes, prohibit blocking and throttling, require greater transparency for consumers, and apply the rules to wireless broadbands so that smart phones are treated just like the browser on your desk.

This plan would cover what is known as the middle mile or Internet traffic or the companies that content providers, such as Netflix, pay to bring traffic to cable companies, such as Comcast, to connect to you, the end user. These important policies will provide certainty to a startup in business, and they will make sure that those products get equal access.

Last month I had a roundtable in Seattle with several startups and experts on Net neutrality, and many of those companies relied on the Internet to transform their ideas into successful businesses. They explained how the debate affects more than just tech companies. They said software is revolutionizing every industry, from retail to health care, everything from the way you pay for your coffee at Starbucks to how you access your own personal health information.

If we allowed a two-tier system to develop, the big guys would have the ability to pay more while the smaller customers would have disruptions. What we have done, hopefully with an announcement today, is to make sure we are putting a stake in the ground to protect consumers.

The CEO of the Washington Technology Industry Association put it best when he said:

We have a multi-trillion dollar evidence base study that says the current rules of the game—which mean open, neutral access to the Internet—work.

I couldn't agree more.

Our innovation economy depends on equal access for all ideas. The proof is in the numbers. Over 6 million U.S. jobs are tied to the Internet. That adds

up to a payroll of \$558 billion. In the Seattle metropolitan area alone, from 2009 to 2014, there were 433 different venture capital deals related to Internet companies, totaling nearly \$2.6 billion.

All of this growth in the Internet economy relies on an open Internet. That means no blocking, no throttling of these priorities. That is why I support strong net neutrality rules. They need to be responsible and efficient.

I thank Chairman Wheeler for his leadership in setting up strong rules. I hope this information on the Web continues to be one of our great economic engines and continues job development here in the United States.

A strong net neutrality rule is the best tool in the toolbox for preserving the openness of the Internet today. It will go a long way to help us continue our economic prosperity.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Georgia.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I find it tragically ironic that on the same day the Islamic State tragically took the life and murdered a Jordanian pilot that the U.S. Senate failed to get a 60-vote majority to move to a motion to proceed to debate the most important issue facing the United States of America. I agree with my colleagues who have talked about the dangers of Islamic terrorism, the dangers of porous borders, and all the other dangers we have spoken about, but we can't solve those problems unless we get the bill to the floor and debate it.

I was elected in 2004. The No. 1 issue in my campaign and in the general election was immigration policy in the United States of America. Eleven years later, it is still the biggest domestic issue in the State of Georgia. We still have a porous border and we know how vulnerable we are. It is time we move this bill to the floor and fully debate it.

I know there are differences of opinion. I know each one of us would do it differently. But we are part of a constitutional government to make decisions for our people. We don't need Executive orders dictating what we should do. We need a House and a Senate to come to common ground, we need a President who will sign a bill, and we need a bill to be upheld. We are not going to get there until we have debate on the floor and move forward on a motion to proceed to debate funding for the Department of Homeland Security.

I just left a Committee on Foreign Relations hearing on human trafficking. We talked about the terrors of what is happening in terms of sexual abuse, sexual trafficking, child labor, minority labor—all of those horrors that are taking place. Do my colleagues know where they are taking

place in our country? They are taking place on the border of the Southwest, in the Presiding Officer's home State of Arizona, where our border is porous. And because of that, drugs and human beings are trafficked every single day. That should stop.

The No. 1 issue when we debated the Department of Homeland Security bill in 2005 was to put in a trigger to ensure that no changes in immigration law took place until we first secured the border.

The border is still not secure. We are trying. I commend our brave soldiers and the State of Arizona, as well as Fort Huachuca, one of the beacons of the drones that are flying on the border with Mexico to try to identify people coming in, but we haven't done enough.

We should bring the Department of Homeland Security bill to the floor. We should make sure the funding for the Department of Homeland Security is sufficient to secure our border. We will find our differences and we will debate our differences and we will come to common ground. But we can't come to common ground—we can't resolve our Nation's No. 1 domestic problem—unless we agree to bring to the floor the motion to proceed and bring a robust debate to the floor of the U.S. Senate.

I, as one Member of the Senate, ran for this job to be a part of the solution, not someone who would throw up my arms and say we can't solve the problems so I am going to sit on the sidelines. Let's get off of the sidelines. Let's come to the floor of the Senate. Let's vote on the motion to proceed. Let's fully amend and debate the bill. Let's send the President a bill from a unified Congress that says we want a secure border, we want an immigration policy that works, and we want to once again be a government of checks and balances, not a government of Executive orders.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. 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. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to please notify me at 9 minutes into a 10-minute speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we are in the odd situation by which our Democratic colleagues are complaining that we are blocking funding for the Department of Homeland Security when the House has passed a bill that fully funds the Department of Homeland Security. It is sitting at the desk today. The majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, has moved to proceed to that bill, and they are blocking it. Senator MCCONNELL moved to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed—to just

get on the bill—and he has indicated, as he has before, that there would be amendments allowed to the bill. This would be the way to move forward with an appropriations bill in the regular order. So it is unbelievable, really, that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to contend that the majority Republicans in Congress, in both Houses, are trying to block funding from the Department of Homeland Security when nothing could be farther from the truth.

Look at today's CNN headline. This is on their Web site: "Democrats Block Funding for DHS to Protect Obama's Immigration Orders."

Why are they blocking it? To protect Obama's immigration orders that are contrary to Congress's will, clearly overwhelmingly rejected by the American people, and contrary to law. Why should Congress fund unlawful activities? Why should it fund policies it does not approve of? Why should it fund policies the American people strongly reject? It has no duty to do that.

Congress is not a potted plant. It is not a rubberstamp. Congress has a duty to the people, which is to ensure that the laws of this country are followed, that the American people have defense for the homeland, with funding for the Department of Homeland Security, and they have done that. What they have said is we are not going to fund actions by the Department of Homeland Security that undermine the law. We are not going to approve money that undermines the laws of the United States, and we are not going to allow the President to take money, which was given to the Department of Homeland Security to enforce the law, so he can undermine the law.

What has the President done with his Executive orders? It is a stunning action. He said over 20 times he didn't have the power to do this. He doesn't have the power to do what he did. He just did it because political pressure, I guess, caused him to do so. He is going to provide legal status, not for children, for 5 million people. They will be given Social Security numbers. Constitutional scholars have told us, colleagues, the utilization of the idea of prosecutorial discretion is not appropriate in such a massive way as this. What I want to tell you is it goes well beyond prosecutorial discretion. The President is going to provide a Social Security number to people who are unlawfully here. He is going to provide a photo ID for people who are unlawfully in America, providing work permits for them, the right to participate in the Medicare and the right to receive checks from the Federal Government in the form of earned income tax credit to the tune of billions of dollars.

One of the first things we do to try to establish a lawful system of immigration is not provide financial benefit to people who come to the United States unlawfully. So this is a problem. I have to say it is a big problem.

My friend and able Member of this Senate, Senator DURBIN, the Democratic whip, assistant minority leader, said this last night, yesterday: "It is incredible to me that we have refused to provide funds the Department of Homeland Security needs to keep America safe." He said: "It is incredible to me that we haven't passed a bill that the House sent over here that fully funds Homeland Security."

I am not blocking the bill. We want to go on the bill. We want to be able to amend the bill to keep America safe. Who is blocking it? It is my Democratic colleagues. Senator DURBIN is the leader of the blocking game. He is the offensive line, the center, I guess, of the offensive line.

Senator DURBIN goes on to say: "There is nothing wrong with a debate over immigration policy."

That is correct. He continues: "In fact, the Republicans, now in the majority control of the House and Senate, could have started the debate weeks ago. They didn't."

Look, we debated Senator DURBIN's vision. It was rejected by Congress, his ideas. Many supported the bill in this body. It didn't come back this fall in part because of their actions on immigration.

President Obama had the choice to go from State to State trying to elect people to pass his immigration bill, but he either didn't do it or it didn't work. The American people do not want this kind of legislation.

My friend Senator DURBIN said further: "Instead, they attached five riders to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill, and they said: We will not allow that Department to be properly funded unless the President accepts these five immigration riders."

This is just a normal bill that says how the money is going to be spent. It is going to be spent for enforcement, and we are not going to spend money to not enforce the law. It doesn't change. The bill the House has sent to us does not change one lawful immigration policy of America, not one. It is the President who adopted a radical new immigration policy contrary to law, contrary to the American people's wishes. In fact, quite a number of Democrats urged him not to issue such an order, but he did it anyway. Congress has a duty.

Senator DURBIN talks about the DREAM Act that he offered. It had a chance for passage a number of times. But every time it was carefully read, it was an overreach. It went too far. But the point of which is it was rejected by Congress. Congress didn't pass that.

We need to be clear about who is objecting to what in this body, who wants to fund Homeland Security and who wants to advance a radical, unlawful, unpopular amnesty agenda the American people don't like.

Yesterday on the floor Senator SCHUMER asked if it wasn't possible for the Senate to pass a Department of Home-

land Security bill—without language that would ensure the President complies with the Constitution, of course—and then send it back to the House.

Senator SCHUMER is one of our more able Members, for sure, in the Senate, and I respect him and his abilities. But the answer is this: The House-passed DHS bill is the only vehicle because the House of Representatives would blue-slip a bill that originates in the Senate. This is a basic tenet of how a bill becomes law. Article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution states:

All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

Over the years, the House of Representatives has asserted, and successfully asserted, that this applied to revenue spending bills as well. According to the Congressional Research Service, as a result, the House customarily originates all "money" bills, including appropriations bills. The Congressional Research Service states:

In practice, the Senate has generally deferred to the House's insistence on originating appropriations.

Indeed, it has generally deferred because they won't move anything that doesn't start over there. They successfully asserted that gray area to their benefit, and perhaps it is consistent with the Constitution.

My staff has been unable to find a single instance where the House took up a Senate-originated appropriations bill in over 100 years, since 1901.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 9 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair.

Our friends in the House have been unequivocal: The Senate must pass the House bill. Speaker Boehner said, "Senate Republicans and Senate Democrats must stand together with the American people and block the President's actions."

House Appropriations Committee Chairman HAL ROGERS said the Senate, "should pass the bill, which funds a very vital national security agency but also turns back this blanket amnesty which is illegal and unconstitutional."

That is where we are. The House has sent over the right bill. It does the right thing. It defends the integrity of the Congress. It defends the wishes of the American people, it defends the policy decision of the Congress of the United States, and prohibits the President from doing what he himself said over 20 different times he did not have the power to do. Professor after professor and historians have said the President doesn't have the power to do it. If the President can do this, if he can execute laws Congress has rejected, what will he be able to do in the future?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the good news is the country has made substantial economical progress in the last 6 years since President Bush left office. Instead of losing 800,000 jobs a month as we were during the final months of the Bush administration, we are now creating some 250,000 jobs a month and have seen steady job growth over the last 58 months.

Instead of having a record-breaking \$1.4 trillion deficit as we did when President Bush left office in January 2009, the Federal deficit has been cut by more than two-thirds. Today the 10-year deficit projection is now \$5.5 trillion lower than what the projections were back in 2010.

Six years ago the world's financial system, as we all remember, was on the verge of collapse. Today that is not the case. In fact, some might suggest that Wall Street is doing too well.

While we can take some satisfaction as to what has been accomplished in the last 6 years, one would be very naive not to appreciate there is also a lot of very bad news in our economy, especially for working families.

Most significantly, the simple truth of the matter is the 40-year decline of the American middle class continues. Real unemployment is not 5.6 percent—including those people who have given up looking for work or people who are working part time when they want to work full time—it is over 11 percent. Youth unemployment—something we almost never talk about in this country—is a horrendous 17 percent, and African-American youth unemployment is over 30 percent. It is totally unacceptable.

Real median family income has declined by nearly \$5,000 since 1999. All over this country—in Vermont and in every other State in this country—we have people working longer hours for lower wages. We have husbands and wives working 50, 60 hours a week just to pay the bills. Incredibly, despite huge increases in productivity, in technology, and all of the global economy we hear so much about, the median male worker now earns \$783 less than he did 42 years ago. Let me repeat that. That American male worker right in the middle of the economy now earns, after inflation adjusted for wages, \$783 less than he did 42 years ago. The female worker right in the middle of the economy now makes \$1,300 less than she made in 2007.

When you ask why people are angry, why people are stressed, why people are frustrated, that is exactly why. Further, this country continues to have, shamefully, the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country on

Earth, and 40 million Americans still have zero health insurance.

In the midst of this tragic decline of the American middle class, there is, however, another reality. The wealthiest people and the largest corporations are doing phenomenally well. The result: The United States today has more income and wealth inequality than at any time since the Great Depression. Today the top one-tenth of 1 percent own almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent. Let me repeat that because that truly is a startling fact. Today the top one-tenth of 1 percent—which is what this chart talks about—owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent.

Today 1 family—the Walton family, owners of Walmart—owns more wealth than the bottom 40 percent of the American people, some 120 million Americans.

I don't believe most of our people think this is what the American economy should be about. In fact, this is not an economy for a democracy. This is what oligarchy is all about. One-tenth of 1 percent owning almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent, 1 family owning the equivalent of what 131 million Americans own, that is wealth. In terms of income—which is what we make every year—what we have seen in the last number of years since the Wall Street crash is virtually all new income is going to the top 1 percent.

Last year—just as one example—the top 25 hedge fund managers earned more income than 425,000 public school teachers. Does anybody believe that makes sense? Twenty-five hedge fund managers making more income than 425,000 public school teachers. That gap between the very rich and everybody else is growing wider and wider and wider.

The fact is that over the past 40 years, we have witnessed an enormous transfer of wealth from the middle class to the top 1 percent. In other words, what we are seeing in our economy is the Robin Hood principle in reverse. We are taking from the poor and the working families and transferring that income and wealth to the very wealthy.

From 1985 to 2013 the share of the Nation's wealth going to the middle class has gone down from 36 percent to less than 23 percent. If the middle class had simply maintained the same share of our Nation's wealth as it did 30 years ago, it would have \$10.27 trillion more in cumulative wealth than it does today. Almost \$11 trillion would have stayed with the middle class but has disappeared since 1985.

But while the middle class continues to shrink, while millions of Americans are working longer hours for low wages, while young people cannot afford to go to college or leave school deeply in debt, while too many kids in this country go hungry, we have seen, since 2009, that the top 1 percent has experienced an \$11.5 trillion increase in

its wealth. So the top 1 percent in recent years sees an \$11.5 trillion increase in wealth, while in roughly the same period the middle class sees a \$10.7 trillion decrease in wealth.

This \$11.5 trillion transfer of wealth from the middle class to the top 1 percent over a 5-year period is one of the largest such transfers of wealth in our country's history. Here is my point. This is not just a moral issue, although it is a profound moral issue—and Pope Francis, by the way, deserves a lot of credit for talking about this issue all over the world. Are we satisfied as a nation when so few have so much and so many have so little? Are we satisfied with the proliferation of millionaires and billionaires, at the same time as we have millions of children living in poverty? Is that what America is supposed to be about? That is the moral component of this debate.

But this is not just a moral issue. It is also a fundamental economic issue. As we know, 70 percent of our economy is based on consumer spending. When working people do not have enough income, enough disposable income, they are unable to go out and buy goods and services that they would like or that they need. The so-called job creators that my Republican friends often refer to are not the CEOs of the large corporations.

The CEOs of large corporations cannot sell their products or services unless people have the income to buy them. Someone can come up with the greatest product in the world, but if people do not have the money, they are not going to sell that product, they are not going to hire workers to produce that product.

The truth is that the real job creators in this country are those millions of people who every single day go out and purchase goods and services, but if they do not have adequate income, the entire economy suffers. There was a very interesting article, I believe it was yesterday or today, in the Wall Street Journal, written by Nick Timiraos and Kris Hudson, talking about how a two-tier economy is reshaping the U.S. marketplace.

What they talk about is:

It is a tale of two economies.

Said Glenn Kelman, chief executive of Redfin, a real estate brokerage in Seattle.

There is a high-end market that is absolutely booming. And then there's everyone in the middle class. They don't have much hope of wage growth.

The article continues.

Indeed, such midtier retailers as J.C. Penney, Sears and Target have slumped.

"The consumer has not bounced back with the confidence we were looking for," Macy's chief executive Terry Lundgren told investors last fall.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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