

to Washington, and we will spend it. That seems to be what the President had to say. Rather than looking at the dire consequences of not addressing these long-term problems, the President proposes to spend nearly \$4 trillion in fiscal year 2016, a 7-percent increase from fiscal year 2015 and about \$1 trillion more than what was spent in 2008. The President wants to eliminate the very budget caps that his administration proposed and he signed into law in 2011.

Well, it may be one thing to adjust those budget caps, particularly as it impacts our national defense and national security, but if that was done in conjunction with a larger proposal to address this out-of-control mandatory spending, wasteful spending, and unnecessary spending that is taking place here in Washington, that would be one thing to consider.

But this simply is just more of the same, going in the same direction, proposing unbalanced budgets each year, and adding more and more to our deficit and to our debt.

The President likes to talk about his veto pen and, with the release of this budget, we can only conclude that pen only contains red ink. The President has taken a pass on the golden opportunity to move forward and work together. Instead, his budget takes us in the same direction we have been going in the past 6 years without any proposal to address it in any kind of serious way. I think it is imperative that we do that.

Just last week, the Congressional Budget Office released its latest economic report and the findings were, once again, very sobering. This non-partisan report warned that under current law our "large and growing federal debt would have serious negative consequences, including increasing federal spending for interest payments; restraining economic growth in the long term; giving policymakers less flexibility to respond to unexpected challenges; and eventually heightening the risk of a fiscal crisis."

The CBO projects that the gross Federal debt is expected to raise another \$10 trillion over the next decade. The report also says that we will spend down almost \$800 billion of the Social Security Trust Fund over the next 10 years.

Ten years from now, it is projected that spending on mandatory programs and interest on the debt will consume almost 94 percent of all Federal revenues, leaving far fewer funds for other important national priorities, such as strengthening our infrastructure, national defense, medical research, education, and any number of issues that could be dealt with on a national basis that would affect the future of this country. But it will not be able to be done because we have not taken these steps. Time is running out to make the tough fiscal choices now so future generations will not be saddled with an even higher burden of debt.

I regret the President has yet to come forward with the serious intent of working with us to deal with one of our country's most challenging and most pressing problems with creative solutions. We will only be able to accomplish the results we need if we work together, as the President has said. But it takes his engagement if we are going to succeed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. First, Mr. President, I commend my good friend, the Senator from Indiana, for his good work on laying out, with the Senator from Oregon, one approach on reforming the Tax Code and his willingness to look at this issue of our national debt.

Let me echo, at \$18 trillion—he cited some statistics—interest rates go up 1 percent. That is more than \$120 billion a year off the top. That is more than we spend each year on the issues I am going to speak to—the Department of Homeland Security.

The only issue I would raise with my friend is that we do need that grand bargain. But no one who has looked at this problem hasn't said: You are not going to solve it without revenues being part of the mix. You have to do entitlement reform. But even with the so-called revenues from the fiscal cliff, let me just point out that we brought the country to the brink of unforeseen financial areas.

To raise \$600 billion, well, in the past few years we have had unprecedented one-time revenues from the Federal Reserve north of \$400 billion, \$200 billion-plus that CBO counts as revenue from paybacks of Fannie and Freddie. We do not have the revenue streams. If we can get back to revenue streams from the late 1990s, revenue as a percent of our GDP, when the economy was booming and jobs were being created and there was bipartisan collaboration, I think that, combined with entitlement reform—to make sure Social Security and Medicare are truly sustainable for the next 50 years—there is a path there and I thank the Senator for his work.

Mr. COATS. If I could ask the Senator from Virginia to yield for a response without yielding the floor, and I will yield right back to him.

I wish to say that the perception of the public is that this is a partisan issue. It is not. The Democratic Senator from Virginia has taken a lead in this effort and committed an extraordinary amount of effort—only to come up short.

I have been privileged to work with him and a number of Members from the other side of the aisle together with Republicans, and we see the need to work together on this. We have lacked one thing. We have lacked support from the executive branch. Until we have that, I don't believe we will be able to take serious steps forward in addressing this problem.

But that is not something that can be defined as one party versus another.

Most of us on both sides of this aisle have recognized the disastrous potential consequences of our not taking action. I appreciate the tremendous work the Senator from Virginia has done in leading this effort, and I know we both regret that we haven't achieved success.

I thank the Senator, and I yield back.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator for his comments. We might agree or disagree on the role the President has played, but that still doesn't beg the fact that we need to continue our efforts in this body and in the body down the hall.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the subject of our debate today is that it is wholly inappropriate that at this moment in time some in Congress are deciding that they are going to hold hostage Homeland Security funding unless they get 100 percent of what they want.

I think immigration reform is a terribly important issue. I was proud to join in one of the broadest, bipartisan votes in the past few years to pass bipartisan immigration reform. I was disappointed when our friends in the House didn't take up that legislation and pass it.

Subsequent to that failure to act on the part of the House, the President has acted—and I believe there are even folks here watching these proceedings now who are beneficiaries of those Executive actions, some of the DREAMers.

Now if this body wants to redebate immigration, that is a fair topic, a fair subject. And I, for one, would welcome that full-throated debate again. But it should not—it should not—be tied to a critical part of national homeland security funding.

The remarkable thing is this is actually an area where both parties came to agreement on the size of the budget and the program prioritization. There was an agreement. But instead, extraneous items were added that now some are saying if we don't get these items we are willing to roll the dice or potentially shut down the most essential parts of our government at a time of enormous international and potentially domestic challenge.

All of us, obviously, can come and speak about the unspeakable tragedies we saw reported coming out of the Middle East. We see as well challenges that ISIL presents potentially—not just in that region but to the homeland and in terms of trying to encourage home-grown terrorists. The notion there would be Members of this body or any body who would say it is okay to cut off funding to DHS at this moment in time is remarkable.

The American people—as someone who just went through a refreshing reminder of what they are looking for through my last election process—do

not want us to legislate in this way. They want us to get things done. They want us to actually find common ground. And on homeland security we have made the hard choices on where the dollars ought to come from and where they ought to be prioritized.

But if the loudest voices get their way and hold this funding hostage, not only would it make our country more vulnerable to terrorist threats but a DHS shutdown would jeopardize our national security by disrupting other important programs, such as grants to train local law enforcement and to protect our communities. And as many as 240,000 people responsible for frontline security—more than 80 percent of DHS employees—will still have to show up to work—they just won't get paid for it. Many of them in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

This is a threat to the homeland, it is a threat to our law enforcement, it is a threat in terms of our ability to respond to crises with FEMA, and there is threat even without those potential tragedies of the normal course of an American citizen as they pass through airports and other venues. Ultimately, for an agency that has been under some strain, these 240,000 people who are working hard to protect our homeland have to provide for their families.

This is not the way this body should operate. I want to commend the majority for trying to say we will bring back an open process. But the notion that we will have a repeat of what we saw when we self-inflicted damage upon this whole economy when we shut down the government a few years ago because of an unwillingness of a few to compromise—if that is repeated now around homeland security, it would be a dreadful mistake.

#### TRIBUTE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEE ANTHONY REGALBUTO

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I come to the floor to continue a tradition that was begun by my esteemed former colleague, the former Senator from Delaware, Ted Kaufman. Senator Kaufman would come to this floor from time to time to celebrate members of the Federal workforce who exemplify excellence in public service. In that tradition I want to honor a great Federal employee: CAPT Anthony Regalbuto.

Captain Regalbuto is a constituent of mine from Burke, VA. He currently serves as the Chief of the U.S. Coast Guard's Office of International and Domestic Port Security. But, in fact, Captain Regalbuto has spent his entire adult life in service to the Coast Guard, with 31 years on active duty and more than 12 years as a civilian—a total of 43 years of service. In this role he has been responsible for addressing the security weaknesses facing our Nation's ports. He has also assisted other countries with improving the safety of their own ports.

More than 90 percent of the imported goods of the United States go through

our ports. The security risks facing the ports are many, and workers such as Captain Regalbuto help ensure they remain safe and secure from threats. For our Nation's ports to remain safe, we must ensure our foreign shipping partners follow established international port security requirements. So part of Captain Regalbuto's job is to make sure foreign countries that want to conduct business using U.S. ports adhere to these requirements.

Captain Regalbuto has developed a solution—a model code that countries could use as a guide to strengthen their own laws to improve the security of their ports. He also oversaw the creation of the Maritime Security Risk Analysis Model. It helps the Coast Guard analyze and address major port security weaknesses by measuring a variety of factors. This risk analysis model has helped the Coast Guard evaluate more than 30,000 potential targets and 100,000 attack scenarios across the country.

Furthermore, this data has helped to efficiently allocate more than \$2.7 billion in grants where they can best help improve port security and get the best bang for the taxpayer dollars.

CAPT Anthony Regalbuto is just one of many Federal employees. He also happens to be a Federal employee who would potentially be affected by Department of Homeland Security funding, which is the current issue on the floor of the Senate.

One of the challenges, even as we move past this particular debate, is to make sure in these tight budget times—going back to the comments of the Senator from Indiana—that we husband our resources. We are going to have to do more with less. One of the things that is terribly important—as someone who has spent more time in business than I have in politics—if you want your workforce to do more, you find ways both psychically, monetarily, and through appropriate review to reward them.

Too often Members come to this floor and sometimes tend to demonize our Federal workforce. Too often over the past few years the Federal workforce is the first to receive the cuts in funding. If we are going to make sure our country remains strong, we want to make sure folks such as Captain Regalbuto keep our ports and keep our homeland safe. We need to recognize their service and, by all means, make sure we don't put in particular the DHS through another ill-fated, politically driven government shutdown.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

(The remarks of Mr. HATCH pertaining to the introduction of S. J. Res. 6 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative 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.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, the House of Representatives has voted to fully fund homeland security, as the President has requested. It sent a bill to the Senate that fully funds all the lawful policies and programs in homeland security. The bill will not deny a penny of funding. In fact, it says, spend the money, but on enforcing the laws of the United States. Don't spend money undermining the laws of the United States. Don't spend money in violation of the laws of the United States. Don't spend money in violation of the established policies of Congress, which rejected the President's ideas that he is now executing. And don't spend money in violation of the will of the American people who overwhelmingly oppose the President's unlawful Executive amnesty.

That is what we are talking about today, and my colleagues continue to suggest that somehow Republicans are not funding the Homeland Security Department. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Our colleagues have now voted to block going to the bill. If they don't like some of the provisions that came over from the House, well, let's get on the bill and let's have some relevant amendments and let's vote on it. That is what Congress is about. That is the way we are supposed to do business here.

But our colleagues have gotten spoiled. They think they can block anything and turn around and blame the Republicans for it and that somehow everybody is going to agree with them.

Look, the American people get this. The President is not entitled to spend money to implement a system of immigration that Congress, representing the American people, rejected. If our Democratic colleagues are unhappy, then, as I said, they can offer amendments.

I feel it would be a stunning event if the Senate removes language from a bill that simply restores the separation of powers and prevents the President from overreaching in violating the Constitution. But if they want to bring up amendments that would allow the President to do this activity, let's do it, let's bring it up, and let's vote on it. Perhaps they might win it. But I think it is untenable constitutionally and it is untenable legally, because it is contrary to the law and the will of the American people.

My good friend Senator SCHUMER is one of our able Members of this body. He spoke earlier today and he said: The