

Mr. Compton has dedicated his entire legal career to affordable housing and community development and for many years has headed the affordable housing practice of a prominent Alabama law firm. Over his distinguished career, Mr. Compton has played a direct role in over 70 transactions that have led to the creation of more than 5,000 units of affordable housing throughout the Southeastern United States. Among peers, he has come to be recognized as an industry-leading expert on the low-income housing tax credit, the new markets tax credit, public-private partnerships, and the regulatory environment surrounding housing production.

Mr. Compton's extensive track record, his experience, and his intimate familiarity with HUD programs make him an ideal fit to join the leadership team at HUD. As general counsel, Mr. Compton will not only serve as the principal legal adviser to Secretary Carson, but he will have a hand in nearly every departmental initiative. Once confirmed, I look forward to working with Mr. Compton to find solutions to our Nation's housing challenges, to eliminate barriers to safe and affordable housing, and to reform our housing finance system.

This confirmation vote is long overdue and is sorely needed. Following the storms that ravaged through Houston, Florida, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and elsewhere, HUD has been deployed on the frontlines, alongside FEMA and other agencies, and has worked to provide emergency and transitional housing to the thousands of families who have been displaced. This work is far from over, and I urge this body to confirm Mr. Compton today, as well as to confirm the various other HUD nominees who are awaiting votes so that they can get to work for the American people.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Compton nomination?

Mr. WICKER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Further, if present and voting the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 318 Ex.]

YEAS—62

Alexander	Flake	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heitkamp	Roberts
Carper	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Cochran	Inhofe	Sasse
Collins	Isakson	Scott
Coons	Johnson	Shaheen
Corker	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	King	Strange
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Tester
Cruz	Manchin	Thune
Daines	McCaskill	Tillis
Donnelly	McConnell	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Murphy	

NAYS—34

Blumenthal	Hassan	Sanders
Booker	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Udall
Casey	Leahy	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Markey	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	
Harris	Reed	

NOT VOTING—4

Baldwin	Duckworth
Capito	McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON WEST NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the West nomination?

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 23, as follows:

The result was announced— yeas 74, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 319 Ex.]

YEAS—74

Alexander	Corker	Hassan
Barrasso	Cornyn	Hatch
Bennet	Cotton	Heinrich
Blumenthal	Crapo	Heitkamp
Blunt	Cruz	Heller
Boozman	Daines	Hoeven
Burr	Donnelly	Inhofe
Cantwell	Enzi	Isakson
Capito	Ernst	Johnson
Cardin	Feinstein	Kaine
Carper	Fischer	Kennedy
Cassidy	Flake	King
Cochran	Gardner	Lankford
Collins	Graham	Lee
Coons	Grassley	Manchin

McCaskill	Risch	Tester
McConnell	Roberts	Thune
Moran	Rounds	Tillis
Murkowski	Rubio	Toomey
Murphy	Sasse	Udall
Nelson	Scott	Warner
Paul	Shaheen	Whitehouse
Perdue	Shelby	Wicker
Portman	Strange	Young
Reed	Sullivan	

NAYS—23

Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Casey	Leahy	Schumer
Cortez Masto	Markey	Stabenow
Durbin	Menendez	Van Hollen
Franken	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Harris	Peters	

NOT VOTING—3

Baldwin	Duckworth	McCain
---------	-----------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from West Virginia.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each and for debate only.

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

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

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

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I come to the floor tonight, once again, to talk about this tax bill being rushed through the House and the Senate. This is the first time in 31 years that a tax bill of this magnitude has been considered. I don't refer to this as tax reform because it is barely reforming anything.

It seems a shame that we didn't follow in the footsteps of what then-President Reagan chose to do when he had the opportunity to reform the Tax Code. The bill he worked on, which was every bit as consequential as the one in front of us, commanded the vast majority of votes in this Chamber—Democrats and Republicans voting together—after years of process, years of committee hearings, years of hearings even out in the country, listening to business owners, economists, and citizens talk about what they thought our

Tax Code needed to be competitive and to be fair to the American people.

I would say through the Chair to the pages that I was in college when the last bill was passed. Now, 31 years later, we are on the verge of passing a bill in the Senate without one Democratic vote—not a single one—and without a single hearing in the Senate Finance Committee, on which I serve—not a single hearing about the text of this bill, not a single hearing to tell the American people that, on the individual side of this bill, we are borrowing \$34 billion from our kids to give a tax cut to the 572,000 taxpayers who are fortunate enough to make more than \$1 million a year. That is 572,000 taxpayers who are fortunate enough to make \$1 million a year. We think it is so essential that each one of them get a \$59,000 tax cut that we are willing to borrow that money from our children to do it. We can't think of a better use than that.

A better use is not to give a tax cut to the middle class, because we know what those numbers look like in this bill. There are not a half million people who make \$50,000 and less in this economy. There are 90 million people. Those people are not getting \$34 billion. Those people are getting \$13 billion. If we do the math, it adds up to about \$160, on average, per taxpayer making \$50,000 or less, in the first year. That is the best year. So 2019 is the best year. That \$160 per taxpayer works out to about \$7.50 a paycheck.

So we are justifying \$34 billion going to 572,000 families because we say at the essence of this is a tax cut for the middle class that is worth \$7.50. I think it is disgraceful to call this a middle-class tax cut. What is as disgraceful is the fact that we are blowing a \$1.4 trillion hole in our deficit.

There are people on the other side—and I grant them this—who say we will grow out of this and that the tax cut will pay for itself. This is exactly what President Bush said in 2001, when he cut taxes. It is exactly what he said in 2003, when he cut taxes. Remember that when George Bush became President of this country, he inherited a projected surplus of \$5.6 trillion. Then, he cut taxes and said it would pay for itself, in 2001. He cut taxes and said it would pay for itself, in 2003. We invaded Afghanistan. We invaded Iraq. Not only did he not ask the American people to pay for those wars, but the 2003 tax cut actually came after the invasion of Iraq.

Today we have massive readiness problems with our military. Today we confront the potential for conflict on the Korean Peninsula. Today we confront uncertainties in the Middle East and behavior by Russia that we need to worry about. Are we going to go in debt to give the wealthiest people in America a tax cut they are not asking for?

I am more sympathetic on the corporate side. I believe our corporate rate is too high. If we had worked in a bipartisan way, I think we could have

gotten to a deal that 75 or 80 people would have voted for. That would have been beneficial for two reasons. It would have represented more widely the American people's view of what we ought to do here. I have heard the majority leader on the floor talking about partisan efforts like this, and how they are doomed to fail because most of the American people will not support it. We can see that in the polling numbers on this bill. But we could have cut a deal that said: Let's bring our corporate rate down to 25 percent. By the way, let's get rid of some of those loopholes. As for all of the stuff we said over the years about lowering the rate and broadening the base, let's actually do that.

That is not what this bill does. This bill cuts the corporate rate to 20 percent and leaves all of the loopholes in place. There is no broadening of the base. So if the effective rate today is actually in the low twenties, even though the published rate is 35 percent, the effective rate is going to be far below 20 percent if we don't actually reform the Tax Code.

I think there would have been bipartisan agreement about doing something with the earned income tax credit or the child tax credit, as my colleague from Florida has tried to do to a degree. I think there would have been bipartisan support for the idea that we ought to do something to repatriate the money stuck overseas and invest it here in the United States in infrastructure. But there was no effort to make a bipartisan effort here—none.

There have certainly been cases where Democrats have been guilty of that. This is a profound case of the Republicans being guilty of that, and the result is that they have a lousy bill that speaks to the extreme wing of their party rather than to the middle of America, because only in that way could you end up with a piece of legislation that the President is describing as a middle-class tax cut that is not one. Nothing about the math in this tax bill suggests it is.

By the way, the \$34 billion I talked about does not include the estate tax. When we include the increase of the estates not subject to the estate tax in this bill, it adds, on average, another \$10,000. Now we are talking about borrowing \$69,000. So we are now borrowing an additional \$10,000 from the sons and daughters of police officers, firefighters, and teachers in order to finance an estate tax cut that we will not pay for.

Pay for it. Don't borrow the money.

I got here 9 years ago at the depth of the worst recession since the Great Depression. Our economy had locked up. Because of the two tax cuts under President Bush, because of the two wars we didn't have the decency to pay for, and because President Bush passed so-called Medicare Part D—which is a prescription drug program for seniors that he didn't pay for—and then with the supply-side economics, they drove

our economy into the worst ditch since the Great Depression.

When President Obama showed up, the surplus was not a surplus. It was a \$1.5 trillion deficit. I was here when we tried to work in a bipartisan way to figure out how to respond to a terrifying circumstance—not for the Senate but for our country.

A woman who came to a townhall told me that her plan was to die sooner because overnight she had lost half of her net worth, and she didn't know how to make it through because the stock market had cratered and her pension was cut in half.

We had more than a 10-percent unemployment rate in the United States of America, and we couldn't get a single person to lift their finger on the other side of the aisle because they said that the deficit was too big. They said that President Obama was pursuing what the pollsters told them was "job-killing government spending." Those were the words. It wasn't his \$1.5 trillion deficit; that is what he inherited. He left with about a \$550 billion deficit. It was cut by two-thirds.

Today, we stand here talking about this absolutely irresponsible tax bill. It is already at \$666 billion. We have a government where we are collecting 18 percent of the GDP in revenue. It is actually about 17.9 percent before this tax cut goes through. We are spending more than 21 percent, and our answer is: Let's cut some more taxes, so we will be spending 17 and change. That is a big delta—17 to 21. That is a conversation we should be having together, not in pieces.

All of these people who say: Don't worry about it; it will pay for itself—remember what they said in 2001 and 2003. They said the same thing. They are going to show up here after this Christmas season has passed, and they are going to say: That is why we need to cut Medicaid and Medicare.

There is no doubt we have to have a conversation about the sustainability of these programs, and there is no doubt we have to have a discussion about how we are going to get out of the fiscal issues we confront. I have no doubt that the moment we face the next crisis, whether it is a national security crisis or an economic crisis, we are going to wish we hadn't passed this tax bill. We are going to wish that when this economy was at full employment, when interest rates are what they are, that we had thought about how to come together in a bipartisan way and actually do something responsible for once.

There is a mayor in Indiana who sent an op-ed piece to the Washington Post last week. He said: Let me break this down for you in terms of my local community. The equivalent of what the Republican tax bill is for my community would be that we would go out and borrow \$400 million, which is a staggering sum, not billions and billions of dollars but, on the basis of the size of their government, \$400 million—four or five times what our indebtedness is today.

Then, what I would do is say: We didn't borrow this money to build infrastructure. We didn't borrow this money to make sure we end poverty in my community or to make sure the water is clean. We gave it to the people in the biggest houses, the richest neighborhoods in our community, hoping that somehow the benefits would trickle down to everybody else.

He said that they would be run out on the rail—and they should be.

There are some politicians who say that it will pay for itself. There is no economist who has said that this is not going to create a deficit. There is probably a consensus, around \$1.4 trillion—I have seen some math that says \$1 trillion, and others that say \$2.5 trillion. Let's take the \$1.4 trillion and consider, as an order of magnitude, if we didn't care about our deficit—which apparently we don't anymore—what else we could spend the money on besides giving this tax cut to the very wealthiest Americans in our country.

In the 9 years I have been here, we have gone from no opioid crisis to an opioid crisis that is killing 50,000 Americans. There are communities all over our States, especially in rural parts of the States, where we have no answer. We have provided no additional treatment, even though we have an emergency today that we didn't have before. That is not the America I grew up in. That is not the America our parents and grandparents set up for us. Look at what you can do to create treatment in every United States county for 10 years. That is this \$60 billion. That is this little orange part of a \$1.4 trillion hole in our deficit. That is one thing you could do.

Another thing you could do would be to provide universal pre-K for low-income children for a decade. That might be worth borrowing from the next generation for because they would actually be getting a benefit. They are not getting any benefit from this \$59,000 that we are giving to people who make more than \$1 million a year.

You could double Federal funding for research and development on clean energy for over a decade. You could maintain our technological advantage over China in emerging industries for a decade. That is a huge concern. That would be \$50 billion, just this little slice—a foregone priority if we pass this bill, just like the response to opioids. You could fund a 20-man mission to Mars. Because of our fecklessness, we can't even put an astronaut into space without putting them on a Russian rocket. That has nothing to do with our lacking the engineering talent. That has nothing to do with our lacking imagination or, for some of us, a sense of mission. It has to do with the fecklessness of this Congress and the inability of it to walk and chew gum at the same time.

We could repair all of America's aging dams, which our parents and grandparents were thoughtful enough to build for us but which we feel we

don't need to maintain for the next generation of Americans. We would rather give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in America.

You could end the backlog of infrastructure repairs in America's airports—end it. Five years of funding, that is only \$100 billion. I say "only." That is a huge number, but not compared to \$1.4 trillion.

You could end the U.S. Air Force pilot shortage. Why do we have a shortage of Air Force pilots? Because this place, for 9 years, has run itself on continuing resolutions. The military can't plan, so we have airplanes that are being scavenged for parts and cannot fly. If they can't fly, the pilots can't get the training hours. If they can't get the training hours, they can't move ahead in their careers, and they can't be ready when the battle comes. You could easily pay for that here.

You could fund the first 5 years of the Navy's plan to build a 355-ship fleet. Everyone around here walks around saying: We don't have any money; we are broke. It is matter of choices and priorities. I cannot think of a set of priorities less out of whack with what Republicans think of in Colorado, much less our Democrats and Independents.

Here is one we really do care about in Colorado and all across the country. You could pay for all deferred maintenance at our national parks and other land management agencies. That is right here, this tiny purple square—\$19 billion. If you look at the bottom right, that includes over a dozen priorities for rural communities that have been kicked around by this Congress and our CRs year after year.

Here are a few things that fit in there. Extend high-speed internet to every rural community in America. That might be a good use of money or a good reason to borrow money—to extend high-speed internet to people who don't have it. This is a world where telling a kid in a rural school that they don't have access to high-speed internet is no different than telling them: Sorry, you are not getting textbooks, but these other kids do.

We could reimburse rural areas with significant public lands for lost tax revenue, the PILT payment.

I promise my colleague from Pennsylvania I am coming to the end. I know he doesn't believe it.

These PILT payments are a pain point for my rural counties. Every year we go through the same nonsense at the end of the year. Every single year they say: Is it going to be funded in the CR? They are using it to pay for something else. Yet it would cost a tiny fraction of just the rural priorities part of it. That is \$111 billion for all the rural priorities. Eliminating the national backlog for the USDA rural water program—can you imagine what that would mean for rural America and economic development in rural America? They wouldn't have to wait for someone in New York to trickle down

to them because they would have an investment in their community. It would create jobs. It would allow them to do economic development and keep their children in their communities and their schools open and their banks open. That is not a priority for the people writing and voting for this bill.

President Trump cut Essential Air Service in his budget—zeroed it out. We could fund Essential Air Service for 10 years, providing a critical economic lifeline to small towns across America and in my State.

We could fund the U.S. Forest Service fires suppression for a decade, so they wouldn't have to keep cannibalizing other parts of the budget. This year, for the first year, they spent more than half of their budget fighting fires because we don't have the sense to budget them so that they can do fire mitigation. Talk about penny wise and pound foolish.

In Colorado, we could clean up the Gold King Mine spill, fund the Arkansas Valley Conduit to provide drinking water to some of the poorest areas in Southeastern Colorado, which we have been promised since John F. Kennedy was President of the United States.

We could do everything I just mentioned, all of these investments—infrastructure, research, public health, housing, national security, and rural communities—for the cost of this tax plan. This is yet another illustration of how profoundly Washington's priorities have decoupled from the priorities of the American people. Beyond that, this bill confirms every other suspicion about how Washington operates.

President Trump ran for office saying that he would drain the swamp. This tax plan is a creature of the swamp. It was jammed through with last-minute changes, scribbled by hand in the dark of the night, with 2 a.m. votes—shameful, 2 a.m. votes on legislation that no one had a chance to fully understand. There was input from lobbyists on K Street but not a single hearing where the American people could express their view.

Given the process, it should surprise no one that the bill substituted the priorities of the American people with a litany of carve-outs and loopholes that powerful special interests have gotten into this bill.

I am going to skip this part because I want to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania, but let me just finish by saying that today, incredibly in America, the top 10 percent of earners take home more than half of America's income. We have not seen that since 1928, the year before the Great Depression. I know the President knows these folks as well as I do. Everybody on this chart is working hard, whether it is the top 10 percent or the bottom 90 percent, but this is not the way our economy ought to work. For almost all of our history, this is not the way it did work.

I was a businessperson before I came to Congress, before I was a school superintendent. I have nothing against

anyone who has done well, but it is preposterous to suggest that the real problem in our economy, when we have a record stock market and record income inequality, is that wealthy individuals and businesses don't have enough.

My final chart is this chart, which shows median household income. Since 1980 until now, the cost of housing, cost of higher education, and cost of healthcare—we have done nothing to address or help this. We have turned our back on this.

I think we could have written a bill, as I said at the outset, that had a real middle-class tax cut in it, but we chose not to do it.

Last year, I met a mom in Rifle, CO, at an early childhood center. In the course of our conversation, she said to me: "I've got a job so I can have health insurance, and every single dollar I earn goes to pay for this early childhood center, so I can work."

That is the story of too many people in my State. My State has one of the most dynamic economies in the United States of America, and still too many people whom I represent are middle-class families whose incomes haven't really gone up, not over 10 years but since 1980, for whom the cost of housing, cost of healthcare, cost of higher education, and the cost of early childhood education have conspired to create for them impossible choices that their parents and grandparents never had to make.

Tax reform should have been the opportunity to have addressed that. It should have been a chance to remind that mom in Rifle that our government or at least someone in our government understands the struggles she faces and has the capacity and the will to help to do something about it. This bill squanders that opportunity. This tax bill squanders it. Worse than that, it reminds Americans of the vast space between their lives and the priorities in Washington. It reminds them of the yawning gap between their voices and the voices of powerful special interests.

We should reject this bill. It fails on the merits. We should reject it because the bill makes a mockery of how our government should work. There is still time to set aside this legislation and do bipartisan tax reform. I know the other side may believe that it has to forge ahead for a political win, but I would ask, at what cost?

As with so many actions around here, we have put it on the next generation of Americans. We have kicked all the hard choices to them ever since I have been here. We have told them that we are going to continue to live in the house of our democratic Republic but that they are going to pay the mortgage. We are so fortunate that our parents and grandparents didn't behave the way we have—they had the decency to look ahead and think of those to come. We have enjoyed years of peace and prosperity in this incredible country. I think, tonight and this week, it is worth all of our asking, will our children be able to say the same of us?

I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for his indulgence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Colorado. I heard most of his remarks, some of them on television before my moving to come over here to speak. I am grateful for his commitment to the arguments that he has made on tax reform and his commitment not only to the people of his State but to the people of our country. I will be speaking about tax reform later this week.

DACA

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to talk about this so-called DACA Program for the Dreamers, the young people whom we have heard so much about, especially in the last couple of months.

As many people across the country know, in September, President Trump ended the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, known as DACA. This decision and, so far, congressional refusal to pass the Dream Act have created both fear and uncertainty for nearly 800,000 young people across our country, so-called DACA recipients.

I know that a lot of Americans have met these young people over the course of not just the last couple of months but maybe over the course of many years. I had that chance most recently, at least on two occasions, when we set up time to sit with young people who were Pennsylvanians. Once was in the city of Philadelphia, where I sat with young people from both Philadelphia and Lancaster, which is not too far of a drive from Philadelphia—about an hour or so. They came to Philadelphia to sit with us. Then a couple of months later, it was in the Lehigh Valley, which is about an hour just north of Philadelphia. The first group was a larger group of maybe 15 young people, and the second group was a group of 3 individuals.

In both of those meetings, I was struck by not just how concerned and worried these young people were about what would happen to them and happen to their friends and, in a larger sense, happen to their families, but I was impressed by their stories—what they had achieved in their young lives. I was also moved by the commitment that they have had to hard work, to being part of the fabric of America, and the real concern that they have had about and the love they have for their own parents. They worried about how this might affect their parents but also had love for the commitment that their parents had made and their family members had made to allow them to succeed in coming here, in some cases

as babies or as very young children, and to live in America for all of these years, not technically as citizens but to live full lives.

They were made a promise by the President of the United States that if they were to come forward and make certain disclosures, this program would protect them. I think that promise is inviolate and should not be broken by any administration. Congress certainly has work to do to enforce the promise and to give the promise an even stronger foundation.

You don't have to be on one side of the aisle or the other to be moved by these stories, and I will get to some of the details later. One of the young women was in the first group that I mentioned when we were sitting around a big conference table. Of course, these individuals don't have to sit with me, and they don't have to travel to tell their stories, but they are worried. They are concerned about the policy and how it might affect their lives.

One young woman said to me: The only country I have ever known doesn't seem to want us—or at least that was her impression. She has lived nowhere else.

If you go person after person after person, these are young people who have lived here virtually their whole lives even though they technically were not born here. They have achieved so much and have gone through our schools. Our Nation has invested in them, and they have succeeded in holding down jobs and getting educations and getting higher educations. All they ask is that we set up a process so that they will not be deported.

It doesn't make a lot of sense, the direction in which we seem to be heading. Rescinding the DACA Program will cost the United States of America jobs. I think it will hurt our security over time.

As I said before, it is a broken promise—a promise that was made to young people by our government. It was not just a casual promise but, I would argue, a commitment, a bond, an agreement that should be honored. As I have said so many times before—and I will keep saying it—why would other countries believe us when we make a commitment if we cannot keep our commitment to these young people? Something on the order of 800,000 young people who live in the United States of America were promised that if they came forward, they would be protected. Why would any country believe us after that if we were to break that promise? Why would they believe Republicans or Democrats? Why would they believe the administration—this administration or future administrations—or this Congress or future Congresses down the road, the House and Senate? If we were to break that promise, would our word be good around the world?

These Dreamers are young people who have lived in this country since