

It is just unbelievable to me that they would make such a statement.

Those of us in the Congress need to be thinking about the long-term financial course of America. We need to be trying to put not just short-term benefits here so Congress can spend more money, but also we need to be thinking about how to place this country on a sound long-term path. Adding more people to Social Security—particularly lower income people as most of these are, who will draw out even more than the higher income people draw out as a percentage on the basis of what they paid in—is not a way to save Social Security.

In a December 1, 2014 article in Investor's Business Daily entitled, "Obama's Amnesty will create a Fiscal Nightmare for Entitlements," Merrill Matthews, resident scholar at the Institute for Policy Innovation, and Mark E. Litow, retired actuary and past chairman of the Social Insurance Public Finance Section of the Society of Actuaries, wrote this:

Obama's amnesty action greatly exacerbates the problem, because retirees get back far more than they pay in.

That is as plain and as simple as daylight following dark. They go on to write:

But millions of Obama's newly legalized are working-age adults with children, so many could be in their 40s or older.

Thus, they could pay FICA taxes for the next, say, 15 or 20 years—less than the average American worker—and be eligible for the full array of Social Security and Medicare benefits.

This is going to be devastating to Social Security and Medicare. It is going to hammer those programs. It is going to make it harder for us to save them, which we have an obligation to do. There is no obligation to give Social Security and Medicare to persons who enter the United States unlawfully. People aren't entitled to come into the country unlawfully and demand the benefits of the country. The first thing we should do to confront unlawful immigration is not to subsidize it with taxpayer money.

The article goes on to say:

Using a basic simulation model, we believe the government will receive about \$500 billion in payroll tax revenue (including Part B and drug premiums) and expect it to pay out some \$2 trillion in benefits over several decades.

So they pay in \$500 billion, but we are going to pay out \$2 trillion—four times as much. How does this make America more financially stable?

On December 4 of last year, in an article in the Atlantic magazine entitled "The Cost of Amnesty," senior editor David Frum wrote this:

In the 2011 tax year, the average EITC payment to a family with children was \$2,905, according to the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities. The Additional Child Tax Credit works in much the same way, paying an average of \$1,800 to qualifying households.

Earned-income tax credit—that sounds like some sort of deduction you

might have, but it is not. So many of the persons who will be given this legal status will be eligible for the earned-income tax credit because they have a family—presumably—that is what the President tells us; these are for families—and their income is at a rate that entitles them to draw earned-income tax credit.

But go to the budget of the United States of America and how the Congressional Budget Office calculates this—they don't calculate earned-income tax credit as some sort of tax deduction. They calculate it as an expenditure of the United States of America, and it absolutely is.

The way it works is your income is so low you have a family of such that you don't owe any income tax, and they send you a credit and they call it an earned-income tax credit, and a tax credit is a cash payment to you. It looks something like a tax matter, but it is really a direct check from the United States of America to lower-income families. So this is going to be qualifying for large numbers of people that will be given a legal status.

Citing the Center for Immigration Studies, Mr. Frum in the Atlantic article explains:

About 14.5 percent of the native-born population of the United States earns little enough to qualify for the EITC. Almost twice as great a portion of the total immigrant population, 29.7 percent, qualifies. But the specific immigrant groups most likely to benefit from the President's actions earned even less.

So you have, on a percentage basis, twice as many in the immigrant population eligible for EITC as the average native-born American would be to qualify to receive that check from the United States.

Mr. Frum goes on to say, "The EITC will cost a shade over \$70 billion in fiscal year 2015."

That is a lot of money—\$70 billion. A Federal highway bill is \$40 billion, moving up to \$50 billion. This is \$70 billion.

The refundable portion of the child tax credit will cost about \$33 billion. That's \$100 billion in total. Together, they cost 10 times as much as traditional cash welfare. Soon they will cost much, much more.

He goes on to note:

Quaintly enough, U.S. immigration law still forbids the president to grant residency to aliens likely to become "a public charge." The list of exceptions, however, overwhelms the rule. Here are the benefits that are "not intended for income maintenance" and therefore exempt, according to the Citizenship and Immigration Services. . . .

And they list a whole lot of taxes.

Well, I just want to wrap up by saying the House of Representatives can do time and order, pass the bill that fully funds the United States, and it does not contain riders and it does not contain pork spending. Well, maybe it contains it, but it is not being complained about at this time, and it is before the Senate. To fund the Depart-

ment of Homeland Security the Senate has to pass the same bill with the same expenditures to do so. So all we have to do is fund the Department of Homeland Security but not approve the President's desire to transmit funds in Homeland Security to an illegal, unlawful policy of amnesty that Congress opposes and the American people oppose. Who do we represent?

Since 2009, we learned today, the Obama administration issued 5.5 million extra work permits—double the normal expected flow by over almost a million a year. We understood it to be 700,000. Now we understand there are so many more that have not been calculated in the numbers. His Executive amnesty will issue 5 million more.

Since 2009 family incomes are down \$4,000. There is no doubt about it, colleagues, that this incredibly large flow of immigrants into America exceeds the ability of the American economy to absorb them. It is pulling down wages. It is moving people out of the workplace. It is making it very difficult for lawful immigrants to get jobs in America because there will always be a new group coming in willing to work for less. It is eroding the middle class and middle-class values.

So we are going to talk about this as we go forward. I believe this country will continue to be a nation that allows immigration. We don't dislike or hate or demean people that want to come to America and work here. But we need to send a clear message: If you are not coming lawfully, don't come. And if you come unlawfully, you are not going to be given amnesty. You are not going to be given Social Security, Medicare, earned income tax credits, and the right to go to any hospital in America and demand health care. We are just not going to do that.

If we do that with clarity, colleagues, what will happen? The people who are coming here unlawfully will stop coming. The numbers will fall dramatically, and we will be in a position, then, to reestablish a lawful system of immigration that the American people have pleaded with us to establish—one that we can be proud of, that is just and fair where people apply and wait their turn and are accepted or not accepted based on the merits. If we do that, we will have served the American people with what they have asked us to do.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:06 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, February 3, 2015, at 10 a.m.