other parts of our broken immigration system is our best chance to produce legislation that can pass the House, pass the Senate, and earn the President's signature. This is why the proposal put forward by Senator GRASSLEY and others, which draws on the President's preferred framework and which the President has officially endorsed, has my support, because presumably we will actually make a law here.

I have made no effort—none—to tell Democrats what amendments they should offer. Of course, they shouldn't try to dictate Republican amendments either.

The longer my colleagues across the aisle refuse to come to the table, the longer they are unable to produce any legislation they actually support, the lower the odds that we can arrive at a legislative solution this week.

Yesterday alone, the Senate was open for 9 hours—yesterday alone, 9 hours. Nine hours we could have spent processing amendments and proceeding to votes. Nine hours down the drain because Democrats won't let us start the debate they have spent months demanding.

Now that we can finally proceed to consider the underlying bill this morning, I hope my colleagues across the aisle will come to the table. The President has made clear what principles must be addressed if we are going to make a law instead of merely making political points.

While our Democratic colleagues can no longer prevent the Senate from starting the debate, they can continue to delay votes on amendments. I hope that won't happen.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on Monday, President Trump unveiled his proposal to improve America's infrastructure, which will host committee chairmen and ranking members at the White House for a bipartisan, bicameral meeting on that subject. I am grateful the President is prioritizing this and reaching across the aisle.

Experts agree that America’s aging infrastructure needs a lot of help. Nation-wide, 91 percent of our bridges are considered structurally deficient, and 13.6 percent are considered functionally obsolete. One recent study suggests that when congestion costs us $160 billion a year—for road congestion. The answer is not simply to throw new money at old problems.

It took American workers less time to build great skyscrapers, start to finish, than it now takes bureaucrats to review—not even build, but review—proposals for new bridges and roadways. We need to streamline regulations, reform the permitting process, and get government out of the way wherever possible. Once projects are proposed, they should be reviewed in a safe but reasonable amount of time and then completed as quickly and cost effectively as possible.

This is a prime opportunity for bipartisan cooperation. Our last three highway bills, our last three WRDA bills, and our last three FAA bills all passed the Senate easily, averaging more than 80 votes. I hope we can renew that consensus when the time comes.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on one final matter, for 8 years under President Obama, our economy didn't perform as well as it should have. America's wages and salaries hardly grew. Many job creators sat on the sidelines, wary of new tax increases or heavy-handed regulations. Washington had its foot on the brake. Last year, all that changed.

President Trump and this Republican Congress set out to make life easier for workers and for job creators. We cut regulations and passed tax reform to give middle-class families immediate relief and set the stage for more hiring and more wage growth in the years ahead.

I recently heard from a small family-owned inland river shipyard in Ashland, KY, along the Ohio River. They build and repair commercial barges. Here is what their president wrote. He said: “Thanks to the tax change and optimism of our customers, we are at last long able to replace equipment which has been used way past [its] life expectancy and possibly add two more production workers.”

Last week a Louisville employer dropped by to tell me how he is using his tax reform savings: $1,000 bonuses for more than 100 Kentucky employees. Small companies and big business alike are thrilled that they finally have a 21st-century tax code. It makes them more competitive with overseas rivals and frees up more money to invest right here at home, and middle-class workers to share the rewards.

Major national companies like Pfizer and Home Depot, which together employ more than half a million Americans, have announced hundreds of millions of dollars in employee bonuses—again, thanks to tax reform.

Just this week, MetLife announced a major new investment in 50,000-plus employees. The company is raising its minimum wage, enhancing benefits, boosting retirement accounts, and creating a skills development fund. In short, MetLife is betting big on U.S. workers, and so are the more than 300 other companies that have already announced major investments in their employees and in their facilities—right here in America, right here, thanks to historic tax reform.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed to H.R. 2579, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.

The Acting President pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill.

The motion to proceed to H.R. 2579, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage, is agreed to.

The Acting President pro tempore. Morning business is closed.
The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 2. STOP DANGEROUS SANCTUARY CITIES ACT.

(a) Short Title.—This section may be cited as the "Stop Dangerous Sanctuary Cities Act.

(b) Ensuring That Local and Federal Law Enforcement Officers May Cooperate to Safeguard Our Communities.—

(1) Cooperate with Federal Officers.—A State, or a political subdivision of a State, or an officer, employee, or agent of such State or political subdivision that compiles with a detainer issued by the Department of Homeland Security under section 236 or 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357)—

(A) shall be deemed to be acting as an agent of the Department of Homeland Security; and

(B) with regard to actions taken to comply with the detainer, shall have all authority available to officers and employees of the Department of Homeland Security.

(2) Legal Proceedings.—In any legal proceeding brought against a State, a political subdivision of a State, or an officer, employee, or agent of such State or political subdivision, that challenges the legality of such State or political subdivision during the period for which it receives funds under this section, any such actions that the unit of general local government received for that period—

(i) in the case of a unit of general local government that is not in a nonentitlement area, shall be returned to the Secretary for grants under this title to States and other units of general local government that are not sanctuary jurisdictions; and

(ii) in the case of a unit of general local government that is in a nonentitlement area, shall be returned to the Governor of the State for grants under this title to other units of general local government in the State that are not sanctuary jurisdictions.

(c) SANCTUARY JURISDICTIONS INELIGIBLE FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(1) Economic Development Administration Grants.—

(A) Grants for Public Works and Economic Development.—Section 201(b) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3141(b)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘‘; and’’; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(4) the area in which the project is to be carried out is not a sanctuary jurisdiction (as defined in subsection (c) of the Stop Dangerous Sanctionary Cities Act).’’.

(B) Grants for Planning and Administration.—Section 203(a) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3143(a)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘‘; and’’; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(4) the area in which the project is to be carried out is not a sanctuary jurisdiction (as defined in subsection (c) of the Stop Dangerous Sanctionary Cities Act).’’.

(C) Supplementary Grants.—Section 206(a) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3146(a)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ‘‘and’’ at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ‘‘; and’’; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(4) the area in which the project is to be carried out is not a sanctuary jurisdiction (as defined in subsection (c) of the Stop Dangerous Sanctionary Cities Act).’’.

(D) Grants for Training, Research, and Technical Assistance.—Section 207 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3147) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(B) SANCTUARY JURISDICTIONS.—Grants funds under this section may not be used to provide assistance to a sanctuary jurisdiction (as defined in subsection (c) of the Stop Dangerous Sanctionary Cities Act).’’.

(E) Community Development Block Grants.—Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) is amended—

(i) in section 102(a) (42 U.S.C. 5302(a)), by adding at the end of paragraph (25) the following:

‘‘(25) The term ‘sanctuary jurisdiction’ has the meaning provided in subsection (c) of the Stop Dangerous Sanctionary Cities Act.’’.

(ii) in section 191 (42 U.S.C. 5394) —

(I) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ‘‘and’’

(ii) by inserting after paragraph (a)(9) the following:

‘‘(10) the grantee is not a sanctuary jurisdiction during the period for which it received funds under this section, any such actions that the unit of general local government received for that period—

(i) in the case of a unit of general local government that is not in a nonentitlement area, shall be returned to the Secretary for grants under this title to States and other units of general local government that are not sanctuary jurisdictions; and

(ii) in the case of a unit of general local government that is in a nonentitlement area, shall be returned to the Governor of the State for grants under this title to other units of general local government in the State that are not sanctuary jurisdictions.

(C) Reallocation Rules.—In reallocating funds under subparagraphs (A) and (B), the Secretary shall—

(i) apply the relevant allocation formula under subsection (b), with all sanctuary jurisdictions excluded; and

(ii) shall not be subject to the rules for reallocation under subsection (c).’’.

(3) Effective Date.—This subsection and the amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on October 1, 2018.

The Acting President pro tempore. The Democratic leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 1958

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1958 to the language proposed to be stricken.

The Acting President pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. Schumer] proposes an amendment numbered 1958 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1959.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The Acting President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is printed in today's Record under "Text of Amendments."

The Acting President pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 1959 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1958

(Purpose: To provide relief from removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States before reaching the age of 18, improve border security, foster U.S. engagement in Central America, and for other purposes.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I call up the Coons amendment No. 1955 to the Schumer amendment No. 1958.

The Acting President pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:
The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], for Mr. COONS, proposes an amendment numbered 1985 to amendment No. 1988.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The Acting President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Tuesday, February 13, 2018, under “Text of Amendments.”

The Acting President pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as we enter the second day of the debate on immigration, everyone should be focused on finding a bill to protect the Dreamers and address border security that can get 60 votes. That is the ball game.

The majority leader’s desire to vote on an unrelated, partisan immigration bill—legislation that is not only silent on Dreamers but is silent on border security as well—is not a productive way to begin debate.

Let’s get to the crux of the issue. Let Republicans offer whatever they want on DACA and border security, and we will do the same. The leader supports the proposal by Senator GRASSLEY, which is, essentially, the President’s plan. Let’s vote on that first. We will have several bipartisan bills to offer. We should vote on those.

Democrats are focused like a laser on finding a bipartisan bill that can pass the Senate to protect the Dreamers. Several moderate Republicans are working toward that as well. The one person who seems most intent on not getting a deal is President Trump.

President Trump’s contribution to this debate has been to put forward a proposal that contains a vast curtailment of legal immigration, far outside the scope of the DACA and border security, and has demanded that the Democrats support it. Instead of making a proposal in good faith or working with Democrats on a compromise, President Trump is trying to force his unpopular, hard-line immigration agenda down the throats of the American people by calling it a DACA bill.

The President’s proposal, now the Grassley bill, is so extreme on legal immigration that several Republicans have voted against it, including my friends from South Carolina and Arizona. Yet President Trump somehow thinks that Democrats would be too blame for not getting a deal on DACA because we didn’t go blind along with his partisan plan—extreme as it is and with no input from Democrats.

That will not happen.

Only in a Kafkaesque, 1984 world could the Democrats be blamed for the current predicament on DACA. As much as the President wants to turn the world upside down, as much as he wants everyone to just accept what he is saying, the American people know better. Everyone here knows that President Trump has stood in the way of a bipartisan solution to DACA from the very beginning. Let’s take a quick look at the history.

First, it was President Trump who terminated the DACA Program last August. President Trump played the Democrats for suckers. Unilaterally, we are in this pickle—worse than a pickle—in this bad situation because President Trump chose to end the DACA Program last August. That stands out above anything else.

Then President Trump turned his back on not one but two bipartisan immigration proposals. I went so far as to put the wall—the President’s signature campaign issue—on the table for discussion. That still did not drive him to a deal.

Finally, now that we are working hard in the Senate to come up with a bipartisan proposal, President Trump is just trying to gum up the works. According to reports, President Trump may try to gum up any legislation that doesn’t match his hard-line demands—“my way or no way” and with no Democratic input. A statement this morning from the White House said the President would oppose even a short-term DACA bill.

So who is intent on kicking out these people who know no country but America, who work in our factories and offices, who go to our schools, who serve in our military? Who is intent on kicking them out? Is it not the American people, as 90 percent want to support the Dreamers. It is not any Democrat and not a good number of Republicans on that side of the aisle. It is just the President.

On three separate occasions, President Trump has stood in the way of a bipartisan solution to DACA—a problem he created in the first place. Yet the President is in this dream world. He thinks: Oh, I can blame the Democrats for the impasse.

As I said, only in a 1984 world where up is down and black is white could this be true. Only in a 1984 world where up is down and black is white would the American public blame the Democrats for this. They know where Trump stands. They know it. The American people know what is going on.

They know that this President not only created the problem but seems to be against every solution that might pass because it is not 100 percent of what he wants.

If, at the end of this week, we are unable to find a bill that can pass—I sincerely hope that is not the case, due to the good efforts of so many people on both sides of the aisle—the responsibility will fall on the President’s shoulders and on those in this body who went along with him.

Bipartisan negotiations are ongoing and are, perhaps, very close to a conclusion. Nothing is ever certain given the contentious nature of this debate, but I am hopeful that Senators can put the President’s hard-line demands to the side and come up with a deal that works for both parties. If we want to go beyond border security and the DACA kids, let’s do comprehensive reform.

We did it once. It worked pretty well in the Senate, but the House blocked it. Let’s go back to it. First, the issues at hand are the DACA kids and border security. That is the only thing that can pass this Chamber—the only thing.

We need to push through to the finish line. There are only 2 days of debate remaining this week. Everyone has to work toward that final effort. We cannot do less.

That doesn’t mean adding new demands or drawing lines in the sand. It means being willing to compromise and take yes for an answer. If we pass something, it might not be everything that either the Democrats want or everything that the Republicans want, but it may get the job done for the Dreamers and the overwhelming majority of Americans who would like to see them stay in the country.

The Republicans have argued on another matter—taxes—our Republican friends argued that their massive corporate tax cut was not such a huge giveaway to corporate America. They predicted that corporations would spend the tax savings on benefits for workers. The evidence is already in use of these predictions were wrong. Since the passage of the Republican tax bill, corporations have been pouring billions of dollars into stock repurchasing programs, not into significant wage increases or other meaningful investments in workers.

These stock buybacks—this stock repurchasing—which benefit, primarily, the people at the top have reached a significant milestone. Since the passage of the Republican tax bill, there have been over $100 billion in stock buybacks. As of last week, corporations had announced twice the number of corporate share buybacks as during a similar period last year. Let me repeat that. The number of corporate share buybacks has doubled since the Republican tax bill passed.

Why is that so significant?

It is that share buybacks don’t help the average worker. They inflate the value of a company’s stock, which primarily benefits shareholders, not workers. It benefits corporate executives, who are compensated with corporate stock, not workers, who are paid by wages and benefits. The money corporations spend on their stock is money that is not being reinvested in worker training, equipment, research, new hires, or higher salaries.

According to analysts at Morgan Stanley, companies that were surveyed said they will pass only 13 percent of the Trump tax cut savings on to workers in comparison to 43 percent that they will spend on share buybacks. For manufacturers, it is even worse: 9 percent to go to workers, 47 percent to share buybacks.

The Republicans made a conscious decision to give corporations and the wealthiest Americans the lion’s share
of the tax cuts and promised it would trickle down to everyone else. Unfortunately, trickle-down never works, and it is not what is happening now. Corporate America is doing what is best for corporate America, and working America is getting left behind. It goes to show how President Trump and the Republicans were working for when they crafted their tax bill. They gave corporations and the wealthiest Americans a huge tax cut and cut out everybody else. I yield back.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore.
The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this is immigration week in the U.S. Senate, and we are preparing today's procedural moves to bring bills to the floor for consideration as early as today, perhaps tomorrow at the latest. It is an unusual time when the Senate is focused on such an issue and actual bipartisan amendments and substitutes are being offered.

We are at this point at this moment in time because of a decision by President Trump on September 5 of last year when he announced he was ending the DACA Program. DACA was a program created by President Obama by Executive order, which allowed those who had been brought to the United States as children, infants, and toddlers to be able to stay legally in the United States on temporary visa renewal every 2 years. It was called DACA, and 780,000 young people stepped up and paid the filing fee of almost $500, went through a criminal background check and an interview and received DACA protection. They then went on with their lives, with 90 percent of them going to work or to school, enlisting in the military—undocumented in America, willing to hold up their hands and take an oath that they would die for America. That is how they love this country. Twenty thousand of them went to work as school teachers across the United States of America. Perhaps they are teaching your children or grandchildren today. They are doing important things in this country. But President Trump announced last September 5 that the program that protects them and allows them to work will end.

Then he challenged us. He said to the Senate and the House: Do something about it. Pass a law. Isn’t that what you are there for? The President is right. That is our job.

This week we are going to try to pass a law to end this crisis, which is going to reach a head on March 5 of this year when the DACA Program officially ends and 1,000 young people a day lose their protection. We have less than 3 weeks. So we are going to move today, I hope, or tomorrow or this week, at some point to consider some alternatives to solve this problem.

I am sorry to say that there is no plan in the U.S. House of Representatives to even address the problem—none. I don’t understand it. They know that lives hang in the balance, and they know that overwhelmingly the American people want to give DACA and the Dreamers a chance. The numbers come rolling in; 75, 80, 85 percent of Americans agree that these young people should be given a chance to earn citizenship to legal status and citizenship. Even 60 percent of those who voted for President Trump agree with what I just said. It is a popular political issue on both sides, and it is also the right thing to do.

What the President has proposed as his alternative, from my point of view, is unacceptable. Let me tell you why.

Two weeks ago the White House released a one-page framework on immigration reform and border security. The White House claimed that this is a compromise because it includes a path to citizenship for Dreamers—some of them. That, of course, as I mentioned, is supported by a majority of Americans. The Trump plan would put the administration’s entire hard-line immigration agenda on the backs of these young people. These young, DACA-protected people are being held as political hostages for President Trump’s hard-line immigration agenda.

For example, the White House wants to dramatically reduce legal immigration by prohibiting American citizens from sponsoring their parents, siblings, and children as immigrants. We are not talking about literally millions of relatives of American citizens who entered this system legally and are following our immigration laws. Some have been waiting for as long as 20 years to immigrate to the United States.

The conservative Cato Institute says the following about President Trump’s proposal:

In the most likely scenario, the new plan [from the Trump administration] would cut the number of legal immigrants by up to 44 percent or a half million immigrants annually—the largest policy-driven immigration cut since the passage of the 1924 law. It would exclude nearly 22 million people from the opportunity to immigrate legally to the United States over the next five decades.

You have to go back in history to a time when there was a proposal that passed on the floor of this Chamber that cut as many legal immigrants to the United States. The year was 1924. The Immigration Act of 1924 was the last time Congress considered immigration. The United States of America has not looked a lot different than it did in 1924. That is the last time the United States established quotas and said: We want America to look a lot different than it would look if other immigrants came to this country.

Thankfully, in 1965, it was changed. Thankfully, we gave up the quotas that had been criticized roundly as being insensitive to the realities of the world population and the reality of the population of America.

Now the Trump administration wants to cut legal immigration to the United States again, by 44 percent, the biggest cut—as the Cato Institute tells us—since that horrible bill was passed in 1924.

Let me tell you what else the Trump immigration proposal would do. It would create an unaccountable slush fund of $25 billion of American taxpayers’ money for a border wall that, remember, Congress mandated was supposed to pay for—$25 billion. I have to double check, but I think that is almost the annual appropriation for the National Institutes of Health. The President wants $25 billion and wants it to be doled out to President Trump’s hard-line immigration agenda.

This administration wants to dramatically reduce legal immigration by prohibiting American citizens from sponsoring their parents, siblings, and children as immigrants. We are not talking about literally millions of relatives of American citizens who entered this system legally and are following our immigration laws. Some have been waiting for as long as 20 years to immigrate to the United States.

The conservative Cato Institute says the following about President Trump’s proposal:

In the most likely scenario, the new plan [from the Trump administration] would cut the number of legal immigrants by up to 44 percent or a half million immigrants annually—the largest policy-driven immigration cut since the passage of the 1924 law. It would exclude nearly 22 million people from the opportunity to immigrate legally to the United States over the next five decades.

You have to go back in history to a time when there was a proposal that passed on the floor of this Chamber that cut as many legal immigrants to the United States. The year was 1924. The Immigration Act of 1924 was the last time Congress considered immigration. The United States of America has not looked a lot different than it did in 1924. That is the last time the United States established quotas and said: We want America to look a lot different than it would look if other immigrants came to this country.

The President’s proposal on immigration, in the midst of the worst refugee crisis on record in the world, is now centered on fast-track deportations without due process of women and children fleeing gang and sexual violence. I can’t tell you how many times we have had this conversation with members of the Trump administration. They create a scenario. The scenario is of a 6-year-old child who is swept up in some Central American country. The parents give thousands of dollars, their life savings, to a smuggler who says: I will get this child to the border of the United States. The child is picked up by the smuggler in a car or truck or bus to the border. The child then comes out of the car, is pointed toward one of our Federal employees with the Border Patrol, and the child walks up and hands a piece of paper to the Border Patrol agent with the name of someone in the United States. That process then unfolds, and the child ultimately, in many cases, ends up with that relative while a decision is made about the status of the child.

Is it an invitation for human trafficking taking place? Yes.
Are atrocities committed against these children in the course of this journey? All true. Should we be dedicated to cleaning this up? Sign me up, on a bipartisan basis.

Let me tell you another scenario, another one that has a different origin than turning over a child to a smuggler. Let me tell you about cases we know of in Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala where, because of the rampant crime, gang activity, and violence that makes it next to impossible for parents, desperate to save their children—a digit of whom have daughters who have been victims of rape by these gangs—send them to the United States in the hope that they can save their lives. They show up at the border, having lived in fear of this violence in their countries, and they are accepted into the United States to determine whether that fear can be established in a hearing.

These are two different cases—a little child being exploited by a smuggler; a young woman being raped and perhaps death because her parents have nowhere to turn to save her life. Should we treat them both the same? I don’t think so. Historically, we have said that when it comes to asylum seekers from countries that have a credible fear for their own lives, the United States has given them a chance to be protected. We have said that over and over again. We said it to the Cubans who were escaping Fidel Castro. We have said it to the Soviet Jews who wanted to have freedom of religion and came to the United States, believing this was the only chance they had in the world.

The Trump immigration proposal does not make a clear distinction on those two cases. In fact, what it does is end up with fast-track deportations without due process. Accepting the Trump approach will literally return many of these folks who have come to our border to harm and in some cases death.

There are fast-track deportations in the Trump proposal without due process for millions who have overstayed their visas. An estimated 40 percent of the 11 million undocumented fit in this category. So even if they have no criminal record, without considering their legal claims to remain in the United States, they would be deported. It dramatically cuts immigration from sub-Saharan African countries.

We have a diversity visa program. It is far from perfect, but it is a program that was created years ago, so countries that do not have an opportunity to send people to the United States for legal immigration would have a chance. Immigrants who come from these countries are limited in number. They have to go through the background checks, criminal background checks, biometric investigations—all of the investigations and interviews that we have. In order to make sure we do everything humanly possible to cull out those who would be any danger to the United States. They face that same scrutiny, and they should. Many of them are rejected. They can’t make the case for their lives and what they have done with them, and they are not given a chance to come. The President wants to eliminate the diversity visa program. For those African countries, huge countries, about 12,000 to 15,000 come to the United States each year through this program. By eliminating this program, the Trump administration sadly is going to deny those immigrants even a chance to apply for this opportunity.

In the past, many Democrats have been willing to support some of the President’s proposals, changes in our immigration system, eliminating the diversity visa lottery, but when we made that offer 5 years ago, it was part of comprehensive immigration reform with give and take and compromise that tried to make sense out of senseless immigration laws.

In 2013 a Democratic-led Senate passed a comprehensive immigration reform bill with a strong bipartisan vote of 68 to 32. The bill was a product of months of negotiations, with committee and floor debate. Unfortunately, in the House the House leadership and the House of Representatives refused to even consider the bill. Now we are being asked to accept the administration’s proposal with no conditions, no compromise, no give and take; rather, take it or leave it.

Democrats have shown they want to comprehensively fix our broken immigration system, but right now we have to focus our focus on the DACA crisis created by President Trump with his announcement of September 5. That has to be our priority.

In the next day or two, we expect the so-called Grassley proposal, which is the Trump immigration plan, to come to the floor. I want to say for the record, Democrats support comprehensiveness in reform but we will not stand by and allow Dreamers to be held political hostage to the administration’s entire immigration agenda.

I yield the floor.

The Acting President pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The Acting President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come here from a great concern for America’s Dreamers, whose futures hinge on the ability of this body to keep its word and get something done. I want to be clear whom we are talking about when we talk about Dreamers. We aren’t talking about criminals. We aren’t talking about violence. We aren’t talking about “bad hombres.” We are talking about kids as American apple pie. As I often say, the only country they call home is the United States. The only flag they pledge allegiance to is that of the American flag. The only national anthem they know how to sing is the “Star-Spangled Banner.”

We are talking about 800,000 young people who were brought to this country as children and were able to obtain legal protection under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, known as DACA. These kids put enor- mous faith in our government. They came out of the shadows, they passed background checks, and they registered with our government—all to get a 2-year renewable work permit and protection from deportation.

Even the Cato Institute, which is a conservative think tank, says that deporting Dreamers—91 percent of whom are gainfully employed—would hurt America’s economy. At the same time, we are also talking about thousands of additional Dreamers eligible for DACA but didn’t apply. Some couldn’t afford the cost and others were still working through the lengthy application process. These are the Dreamers the White House Chief of Staff, John Kelly called lazy asses. I yield the floor. I don’t understand: The reason they didn’t apply is not because they were lazy. In fact, in many cases, they didn’t apply because they were afraid—afraid of people like you. They were afraid that if they came out of the woodwork and registered with the government, they would end up on a short list for deportation. What is depressing is that this administration’s actions have proven them right. Now DACA recipients and undocumented Dreamers alike fear they have a target on their back, and that is because President Trump put an expiration date on their dreams when he decided to end DACA.

Now, let me be clear. DACA was never perfect, and it is certainly no replacement for truly comprehensive immigration reform. Make no mistake, we still need comprehensive immigration reform, and I am committed as ever to that cause—a cause I have spent the better part of my congressional career trying to achieve. I was a member of the Gang of 8 in the Senate back in 2013 when a bipartisan super-majority in the Senate passed the most historic reforms to our immigration system since the time of President Ronald Reagan, only to die in the House of Representatives without even a vote, that debate is for another day. That debate is for what President Trump called phase 2.

This week, we are not here to debate comprehensive immigration reform. We are not here to debate the numerous types of visas that exist under U.S. law. We are not here to debate how mayors run their cities or how police officers do their job. We are here to address a crisis that President Trump started last September when he ended DACA. That is what this week’s debate
is all about—it is about protecting hard-working, upstanding Dreamers across America from being deported to countries they haven’t stepped foot in since they were in diapers.

Now, many of my colleagues have met Dreamers from the States in recent years, and they know the lion’s share of these kids can’t even remember coming here—only growing up here. For the Dreamers who do remember arriving here, they certainly didn’t arrive with the expectation of illegal immigration. They were babies, toddlers, and very young children, and I challenge my colleagues to think of any decision of consequence they made when they were babies, toddlers, and very young children. I bet you didn’t decide what town you lived in, where your parents worked, or what kind of status you had.

When we talk about Dreamers, we are talking about kids who have grown up American in every sense of the word. They are not criminal. We are not talking about gangbangers or drug dealers. We are not talking about terrorists. We are not talking about deporting them—and many of the United States, risking their lives to protect our patients, who are serving this week. We are not talking about Dreamers who have proven themselves worthy of the American dream. Yet the Americans who have proven themselves worthy of the American dream. Yet the Americans who have proven themselves worthy of the American dream. Yet the Americans who have proven themselves worthy of the American dream. Yet the Americans who have proven themselves worthy of the American dream. Yet the Americans who have proven themselves worthy of the American dream. Yet the Americans who have proven themselves worthy of the American dream. Yet the Americans who have proven themselves worthy of the American dream.

Now, as I listen to many of my Republican colleagues on the Senate floor, I am hearing less and less about Dreamers and more and more about spending tens of billions of taxpayer dollars on a wall President Trump promised Mexico would pay for. Considering the Trump administration’s border plan, which is wholesale crossings from Mexico have dropped to their lowest level in nearly 50 years, you have to question the wisdom of a multibillion-dollar wall—a wall between the United States and a country that serves as our second largest export market in the world for American goods and services, as Mexican consumers and businesses buy American goods and services that support jobs created here at home.

Likewise, I am hearing a whole lot about merit-based loaded terms like “merit-based immigration” and “chain migration.” These aren’t terms you find in our laws. They are political catchphrases designed to incite fear and push policies that forever change the way legal immigration works in the United States. The more insidious, of course, is the term “chain migration.” I am appalled when I hear my colleagues talking about chain migration, just like I am appalled that the media—even the so-called liberal media—has adopted this phrase as if it is actually a legitimate term, and I can’t be the only one who thinks the term “chain migration” is downright insulting to the millions of Americans whose ancestors were actually brought to this country in chains.

Now, I have heard a lot about family values from my Republican colleagues throughout my time in Congress. The Republican Party has long claimed to be the party of family values. Well, “chain migration” is a term that dehumanizes families. When we want to dehumanize something, we create an inanimate object, but this chain is about a mother and a father and a son and a daughter. It is not an inanimate object, but it is a dehumanizing term. It is a term designed to make our system of legal immigration and family reunification sound threatening and illogical, but there is nothing threatening about legally bringing family members into the United States. The more insidious, of course, is the term “chain migration” what it really is. They would call it family reunification, but they would call their term of “chain migration.” That is right. Friedrich Trump, Donald Trump’s grandfather, was able to come to the United States from Germany, and yet he built a groundbreaking company.

So let’s get real. When President Trump professes his support for merit-based immigration, he doesn’t have a real plan for allowing a million engineers and inventors from around the world to come to the United States. He is talking about cutting legal immigration by nearly 50 percent. That is a policy with disastrous implications for the future of this country when you consider basic economic facts.

Any credible economist will tell you that without steady immigration, America’s global competitiveness will suffer, and we will fall far behind much larger countries like China, Pakistan, and India. According to a Forbes magazine article, even President Donald Trump is a product of chain migration. That is right. Friedrich Trump, Donald Trump’s grandfather, was able to come to the United States and earn a living in Germany, with no English-speaking ability and no merit-based skills. Why? Because his sister was already in the United States and claimed him as part of family reunification. You get to be President of the United States because of chain migration.

If Republicans were being honest, they would call their term of “chain migration” what it really is. They would call it family reunification, but they don’t want to call it family reunification because they don’t want to own up to their intention, which is to strip U.S. citizens of the right to sponsor their brothers and sisters, mothers
and fathers, and adult children as immigrants.

I ask my colleagues to please give it a rest. If you want to have a debate about the merits of our immigration system, we can have that debate, but that comprehensive immigration reform is not the debate we should have this week. This debate is about whether we will do right by American Dreamers, about whether we will listen to the voices of the American people who overwhelmingly want us to solve this crisis.

According to the latest polls out this week from Quinnipiac University, 81 percent of Americans support giving Dreamers a path to citizenship. Yet, week after week, month after month, Dreamers have languished in uncertainty. Republicans didn’t let us protect them in September or October or November or December or January. Yet, throughout all this time wasted, I hear my colleagues in the majority say such things as: Do the Dreamers who are so talented they are, how hopeful they are, how important they are.

I say to them today that it is getting harder and harder to take your commitment to Dreamers seriously when, at every opportunity you had to do something, you do nothing. Instead, it is beginning to look like President Trump—the person responsible for ending DACA—has enablers in Congress who have been intent on deporting Dreamers from day one. If that is not the case, now is the time to prove it because March 5 is just around the corner. Come March, America’s Dreamers will see their dreams extinguished, replaced with deportation orders to nations they have never called home. So far, there are 19,000 already out of status, and after March 5, there will be 1,000 a day.

If my colleagues want to have a debate about comprehensive immigration reform, we can have that debate some other time but not today, not this week, not until we protect Dreamers living in fear of deportation due to President Trump’s reckless decisions—a President who once said about Dreamers that “we’re going to work something out that is going to make people happy and proud.” Well, the polls show deporting Dreamers will not make Americans happy and proud.

The time for talk is over. The time for know-how is past. Of the 1,000 per day, the bill to the homeland along the northern and southern borders. It is a plan that tries to confiscate tons of drugs that are poisoning Americans in the tens of thousands of every year. It is a plan that makes sure gang members are more likely to be incarcerated. It is a plan that tries to condemn to the border illegally and less likely to go into the very communities that many of the people who immigrate to this country go into. It is a plan to make those communities safer. There is a plan to make sure we know the thousands of people that cross the border illegally are not carrying illicit drugs in a truck or car or a wheel well, the way they do it today, because it is using technology to be able to search more vehicles to make sure our homeland is safe.

It is also a plan that shows more compassion than President Obama’s. It’s a plan. Right now they are saying: Let’s keep DACA going. Well, there are 690,000 people who are in DACA. Their future is uncertain because it is an Executive order. It doesn’t have the force of law. It cannot be challenged by the court. The President decided on September 15 of last year, Congress do your job. You have been talking about immigration reform for two decades. We have an arguably illegal Executive order by President Obama that President Trump kept in place for about a year, and then he said: I am going to give you all 6 months to do your job and come up with something that has enduring value.

The DACA proposal only provided the legally present persons who came to this country—through the decisions of an adult—some certainty that they wouldn’t be deported. It doesn’t give them any certainty in terms of a path to citizenship. People said the President’s hard-line plan is to have nearly three times as many people with a path to citizenship, not a piece of paper that hopefully will be in place for the time you spend in the United States but citizenship. So the President’s hard-line plan actually legalizes about two and a half times as many people, not to just let them be here present, to have legal status but have a path to citizenship. That is hard-line.

I am not sure the President was there when he was running for office, but he listened. He recognizes he wants to be the President who gets something done, and he is willing to accept the criticism from people on my side of the aisle who may not support a path to citizenship, to wish my wife a happy Valentine’s Day, to wish my wife to know I love her and I happen to be several hundred miles away from my sweetheart, but I want my wife to know I love her and I want I wish I was with her.

Now, Mr. President, I want to talk about immigration reform. We have heard a discussion. I tell you, sometimes I think I believe that Dr. King said, right here present, to have legal status but have a path to citizenship. I do, and the President does.

I find it remarkable that somebody would say a President, who has endorsed a bill on the other side of the aisle that the President’s hard-line plan is to have nearly three times as many people with a path to citizenship, not a piece of paper that hopefully will be in place for the time you spend in the United States but citizenship. So the President’s hard-line plan actually legalizes about two and a half times as many people, not to just let them be here present, to have legal status but have a path to citizenship. That is hard-line.

I am not sure the President was there when he was running for office, but he listened. He recognizes he wants to be the President who gets something done, and he is willing to accept the criticism from people on my side of the aisle who may not support a path to citizenship, to wish my wife a happy Valentine’s Day, to wish my wife to know I love her and I happen to be several hundred miles away from my sweetheart, but I want my wife to know I love her and I wish I was with her.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, in a moment, I am going to talk about the immigration debate we are going to have here.

Before I do that, though, I want to recognize that this is Valentine’s Day. I happen to be several hundred miles away from my sweetheart, but I want to wish my wife a happy Valentine’s Day. I made her a little card. I am sure I probably just violated a rule, but I don’t think anybody can fire me. I want my wife to know I love her and wish I was with her.

Now, Mr. President, I want to talk about immigration reform. We just heard a discussion. I tell you, sometimes I think I believe that Dr. King said, right here present, to have legal status but have a path to citizenship. I do, and the President does.

I find it remarkable that somebody would say a President, who has endorsed a bill on the other side of the aisle that the President’s hard-line plan is to have nearly three times as many people with a path to citizenship, not a piece of paper that hopefully will be in place for the time you spend in the United States but citizenship. So the President’s hard-line plan actually legalizes about two and a half times as many people, not to just let them be here present, to have legal status but have a path to citizenship. That is hard-line.
of that is on the northern border. The remainder is on the southern border. Some of that will be spent on wall structures.

When all is said and done, less than half of the 2,300 miles will have a wall structure. The rest will be spent on training additional personnel. If you have ever gone to a border crossing, you know the long lines they have there. This is actually creating tech- nology that has low-intensity pay rates where you could drive a vehicle through. The Border Patrol folks can identify human smugglers, human traf- fickers, and drug smugglers without ever having the person get out of the car. That is what a border security plan is focused on as well. There are wall structures where they make sense. They don’t make sense along about half of the border.

Let me tell you about the humani- tarian case for this, which I find re- markable no one on the other side of the aisle will bring up. I went to Texas last year. I went along the southern border. I was at the Rio Grande, on the Border Patrol on horseback standing at night I took ATVs around. I heard a lot of stories by a lot of people, including property owners. Over the last 20 years, 10,000 people have died trying to cross our border on U.S. soil. We have no idea how many tens of thousands of people die just trying to get there. So 10,000 people died over the last 20 years because we didn’t know where they were. They were on American soil, but we didn’t know where they were. We have 1,000,000 of these children. If that is not a case for need- ing to know who is crossing the border and where they are—even if they may get deported if they don’t have a legiti- mate claim to asylum but have this threat to their safety—then I don’t know what else is. I don’t see how bor- der security is hard-line when you look at the facts—not the theater but the facts.

I think that second pillar of the President’s proposal is balanced. It is less than what he originally wanted, but it makes sense, and it shows a lot of movement on his part. Again, two and a half times the number of people are actually getting a path to citizen- ship—more than the DACA Executive order proposed—and it has border security that makes sense and is no longer this idea of a monolithic wall.

We heard somebody say there is a dramatic shift to legal immigration; that the promise we made to everybody who is in line because of a family rela- tionship is going to be broken. That is utter nonsense. There is no proposal like that on the table. The fact is, there are about 1 million people a year who we the backlog who, if the President’s pro- posal is accepted, will get to this coun- try in half the time it takes today. There are about 3.9 million people waiting to come to this country be- cause of the family relationship who we have proposed—that the President has proposed—should be able to get here sooner.

The diversity lottery is also some- thing. I think, people have been misled or they are trying to mislead you. I will leave it to you to decide. The di- versity lottery is not ending. This ac- tually comes up with a reasonable way to use those 50,000 green cards in a way that lets us use the backlog sooner—instead of having somebody wait 17 years or 20 years to get into the country, maybe 8 or 9, but then it is also with a focus on the underrep- resented countries. There are many countries in the world that have 15,000—that is, we would like to make sure they have an opportunity every year to come to this country. They are from an under-represented country. We have already made proposals that said we are open to other proposals to make that be a part of how the diversity lottery gets settled. So 50,000 will continue to come. When we say we are ending the diver- sity lottery, we are not saying we will end the entry of 50,000 people; we are talking about modernizing it.

The last time we had any major im- migration bill, I was 5 years old. I think it is about time to look at how the world has changed and maybe open your eyes and open your hearts to a better way to do it that benefits the person trying to come to this country and benefits our country as a result of their entry. I think it can be a win-win.

The last thing on chain migration is, I want to go back and find everybody who voted in the past, and they voted for a bill with legislative language in it that referred to chain migration. I am sick of that kind of garbage on the Senate floor. That is just misleading. Chain migration is just a process that has been used in the past—not only by our country but other countries—to kind of link people together.

I am absolutely sympathetic with some of the things the gentleman from New Jersey said that this is some hateful, divisive term is not pay- ing a whole lot of attention to your job. I have only been here 3 years. Many of these people who are here voted for language that had chain mi- gration in it, and now they are saying it is something the hateful folks in our marketing departments created to be divisive. That is just untrue.

Now the last thing. When we are talking about legal immigration in this country, I wrote about 1 million to 1.1 million people a year to this country. I don’t have a problem with that number. If I had Members on the other side of the aisle, some of my colleagues, say, “Thom, we want to try to maintain that same amount of im- migration over time.” I would say that I am open to it. Some of my colleagues I have worked with on this bill may not be. But the way we go about doing it needs to be modernized.

How many times have we heard that when we have a national here who graduates with an engineering de- gree or some degree in STEM, that we should just staple a green card to the back of their diploma—how many times have we heard that?—because we need high-end workers. We need weld- ers. We need carpenters. We need plumbers. We need people to come to this country to fill jobs, or at some point, our economy is going to be limited by the number of resources we have for those jobs. Our unemploy- ment is going down. The demand for the workers is there. But we have an immigration system where about three-fourths of everybody who comes to this country comes purely because of a family relationship. I bet that if we dig it into, many of them actually could qualify on the basis of merit, but right now, it is just a random selection that doesn’t really tie to earning as a nation and for our economic growth or for our economic security.

I believe that if we get the immigra- tion policy right, over the next 10 years, we will get more legal immigration here, more than the 1 million or 1.1 million, but if we don’t fix this, we are not going to fix the underlying problem with our immigration system.

I think that I actually didn’t mean—speaking, I just grabbed a couple of these slides so that I could talk about it. But it is very important to me for us to—I don’t like being a part of an organization that talks a lot and doesn’t get any- thing done, and over the last 17 years, that is all these folks have been doing. They say: Reelect me. I promise you that next year, I will get immigration reform done. Next year, I will file the Dream Act, and we will get it done.

Well, I guess what it didn’t get done under a Republican administra- tion. President Bush was sympathetic to this issue. He couldn’t get it done. Congress couldn’t get it done.

President Obama had the votes to pass ObamaCare. There was a time in this Chamber when not a single Republican vote was necessary to pass a bill out of here, right? So if we had a sin- gle Republican vote in Congress, on the House or the Senate side, why didn’t you get it done? Because I don’t think you have taken the time to construct something that makes sense, that is compassionate, that is responsible, and that will have the enduring value of law. So now is the time to get it done, and the only way we are going to get it done is with bipartisanship.

I don’t think it’s any of the ele- ments of the President’s framework and you set a hammer to it, fold your hands, and say: If you will not vote on mine, I will not vote on yours—look at this and tell us how we can improve it. If you will not vote on the big bill, then tell us what you will vote on. Tell us what we can do to mod- erate this. To call this a hardline bill is absurd. It is theater. It is the kind of stuff that has prevented us from get- ting things done for the last 17 years.

I hope people will have an honest dis- cussion and debate. I hope people will come down here, offer all the amend- ments they want to, and I hope they
will be mature enough, if they fail, to move on to the next one because I, for one, want to provide certainty to the DACA population.

I say to the Presiding Officer, you know better than I because you are in the Maine House of Representatives. There are people serving in the military today—that is more than a battalion, right? We have more than 900 DACA recipients serving in the military. I want to file this bill. I want to get this bill to the President, and say to them: Welcome to this country. Thank you for your service. I can’t wait to go to your ceremony where you swear the oath as an American citizen.

This is what we can do this week. But I guarantee you, anybody who sits here and says that the President’s proposal is unfair and insincere and hardline is playing politics. It makes me wonder if some of them would just as soon speak. But this is the week to get it done. This is the Congress to get it done. This is the President who has given us a historic opportunity. I hope we seize the day.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. 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. MITTEN. Mr. President, the Senate is debating the fate of our Nation’s Dreamers this week. Everywhere I go, people recognize the uncontestable truth that underpins our discussion: We are all a nation of immigrants. Unless you are Native American, you come from a line of people who come from somewhere else. More than in any other country on Earth, this simple fact is a defining characteristic of our national identity. Throughout our history, immigrant communities have greatly enriched our Nation; their individual stories have become the American story. Out of many, we have become one.

My maternal grandparents emigrated from Italy, began a business, hired a lot of people, and were pillars of the community. My wife’s parents emigrated from French-speaking Canada and also owned a business. She was born in Vermont. You know my wife’s uncle, an immigrant from Canada who started off as an $8-a-week clerk at a shoe store. He was buried with honors at the age of 100 yesterday, and people talked about the $20 million or $30 million he has given to philanthropies in Vermont. This $8-a-week immigrant clerk at a shoe store. I think sometimes we forget who we are. In the late 1800s we passed laws excluding Chinese immigrants. During World War II, we turned away Jewish refugees fleeing the Holocaust. Turned them away at the shores of our country—and many went back to die in the gas chambers. We know today that these were tragic mistakes, fueled by our own ill-informed, xenophobic rhetoric. Mistakes we never should have made, but they must never be repeated.

Yet now, in 2018, I am concerned that we are hearing echoes of past mistakes. Anti-immigrant voices, armed with the same shameful fearmongering, are attempting a comeback in our country. In recent months, Dreamers have been regularly disparaged. Some have even suggested that Dreamers pose a risk of terrorism or have links to international drug trafficking. These absurd claims would be laughable if they weren’t so damaging, especially to those of us who remember one of the biggest terrorist attacks on our country, in Oklahoma City by Timothy McVeigh, who was not an immigrant; he grew up there and was born there. Thankfully, most Americans know better. Dreamers are not threats to our national security; not a single one—not a single one—has been suspected of terrorist activities. Nor do Dreamers pose a threat to public safety. Far from it. By definition, Dreamers are law-abiding individuals who seek only to contribute to our country. Brought here as children, Dreamers are now our neighbors, our first responders, our teachers, our medical personnel. Nearly 1,000 have served in our Armed Forces, risking their lives to defend the only country they have ever known as home.

I will never forget one Dreamer who wrote to me. His name is Juan Conde. He is a DACA recipient. He is a resident of Vermont. He was born in Mexico and brought to the United States as a young child by his mother. In 2007, tragically, his mother died of cancer. Showing remarkable courage and determination for a young man, Dr. Conde was motivated by this personal tragedy to help cancer patients like his mother. He ultimately obtained a Ph.D. in cancer research from the University of Texas.

But as accomplished as he already was, Dr. Conde was not satisfied with just studying cancer. He wanted to treat the people suffering with and battling the disease. Everyone of us in this Chamber knows somebody who has suffered from and battled cancer, and many have died.

But only after he enrolled in DACA was Dr. Conde able to attend medical school. And he is in the United States studying oncology at the University of Vermont’s Larner College of Medicine. Dr. Conde hopes to spend his life in the United States treating cancer patients and researching to find a cure. This is the Dreamer I care about—this is the Dreamer that I and I think all Americans would agree—believes that America is a better place with Dr. Conde in it.

There are hundreds of thousands of Dreamers just like Dr. Conde, all with the potential to contribute to our communities and to our country. To deny them these opportunities because they were brought here as children would be as senseless as it is cruel.

Let’s make the better bet than that. And this week, we have an opportunity to prove it. I am proud of those in the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans, who are engaged in good-faith negotiations over proposals to protect our Dreamers and move our legislative process forward. I sincerely believe that we can find a path to 60 votes, and I hope the Republican leadership will let us.

The Majority Leader’s decision yesterday to seek to open up the debate with a vote on a poison pill amendment about so-called sanctuary cities—which has nothing to do with either Dreamers or border security—was less than a helpful start. These kinds of attempts to score political points from the side, in stark contrast to the bipartisan search done by leading Republicans and Democrats behind the scenes for a solution. As the most senior Member of this body, it is my hope that all Senators will focus on a bipartisan solution, not on just divisive distractions.

I respect this institution as much as anybody. For 43 years, I have been here and I have seen—and I hope contributed to—the good that can be accomplished. I have often said that at its best the Senate can and should serve as the conscience of the Nation. But it can only do so when we put aside our own self-interest, and we work across the aisle in the spirit of compromise. I know we are capable of meeting this challenge today. We have done it before.

Five years ago, when I was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, we brought together 58 Senators, Democrats and Republicans, and we voted for an immigration bill that provided protection for Dreamers, including an expedited pathway to citizenship. Unfortunately, the House, even though they had the votes to pass it, would not bring it up. Well, it is time now for the Senate to do so again and, this time, for the House to follow suit.

President Trump claims he will treat Dreamers with great ‘hearts.’ But if he meant what he said, he will certainly sign our bipartisan compromise that emerges. So let’s get to work. The future of Dreamers—and the fate of the
American dream itself—lies in our hands.

As I left that funeral yesterday in Vermont, I thought of my wife’s uncle and her parents coming from Canada to make a better life, my grandparents coming from Italy, and my great grandparents coming from Ireland. I will make such a mark on our little State of Vermont, all for the better. As a member of that family, how proud I am to stand here on the floor of the U.S. Senate, but I want to do more than that. I want to vote for a bill to help more people like those who come to our country and to make our country better. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. 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. CORNYN. Mr. President, today a group led by Chairman GRASSLEY of the Senate Judiciary Committee formally introduced bill to address the DACA issue—the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals issue—that we have heard so much about, as well as border security. I think it is a good starting point, and I am proud to be a co-sponsor of the legislation, which is called the Secure and Succeed Act:

Perhaps the most important thing about this bill is that it actually has a good chance of becoming law. That is because the President supports it. It encompasses the four pillars the President has laid out for us in any solution to the DACA challenge.

The Secure and Succeed Act provides legal status and a pathway to citizenship for an estimated 1.8 million people who meet the specific criteria of DACA. This is a larger number than the number of individuals covered by President Obama’s Executive order. The fact is, this President has not only signed up that same opportunity. What an extraordinarily generous government to force this debate to occur on their terms and at a time they chose. We are still trying to figure out—OK, you won, in a sense. I think the American people lost when you shut down the government, but you made your point. You wanted a time certain and you wanted a fair process by which to present your ideas, and we have been waiting—here it is Wednesday, with the clock ticking, still waiting—for that Democratic proposal. What is their plan? What is their proposal? Do they even have one? And if they do, why are they leaving the rest of us, as well as the Nation, in the dark?

As the majority leader said yesterday, we need to stop trying to score political points and start making law. The way to get this done is to take a proposal like the President’s and get some concessions to that. Whatever gets 60 votes in the Senate passes the Senate, and then it is up to the House to pass it, and then it is up to the President to decide whether to sign it. He has pretty much given us the outline of what he would find acceptable. Again, insofar as it grants a pathway to citizenship for 1.8 million people, that is extraordinary in and of itself.

This bill also provides for a real plan to strengthen border security, utilizing the three things that Border Patrol has always told me are essential: more boots on the ground, better technology, and, yes, some infrastructure in hard-to-control locations, along with enhanced ports of entry.

I know there has been some confusion about that. The President likes to talk about the wall. It is true that back in roughly 2006 or 2007, Congress called for something called the Secure Fence Act, which got the support of then-Senator Obama, then-Senator HILLARY CLINTON, and, of course, current Senator CHUCK SCHUMER. They supported the Secure Fence Act, as did an overwhelming majority of Senators from both parties.

When the President has talked about the wall, he has made pretty clear what he is really talking about is a barrier similar to what was supported on a bipartisan basis. He said that the Border Patrol is going to have to be able to see through it. Indeed, as he has conceded, in many places it doesn’t make sense to put a physical barrier. That is why technology and boots on the ground are so important.

This legislation also reallocates visas from the diversity lottery system in a way that is fair and continues the existing, family-based categories until the current backlog is cleared, which would take, probably, about 10 years. I am proud to co-sponsor this commonsense solution. But I know other colleagues have been working hard on their ideas, which I look forward to reviewing as the debate continues.

One group I haven’t heard from much, though, is our Democratic colleagues. What has the government to force this debate to occur on their terms and at a time they chose. We are still trying to figure out—OK, you won, in a sense. I think the American people lost when you shut down the government, but you made your point. You wanted a time certain and you wanted a fair process by which to present your ideas, and we have been waiting—here it is Wednesday, with the clock ticking, still waiting—for that Democratic proposal. What is their plan? What is their proposal? Do they even have one? And if they do, why are they leaving the rest of us, as well as the Nation, in the dark?

As the majority leader said yesterday, we need to stop trying to score political points and start making law. The way to get this done is to take a proposal like the President’s and get some concessions to that. Whatever gets 60 votes in the Senate passes the Senate, and then it is up to the House to pass it, and then it is up to the President to decide whether to sign it. He has pretty much given us the outline of what he would find acceptable. Again, insofar as it grants a pathway to citizenship for 1.8 million people, that is extraordinary in and of itself.

As the majority leader said yesterday, we need to stop trying to score political points and start making law. The way to get this done is to take a proposal like the President’s and get some concessions to that. Whatever gets 60 votes in the Senate passes the Senate, and then it is up to the House to pass it, and then it is up to the President to decide whether to sign it. He has pretty much given us the outline of what he would find acceptable. Again, insofar as it grants a pathway to citizenship for 1.8 million people, that is extraordinary in and of itself.

As the majority leader said yesterday, we need to stop trying to score political points and start making law. The way to get this done is to take a proposal like the President’s and get some concessions to that. Whatever gets 60 votes in the Senate passes the Senate, and then it is up to the House to pass it, and then it is up to the President to decide whether to sign it. He has pretty much given us the outline of what he would find acceptable. Again, insofar as it grants a pathway to citizenship for 1.8 million people, that is extraordinary in and of itself.

As the majority leader said yesterday, we need to stop trying to score political points and start making law. The way to get this done is to take a proposal like the President’s and get some concessions to that. Whatever gets 60 votes in the Senate passes the Senate, and then it is up to the House to pass it, and then it is up to the President to decide whether to sign it. He has pretty much given us the outline of what he would find acceptable. Again, insofar as it grants a pathway to citizenship for 1.8 million people, that is extraordinary in and of itself.
anything for the money. Unfortunately, victims of human trafficking know exactly what I am talking about. Despite these hardships, businesses in many of the communities, like those along the border, are thriving. But we need to do something we can to make sure that continues to be the case.

Sympathy for DACA recipients is right and good because, in America, we do not punish children for the mistakes of their parents, and we are not going to punish these young people who are now adults and have become part of our communities. But Americans who live along the border in my State realize that illegal immigration has caused real, tangible harm in terms of public safety, property damage, and their way of life.

When I talk to people like Manny Padilla, the Border Patrol’s sector chief for the Rio Grande Valley, it is hard not to realize just how much is required. Of the many more resources we need to maintain situational awareness and operational control along the border.

I will say this: The Federal Government has failed over the years to live up to its duty to maintain the security of our border, so taxpayers in my State have to step up and fill the gap left by the failure of leadership of the Federal Government. But we have an opportunity to fix that in this legislation, following the parameters that the President put forward. That is why, during this week’s debate, ensuring additional resources for border security is an essential piece of the puzzle. That includes areas other than between our ports of entry. Mexico is one of our largest trading partners. We have legitimate trade and commerce that flows back and forth across the border with Mexico and supports 5 million American jobs. Unfortunately, the cartels have figured out how to exploit that well. So, because of antiquated infrastructure and technology at our ports of entry, millions of them are vulnerable through the importation of poison—literally, drugs like methamphetamine, cocaine, heroin, and the like—that has taken the lives of so many Americans. We need to do more and better when it comes to maintaining those ports of entry—upgrading the infrastructure, improving the technology—so we can interdict more of that.

Again, the border is as varied as anywhere in the world, with areas that are flat and open, areas that have mountains and rolling hills, rivers, obviously. Technology, as we have come to see, has transformed our way of life, and technology can increasingly be the answer to supplement the boots on the ground and the infrastructure that the Border Patrol thinks are necessary.

There is a big difference between detecting illegal immigration in rural areas and urban ones. In urban areas, the Border Patrol tells us that you might have just a few seconds before someone can cross the border and enter into the United States. In large, open areas, there is more of a lag time, so perhaps a fence or some infrastructure is not as important; technology might be more important, along with the Border Patrol agents themselves.

My basic point that border security is considered for those who think it is as easy as one, two, three. I encourage you to do as some of my colleagues have done; that is, travel to the border—we will host you—to see firsthand why it is crucial that we strengthen our personnel and infrastructure. That has to be one of our priorities, and I am grateful to the President for making this one of his requirements as well.

We have an opportunity to address not only the anxiety and plight of DACA recipients but also to make our country safer and more secure; to reform our legal immigration system in a way that will help us accelerate the reunification of families out of the backlog of people waiting patiently and legally outside of the country to come into the country through legal immigration; and to address the President’s concern about the roll of the dice in the diversity lottery that makes little sense, given our need for people with job-based skills, graduate degrees, and other merit-based criteria that would make them valuable to the United States, in addition to winning the lottery.

I hope you will take advantage of this opportunity this week. Time is wasting. It is Wednesday, and we don’t have any time to waste at all. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Ernst). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I rise to talk about the topic of the week.

Although some of us have been working on this for some time, many of us in this body have actually been addressing this over the last 20 years or so. I am new to this body, as I have only been here a few years, but, last year I got involved in this. We are dealing with the immigration issue today, not just the DACA issue.

Our current immigration system is outdated, threatens our national security, and does not meet the needs of our economy. The issue before the Senate this week is not just about DACA, which is but one manifestation of our broken immigration policies. Rather, President Trump, while offering a generous solution for DACA recipients, has proposed a comprehensive solution to our legal immigration system that will ensure that we are not back here in just a few short years to deal with this same problem again. Over the past 11 years, Congress has failed to fix our broken immigration system three times, primarily because it has attempted to solve the entire situation, the comprehensive problem, which would be the legal situation, the temporary work visa problems, and then the illegal situation.

The Secure and Succeed Act only deals with our legal immigration policy. From the onset of these negotiations, President Trump has been consistent with what we have said as part of any immigration deal that deals with the legal immigration system.

Months ago, he gave us a clean framework. He said that any plan that didn’t fit that framework would never become law. The Secure and Succeed Act, which we are dealing with this week, is the only plan that actually fits that framework. It is the only plan the President has said he will sign into law. The framework that has been laid out by President Trump has four parts. It provides for the DACA situation and ends the program. It does so in a compassionate, responsible way that every Senator on the other side of the aisle should support and has supported at various times.

President Trump wants a way to reach across the aisle to the Democrats when he expanded the population that was being discussed in the DACA situation, and he actually talked about providing long-term certainty for this population group.

Second, this bill secures our borders with additional border security and a wall where required. It puts $25 billion in a trust fund toward border security and a wall system. This money would be spent over the next few years to provide better national security for our country’s borders. It ends policies like catch and release, which encourage more illegal immigration. It makes critical changes to the immigration system to create a more merit-based system, expedite court hearings, and give law enforcement the resources it needs to do its job properly.

Third, this bill fixes the flaws in the current immigration system that spurred this DACA problem in the first place and incentivized illegal immigration. It protects the immediate family of the primary worker. Seventy-two percent of Americans believe immigration should include the primary worker’s spouses, children, and immediate minor children, which is exactly what this bill does. In addition, two-thirds of Americans actually believe that the solution here for illegal immigration includes the DACA fix, an end to chain migration, border security, and an end to the diversity lottery—two-thirds. That is from a Harvard poll that was put out several weeks ago, and there are others that actually corroborate that.

What this bill also expedites the backlog, which is something that was not even discussed before we brought this bill forward. This bill ensures that the primary family of immediate citizens—
some of them are recent green card recipiends and new citizens who are trying to get their families in—will be reunited. But there is a backlog. We have that in this bill and have ensured that the backlog will be taken care of and that forever, the backlogs will be eliminated, which is what most Americans want.

Fourth, the Secure and Succeed Act ends the archaic visa lottery program. This failed program is dangerous, filled with fraud, and has proven to be an avenue to enter our country illegally. We simply must fix these national security flaws and close the loopholes in our current immigration system that incentivize illegal immigration. If we don’t deal with these problems that got us here in the first place, we will be right back here in just a few short years. This is the President’s objective. If we are going to deal with it, let’s deal with it once and for all on the immigration side and then move on to the temporary work visas and solve that as well.

I don’t think anybody in this body wants to be back here in a few short years. Many on the other side and on our side have been trying to find a common solution to this for decades. I believe historic opportunities are right now to do something that people in this body have wanted to do for a long time, and that is to solve our legal immigration system in a very compassionate, fair way that will benefit every American. That is why we have to deal with these issues in a responsible and fair way.

Politicians have talked about this for far too long. I have discovered, now having been in this body, that it is easy for some to just kick this down the road. It is a great pandering opportunity for one side or the other to blame this on them. Unfortunately, the American people deserve better than that. We have a clean opportunity here to do what most people in America want us to do.

Other than politics, there is no reason for the Secure and Succeed Act not to have widespread, bipartisan support this week in this body. Each part of the Secure and Succeed Act has been supported by many Democrats at various times over the last 30 years. As a matter of fact, in 1994, Barbara Jordan presented the result of her bipartisan immigration commission report to then-President Clinton. The recommendations at that time were to change our immigration system from our current country caps and chain migration system to more of a skills-based system like those seen in Canada and Australia.

They knew then the flaws that were included in our immigration law that was written in 1965 that actually incentivized illegal immigration. Unfortunately, it seems that because these ideas are not being put forward by President Donald Trump, the Democrats, all of a sudden, disagree with these principles. President Trump has crafted a deal that is tough but more than generous. Nobody asked him to expand the number or to even talk about certainty in the long term. He has brought that forward because he wants this done. He wants this solved. He wants this ended right now.

The Secure and Succeed Act follows the framework that President Trump has crafted. Compromises have been made on both sides of this issue. It deals with the DACA issue, secures the border, and fixes critical flaws in our immigration system that incentivize illegal immigration today. This is to ensure that we are not back here in a few short years to deal with the problem again of a new wave of young people who may be brought here illegally again.

Again, the President has said repeatedly that the Secure and Succeed Act is the only bill that he will sign into law. Leadership in the U.S. House of Representatives has also been clear that the only plan it will bring up for a vote in its body is one that will be signed into law. The Secure and Succeed Act is that plan.

We don’t have many opportunities in this body for common thought and common positions, but we have one here. I have seen what most people in this body think about these issues, and it impresses me that there is commonality of thought. At the root, this body wants to solve the DACA issue, but it also wants to solve the problems that caused this issue in the first place. The President called for a compassionate compromise when he met with Democrats and Republicans several weeks ago at the White House, and we all agreed it was time to do that for the American people. Yet the American people want to be assured that the borders will be secure. They want to be assured that the policies that are embedded in our immigration system will not create another wave of illegal immigrants. They also want this archaic diversity lottery to end, which has never worked as it was originally intended and is nothing but a loophole for terrorists today.

I think there is too much talk about this bill cutting immigration. That is not the intent here. The intent is long term. We have a bill in here called the RAISE Act that would actually move us to a merit-based system like those in Canada and Australia. That is not included in the Secure and Succeed Act. What is included here is a first step toward a long-term solution not only on our legal immigration side, but it sets us up to then deal with the temporary work visas and, ultimately, with the illegal population.

I believe, as I know the President does, that it is time for those in this body to put our self-interests and our partisan interests aside, as we say so many times, and to do what the American people want us to do, for which we now have hard evidence. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.
young man coming from Poland who managed to see two of his kids go to college and one of his sons become a U.S. Senator. It is not just my family’s story. It is the story of my wife’s family who came from Ireland, and it is the story of millions of American families who came from every single part of this world.

In September of 2017, President Trump precipitated the current crisis we are dealing with by revoking President Obama’s DACA Executive order. If President Trump believed that Executive order was unconstitutional and it needed legislation, he could have come to Congress for a legislative solution without holding 800,000 young people hostage by revoking their DACA status. President Trump chose not to do that. He chose to provoke the crisis we are experiencing today. That is a crisis we have to deal with in the Senate, and we have to deal with it now.

Let’s talk about the nature of this crisis because some people say: Well, it is really not imminent. It is not something we have to worry about now. Those people are wrong. As a result of Trump’s decision, 122 people every day are losing their legal status, and within a couple of years, hundreds of thousands of these young people will have lost their legal protection and be subject to deportation. The situation we are in right now, as a result of Trump’s action, means, if we do not immediately protect the legal status of some 800,000 Dreamers—young people who were brought to this country at the age of 1 or 3 or 6—young people who have known no other home but the United States of America—let us be clear that if we do not act and act soon, these hundreds of thousands of young people could be subject to deportation.

That means they could be arrested outside their home, where they have lived, for their entire life, and suddenly be placed in a jail. They could be pulled out of a classroom where they are teaching, and there are some 20,000 DACA recipients who are now teaching in schools all over this country. If we do not act and act now, there could be agents going into those schools, pulling those teachers right out and arresting them and subjecting them to deportation. Insane as it may sound, I suppose the 900 DACA recipients who now serve in the military today could find themselves in the position of being arrested and deported from the country they are putting their lives on the line to defend. Some people say: Well, that is far-fetched. Well, I am not so sure. It could happen. How insane is that? That is where we are today, and that is what could happen if we do not do the right thing and this week pass legislation in the Senate to protect the Dreamers.

We have a moral responsibility to stand up for the Dreamers and their families and to prevent what will be an indelible moral stain on our country if we fail to act. I do not want to see what the history books will be saying about this Congress if we allow 800,000 young people to be subjected to deportation, to live in incredible fear and anxiety.

Here is the very good news for the Dreamers. It is actually news that a couple of years ago, I would not have believed to be possible. The overwhelming majority of American people—Democrats, Republicans, Independents—absolutely agree we must provide legal protection to the Dreamers and that we should provide them with a path toward citizenship. That is not BERNIE SANDERS talking, that is what the American people are saying in poll after poll.

Just recently, a January 20 CBS News poll found that nearly 9 out of 10 Americans, 87 percent, favor allowing young immigrants who entered the United States illegally as children to remain in the United States—87 percent, favor allowing young people to automatically become U.S. citizens as long as they have a criminal record. In other words, the votes that are going to be cast hopefully today, maybe tomorrow, are not profiles in courage. They are not Members of the Senate coming up and saying: Against all the odds, I believe I am going to vote for what is right. This is what the overwhelming majority of the American people want.

Maybe, just maybe, it might be appropriate to do what the American people want rather than what a handful of xenophobic extremists want. Maybe we should listen to the American people. Democrats, Republicans, and Independents—who understand it would be a morally atrocious thing to allow these young people to be deported. When I think, from a political perspective, about 80, 85, 90 percent of the American people supporting anything in a nation which is as divided as we are today, this is really extraordinary. You can’t get 80 percent of the American people to agree on what their favorite ice cream flavor is, but we have 80 percent of the American people who are saying, do not turn your back on these young people who have lived in this country for virtually their entire lives.

We have to act and act soon in the Senate, and they did not need legislation that would allow us to do that. In the House, the good news is, there is now bipartisan legislation, sponsored by Congressman HCDR and Congressman AGUILAR, which will provide protection for Dreamers and a path toward citizenship. My understanding is, bipartisan legislation now has majority support.

I urge, in the strongest terms possible, that Speaker RYAN allow democracy to prevail in the House, allow the vote to take place. If you have a majority of Members of the House, in a bipartisan way, who support legislation, then you should vote on legislation and if that occurs, I think the Dreamers legislation will prevail.

Madam President, we all understand that there is a need for serious debate on legislation for comprehensive immigration reform. This is a difficult issue, an issue where there are differences of opinion. There are a whole lot of aspects to it. How do we provide a path toward citizenship for the 11 million people in this country who are currently undocumented but who are working hard, who are raising their kids, who are obeying the law? What should the overall immigration policy of our country be? How many people would be allowed to come to this country every year? Where should they come from?

All of this is very, very important and needs to be seriously debated, but this debate and this legislation is not going to be taking place in a 2-day period. It is going to need some serious time, some hearings, some committee work before the Congress is prepared to vote on comprehensive immigration reform, and it will not and cannot happen today, tomorrow, or this week.

Our focus now, as a result of Trump’s decision in September, must be on protecting the Dreamers and their families and on the issue of border security. There will be important legislation coming to the floor of the Senate today or maybe tomorrow, and I would hope that we could do the right thing, do the moral thing, and do something that has been made possible by the fact that there will be legislation on the floor. (The Acting President pro tempore assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE), The Senator from Oregon. Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, our Constitution begins with three very simple and very powerful words: “We the People.” It is the mission statement for our Nation, for our Constitution. It is a vision in which decisions are made of, by, and for the people, not for the privileged and not for the powerful.

Who wrote those words? Well, it happened to be a group of White, wealthy landowners—the powerful and the privileged. They did not have the vision to build a nation that would make laws for their benefit but laws that would be designed for the entire populous to thrive.

They were descended from immigrants. In our country, unless you are 100 percent Native American, unless you have just arrived as a new immigrant, you are descended from immigrants yourself. It is part of the fabric
of our Nation. It is what makes us a combination of powerful talents and abilities from around the world.

George Washington himself once said: “America is open to receive not only the Opulent and respected Stranger, but the Oppressed and Persecuted of all Nations.” On another occasion, he wrote to a friend: “I had always hoped that this land might become a safe and agreeable asylum to the virtuous and persecuted part of mankind, to whatever nation they might belong.” Washington’s wishes and to his vision, that is the land we have been. It has been that land of opportunity, that land that welcomes others to our shores and gives them the chance to pursue the vision of opportunity, to help participate in the making of our great Nation, and to do so, each generation brings together a variety of languages and cultures and backgrounds. That is America.

That is why, a century after our Nation’s founding, the French gave to the United States the Statue of Liberty. The Statue of Liberty has stood as a beacon of hope, welcoming those from other lands. Inscribed in the pedestal of that statue are these words:

Give me your tired, your poor, Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, The wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door!

Those are the words for hundreds of thousands arriving here in the United States.

As I speak at this moment, 800,000 young men and women right here in America are yearning to breathe free as full participants in the Nation that they have grown up in. These are our Dreamers—Dreamers like this group of Oregonians who visited my office in December, who came to this country as very young children, who went to elementary school here, who are our neighbors, our community members, who have gone on to college, who have taken jobs, and who are contributing in every possible way to our community, studying in their schools, practicing and working in our industry. They are now young adults who are striving to support their families, building to strengthen this economy, and building a future for themselves. They are paramedics saving lives.

If you stand on a street corner in Oregon and look around, there is a pretty good chance you will see a Dreamer. You may not know it because they are full members of our community, and you will not think of them contributing. But they have overcome a lot of obstacles, which creates a grit of character. It also helps to build the future of our Nation, just as it did for those of our forefathers and foremothers who arrived 1 or 2 or 3 or 10 generations ago.

We have a program, the DACA Program, which struck a deal that said: If you give us all of your information, we will make sure that you are legally protected. President Trump has broken that promise. He has broken that deal, that commitment made by our executive branch to these Dreamers. So it puts them in a terrible spot of uncertainty and stress and limbo. Now, it is time to put that right, could be set right by the President in a moment.

Several of the courts have weighed in and said that the President has acted unconstitutionally in attacking our young immigrants, our Dreamers. But let’s not wait for the courts to remedy this. Let’s take care of it ourselves in this Chamber, the Senate Chamber.

After months and months of inaction, after broken promises by President Trump, let’s finally protect young men and women who do so much to embody the American spirit.

As we move forward in this debate, we must look again to what our Founding Fathers intended for the Nation they created and ensure that the “golden door” that the poet Emma Lazarus wrote about in her poem remains an open door, open to all those who dream to become an American and to contribute to America. Without them we must remain, in President Washington’s words, “open to receive not only the Opulent and Respected, but the oppressed and persecuted of all Nations.”

Yet, looking at the plan that President Trump has put forward and similar plans offered in this Chamber, there is a real interest in slamming the door shut by those who have already arrived as immigrants, who have fled persecution, who have pursued freedom, who have pursued opportunity, and who have escaped from famine to come in and slam the door on everyone else. It is not very American to do that, and it is not a strength to undermine the future success of our economy by draining away the extraordinary talents of our Dreamer community.

President Johnson made the point. He said: “The land flourished because it was fed from so many sources—because it was so many cultures and traditions and peoples.”

President Ronald Reagan made the point. He said: “More than any other country, our strength comes from our own immigrant heritage and our capacity to welcome those from other lands.”

The founding President of our country, a respected Democratic President of our country, and a respected Republican President of our country have said the same thing: The strength of our country is in the contributions that have been made by our immigrants.

The Founding Fathers wrote those words, that mission statement, that this would be a nation of, by, and for the people, not one to make laws by and for the powerful and the privileged. That is the vision we need to continue to hold on to—to understand that the strength of this Nation comes from weaving together the many cultural threads of the people of the United States of America.

Let’s get this Dream Act to this floor. There is a bipartisan understanding around restoring legal status. There is a bipartisan foundation for border security. Let’s not give in to those far-right Breitbart voices that are so out of sync with the traditions, the history, that is the vision of our Nation. Let’s restore the legal status for our Dreamers, enhance our border security, and do the work that this Chamber should have done long ago.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am pleased to come and talk today.

This is a week where we had all anticipated a return to the Senate, where ideas are widely debated. I was standing by the majority leader last week when he was talking about this, and he said that we will let a thousand flowers bloom. It didn’t sound like something Senator McConnell would normally use as a reference, but he did, and I am thinking, well, that would be a good thing, to see a thousand different ideas widely debated on the Senate floor.

So far this week, there has not been a debate because we seem to agree on who votes on what first. I think that is a particular level of dysfunction that we should all be concerned about. For the Senate to do its work, we have to be willing to vote and have to be willing to take some hard votes. My sense of politics today is, whether you have taken the vote or not, someone is going to accuse you of taking that vote. So you might as well not worry about the vote you take; just worry about the work we get done and whatever votes are necessary to be taken to get that done.

On this topic, it does seem to me that we have two issues here that should be solved, two issues on which there is broad agreement, I have said for a long time that there are really three questions in the immigration debate that need to be answered: No. 1, how do we secure the border; No. 2, what are the legitimate workforce needs of the country; and No. 3, what do we do with people who came and stayed illegally?

As we think about securing the border, by the way, half the people who are in the country illegally came legally and just stayed. So it is not all a border issue, but border issue is partly and significantly a border issue.

One of the things that people expect a government to be able to do is to secure its own borders. Often, when we hear a story of a country somewhere in the world in which the government has disintegrated and is no longer in control of the country, one of the first things that are mentioned by people talking about that dysfunctional government is that they don’t control their own borders. It truly is a legitimate complaint when government that you control your own borders. It is also a legitimate expectation of government that you look at
your economy and you look at what workforce needs you have that aren’t being met and figure out the best way to meet those workforce needs.

In this debate, because we haven’t controlled our borders and because we have kept thousands of people who legally crossed our borders and as a result, we have some number of people—usually the estimate is about 11 million people in the country—who are not here legally, what do we do with those people?

My view has always been that if the government met its primary responsibility, which is an immigration system that works, the American people would be very forward-leaning about those other two issues, because nobody really argues that if we don’t have people here to do the work that needs to be done, whether it is highly skilled or not highly skilled, we ought to be thinking about what we need to do to get people here who can do that work. Also, we need to do to keep people here who came here to get training to do highly skilled jobs and graduated from colleges and universities or other skill-enhancing things that happened while they were here. If they went to school here, whether you signed up as a DACA kid, you could still be part of that evolution of earning a higher wage and be part of the American dream and part of the American workforce.

Also, what do we need to do to keep those workers in the country? That works for kids who were brought here illegally, as well as for the American Dream, as well as for the American workforce.

In some respects, we have two separate issues here. People who were raised here, who have done everything that anybody else would do to acclimate as an American in all ways, who went to school here, who did everything else here—70 or 80 percent of the American people. And if we see a number even higher than that, believe they should be allowed to stay. More and more, as people think about that, they also believe that after they have been here, like any other immigrant who legally came here, they would eventually be able to take the test and go through the process to become a citizen. That is a widely accepted premise that this debate should be built on.

Another widely accepted premise that this debate should be built on is that 70 percent or so of the American people—and it would be a higher percentage if people really knew the facts—believe the government has not met its responsibility to secure our own borders.

Let’s assume that number is 70. We have two 70 percent issues. We would assume that a working Congress could take 70 percent issues and come up with a plan that would be a way to solve a number of border issues. That is the President’s desk and solves both of these problems.

We are not going to solve these problems by saying: OK, we are going to solve the problem for people who are already here and are not going to do anything to make it harder for others to be brought here illegally by someone who has control of them. We are not going to solve that. Of course that is not going to work. I don’t think whether you signed up for DACA should be a determiner, and apparently the President agrees. If you are here and in the category of those who were brought here and grew up here, whether you signed up as a DACA kid, you are part of that overall discussion of how to stay, and you still get to stay if we can come up with a solution for you to do that.

But we are not going to solve that problem and say: We will have a study of the other problem to see what is wrong. If by now we largely don’t know what is wrong with the other problem, we are never going to figure out what is wrong with the other problem.

In 1986, long before the President of the United States and maybe long before some of us graduated from high school, we were going to solve this problem. Everybody who was here illegally could stay if they wanted to, and the borders would be made secure. Here we are, over three decades later, still debating the same thing.

We need to solve both of these problems. If we can solve other problems while we are doing it, that is fine, too, but we need to come up with a solution. There are a number of ideas out there, and we need to have the Senate move forward.

On the DACA issue, it is important to remember that President Trump said: I am going to give the Congress 6 more months to solve this problem—until March 5. It is also important to know that the courts have allowed people to continue to sign up, so really the deadline is somewhere beyond March 5. But if we want to accomplish this, we need to give the Congress 6 more months.

President Obama didn’t do anything about this for years—not because he didn’t want to, I believe, but because he didn’t know how to. President Obama repeatedly said: The President cannot solve this problem; Congress has to solve the problem. In spite of 6 or 7 years of saying that he couldn’t solve this problem on his own, he ultimately decided to try to do it with an Executive order.

The truth is, that Executive order was never going to do the job. I think President Obama knew that. When President Trump did his own order, he decided to try to solve the problem because the ability to do that any more than President Obama had to do what he did. But both of these Presidents in their own way have tried to drive the Congress toward making a decision that comes up with a plan that that works for kids who were brought here with no choice in the matter and a plan for seeing to it that kids can’t still be easily brought here with no choice. We need to let young people come here because we need them here as part of our workforce, as part of our country.

Legal immigration is what made America great. The rule of law is also what makes our country what it is. We can continue to see immigration be an area where we have decided there are laws that we will not enforce.

The challenge for the Congress right now is to come up with a solution so that this problem is not going to continue to be the same problem it is today, but as far as the problem today, we are going to solve it. We are going to solve it in a way that lets kids who grew up here become part of the solution.

I continue to be committed to strengthening our borders. I continue to be committed to stemming the tide of illegal immigration. Frankly, I continue to be committed to the idea of legal immigration as part of continually reinforcing and re-enthusing who we are. But I am also committed to finding a permanent solution for young people in that category who were brought here, grew up here, haven’t gotten into trouble while they were here and have every reason to want to be part of the American Dream and part of the American people whom they have been part of up until now.

I hope we can find common ground on a bill that does that. I hope we can pass a bill from the Senate that the House will also pass. If Senators think they have done their job by passing a bill that can’t possibly pass the House, that is just kicking the can down the road. We need to find a solution that really resolves this problem, and we solve this problem by putting a bill on the President’s desk. To do that, we are going to
have to vote. We can’t do that by just having a quorum call or a vacancy here on the Senate floor. We have to be willing to vote.

There are some things that I will enthusiastically vote for and some things I will not vote for. But that doesn’t mean that I should say: If I can’t be for whatever is brought to the Senate floor, then I don’t want to vote on it or debate it. We can’t continue to tune in to a vacat screen of the Senate floor. This is the week that we have all committed to having a real debate about solving as many problems as we can that relate to kids who were brought here and grew up here and solved that problem so other kids in these numbers are not likely to face that problem in the future.

As I yield, I hope the floor is filled over the next couple of days with a vigorous debate about the best way to solve the problems before us in a way that the people we work for will feel good about it and the people who are most impacted by our decision will feel equally the concern, the warmth, and the desire of our country to have a vibrant economy that has people who want to be part of it, able to be part of a vibrant economy that has people who are working in smaller businesses, like the Jonah Bank in Cheyenne. It is not a nationally known bank, but it is very important in our State and in our communities. Every employee of this bank is getting a $1,000 bonus. The bank is also increasing its giving in the communities in which it has branches. Workers benefit, and the community benefits. That is what happens when we change the tax law so Washington gets less and taxpayers get to keep more. That is why I voted for this tax law—to give the kind of tax relief that made it possible for people to have these bonuses and these pay raises possible. It is good for Wyoming, and it is good for people all across the country.

By the end of this month, 90 percent of workers across the country will see more money in their take-home paychecks. The IRS tells employers how much money to withhold from people’s paychecks so that their taxes work out pretty close at the end of the year. That is the way it is set up. Well, the IRS looked at the new tax reform law and saw that people are going to be paying lower taxes at the end of the year, so they put out the new tax tables. They told businesses to adjust how much money to withhold from a person’s paycheck and to do it by February 15, tomorrow. For 90 percent of Americans, this tax amount is going to be lower, which means their paychecks are going to be larger. A tax cut is the same as a raise. That is what we are seeing all across the country—people getting a raise in their pay.

Some people have already gotten a paycheck with the new, higher wages. Others are going to get it very soon. The website Yahoo Finance crunched the numbers. They found that a typical worker making $60,000 a year will get an extra $112 in their paychecks every month because of the tax law. That is over $1,300 for the year. To me, that is very good news for American workers. I went on the road this past weekend, traveling around the State, and I am hearing about it in all the different communities I go to. People are saying: This has been better for me and my family personally.

On Tuesday, a lot of workers are getting special bonuses and raises because of the tax law. So not only are they getting more money because of the fact that the tax rates have been lowered, additionally, they are getting more money because they have gotten a raise or a bonus. It seems there are about 4 million hard-working Americans who are getting bonuses of hundreds or even thousands of dollars as a result of the new tax reform law. They are also getting extra money in their retirement plans. They are getting higher starting wages. We are seeing many places increasing the starting wages, some up to $15 an hour. More than 300 companies have said they are increasing all of these kinds of compensations as a direct result of the tax law. In my home State of Wyoming, people across the State are getting bonuses—bonuses. These are people who work at Home Depot, Lowe’s, Walmart, Starbucks, Wells Fargo, and other businesses that have familiar names to people across the country. They are also people who are working in smaller businesses, like the Jonah Bank in Wyoming. It has branches in Casper and in Cheyenne. It is not a nationally known bank, but it is very important in our State and in our communities. Every employee of this bank is getting a $1,000 bonus. The bank is also increasing its giving in the communities in which it has branches. Workers benefit, and the community benefits. That is what happens when we change the tax law so Washington gets less and taxpayers get to keep more. That is why I voted for this tax law—to give the kind of tax relief that made it possible for people to have these bonuses and these pay raises possible. It is good for Wyoming, and it is good for people all across the country. It is interesting—it is even good for people in States whose Senators voted against the tax law. Ninety percent of people across the country are seeing the benefits no matter which State they are from.

There is a business in Grand Rapids, MI, called the Mill Steel Company. They said last week that they are giving an extra $1,000 to their workers because of the tax law that every Republican voted for and every Democrat voted against. Now, 400 people at that company are getting a bonus.

Michigan has the Democratic Senators. They both voted against the tax relief law. It still led to $1,000 bonuses for these 400 workers. What do the Senators have to say about it now? Are they proud that they voted against the tax law? Are they glad they said no to these sorts of raises that made it possible for people in their home States to get the bonuses?

We know what NANCY PELOSI thinks. She went out and first she talked about how the tax law was Armageddon, and then she said it was the end of the world. Most recently, she said all the benefits people are getting under the tax law, in her words, are just "crumbs." You can’t talk about how the tax law was much more than crumbs. An extra $1,300—I talked about the worker earlier—in that paycheck is much more than crumbs. For a person with a starting wage of $15 an hour, that is more than crumbs.

It is bad enough Democrats tried to keep people from getting the extra money—Democrats voted against it because they didn’t want to get the extra money, it seems to me. It is hard to believe they would continue this way and take pride in voting against it, but they did. Now it seems like Democrats want to insult people who are working to get what they want, and what their benefits are, are resulting in crumbs. It is completely unfair, and I think it is disrespectful to the American people.

There are just some of the cash benefits that workers are getting from the tax law. Republicans predicted, during the debate over this law, there would be other benefits as well. We said businesses would pay less in taxes, and some of them would be able to add additional cut prices for consumers—let people buy things more cheaply.

Americans are starting to see this prediction come true as well. One of the first places they are seeing it is in their utility bills. Gas, electric, and water utilities are cutting their rates because their taxes are going down under the law. In Vermont, the State’s only natural gas utility company is cutting rates by more than 5 percent because of the tax law. Both of the Senators from Vermont voted against the law, but it is the law Republicans passed that caused these rates to go down. In fact, people living in at least 23 States and the District of Columbia are going to be paying lower utility bills because of the tax relief law. Another 26 States are looking into cutting rates. Rates are going down in California, Maryland, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut—States where every Democratic Senator voted against the tax law.

What do these Democratic Senators have to say now? Are they proud of the fact they voted against the tax cuts that made it possible for people to have lower utility bills in their States? When people’s monthly bills get cut, it is like getting more money in their own pockets. They have more money to either save or to spend on other things or to invest.
The owner of a gym in Cincinnati, OH, spoke with his local television station about what tax relief means for him. He said:

When people have that extra money to spend, they spend it.

Some save it.

They eat. They buy gym memberships. And they enjoy themselves.

People have that extra money to spend now, today, because of the tax law Republicans passed. They have the extra money despite every Democrat in this body voting against tax relief. Everyone said no. Republicans voted no to tax relief for American families essentially voted yes to keep the extra money in Washington so they can decide how to spend it.

I have much more faith in people at home in Wyoming deciding how to spend their money than any faith I have in Washington, DC. For so many Americans, every dollar helps, and they are not crums. Democrats may not know the difference, but the American families do. People in every State of this country know the difference.

The American people understand what Republicans did with this tax law. They are seeing more money in their paychecks, more take-home pay, more money to decide what to spend and what to invest and what to save. They know Republicans promised to cut people’s taxes. People know Republicans delivered on the promise. They know the benefits they have gotten already, and they are confident the economy will continue to grow stronger day by day.

People across the country also know the fact that every Democrat voted against this law, voted against giving them a tax break, voted against allowing them to keep more of their hard-earned money. The American people know who took their side, who voted no. Democrats who voted no to tax relief for American families essentially voted yes to keep the extra money in Washington so they can decide how to spend it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, it is time for the Senate to do its job as a separate branch of government.

This week, we can come together on a bipartisan basis to resolve the crisis Donald Trump created when he canceled DACA. We can provide hundreds of thousands of young people in our country their shot at pursuing the American dream without fear of deportation. Right now, these young people who were brought to this country as children are terrified they will be separated from their families and the lives they have built here, in the only country they knew.

I have met and spoken with so many Dreamers in the Halls of Congress these past months. Their focus, determination, and commitment in this fight continue to inspire and inspire. Each Dreamer has a different story to tell, but they all share a profoundly simple aspiration—to live, work, and study in the only country they have ever called home.

When you listen to their stories, it is not difficult to understand why between 80 and 90 percent of Americans support protecting these Dreamers—people like Karen, Maleni, and Beatrice, who can attend the University of Oregon, who works three jobs so she can pursue her dream of becoming a nurse practitioner for our seniors. These inspiring young people don’t need to hear any more promises. They need Members of Congress to put their votes where their mouths have been and do the right thing.

Like many colleagues, I strongly support passing a clean Dream Act—legislation that already has bipartisan support—but it is critical that we get to the 60 votes we need to pass a bill. There are different provisions, including some funding for border security to help us get there. We can and should have a debate on comprehensive immigration reform but only after we pass legislation this week to protect the Dreamers. We cannot and should not use this debate to provide cover for efforts to dismantle the family-based immigration system or to make massive cuts to legal immigration.

The President and a number of colleagues have made it clear they would like to eliminate family-based immigration in favor of a system that is designed only to recruit immigrants with advanced degrees and specialized skills. It is important for the United States to recruit highly skilled immigrants, and we have a number of immigration programs that are designed specifically for this purpose, but when you restrict immigration only to people with highly specialized skills and advanced degrees, you lose out on a lot of human potential that has historically contributed so much to our country. We don’t have to look far back into history to prove why this is true.

Over the past week, the Olympics has captured the excitement and imagination of people across the country—in fact, the world. Many of the people we have been cheering for are either the children of immigrants or are immigrants themselves.

Over the weekend, we saw Mirai Nagasu, whose parents emigrated from Japan, become the first American woman to land a triple axel in the Olympics during her appearance in the team figure skating competition. Yesterday, we saw Maame Biney, who immigrated to the United States from Ghana, take to the ice to compete in the short track speed skating.

Two nights ago, I watched Chloe Kim throw down a near perfect score in the women’s snowboard halfpipe to win the Olympic Gold Medal. After completing her history-making run, the cameras panned to her father, Kim Jong, who proudly waved his “Go Chloe” sign in the audience.

Jong arrived in California in 1982 with $800 in his pocket. He worked for years at minimum wage jobs to save for college. While studying at El Camino College, he worked as a heavy machinery operator at night. Jong encouraged Chloe to begin snowboarding when she was 4. They would jump off the lifts together, but because he didn’t know how to snowboard, he would tumble to the ground. Jong bought Chloe her first snowboard on eBay for $25. When Chloe was 8, Jong quit his job as an engineer to support her snowboarding career. He would often wake up at 2 a.m. in the morning to drive Chloe over 300 miles to her practices.

After watching his daughter win the Olympic Gold, Jong said in Korean, "When I came to the United States, this was my American hope. Now, this is my American dream.”

In reflecting on her father’s sacrifice, Chloe said, “My dad has definitely sacrificed a lot for me, and I don’t know if I could do it if I was in his shoes, leaving your life behind and chasing your dream because your kid is passionate about this sport. I think today I did it for my family, and I am so grateful to them.”

Chloe’s story of winning the Olympic Gold is extraordinary, but her father’s story speaks to a deep and abiding foundation of America and to my personal experience as an immigrant.

My mom also came to this country—poor and without skills to escape an abusive marriage—to give her three children, of which I am one, a chance at a better life. Like Jong and Chloe, one generation after my mom came to this country, I am standing on the floor of the U.S. Senate, fighting for humane immigration policies.

I would ask my colleagues: Do you think the United States would be better off if we prevented immigrants like Jong and me from coming to this country? Targeting immigrants for discriminatory and harsh treatment is destroying our country’s history. With the exception of our original peoples, everyone came to our country from somewhere else. We are fighting to preserve
the spirit of our country—that shining city on a hill.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, like my colleagues from whom we are hearing today, I also rise to talk about the importance of protecting the Dreamers, not just in the State of Nevada but across this country.

I want to talk specifically about a term that I constantly hear during this debate on how we need to protect Dreamers and at the same time address this issue of “chain migration.” I call on my colleagues from the House to really stop using that term and to abandon the offensive and misleading term of “chain migration” because it paints a picture that does not reflect reality.

Immigrants cannot sponsor their entire families to come here. Our system of family-based immigration allows American citizens and green card holders to petition for some of their immediate family members to join them in the United States. There are numerous steps families take to legally immigrate to the United States. It is a long and arduous process that leaves husbands, wives, parents, brothers, and sisters waiting for decades. This system is so broken and slow that many people die before they ever have the chance to be reunited with their loved ones again.

So this image of immigrants coming in endless chains across our borders couldn’t be further from the truth. For instance, the Citizenship and Immigration Services is currently processing visa applications for the siblings of U.S. citizens from 1994. That is 24 years ago. This backlog is painful for many American families, like Fely. Fely is an immigrant from the Philippines who arrived in the United States with her husband and her youngest son back in 1989. Her father was a veteran who served in World War II, earned his citizenship, and petitioned to have Fely join him in the U.S.

In the almost three decades since then, Fely has worked tirelessly to reunite with her other children. Now at 80 years old, she is still waiting and hoping that three of her children will make it through the backlog to join her at home. Her story shows us that sponsoring even your closest family members is a lengthy and difficult process. Tragically, Fely’s struggle is not uncommon. Thousands of Filipino veterans and their families make by passing this bill, not by forcing them to wait in perpetual limbo.

Our immigration system reflects our national commitment to the strength and importance of the family unit. Families are support systems. They pull each other up when someone is in need and pull together their resources. Strong families build strong communities.

Karl is a 20-year-old Filipino-American community organizer born and raised in North Las Vegas. Karl’s whole family is committed to community service. While attending high school, Karl’s brother volunteers at an organization that serves the homeless. Karl’s mother teaches special education in North Las Vegas to low-income children. Karl’s dad is a mechanic and a military veteran, having served this country in multiple branches of the armed services. None of them would be here if not for our family-based, legal immigration system.

Some of my Republican colleagues claim to be champions of strong, nuclear families and family values. Yet here is a measure that would tear apart families like Karl’s, that would leave parents without children, sisters without brothers, and husbands without wives. Why does the party of family values think that is acceptable?

The problem is that the party of Donald Trump is not the party of family values. Donald Trump doesn’t care about families. He wants to be able to pick and choose which families get to come and which have to stay out. The White House immigration plan we are considering would cut legal immigration by up to 44 percent. That is half a million more immigrants who would be banned each year. This is one of the largest xenophobic-driven cuts to legal immigration since the 1920s. It would affect nearly 22 million people over the next five decades. What is going on here? What are they so afraid of?

I recently sat down with immigrant workers in the Senate and the Pentagon who are about to lose their protections from deportation. One of them told me that she left El Salvador after seeing her husband brutally murdered in front of her and her son. She has been working for the Federal Government for the past two decades, serving the very men and women who are preparing to vote to send her back to the country she fled with her children.

I also spoke with a Dreamer who works right here in the Senate cafeteria. She is the sole provider for her three American-citizen children, and she, too, is afraid that under Donald Trump’s deportation policy, she is going to be ripped apart from her children and sent back to a country that she fled.

These are the people Donald Trump wants to throw out of their homes. They are not asking for special treatment or handouts or giveaways. They just want to be allowed to stay and work hard and provide for their families. They don’t want to have to go back to a place where they will have to live every day for the rest of their lives and for their children’s lives.

This President will tell you that immigrants are taking jobs. That is a myth. It is a lie that has been spread about every immigrant group in American history, and it has been repeatedly debunked by economic research. According to the National Academy of Sciences National Research Council, a typical immigrant family will pay an average of $900 more in taxes than they receive in public benefits over their lifetime.

Immigrant families bring long-term economic benefits to our country by starting businesses, purchasing property, and supporting the education and achievement of their children. Research shows that immigrants drive growth. They generate new patents at twice the rate of native-born Americans. In 2014, they earned $1.3 trillion and contributed $166 billion in State and local taxes and nearly $224 billion in Federal taxes. Immigrants are 30 percent more likely to start a business in the United States than non-immigrants, and 18 percent of small business owners in the United States are immigrants. They create jobs right here in the United States. Jobs that are not the problem here.

The problem is the color of immigrants’ skin. We have a President of the United States who has wondered out loud why we can’t have more Whites come to this country, President Trump denies being a racist. For a non-racist, he has done a shockingly good job of cultivating support among White supremacists.

This is not about the color of people’s skin, but this is about family. This is about strong nuclear families and family values. I am proud of who I am, which I have come from, and I am a descendant of immigrants. But I also learned and believe in strong values and strong family values, and we lead with those values. So our immigration system should reflect our national commitment to the strength and the importance of that family unit and those family values.

It makes no sense to me that we are fighting today to protect these kids who put themselves in danger and then take their parents and rip them out of their homes and send them back to a country that they do not want to go to, that they do not call home, and where their safety is called into question. I don’t understand why that is not considered a family value or as an American value.

So I ask my colleagues, when we are talking about the immigration system
and protecting Dreamers, let’s implement commonsense immigration reform. Let’s make sure that when we are protecting Dreamers, we are also protecting their family unit and those family values. This is not about pitting parents against their kids or having kids decide whether they should stay here or their parents should.

No child should have to go to school concerned that when they come home, their parents may not be there. I don’t know about you, but I went through the public school system in the State of Nevada, and I was always, always comforted with the thought that when I walked through that door, my mother and father would be there. Any other way to treat these children and their families, to me, is inhumane. They are not values that we stand for as Americans, and they are not values that we lead with when we are talking about commonsense reforms to immigration.

So I ask my colleagues: Please, as we go through, remember who we are talking about. There are faces, there are families, there are people behind the very decisions that we make this week.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, as the Senate takes to the floor to debate a long-overdue, bipartisan solution for Dreamers—young immigrants who came to our country as children—I would like to tell you a story about one Dreamer in my home State of New Mexico to illustrate what is at stake here this week.

Immigrants have long helped to write the economic, social, and cultural story of my home State of New Mexico and, for that matter, our entire Nation. We are, after all, a nation of immigrants. Over the last centuries, our Nation’s foundation and the enduring American spirit were built by the hard work and the dreams of so many striving young immigrants.

When President Trump made the outrageous decision last fall to end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program—DACA—he threw hundreds of thousands of Dreamers deep into fear and uncertainty. Two weeks ago, I was proud to welcome Ivonne Orozco-Acosta, one of the estimated 7,000 Dreamers from New Mexico, as my guest at the State of the Union Address.

Ivonne’s family immigrated to the United States when she was 12 years old. She learned English through middle school and graduated from high school in Estancia, NM. It was during these best and most challenging years of learning that Ivonne was encouraged by her teachers to grow and to learn. Ivonne knows the power that educators hold to create positive change in students’ perspective of themselves.

Ivonne attended the University of New Mexico, where she earned her BA in secondary education with a concentration in Spanish. It is estimated that approximately 1,000 students at the University of New Mexico right now are Dreamers like Ivonne. These are some of our brightest students, and they are our future leaders. Since she graduated from UNM 4 years ago, Ivonne has been teaching Spanish for Performing Arts, a charter school in Albuquerque, NM.

Ivonne told me what DACA has meant for her. DACA allowed her to get a work permit, to follow her passion for education. It made it possible for her to buy a home and her first car. It has also given her an opportunity to impact the lives of her students each day and to contribute to our State’s economy as a teacher and as a taxpayer. In her own words, “a sliver of hope”—hope that she will finally be able to have a permanent home and a place in the only country that she knows how to call home.

Because of her excellent teaching in the classroom and her incredible passion for her students, Ivonne was just selected as the 2018 New Mexico Teacher of the Year by the New Mexico Public Education Department. That is right. Ivonne has just been recognized as the teacher of the year for our entire State.

Ivonne’s commitment to education and to giving back to her community is truly inspiring, and it reminds us just how much is at stake for New Mexico and our country in this debate. Our State already struggles to keep schools filled with teachers and has one of the highest teacher turnover rates in the Nation. Dreamers across the country, like Ivonne, are stepping up to serve our communities, to teach our students.

Nearly 9,000 of the Dreamers who received temporary legal status and work permits through the DACA Program are teachers like Ivonne. Many more are firefighters; they are police officers; they are scientists; they are doctors; they are members of our military. These inspiring young people are Americans in every sense of the word, except for a piece of paper, and they want nothing more than to be productive members of our communities.

But until Congress passes the Dream Act, these young people like Ivonne will continue to worry about whether they will be able to stay in school, keep working, contributing to our economy, or remain even in their homes and their neighborhoods.

I have to ask: Why would we even consider threatening to deport the teacher of the year from my State? I simply cannot accept the idea of living up to all that our Nation stands for.

The Santa Fe New Mexican covered Ivonne’s visit to Washington. The New Mexican’s editorial board said: “It is no exaggeration to state that as the immigration debate goes, so does her future.”

They went on to call the immigration debate we are engaging here in this Nation “a fight for the soul of this country, founded and strengthened by immigrants throughout our history.”

I, for one, hope that we can learn from the best and most challenging parts of our Nation’s history of immigration and understand that Americans like Ivonne are part of the immigration story that has always made our Nation great. Deporting these young people who grew up in America and want to contribute to their Nation is not what the America that I know and love would do. Dreamers deserve commonsense, compassionate, and responsible policy.

Two weeks ago, while President Trump was taking cheap shots at immigrants during his State of the Union Address, and insinuating that all immigrants and asylum seekers pose an existential danger to our children and our families, I couldn’t help but think of the impacts of his words on Ivonne as she sat in the Gallery. There are hundreds of thousands of Dreamers like her. They are truly bright spots and rising stars in our communities and in our country, and the time has come for us to stop playing politics with their lives. Let’s stop stirring up fear and division when we should be working to find a real path forward.

This week, I believe we have a path forward here in the Senate in this debate, and we must pass a bipartisan immigration bill that includes the Dream Act in the Senate and in the House. I will do everything I can to pass a solution for Dreamers, to create rational border security policies, and to make the investments that our border region and its communities actually need.

I will stand in solidarity with young Americans against President Trump’s fear-based and un-American views, frankly, on immigration and his offensive and wasteful border wall that have no place in this debate.

I hope that each of us in this body recognizes our moral responsibility and our obligation to live up to our Nation’s ideals and its values. We must act with a sense of urgency to find a way forward for these Dreamers. Every day that passes without passing the Dream Act is another day of desperation and limbo for young people like Ivonne who only know America as their home. Now is the time to give these young Americans a permanent place and an earned path to citizenship in our Nation. I will do everything I can every step of the way to make that happen.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tillis). The Senator from Connecticut.
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out in a high school in South Florida. Turn on your television right now, and you will see scenes of children running for their lives—what looks to be the 19th school shooting in this country, and we have not even hit March.

I am coming to the floor today to talk about something else, but let me note once again for my colleagues that this happens nowhere else other than the United States of America, this epidemic of mass slaughter, this scourge of school shooting after school shooting. It only happens here, not because of coincidence, not because of bad luck, but as a consequence of our inaction. We are responsible for the level of mass atrocity that happens in this country with zero parallel anywhere else.

As a parent, it scares me to death that this body doesn’t take seriously the safety of my children, and it seems as though a lot of parents in South Florida are going to be asking that same question later today. We pray for the families and for the victims. We hope for the best.

Mr. President, I came to the floor today to talk about immigration. I want to make a specific case to you today, but before I do, I want to talk a little about process.

I heard a lot of my friends on the Republican side of the aisle say on this floor and in theHall of Congress that President Trump has made an immigration proposal and Democrats have been asking for an immigration proposal, so we should just accept his first and only offer. What is the big deal? President Trump does not have you something that says “immigration” on it. Why aren’t you accepting it?

It is a terrible proposal. It is bad for America. To his credit, President Trump does attempt to try to deal with these Dreamer kids, but these 3 million potentially eligible individuals in this country, and it only allows about 1.8 million of them to get through the process.

But that is really not the worst part. The worst part is that it cuts legal immigration by 40 percent. It basically abandons this country’s commitment to family-based immigration. I wouldn’t be here if we only had skills-based immigration. Most Members of this body wouldn’t be here if the only way that your parents or grandparents or great-grandparents could have come here is because of a Ph.D. or a degree or a certificate. Most of the people in this Chamber, I would imagine, are here because their parents or great-grandparents or great-great-grandparents came here because they had friends or family here. Let’s not re-imagine the history of this country.

Democrats were obligated to accept the first offer from this President if it is not good for America. Negotiation still has to be part of the legislative process, and I am glad there are Members of the Republican and Democratic caucuses who have been trying to do that. We will see where that goes.

The President has put this proposal on the table that dramatically cuts immigration into this country because he sees immigration as a core weakness of this country. He views new entrants to America as an economic drain. That is why he wants to potentially kick out 3 million Dreamer kids next month if we don’t act. That is why he wants to dramatically curb the number of people who are allowed to legally immigrate to America. He views immigrants as a problem that needs to be dealt with. And he is not alone. Many Americans agree. I, frankly, hear from them regularly in my office.

Frankly, one could also argue that there is nothing more American than being scared of immigrants. Every single new wave of immigrants to our shores has been met with some degree of fear and derision and prejudice. Like clockwork, every generation or two, American politicians denounce immigrants as a threat to the American-born worker.

In the 1860s, growing numbers of Catholic immigrants from Ireland—as the Murphys came—and from Germany led to an anti-immigrant party arising in this country that elected more than 100 Congressmen, eight Governors, and thousands of local politicians. They claimed that Catholic immigrants could never be Americans because they owed allegiance to the Pope.

In the 1880s, hundreds of thousands of Chinese immigrants began to immigrate to the west coast, causing a national outcry. A settlement that eventually resulted in the passage of something called the Chinese Exclusion Act.

Fearing those who are different from us in skin color or religion or national origin or language is an unmistakable facet of American history, but over and over again, we have overcome these base instincts because our better angels prevail but also because of this bright, straight line that connects America’s liberal immigration policy with our economic growth.

I want to take just a couple of minutes to make for you a compact but irrefutable case for the correlation between economic power and American immigrants.

From 1870 to 1910, it is no coincidence that America’s transformation into a global economic powerhouse occurred during a period of massive influx of human capital. During that time, nearly 15 percent of all Americans were foreign-born. That is a share that our country has never reached since then. This period of unprecedented growth forever dispelled the myth that we still labor under today that the number of American jobs is fixed. Immigrants increase demand, and that increased demand creates jobs.

Organizations from the National Academy of Sciences to the conservative Cato Institute have done their own studies on this question and have come to the same conclusion. Cato recently said this:

Immigrants add jobs, in part by raising consumer demand. So getting rid of immigrants, such as by deporting unauthorized workers, would most likely destroy jobs and raise native unemployment.

That makes sense, right? But if you don’t believe that immigrants create growth, there is another, even simpler reason as to why we need family-based immigration. At present birth rates, we don’t have enough people born here to fill all the jobs that are going to be created in the next 20 years. It is estimated that, accounting for growth, America is going to need 33 million new workers to enter the workforce in the next 20 years. But here is the problem. Only 51 million new workers will be native-born. That leaves us 32 million short. Unless folks start churning out a lot more babies, immigration is the only way to fix that deficit.

Not convinced? Well, think about how the Federal budget works. Most of our budget is social insurance—work-aging. Americans paying into accounts that pay benefits to many retirees and that few workers. Because of America’s liberal immigration policy, our average age, which today is 38, will increase in 2030 to just 39. During that time, China—another country that doesn’t really allow immigration—will go from having a median age that is 2 years younger than that of the United States to 3 years older.

In 2010, undocumented immigrants and their employers sent $13 billion to Social Security. The trust fund would be out of money today. You are not there yet? Let’s talk jobs. Just ask your farmers in your State how important lower skilled immigration is to keeping their farms afloat. But let’s talk about high-skilled jobs. Would it shock you to know that 31 percent of Ph.D. holders in this country are immigrants? It is amazing. And more than one-quarter of all high-quality patents in the United States are being granted to immigrants.

How about a study from 3 years ago that Senator Cortez Masto referred to that found that immigrants are twice as likely as native-born Americans to start a business. That is not good enough for you? Here is a mind blower: 43 percent of Fortune 500 companies in the United States were founded or co-founded by an immigrant or a child of an immigrant. You know who they are. The founder of eBay, born to Jewish parents from Russia when he was 6. The founder of Google’s co-founder, Sergey Brin, emigrated with his family from Russia when he was 6.
Elon Musk, who started SpaceX, which has 4,000 employees, came from South Africa. Daniel Aaron, who cofounded Comcast, was a refugee from Nazi Germany. Henry Ford was an Irish immigrant. Estee Lauder’s family was Hungarian. Herman Hollerith, one of the founders of IBM, was a German immigrant. You don’t want Ford or IBM or Google to be part of the American story? Then keep saying immigrants are an economic drain.

Margaret Thatcher once marveled of America: “No other nation has so successfully combined people of different races and nations within a single culture.” This combination is our definition as a nation, but it is also the story of our economic greatness, of our sprawling leap in under two short centuries from an idea to the biggest, most dynamic economy on the face of the planet. To deny that history or to misremember it would be perhaps an irreversible error. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, some of what I just heard, I can readily agree to. Certain things, such as that we are a nation of immigrants—no doubt about that. We need immigrants. We take roughly 800,000 to 1 million legal immigrants a year. They are welcomed. We also, though, are a nation of laws, and as a nation of laws, we want people to come here according to our laws and abide by the laws.

We are working with a group of people. If you call them DACAs, it would be about 800,000. If you refer to them as Dreamers, it is maybe 1.6 million. We obviously have sympathy for them because as a baby brought here in diapers by a person or family who crossed our border without papers, hence entering our country illegally—we don’t attribute the sin and the unlawfulness of the parent to the baby. A lot of that has happened.

There is a general agreement—maybe not everybody in my political party agrees with this, but I think 80 percent of them do—that we need to deal with people who are here through no fault of their own and give them legal status. That is the compassion we are showing for people who broke our laws by their parents doing it but not the kids doing it.

I also didn’t ever think we would be here today debating this because I went through the 2013 debate on immigration. The Senate passed a bill; the House of Representatives didn’t take it up. I was in the minority at that time, both in the caucus that was in the minority as well as in the minority that voted against that bill, because I didn’t think it did things the way I would do them. Everything died in the House of Representatives. Then, 2 years later, I became Chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I was involved in immigration legislation. I could have spent 3 months on immigration during 2015 or 2016 and sent a bill to the House of Representatives that probably would have died, but I made up my mind early in my chairmanship that I wanted to do things that we could get passed. So over the period of the last Congress, my committee voted out 31 bills, all bipartisan, and 18 of them got to a vote. In 2015 and 2016, I felt, why go through that process if it is going to die in the House of Representatives?

Now, a year later, after the election of a President who is so much against anything dealing with immigration and legalization of people who are here—even young people, whom he has now come to the conclusion we ought to legalize—I didn’t think we would be having this debate, and somehow I think Members of the Democratic Party didn’t think we would be having this debate. I think they probably were shocked 2 or 3 weeks ago when the government shut down and when the majority leader decided to make an agreement to bring up this issue. But here we are, debating an immigration bill that, quite frankly, I didn’t think we would be debating. Here we are.

Then, of course, we didn’t do anything Monday. We didn’t do anything on this issue Tuesday. I don’t know whether we are going to have any votes today, but here we are debating immigration. We have a chance to do what Members of the other political party, as advocates for Dreamers and DACA kids—and we have them on this side but maybe not as vocal or as loyal as Democrats are on this issue. Somehow, we are now having a difficult time getting the issue up and getting something passed.

I offer to my 99 colleagues something the President said he would sign. Maybe you don’t like exactly what is in that proposal, then get it up and amend it, and let’s see what sort of compromise we can come up. But we are fortunate here because the leader said that we are going to work on this issue. It was something that the minority demanded. We ought to reach a conclusion on it and get something to the President of the United States.

Once we knew that this issue was going to come up—and we knew that on September 5 when the President said that he was not going to continue the illegal approach to the DACA kids—it didn’t take me long to reason to believe this from court decisions on older people where they ruled that the President didn’t have the authority to do what he did with the DACA kids. In fact, at least a dozen times before he made that decision, he was telling the entire country he didn’t have the authority to do it, and then he went ahead and did it.

So this President comes in, takes an oath to uphold the Constitution and the laws of this country, and he decides what he is going to do. I think that he acted unconstitutionally as he has done with immigration legislation. I could have spent 3 months on immigration during 2015 or 2016 and sent a bill to the House of Representatives? This is a congressional decision that needs to be made, and Congress ought to make it. We were told on September 5 to do something by March 5, and here we are.

I heard from the previous speaker—and maybe a lot of speakers—that this is the President’s plan. Yes, this is a part of the President’s plan, but I think he is going to support and will sign, but I want to say to you that the work that a group of us Senators have put into this issue over a period of the last 3 months, with about 18 meetings, 4 meetings with the President of the United States to discuss the issue—most of what is in the proposal that is put before you are things that a group of Senators put together. I would say that as our group met, we probably had subgroups of three who had different views, and some of them felt strongly about their positions, but everyone came together in a compromise that you see here before us in my amendment.

In some of those meetings, we discussed these things with the President, and I want to give the President credit. In a January 9 meeting that he had where he called together 23 of us—bipartisan and bicameral—we were able to dial down all the things that we were discussing, and we came to the conclusion that there were four main points that we ought to be dealing with. You have heard of these as the four pillars, but let me repeat them.

Number 1 was legalization of these children who were brought here by their parents; No. 2 was border security; No. 3 was chain migration; and No. 4, diversity visa. We discussed these things with the President, and I suppose the President probably emphasized citizenship to a greater extent than maybe we did in our deliberations, but we have something that has been put together by Members of this body who have compromised, with none of us getting everything we wanted. We are fortunate enough to have the President’s backing on this.

So I hope that you see this, not as we have heard from the other side as the President’s plan—as if seven of us who introduced this proposal somehow just took something from the White House and put our names on it, and it is here before the U.S. Senate—because that isn’t how it worked.

I want to address some of the issues that have been put before us by you people on the other side. I want to express—as you probably have seen me expressing already in my remarks so far—my frustration with the current status of the immigration debate here in the U.S. Senate. It amazes me that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle simply aren’t ready to have a serious immigration debate. They have been demanding to have this debate for months. They have even shut down the government to get to this point, and now think we are going to improve immigration legislation. They have been demanding that we debate for months during this Congress—some on the other side of the aisle for
years—and now when it is time to put up or shut up, they have come up empty-handed. Despite having weeks to prepare, Senate Democrats are still rushing to put some plan together.

Let that sink in. Think about this just for a moment. The Senate Democrats recklessly shut down the Federal Government over immigration, and they did it over plans that they still largely haven't drafted. That should be very frustrating, not only to this Senator but to most of my colleagues, and it is because the American people seem to have less faith in this process in Washington, DC. Even more frustrating is that for 2 valuable days, they have refused to allow the Senate to debate immigration measures.

I do understand why the Democrats are afraid to vote on ending sanctuary cities. Those policies of sanctuary cities are massively unpopular with the American people. In other words, the American people feel that when the Constitution says that illegal aliens are not entitled to federal benefits, they don't seem to be discussing here.

Those policies of sanctuary cities are massively unpopular with the American people. In other words, the American people feel that when the Constitution says that illegal aliens are not entitled to federal benefits, they don't seem to be discussing here.

I am here to tell you that it is a tragedy that some people in this body just want to legalize some people for 1 year, 2 years, or 3 years, and put maybe a little bit of money into border security with no commitment to the future. Then all we have done is kick the can down the road.

Worse still, none of my colleagues' proposals are being developed in a way that they can actually become law. Maybe for them, simply passing a partisan bill is enough. Leader SCHUMER said that this morning, and I was here listening to him. But that is not enough for this Senator. This Senator actually wants to see something passed into law that will provide real protection for DACA kids.

That is why I have offered an amendment that could actually pass the House of Representatives, and we know the President would sign it. Polls show that the framework a number of us developed, along with the President's input, is overwhelmingly popular. A Harvard Harris poll showed that 65 percent of the voters agreed with our plan, including 64 percent of Democratic voters. So despite the hyperbole we hear from the Senator, neither the President said he would sign is not only popular, but, again, it is the only plan that has any chance of becoming law.

It is time for all of my colleagues to get serious about fixing DACA. It is time to stop posturing, to stop showboating, and to stop simply trying to pass a bill out of the Senate that will not get considered in the other body and will not be signed by the President of the United States.

The focus ought to be on making actual law. If all of us here in the Senate, particularly those who are in the Democratic Caucus, focus on those things, then the choice for them will be very clear. They will vote for the amendment that the Senate of us have put before the Senate called the Grassley amendment, they will back the President, and they will provide real security and certainty to the DACA recipients and the American people.

In fact, it is so simple for some on the other side who have been promising DACA certainty for years and some for months but, really strongly over the last three or four months. It is an opportunity for everything you have told those kids, including that you are going to get them legal and even give them a path to citizenship that you can deliver. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the issue that we are dealing with on the floor, and I am grateful for this opportunity.

I wanted to first of all stress the critical urgency that we act to protect America's Dreamers. The United States is a proud Nation of immigrants. Yet in recent months the administration insulted our values by announcing a decision to end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, which we know by the acronym DACA.

Dreamers are young people who have lived in our country since they were children. They are law-abiding residents who have learned English. They have paid taxes, and they have secured jobs to support themselves and their families. Our government promised them that they would be protected if they came forward, and now the administration, at least so far, has broken that promise.

Democrats have been fighting for something on the Dream Act since the administration first announced its decision on DACA more than 5 months ago. We have yet to vote on a single piece of bipartisan legislation to protect Dreamers. I do, however, commend the bipartisan work of a number of my colleagues in both parties who have come to the table to draft legislation that protects Dreamers and secures our border.

With hundreds—soon to be thousands—of Dreamers losing protection every day, it is critical that we come together to pass bipartisan legislation that will provide permanent protections for these remarkable young people. Dreamers are deeply integrated into communities across Pennsylvania, as well as in a lot of other States and across our country, of course. Dreamers work as nurses, caring for our families. They work as teachers, educating our children, and as servicemen and servicewomen in our military, working to keep us safe.

Take a young Pennsylvania Dreamer whom I met a few months ago—way back, I guess, in September. She was...
studying to be a nurse. Talking about her own life, she said:

All I want to do is heal people. All I want to do is be a nurse.

Then she became very upset thinking about whether or not she might have that opportunity because of what had not happened in Washington—no legislation passed to protect her.

Another Dreamer from Lancaster, PA—the Presiding Officer knows that part of our State well—is Audrey Lopez. Audrey was brought to the United States from Peru when she was just 11 years old. Audrey spent most of her childhood in Pennsylvania, and her parents instilled in her the value of hard work and education. Like so many Dreamers, Audrey only learned that she was undocumented when she was applying to college and learned that she did not have a Social Security number. Despite not having access to financial aid, Audrey worked hard, and she graduated from college.

After graduation, she took a job in public service working at Church World Services, assisting refugees with resettlement. This past fall, Audrey accepted a nearly full scholarship to American University, where she will obtain a master’s degree in international development.

Audrey is an American in every way but not on paper. She is continuing to work hard, despite not knowing if she will have a future in the country she calls home.

We should be supporting young, hard-working people like Audrey who want to work in the service of others and our Nation. Instead, some, but not all—not all—Republicans are threatening her future—not only her future, but our Nation’s future—by making us less safe and, frankly, damaging our economy.

Protecting Dreamers is not only the right thing to do, but it is also good for the American economy, and it is in our national security interests.

DACA protected almost 800,000 young people to grow and thrive in America, including about 5,900 in Pennsylvania. As part of the fabric of our community, these impressive young people, like Audrey, provide an enormous contribution to our society, including paying an estimated $2 billion each year in State and local taxes.

By contrast, repealing DACA would amount to a loss of $460.3 billion from the national GDP over the next decade. So if you want to do it by year, it is roughly $46 billion a year for each of the 10 years.

In Pennsylvania, ending DACA would result in an annual loss of $357.1 million to the State GDP, according to the Center for American Progress.

Currently, about 900 Dreamers are serving in the U.S. military and more than one out of every seven DACA-eligible immigrants has language skills that are much in short supply in the U.S. military. It makes no sense to remove these Dreamers from a country they call home. I believe it is both wrong and dangerous.

The American people overwhelmingly support allowing Dreamers to stay in the United States. It is about time Congress listened to the nearly 80 percent of Americans who want to pass protections for Dreamers, along with increased border security so we can prevent the situation in the future.

So it is time for action. We need a real compromise solution that will get 60 votes in the Senate and, of course, 218 votes in the House, and a signature from the President of the United States.

While I have advocated in the past for a clean vote on the bipartisan Dream Act, which is what I would prefer, compromise will be critical to ensuring we get something done and sent to the President’s desk.

In 2013, I and many others—67 other Senators—voted for a bipartisan immigration bill that would have doubled the number of Border Patrol agents. That bill also would have mandated 24-hour surveillance of the border using advanced technology, like drones, and it would have provided a pathway to citizenship for law-abiding immigrants.

There are a number of bipartisan proposals to pair Dreamer protections with data-sharing and increased border security that focuses on public safety.

I look forward to finally voting on these issues, and I hope my Republican colleagues will continue to work with us to secure our border and ensure that Dreamers like Audrey and Lopez have a future they can count on.

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

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

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I want to speak about our immigration debate and my amendment in particular, but first let me say we are going to find out just how serious our colleagues are about granting not just legal status to the Dreamers—people who came to this country or were brought here illegally when they were children and couldn’t and shouldn’t be held accountable for that action. There is a proposal that will be available for a vote later this week will not just grant legal status but will actually grant a path to citizenship. It goes well beyond the illegal Executive order President Obama issued, and it will be available to far more people than those who took up President Obama’s illegal Executive order. It is really going to be an extraordinary moment. I hope we are able to reach an agreement on this because I think this needs to get done.

Mr. President, I want to first address an amendment I have offered that is now up and pending—and I think we will be voting on it at some point this week—which is all about keeping our communities safer by addressing the terrible problem of sanctuary cities. This is a problem that one father in particular knows all too well.

On July 1 of 2015, Jim Steinle was working in a marina when a gunman Kate at a pier in San Francisco. Suddenly, a gunman sprang out and opened fire, killing Kate. She pleaded, “Help me, Dad,” as she bled to death in her father’s arms.

Now, any murder is appalling, but one of the things that makes this even more appalling is that the shooter should never have been on the pier that day. The fact is, he was an illegal immigrant who had been convicted of seven felonies and had been deported five times, but even more galling is, 3 months before the day he murdered Kate Steinle, this murderer was in the custody of the San Francisco Police Department. They had him. He was in custody. They had him on an old warrant as a previous offender.

When the Department of Homeland Security found out that the San Francisco Police Department had this guy in custody, they immediately reached out and said: Hold this guy until we get the warrant, and then we’ll take him into custody. We know he is dangerous, we know he is here illegally, and we want to get him out of this country, but the San Francisco Police couldn’t provide that minimal cooperation. Instead, they released this man back onto the streets from which, 3 months later, he murdered young Kate Steinle.

Why would the police of San Francisco do a thing like that? Why in the world would they refuse to provide this minimal cooperation with immigration authorities with respect to a dangerous individual? The reason is because San Francisco is a sanctuary city. That means it has as its explicit legal policy a prohibition that forbids their police from cooperating with Federal immigration officials, even if the police want to. It extends to other law enforcement, like sheriffs and deputy sheriffs.

This is the case even when local law enforcement authorities believe the person is dangerous, and the local law enforcement folks wish to cooperate with the Federal authorities because they know this person is a threat to the security of their community, but local politicians override the police and decide this will be a sanctuary city.

Such is the case with San Francisco, and so the San Francisco Police had no choice. They were required by local laws to release this man onto the streets.

One of the many ironies about sanctuary cities is if Federal officials had called the San Francisco Police about any number of other crimes—robbery, murder, theft, violating a trademark, counterfeiting—any number of other Federal crimes, then the San Francisco Police would have been allowed to cooperate. They would have been happy
to cooperate. They would have been able to cooperate, but because the crime was committed by an illegal immigrant, the police’s hands were tied. The police were forced to release Kate Steinle’s killer. It is just unbelievable to me that we have communities across the country that wish to provide this special privilege—this special protection—for even dangerous criminals because they are here illegally. It is unbelievable, but that is the case.

Sadly, the Steinies are not alone. They are not the only family who has been affected this way because, of course, San Francisco is not our Nation’s only sanctuary city. Philadelphia—the fifth largest city in America, the largest city in my home State—has an extreme sanctuary city policy, and it has had appalling consequences already.

Maybe the most heartbreaking of these is the case of Ramon Aguirre-Ochoa. Ochoa was a Honduran national in the United States illegally. He was deported in 2009, but he illegally reentered the United States, which is itself a felony. He found his way to Philadelphia, and in 2015 the Philadelphia Police arrested him on charges of aggravated assault and various other crimes. When the background check went through the Department of Homeland Security saw that the Philadelphia Police had this guy. They knew who this guy was. They knew he was here illegally, they knew he had been deported, and they believed him to be the dangerous criminal he was. They asked the Philadelphia Police: Could you hold this guy for 24, 48 hours, until we can get an agent there to take him into custody and begin deportation proceedings? We know he is a bad guy. We want him out of the country.

Unfortunately, Philadelphia Police had to refuse. Instead, they released him onto the city streets in January 2015. The Philadelphia D.A. didn’t feel like he had enough evidence to prosecute. So they dropped the charges, and rather than cooperate with the Department of Homeland Security, they released Ochoa back onto the streets of Philadelphia.

That was January of 2015. In July of 2016, Ochoa was arrested for raping a child under the age of 13. This brutal attack on the child was only possible because Philadelphia is a sanctuary city. It is these appalling cases—like the Steinie case or this case in Philadelphia—that make it so important that we end these sanctuary cities if it is at all possible to do so.

My amendment is a bipartisan amendment. It is identical to a bill I introduced in the Senate. It is scheduled to consider in 2016. I reintroduced it in 2017. It does two things: It tackles a legal liability for localities that wish to cooperate with the Department of Homeland Security, and, with that legal liability problem solved, it imposes penalties on communities that choose nevertheless to be sanctuary cities.

We don’t have the authority as a Federal Government to dictate the policy that a local community must follow. There is a constitutional separation that gives them the power to do what they will, but we don’t have to subsidize their behavior when it endangers our country. That is why my legislation goes after. So let me discuss first the legal liability issue.

There are now at least two court decisions that have put pressure on municipalities to cooperate with the Department of Homeland Security. It simply transfers the liability from the part of the person who is wrongly detained. If that happens and the local municipality can be held liable for the ensuing litigation on the part of the person who is wrongly detained.

My bill addresses this problem by simply saying that when a local law enforcement officer complies with an immigration detainer request from DHS that is a duly issued and bona fide request, the officer has the same authority as a DHS official. In a way, the officer would be considered an agent of the Department of Homeland Security for this purpose, and the entity the person would then sue in the event that a person is wrongly detained and their civil rights are violated would be the Federal Government. The responsibility should be on the Federal Government, since it was, after all, a request that initiated with the Federal Government.

My legislation does not in any way curb an individual’s ability to file a suit if their civil or constitutional rights are violated, whether it is intentional or accidental. There is no curb on an individual’s ability to redress that if they were wrongfully detained. It simply transfers the liability from the municipality to the origination of the detainer request, which is the Department of Homeland Security.

So the second point I want to stress is that any local community that has solved this legal liability problem which has some municipalities across America—certainly in my State of Pennsylvania—choosing to be sanctuary cities, even though they would rather not be. Now, having said that, if our legislation is adopted, and we have thereby solved this legal liability problem, if a community nevertheless decides it is going to endanger all the rest of us by conferring this special protection on somebody just because they are illegal, we put in place the fact that they may well be a dangerous criminal—in that case, under my amendment, that community will be deemed a sanctuary city, and under my amendment several types of Federal funding would be withheld from it. Specifically, we would withhold from the sanctuary cities community development block grants and certain grants from the Economic Development Administration.

I think this is eminently reasonable. Sanctuary cities impose costs on all of us. They raise the cost to the Federal Government of enforcing immigration law by far out of proportion to the number of arrested or convictions for those costs on the rest of us, the Federal Government will not be subsidizing it.

Let me debunk some of the misinformation that is occasionally disseminated about my amendment. One is it somehow discourages law enforcement. This is not anti-immigrant at all; this is pro-immigrant.

The fact is, the vast, overwhelming majority of immigrants in America, legal and illegal, would never commit these horrible crimes. The second point I want to stress is that it is a case of wrongful identity. They ask a local police force to hold someone who, in fact, is an American citizen, should be here and is here legally, and so it is therefore an erroneous determination is somehow the appropriate stance. The first is, of course, San Francisco is not our Nation’s only sanctuary city. Philadelphia—the fifth largest city in America, the largest city in my home State—has an extreme sanctuary city policy, and it has had appalling consequences already.

Maybe the most heartbreaking of these is the case of Ramon Aguirre-Ochoa. Ochoa was a Honduran national in the United States illegally. He was deported in 2009, but he illegally reentered the United States, which is itself a felony. He found his way to Philadelphia, and in 2015 the Philadelphia Police arrested him on charges of aggravated assault and various other crimes. When the background check went through the Department of Homeland Security saw that the Philadelphia Police had this guy. They knew who this guy was. They knew he had been deported, and they believed him to be the dangerous criminal he was. They asked the Philadelphia Police: Could you hold this guy for 24, 48 hours, until we can get an agent there to take him into custody and begin deportation proceedings? We know he is a bad guy. We want him out of the country.

Unfortunately, Philadelphia Police had to refuse. Instead, they released him onto the city streets in January 2015. The Philadelphia D.A. didn’t feel like he had enough evidence to prosecute. So they dropped the charges, and rather than cooperate with the Department of Homeland Security, they released Ochoa back onto the streets of Philadelphia.

That was January of 2015. In July of 2016, Ochoa was arrested for raping a child under the age of 13. This brutal attack on the child was only possible because Philadelphia is a sanctuary city. It is these appalling cases—like the Steinie case or this case in Philadelphia—that make it so important that we end these sanctuary cities if it is at all possible to do so.

My amendment is a bipartisan amendment. It is identical to a bill I introduced in the Senate. It is scheduled to consider in 2016. I reintroduced it in 2017. It does two things: It tackles a legal liability for localities that wish to cooperate with the Department of Homeland Security, and, with that legal liability problem solved, it imposes penalties on communities that choose nevertheless to be sanctuary cities.
makes sense because we do want to encourage victims and witnesses of crimes to come forward. We get it. We don’t want to create a worry that there would be deportation consequences for them.

A third point which some have alleged and which I want to be very clear about is that the penalties my amendment has for a community that chooses to be a sanctuary city do not include the loss of any funds whatsoever related to local government or security. That is simply not the case. The list of categories that we include in that funding is economic development in its nature. It is not at all law enforcement.

Another point that some on the other side have made is that somehow this legislation, my amendment, would impose an unmanageable burden on law enforcement. One simple fact to consider is, if that is the case, then why has it been endorsed by law enforcement? The National Association of Police Organizations has endorsed my amendment. The National Law Enforcement Officers Association has endorsed my amendment. The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association has endorsed my amendment. These groups endorse a bill that imposed an unworkable burden on their own members? I rather doubt it. I think they understand that this amendment encourages local law enforcement to share information with the Department of Homeland Security and in some cases to temporarily and briefly hold people in custody until the Department of Homeland Security can get there.

This is a bipartisan amendment. In 2016, when the Senate voted on this very same amendment in the form of a freestanding bill, it received a majority, and it had bipartisan support. Unfortunately, a minority filibustered it and blocked it. But the fact is, it is a bipartisan piece of legislation with majority support. I don’t think it should even be controversial.

I think we will have a vote on this relatively soon, in the coming days. I hope it will have very broad support. This is common sense. It stands for the principle that the safety of the American people matters, that the lives of Kate Steinle and other victims of violent crime matter, and that all of our communities should be as safe as they can be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

PARKLAND, FLORIDA, SCHOOL SHOOTING

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, watching the pictures today as I came to the floor was deeply moving. Even though there is much that we don’t know and a lot of information that we lack about what is happening at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, FL, the images of emergency vehicles and emergency responders and of young children returning to school after another tragic incident of gun violence brings back memories that are searing and harrowing. Once again, we feel that churning in our stomach, that sense of gut-punch, and a wrenching of hearts that reminds us of how we felt the day of violence in Newtown. Yet another school is victimized by gun violence.

We are faced with the details, but certainly our hearts and prayers go to the victims and their loved ones. Our gratitude goes to the courageous first responders who are on the scene now apprehending the shooter and administering to the victims. I don’t suppose how they feel. This morning, I heard prayers are said and they are with those students, emergency responders, parents, loved ones, and the community of Parkland.

Again, gun violence respects no boundaries. It spares no communities. It victimizes all of us, wherever it happens and whenever, including the gun violence that kills people every day individually, often unpublicized and invisible.

My heart breaks to hear that one more school is facing this unthinkable horror, that again this harrowing scene plays before the people of America, literally unfolding in real-time. I know that I and all of the Members of this Chamber share the grief and sympathy and heartfelt understanding that community is experiencing today.

Mr. President, I want to talk about the Connecticut Dreamers and share their stories and call for this Chamber to take narrow and focused action to prevent their draconian mass deportations and protect them from that kind of very unfortunate outcome.

The Dreamers would be covered under legislation, which I hope will pass in the next 24 hours, came here as children. They grew up as Americans. This country is the only one they know. English is the only language many of them speak. They go to our schools. They serve in our military. They support our economy. They belong to all of us. They believe in the American dream, but so do they. They work hard and give back. Deporting the Dreamers would be cruel, irrational, and inhumane—unworthy of a great country. It would break our promise to the Dreamers who came forward when they were told they would be given protected status and would be a violation not only of the American dream but of the promise made by a great nation.

Gabriel Cerda, 17, came to the United States in 2001 from Lima, Peru. He has excelled there. He has been accepted at the University of California, Berkeley’s physical chemistry program. He had to live under the threat of deportation because he had no way to apply for permanent lawful status. While he was continuing his studies here, he lived with the threat of deportation.

There is a young man in Bridgeport who was brought to Connecticut at the age of 5. He was educated in the Bridgeport public schools. He majored in chemistry and now attends Fairfield University. He has excelled there. He finished his first degree and was accepted at the University of California, Berkeley’s physical chemistry program. He had to live under the threat of deportation because he had no way to apply for permanent lawful status. While he was continuing his studies here, he lived with the threat of deportation.

There is a New Britain woman who was born in Mexico and brought to America when she was 6 years old. The journey was terrifying. She could barely speak English. When they settled in Norwalk, CT, her mother told her that she was going to America to study hard and make something of herself. She had no idea at 6 years old that she was entering America in a way that would affect her for the rest of her life. It was not her choice to come here or to come here in that way, but it has affected her. In fact, despite her attending school and then going to college out of state at Bay Path University and earning a great many leadership positions there, she remains in the limbo of uncertainty and anguish and anxiety created by the threat of deportation. She dreams about helping people, making sure that families with low incomes have access to occupational therapy. She is pursuing a master’s degree in occupational therapy.

Finally, there is a woman I know who came here from Venezuela. She was brought here when she was 11 years old. She remembers her mother telling her that she was going to America to learn English. When they settled in New Haven, CT, her mother told her that she could be successful if she were bilingual. She began to go to school right away. Life was difficult at the beginning, and there was a lot to learn. By the time she was a junior in high school, she stopped trying to get perfect grades because she feared colleges would not accept her, and even if they accepted her, she could not be eligible for financial assistance because she was undocumented.

But she persevered, and she attended community college. She went on to Western Connecticut State University, and she overcame obstacles that for many Americans born here would be
insuperable. Now facing deportation, she fears all of those dreams and all of that work will be for naught.

These Dreamers, in fact, have trusted America. They believed in America’s promise to them. Coming forward, providing facts about their residence, their family, their job, and Social Security number, they believed in America. It wasn’t a dream. America is to be trusted. America is the land of opportunity. America is the greatest Nation in the world. They have a dream that is American, which is that they will have the opportunity to pursue their full potential as human beings to give back, to educate themselves, and to better their lives. That is the American dream.

In Dr. Martin Luther King’s “I Have a Dream” speech, he said:

“When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note … a promise that all men—And he might have added women—would be guaranteed the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they promised to all of the American dream can be made a reality by this Chamber today and tomorrow.

I understand that some of my colleagues may want to change the immigration system. It is a broken system in need of comprehensive reform. That task is for another day. Today, we must make sure that we provide these Dreamers with legal status and a path to citizenship. That is our moral obligation. That is our job. Let’s get it done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. INKOFF. Mr. President, the Senate is probably interested in the status of the debate on immigration. This debate started in September in hallways, committee rooms, and in our offices—opportunities for us to talk about these issues now for months.

Several weeks ago, there was a government shutdown demanding that we actually have a vote on immigration right now or that we don’t reopen the government. After 3 days of government shutdown, the government was reopened, demanding that we move the immigration debate earlier to make sure we would get this done earlier. Now it is Wednesday of the week that it was supposed to occur, and the proposal is on the table. It has been a frustrating journey.

I can’t even begin to count the number of hours I have spent in bipartisan conversations trying to circle around a simple set of issues. How do we resolve a small group of issues related to immigration?

I thought this was resolved in some ways. Back in early January, there was a large bipartisan meeting with the House and Senate to discuss what was widely televised as the scope for immigration and the key issues we were going to address. It came down to four issues, and there was agreement among members, among us, amongst us in the room, amongst the groups, that these were the only four issues we are going to deal with: DACA and those DACA-eligible and how we move them toward citizenship, border security and all the things around border security, diversity, reunification, family reunification. All of those have been dealt with in legislation before—in fact, for decades, in one version or another—for the issue of DACA. That one is new. That is the only one that hasn’t been done with legislation before. The others all have.

The Gang of 8 bill in 2013 had border security and all kinds of different issues related to both construction of walls, technology, and legal loopholes. It had diversity lottery. It had chain migration. It went back to an immigration study during the Clinton administration, in 1995, there was a proposal put out by Barbara Jordan, the Democratic House Member from Texas, who led that particular study on immigration administration dealing with chain migration, dealing with how we transition to merit-based immigration.

This has been dealt with literally in hearings for decades, but what I have heard from the people in the room is that there is no time to do any of those things. The only time that we have is to deal with DACA. We can’t even discuss anything else. Meeting after meeting after meeting since early November, I have heard the same thing: There is no time. There is no time. There is no time.

Now we are getting down to the day, and there is still a conversation about how we deal with these four simple issues. It has lasted about 10 months, that the House and Senate have debated for decades, and on which we have had an untold number of hearings for decades to try to actually land them, to get legislation ready, and to get this resolved.

Let me just focus on a few things, because a few of us have put out a proposal that covers those four areas that was a middle-ground proposal. It is certainly not everything that I would like to have and certainly not everything that Democrats would like to have, but it is a middle ground between all of those. It is one the White House has already announced that they will certainly sign. It has 1.8 million people moving into naturalization, or citizenship. These are the individuals whose parents brought them illegally, but they were children at the time. Those individuals came into the country. They have now lived here for years. They know no other place. Those individuals are offered an opportunity to become citizens of the United States 10 years from now.

Why 10 years from now? That gives us a time period of 10 years, which is commonly agreed that it will take to be able to secure the border. In that 10-year time period, the border security could be put in place to make sure that we have a secure border. It is not an unreasonable thing. In that same 10-year time period, about 2 million people are going to move, actually, into citizenship.

How does that affect the rest of our process? Well, let me just think about how it affects it. Right now we have a 20-year backlog to be able to come into the United States legally—20 years to be able to come through that process. Once we add another 2 million people in that process and all the family that will be connected to them, in all likelihood, that backlog moves from 20 years to 25 years. It is ridiculous at 20 years, and it is even worse at 25.

We all know that this issue of family migration and the broad allowance of people coming in, what they can do with what skills they have but based on being someone’s brother-in-law, is not the best way to do immigration, and we are the only country that does it this way. Seventy percent of the people who come into our country come through a family connection—being someone’s brother, being someone’s sister, being a relative in some way that they are able to come into the country.

Canada, just to our north, is exactly the opposite. Sixty-three percent of the people who come into Canada legally through their immigration system come because they are bringing a work skill. Now, I don’t want to oppose anyone coming from anywhere in the world. There is a uniqueness to the United States and how we handle immigration, and we allow people from all over the world, from every country, to come. That should remain the same, but we should have one simple requirement: They come to bring something to the Nation. I don’t think that is too hard of a hill to climb.

It is not a matter of who you are related to. You certainly should be able to bring in your spouse and your children, but brothers and sisters and other adults and such that would be in your family, maybe, should come based on their own merit, as well, for them to be able to come and be a part of our great culture, as well, or they are able to come in a visit and come in and be here for a period of time but not necessarily come for citizenship, unless you are coming to bring them. Again, that doesn’t seem too difficult.

The diversity lottery hasn’t been the challenging issue. Quite frankly, that has been an issue that was in the 2013 Gang of 8 bill, saying: Why do we have 50,000 visas for individuals from anywhere, from around the world, who can come who don’t necessarily bring a skill at all? Why don’t we just add a simple permanent residence requirement? We could say that you are welcome to come from anywhere, but at least we should know that those who
are coming from anywhere and everywhere bring something to the American economy. Again, that hasn’t been controversial nor partisan in the past, and now, suddenly, it has become that.

The border security part of it has been confusing part of the debate for me on this thing. Months ago, some of my Democratic colleagues over and over said: The wall will do nothing. There is no benefit in the wall. If you put up a 20-foot wall, there will be a 21-foot ladder. It will do absolutely nothing.

Now, the conversation is this: Well, we will give citizenship to DACA, and we will give you some money to build a wall, and we will call it even. That has never been the request, and everyone knows it.

The request has been border security, not just a wall. I am very aware that the President has talked about a big beautiful wall a lot. I get that. But it has always been about border security, not just putting up a wall in certain places. There has never been an emphasis to build 2,000 miles of wall.

There isn’t a need for a wall in certain urban areas, but what is really needed is border security and everyone knows it. I think why border security has suddenly become a controversial issue.

What we have asked for and what we have laid out in a proposal seems to be a very middle-ground proposal. It doesn’t do border enforcement. Quite frankly, our Democratic colleagues have said: Absolutely no additional interior enforcement—we are open to border security, but nothing that secures the interior of the country.

So we have said: OK, that will be a future bill dealing with interior enforcement, but we do feel like border security is very important.

So they have said: OK, we will give you some money to build a wall in sections.

Can I say what they are trying to exclude? Border security, when you lay it out, is also the legal loopholes. So here are just a few of the things that we have laid out, which I don’t think should be that controversial, that we have included in our language and said: If we are going to do border security, let’s be serious about it. For instance, we have asked for additional penalties for people who do human smuggling. Right now on the border, if you do human smuggling into the country, the coyotes and others are able to do human smuggling into the country in transit.

There are also people who are individuals in our country watching out for Border Patrol agents, radioing other people saying: Hey, Border Patrol is here. Go a different direction. They are actually helping to divert people away. We think we should increase the penalties. Our Democratic colleagues have pushed to put no on wall. It doesn’t seem unreasonable to increase the penalties for human smuggling and the same for drug smuggling. To increase the penalties for those who are spying out and redirecting people who are doing drug smuggling doesn’t seem too hard to be able to accomplish.

We would like to allow an individual State and their National Guard to be able to secure their own border. This now, the National Guard is not law enforcement. What does the National Guard bring, though? They bring helicopters that have infrared technology. They are able to fly over sections of the border to be able to see the area below, to help direct Border Patrol to it. To participate with the National Guard and allow them to bring some of those resources those States already have shouldn’t be that difficult. That is just a part of border security, but our Democratic colleagues are pushing back on that.

We would like to do an initiative to be able to work with Mexico and provide Mexico some additional funding and support and consultation on their national guards, in the northern border, in the southern border of Mexico—which is literally kind of our first border. It is their southern border. We have been pushed back, though, to say that is not border security. It is slowing down people smuggling through Central America into Mexico. We think that is part of it.

How about this one? All along the Rio Grande in Texas, there is Carrizo cane that are there—this large cane that grows in the river. In that area, you are able to hide people, drugs—whatever it may be—in this tall cane because you just disappear in it. It is on both sides of the border. We have been pushed back, though, to say that is not border security. It is slowing down people from trafficking through the Rio Grande in Texas, there is Carrizo cane because you just disappear in it.

That cane is only there because it is a transnational criminal organization is using it. That is why we are doing biometrics at the entry and exit is something that has been required since the 9/11 Commission. So we can accelerate that process that as people cross the country illegally, we are able to pick them up, detain them, and make sure they have due process. Some of them make claims for asylum and make claims of credible fear or other things. Instead of doing a hearing on that, we actually give them a piece of paper that is called a notice to appear and release them into the country and say: We will see you in about 2 years for your hearing date—instead of actually doing the hearing right then. Nothing has changed. No facts have changed. Nothing has changed during that time of delay. We just release them because we don’t have enough judges, enough attorneys, enough advocates to be able to accomplish that. So they are released for years in the country. You may be surprised to know that most of the individuals never show up for their court hearing. They are just released into the country.

There is also a statement saying: Well, what about unaccompanied minors? Again, you might be interested to know that three-fourths of the unaccompanied minors who cross into the country are actually 14 years old or up. These are not 6-year-olds who are crossing in and 5-year-olds who are crossing in. Most of them are older teenagers. Two-thirds of the people who are coming in as unaccompanied minors are actually teenage boys, and most of them come in to be able to work. So the question is this: How do we handle that?

I think we do fair detention. I think we go through the due process and make a decision right then. Again, you will be interested to know that for individuals who actually do show up for their court hearing, which is a small group, about 30 percent of those who go to the court hearing do get asylum once they finally get to the court hearing. But we are not getting to the court hearing for most of those individuals. That shouldn’t be that controversial.

We should be able to handle how we go through this process in an equitable and fair way.

I would like us to be able to deal with the cost, quite frankly, of detention. We have asked for a simple part of this process on border security, to honor the taxpayer, to say that we will not spend more than $500 a night on housing individuals whom we have in detention. Now, I think most Americans—certainly most Oklahomans—would like to stay in a hotel that costs $500 a night. Putting a cap on how much we spend, that I think, is a reasonable thing to be able to put into it, but we have had pushback.
We have asked for emergency immigration judges. Right now there are almost 700,000 people in a backlog in our immigration courts—almost 700,000. We don’t think it is unreasonable to ask for emergency judges to come in to help us with the backlog. We are not talking about judges who are in the Federal system who are knowledgeable of these issues and to do a surge of judges to help us get caught up.

We should be able to do all of these things, but I go back to these issues should be controversial. This is what it means when you start talking about real border security, not just adding a wall in some places, not just adding a couple of additional agents but actually putting the things around them that they need to actually be able to enforce the law. I think people lose track of the fact that ICE folks and Customs and Border Patrol are not enemies of our State. They are American law enforcement. They are doing what is right to keep us safe and to enforce the laws of our Nation. I am appalled at the way they are spoken of on this floor and treated in conversations. They are American law enforcement enforcing American laws. If they are enforcing it, this body should vote on it and fix the law, not beat up on the people who are enforcing the law and doing what we have asked them to do as a Congress.

In the days ahead we can actually get this passed. I hope we can actually move toward citizenship for 1.8 million people, which the President has asked for, and I think it is a reasonable thing to be able to do for those individuals who came into our country as children. But I also hope that this time we don’t say that we are going to do citizenship and not do border security. I hope we don’t just throw some money and pretend we are doing it. I hope we, as a body, can have a serious conversation and pretend we are doing it. I hope we don’t just throw some money at the problem with what we are enforcing, this body should vote on it and fix the law, not beat up on the people who are enforcing the law and doing what we have asked them to do as a Congress.

The President of the Senate and this country needs in times like this, when our disagreements seem too wide, when our instincts are to argue rather than listen. This Chamber and this country need someone who is able to show us a way forward and lead us out of our stubborn, sometimes too partisan fights—someone like Senator McCAIN.

As this debate has progressed in recent days, I have been reminded of something I heard Senator McCAIN say late last year when he accepted the Liberty Medal from the National Constitution Center in Philadelphia. When speaking about our country and when speaking about the opportunity he has had here, he said:

What a privilege it is to serve this big, boisterous, brawling, intertemperate, striving, daring, beautiful, bountiful, brave, magnificent country. With all our flaws, with all our mistakes, with all the frailties of human nature as much on display as our virtues, with all the rancor and anger of our politics, we are blessed. We are living in the land of the free, the land where anything is possible. The land of the immigrants’ dream, the land with the storied past forgotten in the rush to an imagined future.

What a country, indeed. Beautiful, brave, and magnificent, as John said, but also challenged by occasional frailty, rancor, and anger that we have seen too much of in this sustained debate over immigration.

The great Senator McCain made that night in Philadelphia—and the point he has made every day serving our Nation for more than six decades—is that working through our disagreements, our divisions is worth it, not just as Senator but as citizens.

The whole point is, we may be boisterous and intertemperate, which John has certainly also been accused of being a time or two, but we don’t stop striving for our ideals, believing in our future, because I understand the other. That is often difficult—especially here in politics—but it is the challenge that comes with the blessings of living and serving this great country.

So I was honored when Senator McCAIN spoke last week about the McCain-Coons bill that is long awaited for, and they deserve. Our bill would do two things: secure our border and finally give Dreamers the pathway to citizenship they have long awaited for, and they deserve.

To address border security, our bill would ensure we gain operational control of the border by 2020 with new technology, new resources for Federal, State, and local law enforcement, and new infrastructure.

It would reduce the existing immigration case backlogs by funding new judges and new attorneys, while also addressing one of the root causes of migration into our country from Central America.

Our legislation would give certainty to 1.8 million Dreamers brought here as children through no fault of their own, who are American in every way but the paperwork. Dreamers who continue to play by the rules by going to school, serving in the military, or being employed here in the United States, permanent residents and, at least 5 years later, U.S. citizens.

Senator McCAIN and I aren’t the only ones who think this bipartisan solution makes sense. In fact, the reason we filed it here was because of the strength of its development in the other Chamber, the people’s House, the House of Representatives. This bill was crafted by Republican Congressman WILL HURD of El Paso, TX, whose district has more than 800 miles of the U.S.-Mexico border—more than any district in our country with a U.S.-Mexico border—and his partner, Democratic Congressman PETE AGUILAR, who is from Southern California. The two of them put this bill together after a lot of consultation and meetings with their colleagues in the House. Today, it enjoys 27 Republican cosponsors and 27 Democratic cosponsors. I often hear we shouldn’t take up and consider anything that can’t pass the House, but a bill that has 54 bipartisan cosponsors in the House is certainly on the right track.

I hope in the days ahead we can actually get this passed. I hope we can actually move toward citizenship for 1.8 million people, which the President has asked for, and I think it is a reasonable thing to be able to do for those individuals who came into our country as children. But I also hope that this time we don’t say that we are going to do citizenship and not do border security. I hope we don’t just throw some money and pretend we are doing it. I hope we, as a body, can have a serious conversation and pretend we are doing it. I hope we don’t just throw some money at the problem with what we are enforcing, this body should vote on it and fix the law, not beat up on the people who are enforcing the law and doing what we have asked them to do as a Congress.

I hope in the days ahead we can actually get this passed. I hope we can actually move toward citizenship for 1.8 million people, which the President has asked for, and I think it is a reasonable thing to be able to do for those individuals who came into our country as children. But I also hope that this time we don’t say that we are going to do citizenship and not do border security. I hope we don’t just throw some money and pretend we are doing it. I hope we, as a body, can have a serious conversation and pretend we are doing it. I hope we don’t just throw some money at the problem with what we are enforcing, this body should vote on it and fix the law, not beat up on the people who are enforcing the law and doing what we have asked them to do as a Congress.

I hope in the days ahead we can actually get this passed. I hope we can actually move toward citizenship for 1.8 million people, which the President has asked for, and I think it is a reasonable thing to be able to do for those individuals who came into our country as children. But I also hope that this time we don’t say that we are going to do citizenship and not do border security. I hope we don’t just throw some money and pretend we are doing it. I hope we, as a body, can have a serious conversation and pretend we are doing it. I hope we don’t just throw some money at the problem with what we are enforcing, this body should vote on it and fix the law, not beat up on the people who are enforcing the law and doing what we have asked them to do as a Congress.

I hope in the days ahead we can actually get this passed. I hope we can actually move toward citizenship for 1.8 million people, which the President has asked for, and I think it is a reasonable thing to be able to do for those individuals who came into our country as children. But I also hope that this time we don’t say that we are going to do citizenship and not do border security. I hope we don’t just throw some money and pretend we are doing it. I hope we, as a body, can have a serious conversation and pretend we are doing it. I hope we don’t just throw some money at the problem with what we are enforcing, this body should vote on it and fix the law, not beat up on the people who are enforcing the law and doing what we have asked them to do as a Congress.
even over the next few hours, take im-
portant, even historic steps forward.
We can lay the groundwork for secur-
ity, and we can help build a new Ameri-
can economy that will benefit all Ameri-
cans, without living in con-
stant fear of imminent deportation.

These are tough issues, but the solu-
tion can be fairly simple. I think our legis-
lative leadership has to agree on every-
thing. We just have to agree on every-
things—a determined willingness to com-
prise, and that all of us, together, can
find a path through com-
plex issues—such as immigration.

I have been proud to participate in a
large bipartisan effort by the Common
Sense Coalition, and as it has, as a
group, tried to hammer out a bipar-
tisan deal. I have been honored to have
started this discussion, this debate,
with Senator McCain by filing our bill
that we brought over from the House.
It is a bipartisan bill that I believe is
the most bipartisan bill currently be-
fore this Chamber on this issue. If we
can make more progress, if we can at-
tract more bipartisan support through
some amendments or revisions, I wel-
come that.

I believe this week, this day, this open-
ing on our Senate floor is not only a
challenge but an incredible oppor-
tunity to do the right thing. We don’t
have to agree on everything. We just
can, and we can find a way forward to-
gether.

It is an enormous honor to have the
opportunity to partner with Senator
McCain in this legislative effort. While
he is not with us today, I know he is
with us in spirit and watching our de-
liberations, and he is someone who has
shown not just courage on the battle-
field but courage in American poli-
tics—a determined willingness to com-
promise and to work tirelessly to ad-
vance the interests of the American
people. I can only hope my colleagues,
when they have a chance to vote on this
bill—which I hope we will later today—
will join me in supporting it in recogni-
tion of his lifetime of service to our
Nation and his commitment to biparti-
sanship.

It is my hope that as this day and to-
morrow unfolds, we will have the open
and fair process that has been prom-
ised, and that all of us, together, can
do what we were sent to do: listen to
each other, trust each other, work to-
gether, and find a path through com-
promise that can solve these two very
important and pressing issues in the
field of immigration.

Thank you.
I yield the floor.

(The Acting President pro tempore assumed the Chair.)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Pudvah). Without objection, it is so or-
dered.

PARKLAND, FLORIDA, SCHOOL SHOOTING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, every
day in America we face the devastating
reminder of the toll of gun violence.
Today, we are watching the horrific
scenes at Marjory Stoneman Douglas
High School in Parkland, FL, where
yet another school shooting has taken
place. It is gut-wrenching. We know
that so many families have just had
their loved ones forever taken by
senseless gun violence. Ironically,
this is the 10th anniversary of a similar
shooting at Northern Illinois Univer-
sity in DeKalb, IL. Our prayers go out
to the victims, to the families, to the
first responders, and, of course, to the
Parkland community.

HONORING COMMANDER PAUL BAUER

Yesterday, Mr. President, in the city
of Chicago, which I am honored to rep-
resent, we lost one of our finest, Com-
mander Paul Bauer of the Chicago Po-
lice Department. He was shot and
called a gunman in the Chicago Loop.

Commander Bauer was a 31-year vet-
eran of the CPD and the commander
of the 18th police district in the Near
North Side. He was a pillar of that
community. He was well-known in his
district. He had been commended by
the city council last year for a charity
holiday party he helped to host for un-
derprivileged children.

He was a husband to his wife Erin
and a father to a 13-year-old daughter
dnamed Grace. Commander Bauer was
at a training session yesterday in the
Loop, but he didn’t hesitate to help out
his fellow officers when they were pur-
suing a fleeing suspect. Commander
Bauer was shot several times by the
suspect, and he died from his wounds.

Chicago police superintendent Eddie
Johnson said this was an extremely dif-
cult day for the Chicago police fam-
ily. Commander Bauer was a hero in
life. He made the ultimate sacrifice to
help protect the city he served and the
city he loved. His loss is a tragedy.

Our prayers go out to the com-
munity. Commander Bauer leaves
his loved ones, and, of course, his family
ddaughter.

10TH ANNIVERSARY OF NORTHERN ILLINOIS
UNIVERSITY SHOOTING

As I mentioned, Mr. President, today
marks the 10th anniversary of one of
the most devastating shootings ever
to occur on a college campus in America.
On February 14, 2008, a gunman with
a history of mental instability walked
into a lecture hall at Northern Illinois
University in DeKalb and opened fire.
His bullets killed five students and
wounded 17 more. It was a horrific
mass murder, and it shocked the entire
Nation.

The five young Illinoisans we lost
that day all had bright futures ahead of
them: Gayle Dubowski, 20 years old,
from Carol Stream, who worked as a
camp counselor and was a talented
singer in her church choir; Catalina
Garcia, of Cicero, 20 years old, a smil-
ing, outgoing young woman who
planned to go to college; Juliana
Gehant, of Mendota, 32 years old,
who served our country in the U.S. Army
and Army Reserve and who went to
NIU to study to be a teacher; Ryanne
Mace, of Carpentersville, a 19-year-old,
who was funny and fun to be with and
who aspired to work as a counselor;
and Daniel Parmenter, 20 years old,
from Westchester, a rugby player, who
lost his life because he shielded his
girlfriend from the shooter.

It is heartbreaking to think what
these five young people could have ac-
complished in the 10 years since that
dark day. We mourn their loss and,
again, our hearts go out to their fami-
lies.

We remember and honor the wounded
who still bear the scars of that terrible
day. We renew our thanks over and
over to the law enforcement officers
and first responders who headed toward
the sound of gunfire that day and who
treated the victims as they were
wounded.

We commend the many members of
the community who stepped up in the
days that followed, working to per-
suade through this tragedy, with
heavy hearts but unbroken spirits and
moving “forward, together forward,”
in the words of that Northern Illinois
University Huskie football team.

It is devastating to think that in this
great country, students and educators
could be gunned down in our schools.
But it happens so often that I am
dreadfully numb that it is happening
just in the last few months, we have
had fatal shootings of students at
Aztec High School in Aztec, NM; Wake
Forest University in North Carolina;
Marshall County High School in Ben-
tmore, KY; and then, today, in Florida.

Other tragedies have been narrowly
avoided because of well-trained staff.
At Mattoon High School in Illinois, a
heros teacher named Angela McQueen
stopped a student gunman from caus-
ing a massacre there last September.

The threat of shootings in our
schools is ever present. According to a
tally kept by the group Everytown,
there have been at least 18 incidents so
far this year where a gun has been fired
on a school or college campus.

Schools and colleges are doing the
best they can to prepare and protect
their students. I salute the educators
and administrators who are working
hard, but in Congress doing all that it
can to keep our Nation’s students safe
from gun violence? Not even close.

Of course, there is no single reform
that could stop every shooting in
America, but we know there are big
problems in our laws that need to be
tackled, from criminals, abusers, and
mentally unstable people to get their
guns on guns that hurt innocent people.
Congress has done nothing—nothing—in
recent years to close those gaps and
make America safer.

Congress hasn’t even closed the gun
show loophole that the 1999 Columbine,
CO, killers used to buy their weapons,
and we did nothing in response to the
murder of 20 first graders and 6 edu-
cators at Sandy Hook Elementary
School in Connecticut.

In fact, the only vote taken by the
Senate on gun laws in this current
Congress was to weaken gun law safety provisions on the books. That was a vote that Senate Republicans brought up last year that prevented the Social Security Administration from alerting the FBI’s gun background check system about people with mental illness. It is before this year is over, the Republican majority will call up more bills to weaken gun safety laws. That is the wrong response to the epidemic of gun violence in America.

I am not going to give up on trying to close loopholes in our gun laws. I am going to keep fighting for universal background checks, tougher straw purchasing laws, and better laws to prevent gun theft. I am not going to give up because of people like Patrick Korellis, who was shot in the head 10 years ago at the tragedy at Northern Illinois University. Luckily, Patrick survived, and since that day, he has been a leader in Illinois, fighting for commonsense gun reform. I have come to know and admire him for his efforts.

No one should have to go through what Patrick went through and so many others went through on that day in DeKalb, IL, 10 years ago. We owe it to Patrick, to the other NIU victims and families, and community members, and to the hundreds of thousands more across America who have been killed and wounded by guns this past decade to keep trying to reduce the toll of gun violence.

Maybe we can’t stop every shooting, but if we do our best to keep guns out of dangerous hands, we will save lives. I intend to keep doing my best to achieve that goal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 198, AS MODIFIED

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I modify my amendment No. 198 with the text attached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken, insert the following:

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Immigration Security and Opportunity Act”.

**SEC. 2. CANCELLATION OF REMOVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF CERTAIN LONG-TERM RESIDENTS WHO ENTERED THE UNITED STATES AS CHILDREN.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

SEC. 244A. CANCELLATION OF REMOVAL FOR CERTAIN LONG-TERM RESIDENTS WHO ENTERED THE UNITED STATES AS CHILDREN.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPLICABLE FEDERAL TAX LIABILITY.—The term ‘applicable Federal tax liability’ means liability for Federal taxes imposed under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, including any interest on Federal taxes imposed under that Code.

“(2) ARMED FORCES.—The term ‘armed Forces’ has the meaning given the term ‘armed forces’ in section 101 of title 10, United States Code.

“(3) DACA.—The term ‘DACA’ means the deferred action for childhood arrivals policy described in the memorandum issued by the Secretary dated June 15, 2012 (rescinded on September 5, 2017).

“(4) DACA RECIPIENT.—The term ‘DACA recipient’ means an alien who was granted and remained in deferred action status under DACA.

“(5) DISABILITY.—The term ‘disability’ has the meaning given the term in section 3(1) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102(1)).

“(6) EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM.—The term ‘early childhood education program’ has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1003).

“(7) ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.—The term ‘elementary school’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

“(8) FELONY.—The term ‘felony’ means a Federal, State, or local criminal offense punishable by imprisonment for a term that exceeds 1 year.

“(9) HIGH SCHOOL.—The term ‘high school’ means the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

“(10) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002).

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘institution of higher education’ does not include an institution of higher education outside the United States.

“(11) MISDEMEANOR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘misdemeanor’ means a Federal, State, or local criminal offense punishable by imprisonment for a term that exceeds 1 year.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘misdemeanor’ does not include a State or local criminal offense for which an essential element is the immigration status of an alien.

“(12) PRIMARY RESIDENT STATUS ON A CONDITIONAL BASIS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘primary resident status on a conditional basis’ means the immigration status of an alien.

“(13) POVERTY LINE.—The term ‘poverty line’ has the meaning given the term in section 673 of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 1990).

“(14) SECONDARY SCHOOL.—The term ‘secondary school’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

“(15) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

“(16) SIGNIFICANT MISDEMEANOR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘significant misdemeanor’ means a Federal, State, or local criminal offense—

“(i) for which the maximum term of imprisonment is—

“(I) more than 5 days; and

“(II) not more than 1 year; and

“(ii) that, regardless of the sentence imposed, is—

“(aa) a crime of domestic violence (as defined in section 1227(a)(2)(E)(i)); or

“(bb) an offense of—

“(AA) sexual abuse or exploitation; or

“(BB) burglary;

“(CC) unlawful possession or use of a firearm;

“(DD) drug distribution or trafficking; or

“(EE) driving under the influence, if the applicable State law requires, as elements of the offense, the operation of a motor vehicle and a finding of impairment or a blood alcohol content equal to or greater than .08; or

“(II) that resulted in a sentence of time in custody of more than 90 days.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘significant misdemeanor’ does not include a State or local offense for which an essential element is the immigration status of an alien.

“(17) UNIFORM SERVICES.—The term ‘Uniformed Services’ has the meaning given the term ‘uniformed services’ in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

“(B) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall cancel the removal of, and adjust to the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence on a conditional basis, an alien who is inadmissible to, or deportable from, the United States if—

“(i) the alien is a DACA recipient; or

“(ii) the alien has been continuously physically present in the United States since June 15, 2012;

“(B) the alien was younger than 18 years of age on the date on which the alien initially entered the United States;

“(C) subject to subsections (c) and (d), the alien—

“(i) is not inadmissible under paragraph (2), (3), (6)(E), (6)(G), (8), (10)(A), (10)(C), or (10)(D) of section 212;

“(ii) has not ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; and

“(iii) has not been convicted of—

“(I) a felony;

“(II) a significant misdemeanor; or

“(III) 3 or more misdemeanors—

“(aa) not occurring on the same date; and

“(bb) not arising out of the same act, omission, or scheme of misconduct;

“(D) the alien—

“(i) has been admitted to an institution of higher education;

“(ii) has earned a high school diploma or a commensurate alternative award from a public or private high school; or

“(III) has obtained—

“(aa) a general education development certificate recognized under State law; or

“(bb) a high school equivalency diploma in the United States;

“(iii) is—

“(I) a DACA recipient; or

“(II) an education program assisting student in—

“(aa) obtaining—

“(AA) a regular high school diploma; or

“(BB) the recognized equivalent of a regular high school diploma; or

“(BB) a secondary school or

“(BB) an education program assisting student in—

“(aa) obtaining—

“(AA) a regular high school diploma; or

“(BB) an alternative award from a public or private high school; or

“(III) is—

“(I) a DACA recipient; or

“(II) an education program assisting student in—

“(aa) obtaining—

“(AA) a regular high school diploma; or

“(BB) the recognized equivalent of a regular high school diploma; or

“(BB) a secondary school or

“(BB) an education program assisting student in—

“(aa) obtaining—

“(AA) a regular high school diploma; or

“(BB) an alternative award from a public or private high school; or

“(III) is—

“(I) a DACA recipient; or

“(II) an education program assisting student in—

“(aa) obtaining—

“(AA) a general education development certificate recognized under State law; or

“(bb) a high school equivalency diploma in the United States;

“(iii) is—

“(I) a DACA recipient; or

“(II) an education program assisting student in—

“(aa) obtaining—

“(AA) a general education development certificate recognized under State law; or

“(bb) a high school equivalency diploma in the United States;

“(iii) is—

“(I) a DACA recipient; or

“(II) an education program assisting student in—

“(aa) obtaining—

“(AA) a regular high school diploma; or

“(BB) the recognized equivalent of a regular high school diploma; or

“(BB) a secondary school or

“(BB) an education program assisting student in—

“(aa) obtaining—

“(AA) a general education development certificate recognized under State law; or

“(bb) a high school equivalency diploma in the United States;
(BB) a high school equivalence diploma examination; or
(CC) any other similar State-authorized exam; or
(D) if it has served, is serving, or has enlisted in the Armed Forces; or
(E) if the case of an alien who has been discharged from the Armed Forces, has received a discharge:
   (i) the alien has paid any applicable Federal tax liability incurred by the alien during the entire period for which the alien was authorized to work in the United States; and
   (ii) the alien has entered into an agreement to pay, through a payment installment plan approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, any applicable Federal tax liability incurred by the alien during the entire period for which the alien was authorized to work in the United States; and
(F) the alien was under the age of 38 years on June 15, 2012.

(1)(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to any benefit under this section, the Secretary, on a case-by-case basis, waive a ground of inadmissibility under paragraph (2), (6)(E), (6)(G), or (10)(D) of section 212(a)—
"(B) for humanitarian purposes; or
"(C) if the alien is otherwise in the public interest.

(2) QUARTERLY REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, and quarterly thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that identifies, for the preceding quarter—
"(A) the number of waivers requested by aliens under paragraph (1); and
"(B) the number of waiver requests granted by the Secretary under that paragraph; and
"(C) the number of waiver requests denied by the Secretary under that paragraph.

(3) TREATMENT OF EXPUNGED CONVICTIONS.


"(2) CASE-BY-CASE EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall evaluate an expunged conviction on a case-by-case basis according to the nature and severity of the offense underlying the expunged conviction, based on the record of conviction, to determine whether, under the paragraphs of this subsection, the alien is eligible for cancellation of removal, adjustment to permanent resident status on a conditional basis, or adjustment of status under this section.

"(e) DACA RECIPIENTS.—With respect to a DACA recipient, the Secretary shall cancel the removal of the DACA recipient and adjust the status of the DACA recipient to the status of an alien allowed to be admitted for permanent residence on a conditional basis unless, since the date on which the DACA recipi ent was granted deferred action status under DACA, the DACA recipient has engaged in conduct that would render the alien ineligible for deferred action status under DACA.

"(f) APPLICATION FEE.—
"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may require an alien for an application for permanent resident status on a conditional basis to pay a reasonable fee that is commensurate with the cost of processing the application.
"(2) EXEMPTIONS.—An applicant may be exempted from paying the fee required under paragraph (1) only if the alien—
"(A) is younger than 18 years of age; or
"(B) is younger than 18 years of age; or
"(i) the alien has paid any applicable Federal tax liability incurred by the alien during the entire period for which the alien was authorized to work in the United States; and
"(ii) the alien has served, is serving, or has enlisted in the Armed Forces; or
"(E) if it has served, is serving, or has enlisted in the Armed Forces, has received a discharge:
   (i) the alien has paid any applicable Federal tax liability incurred by the alien during the entire period for which the alien was authorized to work in the United States; and
   (ii) the alien has entered into an agreement to pay, through a payment installment plan approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, any applicable Federal tax liability incurred by the alien during the entire period for which the alien was authorized to work in the United States; and
(F) the alien was under the age of 38 years on June 15, 2012.

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not grant an alien permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section unless the alien submits biometric and biographic data, in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary.

"(2) ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE.—The Secretary shall provide an alternative procedure for any alien who is unable to provide the biometric or biographic data referred to in paragraph (1) due to a physical impairment.

"(g) SUBMISSION OF BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC DATA.

"(1) REQUIREMENT FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The Secretary shall use biometric, biographic, and other data that the Secretary determines appropriate—
"(A) to conduct security and law enforcement background checks of an alien seeking permanent resident status on a conditional basis; and
"(B) to determine whether there is any criminal, national security, or other factor that would render the alien ineligible for permanent resident status on a conditional basis.

"(2) COMPLETION OF BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The Secretary may make additional background checks of an alien required under paragraph (1) shall be completed, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, before the date on which the Secretary grants the alien permanent resident status on a conditional basis.

"(3) CRIMINAL RECORD REQUESTS.—With respect to an alien seeking permanent resident status on a conditional basis, the Secretary shall provide the requested information to any appropriate law enforcement agency, any other international or national law enforcement agency of the country of nationality, country of citizenship, or country of last habitual residence of the alien.

"(k) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUOUS PRESENCE.

"(l) EXEMPTION FROM NUMERICAL LIMITATION.

"(m) CERTAIN ALIENS ENROLLED IN ELEMENTARY OR SECONDARY SCHOOL.

"(n) BURIAL AND CREMATION.

"(o) DURABILITY OF DECISIONS.

"(p) EXEMPTION FROM FBI FINGERPRINT CHECK.

"(q) EXEMPTION FROM NUMERICAL LIMITATION.

"(r) N Let of Stay.

"(s) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBERS.

"(t) ISSUANCE OF VISA.

"(u) COLLECTION OF CRIMINAL HISTORY DOCUMENTATION.

"(v) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUOUS PRESENCE.

"(w) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUOUS PRESENCE.

"(x) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUOUS PRESENCE.

"(y) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUOUS PRESENCE.

"(z) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUOUS PRESENCE.
‘(A) IN GENERAL.—Permanent resident status on a conditional basis is—

(1) Period of status.—

(I) A period of status is—

(i) subject to subparagraph (B), valid for a period of 7 years; and

(ii) subject to termination under paragraph (3).

(II) Extension authorized.—The Secretary may extend the period described in subparagraph (A)(i).

(III) Notice of requirements.—At the time an alien obtains permanent resident status on a conditional basis, the Secretary shall provide any alien regarding the provisions of this section and the requirements to have the conditional basis of that status removed.

(3) Termination of status.—The Secretary may terminate the permanent resident status on a conditional basis of an alien only if the Secretary—

(A) subject to subsections (c) and (d), determines that the alien—

(i) is inadmissible under paragraph (2), (3), (6)(E), (6)(G), (8), (10)(A), (10)(C), or (10)(D) of section 212(a);

(ii) has engaged, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; or

(iii) has been convicted of—

(I) a felony;

(II) a significant misdemeanor; or

(III) 3 or more misdemeanors—

(aa) not occurring on the same date; and

(bb) not arising out of the same act, omission, or scheme of misconduct; and

(B) prior to the termination, provides the alien—

(1) notice of the proposed termination; and

(2) the opportunity for a hearing to provide evidence that the alien meets the requirements or otherwise contest the termination.

(4) Return to previous immigration status.—The immigration status of an alien whose permanent resident status on a conditional basis expires under paragraph (1)(A)(i) or is terminated under paragraph (3) or whose application for permanent resident status on a conditional basis is denied shall be returned to the immigration status of the alien on the day before the date on which the alien received permanent resident status on a conditional basis as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien—

(i) subject to subsections (c) and (d)—

(I) is not inadmissible under paragraph (2), (3), (6)(E), (6)(G), (8), (10)(A), (10)(C), or (10)(D) of section 212(a); or

(II) has not ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; and

(III) is not convicted of—

(aa) a felony; or

(bb) a significant misdemeanor; or

(cc) 3 or more misdemeanors—

(i) not occurring on the same date; and

(ii) not arising out of the same act, omission, or scheme of misconduct;

(ii) has engaged, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; and

(III) has not been convicted of—

(aa) a felony; or

(bb) a significant misdemeanor; or

(cc) 3 or more misdemeanors—

(i) not occurring on the same date; and

(ii) not arising out of the same act, omission, or scheme of misconduct;

(iii) has not been released from custody after a conviction for an offense described in clause (i)(II) on or after November 10, 2016; or

(iv) has engaged, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; and

(v) has been convicted of—

(I) a felony;

(II) a significant misdemeanor; or

(III) 3 or more misdemeanors—

(aa) not occurring on the same date; and

(bb) not arising out of the same act, omission, or scheme of misconduct; and

(C) prior to the termination, provides the alien—

(1) notice of the proposed termination; and

(2) the opportunity for a hearing to provide evidence that the alien meets the requirements or otherwise contest the termination.

(5) Eligibility for removal of conditional basis.—

(A) In general.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall remove the conditional basis of the permanent resident status of an alien granted under this section and grant the alien status as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien—

(i) subject to subsections (c) and (d)—

(I) is not inadmissible under paragraph (2), (3), (6)(E), (6)(G), (8), (10)(A), (10)(C), or (10)(D) of section 212(a); or

(II) has not ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; and

(III) has not been convicted of—

(aa) a felony; or

(bb) a significant misdemeanor; or

(cc) 3 or more misdemeanors—

(i) not occurring on the same date; and

(ii) not arising out of the same act, omission, or scheme of misconduct;

(ii) has engaged, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; and

(III) has not been convicted of—

(aa) a felony; or

(bb) a significant misdemeanor; or

(cc) 3 or more misdemeanors—

(i) not occurring on the same date; and

(ii) not arising out of the same act, omission, or scheme of misconduct;

(iii) has not been ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; and

(IV) has been convicted of—

(I) a felony;

(II) a significant misdemeanor; or

(III) 3 or more misdemeanors—

(aa) not occurring on the same date; and

(bb) not arising out of the same act, omission, or scheme of misconduct; and

(B) prior to the termination, provides the alien—

(1) notice of the proposed termination; and

(2) the opportunity for a hearing to provide evidence that the alien meets the requirements or otherwise contest the termination.

(B) Citizenship requirement.—The conditional basis of the permanent resident status granted to an alien under this section may not be removed unless the alien demonstrates that the alien satisfies the requirements of section 312(a).

(C) Application for naturalization.—

(1) In general.—The Secretary may require an alien applying for lawful permanent resident status under this subsection to pay a reasonable fee that is commensurate with the cost of processing the application.

(2) Exemption.—An applicant may be exempted from paying the fee required under clause (i) only if the alien—

(I) has paid any applicable Federal tax liability incurred by the alien during the entire period for which the alien has been in permanent resident status on a conditional basis; or

(II) has entered into an agreement to pay the applicable Federal tax liability through a payment installment plan approved by the Commission on Immigration Revenue; and

(III) has demonstrated good moral character during the entire period for which the alien has been in permanent resident status on a conditional basis.

(D) Removal of conditional basis; and

(E) Naturalization.—

(1) In general.—For purposes of title III, an alien granted permanent resident status on a conditional basis shall be considered to have been admitted to the United States, and to be present in the United States, as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(2) Limitations on application for naturalization.—

(A) In general.—An alien shall not be naturalized—

(I) on any date on which the alien is in permanent resident status on a conditional basis; or

(II) subject to clause (iii), before the date that is 12 years after the date on which the alien was granted permanent resident status on a conditional basis.

(B) Advanced filing date.—Subject to clause (iii), with respect to an alien granted permanent resident status on a conditional basis, the alien may file an application for naturalization not more than 90 days before the date that is 12 years after the date on which the alien was granted permanent resident status on a conditional basis.

(C) Reduction in period.—

(1) In general.—Subject to subsection (i), the 12-year period referred to in clause (i) and clause (ii) may be reduced by the number of days on which the alien was a DACA recipient, if applicable.

(D) Limitation on certain parents.—An alien shall not be eligible to adjust status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence based on a petition filed by a child, a parent, or a son or daughter of the alien if—

(A) the child or son or daughter was granted permanent resident status on a conditional basis; and

(B) the alien knowingly assisted the child or son or daughter to enter the United States unlawfully.

(E) Documentation requirements.—

(1) Documents establishing identity.—An alien’s application for permanent resident status on a conditional basis may include, as proof of identity—

(I) a passport or national identity document from the alien’s country of origin that includes the alien’s name and the alien’s photograph or fingerprint;

(II) the alien’s birth certificate and an identity card that includes the alien’s name and photograph;
“(C) a school identification card that includes the alien’s name and photograph, and school records showing the alien’s name and that the alien is or was enrolled at the school; 

“(D) a Uniformed Services identification card issued by the Department of Defense; 

“(E) any immigration or other document issued by the United States Government bearing the alien’s name and photograph; or 

“(F) a State-issued identification card bearing the alien’s name and photograph. 

“(2) and who has direct knowledge of the alien.

“(b) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING CONTINUOUS PHYSICAL PRESENCE IN THE UNITED STATES.—To establish that an alien has been continuously present in the United States, an alien may submit documents to the Secretary, including— 

“(A) employment records that include the employer’s name and contact information; 

“(B) records from any educational institution the alien has attended in the United States; 

“(C) records of service from the Uniformed Services; 

“(D) official records from a religious entity confirming the alien’s participation in a religious activity; 

“(E) passport entries; 

“(F) a birth certificate for a child of the alien who was born in the United States; 

“(G) a birth certificate for a child of the alien; 

“(H) deeds, mortgages, or rental agreement contracts; 

“(I) tax receipts; 

“(J) insurance policies; 

“(K) remittance records; 

“(L) records from any educational institution conferring a degree from an institution of higher education; 

“(M) copies of money order receipts sent in or out of the country; 

“(N) dated bank transactions; or 

“(O) 2 or more sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien who have direct knowledge of the alien’s continuous physical presence in the United States, that such alien—

“(i) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and 

“(ii) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien.

“(3) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING INITIAL ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES.—To establish that an alien has entered the United States, an alien may submit documents to the Secretary, including—

“(A) an admission stamp on the alien’s passport; 

“(B) records from any educational institution the alien has attended in the United States; 

“(C) any document from the Department of Justice or the Department of Homeland Security stating the alien’s date of entry into the United States; 

“(D) hospital or medical records showing medical treatment or hospitalization, the name of the medical facility or physician, and the date of the treatment or hospitalization; 

“(E) rent receipts or utility bills bearing the alien’s name or the name of an immediate family member of the alien, and the alien’s address; 

“(F) employment records that include the employer’s name and contact information; or 

“(G) records from a religious entity confirming the alien’s participation in a religious ceremony; 

“(H) a birth certificate for a child of the alien who was born in the United States; 

“(I) automobile license receipts or registration; 

“(J) deeds, mortgages, or rental agreement contracts; 

“(K) tax receipts; 

“(L) travel records; 

“(M) copies of money order receipts sent in or out of the country; 

“(N) dated bank transactions; or 

“(O) remittance records; 

“(P) a State-issued identification card bearing the alien’s name and photograph. 

“(4) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING ADMISSION TO AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—To establish that an alien has been admitted to an institution of higher education in the United States, the alien shall submit a document from the institution of higher education certifying that the alien—

“(A) has been admitted to the institution; or 

“(B) is currently enrolled in the institution as a student.

“(5) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING RECEIPT OF A DEGREE FROM AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—To establish that an alien has acquired a degree from an institution of higher education in the United States, the alien shall submit to the Secretary a diploma or other document from the institution stating that the alien has received such a degree.

“(6) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING RECEIPT OF A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA, GENERAL EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE, OR A RECOGNIZED EQUIVALENT.—To establish that an alien has earned a high school diploma, General Education Development certificate, or other school equivalency diploma in the United States, the alien shall submit to the Secretary—

“(A) a high school diploma, certificate of completion, or other equivalent award; 

“(B) a high school equivalency diploma or certificate recognized under State law; or 

“(C) evidence that the alien passed a State-authorized exam, including the general educational development exam, in the United States.

“(7) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING ENROLLMENT IN AN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM.—To establish that an alien is enrolled in any school or education program described in subsection (b)(2)(A), (m)(1)(C), or (p)(1)(A)(iii)(III), the alien shall submit school records from the United States school that the alien is currently attending that include—

“(A) the name of the school; and 

“(B) employer records; 

“(ii) business records; 

“(iii) employer records; 

“(iv) records of a labor union, day labor center, or organization that assists workers in employment; 

“(v) sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the alien’s work, that contain—

“(i) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and 

“(ii) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien; and 

“(iv) remittance records.

“(II) AUTHORITY TO PROHIBIT USE OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS.—If the Secretary determines that a document is not maintained by the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, or any other Federal, State, or local government agency, 

“(i) at least 2 sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the alien’s work and income that contain— 

“(1) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and 

“(2) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien; and 

“(3) $10,000 or more in debt in the past 12 months as a result of unreimbursed medical expenses, the alien shall provide receipts or other documentation from a medical provider that—

“(i) bear the provider’s name and address; 

“(ii) bear the name of the individual receiving treatment; and 

“(iii) bear the amount of the debt incurred; 

“(iv) bear the provider’s name and address; and 

“(v) have been maintained by the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, or any other Federal, State, or local government agency.

“(8) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING EMPLOYMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An alien may satisfy the employment requirement under subsection (p)(1)(A)(ii)(III) by submitting records that—

“(i) establish compliance with such employment requirement; and 

“(ii) have been maintained by the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, or any other Federal, State, or local government agency.

“(B) COMPARATIVE DOCUMENT.—An alien who is unable to submit the records described in subparagraph (A) may satisfy the employment requirement by submitting at least 2 types of reliable documents that provide evidence of employment, including—

“(i) bank records; 

“(ii) business records; 

“(iii) employer records; 

“(iv) records of a labor union, day labor center, or organization that assists workers in employment; and 

“(v) sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the alien’s work, that contain—

“(i) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and 

“(ii) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien; and 

“(vii) remittance records.

“(9) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING SERVICE IN THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.—To establish that an alien has served in the Uniformed Services for at least 2 years and, if discharged, received an honorable discharge, the alien shall submit to the Secretary—

“(A) a Department of Defense form DD-214; 

“(B) a National Guard Report of Separation and Record of Service form 22; 

“(C) personnel records for such service from the appropriate Uniformed Service; or 

“(D) health records from the appropriate Uniformed Service.

“(10) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING EMPLOYMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An alien may satisfy the employment requirement under section (p)(1)(A)(ii)(III) by submitting records that—

“(i) establish compliance with such employment requirement; and 

“(ii) have been maintained by the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, or any other Federal, State, or local government agency.

“(B) COMPARATIVE DOCUMENT.—An alien who is unable to submit the records described in subparagraph (A) may satisfy the employment requirement by submitting at least 2 types of reliable documents that provide evidence of employment, including—

“(i) bank records; 

“(ii) business records; 

“(iii) employer records; 

“(iv) records of a labor union, day labor center, or organization that assists workers in employment; and 

“(v) sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the alien’s work, that contain—

“(i) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and 

“(ii) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien; and 

“(v) remittance records.

“(11) AUTHORITY TO PROHIBIT USE OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS.—If the Secretary determines that a document is not maintained by the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, or any other Federal, State, or local government agency, 

“(i) at least 2 sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the alien’s work and income that contain— 

“(1) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and 

“(2) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien; and 

“(4)必須用documents that have been maintained by the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, or any other Federal, State, or local government agency; 

“(5) sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the alien’s work, that contain— 

“(i) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and 

“(ii) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien; and 

“(v) remittance records.

“(12) AUTHORITY TO PROHIBIT USE OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS.—If the Secretary determines that a document is not maintained by the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, or any other Federal, State, or local government agency, 

“(i) at least 2 sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the alien’s work and income that contain— 

“(1) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and 

“(2) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien; and 

“(v) remittance records.

“(13) AUTHORITY TO PROHIBIT USE OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS.—If the Secretary determines that a document is not maintained by the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, or any other Federal, State, or local government agency, 

“(i) at least 2 sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the alien’s work, that contain— 

“(1) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and 

“(2) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien; and 

“(v) remittance records.
does not reliably establish identity or that permanent resident status on a conditional basis is being obtained fraudulently to an unacceptable degree, the Secretary may prohibit the use of such document or class of documents.

‘(r) Rulemaking.—

‘(1) INITIAL PUBLICATION.—

‘(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register regulations implementing this section.

‘(B) AFFIRMATIVE APPLICATION.—The regulations published under paragraph (A) shall allow any eligible individual to immediately apply affirmatively for the relief available under subsection (b) without being placed in removal proceedings.

‘(2) INTERIM REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding section 553 of title 5, United States Code, the regulations published pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) shall be effective, on an interim basis, immediately on publication in the Federal Register, but may be subject to change and revision after public notice and opportunity for a period of public comment.

‘(3) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which interim regulations are published under this subsection, the Secretary shall publish final regulations implementing this section.

‘(s) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.—

‘(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not disclose information for the purpose of immigration enforcement any information provided in—

‘(A) an application filed under this section; or

‘(B) a request for deferred action status under DACA.

‘(2) REFFERRALS PROHIBITED.—The Secretary may not refer to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or any designee of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement or U.S. Customs and Border Protection any individual who—

‘(A) has been granted permanent resident status on a conditional basis; or

‘(B) was granted deferred action status under DACA.

‘(t) LIMITED EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), information provided in an application for permanent resident status on a conditional basis or a request for deferred action status under DACA may be shared with a Federal security or law enforcement agency—

‘(A) for assistance in the consideration of an application for permanent resident status on the amount available for fiscal year 2018 as follows:

‘(B) to identify or prevent fraudulent claims;

‘(C) for national security purposes; or

‘(D) for the investigation or prosecution of any felony not related to immigration status.

‘(u) PENALTY.—Any person who knowingly uses, publishes, or permits information to be examined in violation of this subsection shall be fined not more than $10,000.

‘(v) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 242 the following:

Sec. 242A. Cancellation of removal for certain long-term residents who entered the United States as children.'
for improving security along the borders of the United States, including the use of personnel, fencing, other physical barriers, or other tactical infrastructure and technology.

(2) Certification.—The report required by this subsection shall include the following:

(A) A statement of goals, objectives, activities, and milestones for the plan.

(B) A certification schedule for the plan with estimates for the planned obligation of funds for fiscal years 2019 through 2027 that are linked to the milestone-based delivery of objectives under the plan, and for which the Department of Homeland Security has provided for in the request for other appropriations for such fiscal years.

(3) Certification under the plan shall enhance border security goals and objectives and address the highest priority border security needs.

(4) The report shall include:

(A) An identification of the planned locations, quantities, and types of resources, such as fencing, other physical barriers, or other tactical infrastructure and technology, under the plan;

(B) A description of the methodology and analyses used to select specific resources for deployment to particular locations under the plan that included:

(i) Capabilities and services;

(ii) Mission benefits and outcomes;

(iii) Cost and management capabilities; and

(iv) Lifecycle cost estimates.

(C) A description of the manner in which specific projects under the plan will enhance border security goals and objectives and address the highest priority border security needs.

(D) An identification of the planned locations, quantities, and types of resources, such as fencing, other physical barriers, or other tactical infrastructure and technology, under the plan;

(5) Certification requirements established by the Office of Management and Budget, including as provided in Circular A–11, part 7; and

(6) Certification in accordance with an acquisition review established by the Office of Management and Budget including as provided in part 7 of Circular A–11.

(7) The certification provided in subsection (a) shall include:

(A) a statement of the number of new U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers to be hired in such fiscal year under the plan and the intended location of deployment;

(B) a description of the new roads to be installed in such fiscal year under the plan;

(C) a description of the land to be acquired in such fiscal year under the plan, including:

(i) all necessary land acquisitions;

(ii) the total number of necessary condemnation actions; and

(iii) the precise number of landowners that will be affected by the construction of such physical barriers;

(D) a description of the amount and types of technology to be acquired for each of the northern border and the southern border in such fiscal year under the plan; and

(E) a statement regarding each of the northern border and the southern border for which the Department of Homeland Security will obtain full situational awareness in such fiscal year under the plan, and

(F) a determination that the Department of Homeland Security will continue to develop other tactical infrastructure and technology, including as described in subsection (b), in accordance with an acquisition review established by the Office of Management and Budget.


(H) A description of the implementation of the management and analysis tools used to select specific resources for deployment to particular locations under the plan that included:

(i) An alternative, including comparative costs and benefits;

(ii) An assessment of effects on communities and property owners near areas of infrastructure development;

(iii) A description of other factors critical to the decision-making process.

(8) Limitation.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the amounts appropriated under this section may be reprogrammed for or transferred to any other component of the Department of Homeland Security.

G. In the Senate, it shall not be in order in a conference report on, or an amendment to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order made by any Senator pursuant to subparagraph (A), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in any conference report or Senate amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall be further amended, in any form or manner, by any Senator as provided in section 4106 of H.Con.Res. 71 (115th Congress), except that such point of order shall not be stricken.

H. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the amounts appropriated under this section may be reprogrammed for or transferred to any other component of the Department of Homeland Security.

I. DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘‘covered appropriation amount’’ means the amount appropriated for border security for a fiscal year under subsection (b).

J. POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider a provision in a bill, joint resolution, amendment to a bill, joint resolution, amendment to an amendment to a bill, joint resolution, amendment to a conference report, or amendment to a conference report that would reduce the covered appropriation amount for a fiscal year.

(2) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(A) POINT OF ORDER.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider a provision in a bill, joint resolution, amendment to a bill, joint resolution, amendment to an amendment to a bill, joint resolution, amendment to a conference report, or amendment to a conference report that would reduce the covered appropriation amount for a fiscal year.

(J) LIMITATION.—If a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision described in clause (i), and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(3) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order made by any Senator pursuant to subparagraph (A), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in any conference report or Senate amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall be further amended, in any form or manner, by any Senator as provided in section 4106 of H.Con.Res. 71 (115th Congress), except that such point of order shall not be stricken.

(4) ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) FELONY.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘‘felony’’ means a Federal, State, or local criminal offense punishable by imprisonment for a term that exceeds 1 year.

(II) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘‘felony’’ does not include a State or local criminal offense for which an essential element is the immigration status of an alien.

(B) MISDEMEANOR.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘‘misdemeanor’’ means a Federal, State, or local criminal offense punishable by imprisonment for a term that is less than 1 year.

(II) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘‘misdemeanor’’ does not include a State or local criminal offense for which an essential element is—

(A) the immigration status of an alien; or

(B) a significant misdemeanor.

(2) ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES.—

(A) POINT OF ORDER.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order to consider a provision in a bill, joint resolution, amendment to a bill, joint resolution, amendment to an amendment to a bill, joint resolution, amendment to a conference report, or amendment to a conference report that would reduce the covered appropriation amount for a fiscal year.

(II) POINT OF ORDER.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order to consider a provision in a bill, joint resolution, amendment to a bill, joint resolution, amendment to an amendment to a bill, joint resolution, amendment to a conference report, or amendment to a conference report that would reduce the covered appropriation amount for a fiscal year.

(II) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the amounts appropriated under this section may be reprogrammed for or transferred to any other component of the Department of Homeland Security.

(3) BUDGET REQUEST.—An expenditure plan for amounts made available pursuant to subsection (b) shall include in each budget for a fiscal year submitted by the President under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code; and

(4) ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES.—

(A) POINT OF ORDER.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘‘misdemeanor’’ means a Federal, State, or local criminal offense punishable by imprisonment for a term that exceeds 1 year.

(II) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘‘misdemeanor’’ does not include a State or local criminal offense for which an essential element is the immigration status of an alien.

(B) MISDEMEANOR.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘‘misdemeanor’’ means a Federal, State, or local criminal offense punishable by imprisonment for a term that is less than 1 year.

(II) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘‘misdemeanor’’ does not include a State or local criminal offense for which an essential element is—

(A) the immigration status of an alien; or

(B) a significant misdemeanor.

(3) SIGNIFICANT MISDEMEANOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘‘significant misdemeanor’’ means a Federal, State, or local criminal offense—

(III) a minor traffic offense.
We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 1954 to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.


CLOTURE MOTION
Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for amendment No. 1958, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION
We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 1954 to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.


CLOTURE MOTION
Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I send a cloture amendment to the desk for amendment No. 1958, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture amendment having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION
We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 1954 to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.


CLOTURE MOTION
Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for amendment No. 1958, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION
We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 1954 to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.


CLOTURE MOTION
Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for amendment No. 1958, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION
We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 1954 to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.


CLOTURE MOTION
Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I send a cloture amendment to the desk for amendment No. 1958, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture amendment having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION
We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 1954 to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.


CLOTURE MOTION
Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for amendment No. 1958, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION
We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 1954 to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.


CLOTURE MOTION
Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I send a cloture amendment to the desk for amendment No. 1958, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture amendment having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION
We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 1954 to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.


CLOTURE MOTION
Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for amendment No. 1958, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION
We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 1954 to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.


CLOTURE MOTION
Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I send a cloture amendment to the desk for amendment No. 1958, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture amendment having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION
We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 1954 to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.


CLOTURE MOTION
Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for amendment No. 1958, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION
We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 1954 to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.


CLOTURE MOTION
Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, I send a cloture amendment to the desk for amendment No. 1958, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture amendment having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION
We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 1954 to H.R. 2579, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.