

and across the Nation. If you don't believe me, go to Oklahoma State and the University of Oklahoma and talk to the scientists I just mentioned. The outlook for us if we fail to act is increasingly dark.

But look again at Oklahoma. The Sooner State is the fourth largest producer of wind power in the country. Wind turbines there make progress toward energy independence and they give Oklahoma farmers steady income as a hedge against droughts and extreme weather. So people farm and they get paid for having a wind turbine located on your farm. It is a win-win. Gary McManus, the Oklahoma State climatologist, has given a number of presentations on climate change and its likely effects on his home State. He often prefaces those talks with this admonition:

This is the science. It is up to you to decide what you do with it. You can either ignore it or you can use it.

In my view, there will be a high price in harm and in infamy to this democracy if we continue to ignore it. So I say let's use it, but first we will have to wake up.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 335 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRASSLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CHIP FUNDING

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, 1 year and 1 week ago, on a cold, snowy morning in Cleveland, OH, not much different from what I woke up to this morning in Cleveland, OH, I attended the Dr. Martin Luther King Memorial Breakfast in that city, which is also my hometown. A minister at that breakfast said something that we all know but probably have not thought about and rarely put in such succinct, meaningful words. He said: Your life expectancy is connected to your ZIP Code. Think about that. Whether you grew up on the east side of Cleveland or Gary, IN, or whether you grew up in Appalachia, OH, or southern Indiana, or whether you grew up in a city, suburb, small town, affluent, less affluent, low income, rural, or urban, your ZIP Code often determines whether you have access to quality health care, to a good, solid education, and the social support that is necessary to succeed. It is up to this body to help ensure—not

to do it and not to do it alone—that every ZIP Code is one that provides opportunity, not inequality.

Ten years ago, the ZIP Code where my wife and I live in the city of Cleveland had the highest foreclosure rate of any ZIP Code in America. Think about what that means for a 12 year-old-child of a family where the father gets laid off from work and the mother has her hours cut back. Even though they were doing everything right, they can't pay their mortgage. They sit down with their 12-year-old daughter and say: Honey, we are going to have to move, but we don't know where we are going yet. We don't know what school district you are going to be in, and we don't know if you will be close enough to be able to stay with your friends.

Those kinds of decisions happen far too often. Those kinds of scenarios happen far too often. But we know that in many ways we have made progress. Fifty years ago the poverty rate was 26 percent, and today it is around 15 percent thanks in large part to what people in this institution have done with social insurance programs, such as the Affordable Care Act, Medicaid, and today's Children's Health Insurance Program, so-called CHIP.

There was no greater champion in the Senate for children's health care than my predecessor, the Senator from West Virginia who actually sat at this desk on the Senate floor, retired Senator Jay Rockefeller. He helped to write CHIP in 1997. I was a member of the House Health Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee at that time. I believe the Presiding Officer sat on that committee when he was in the House many years ago. We worked on writing CHIP in 1997 when it was a joint State-Federal health insurance program for low- to moderate-income children and pregnant women.

Keep in mind that in most cases the children who are in today's Children's Health Insurance Program have at least one working parent in their family. CHIP provides health insurance to low-income families who fall into a coverage gap: They make too much to qualify for Medicaid, but they don't make enough to qualify for private insurance. Many employers don't offer the insurance. They don't make enough money and are not able to afford to buy the insurance due to the high copays and the high premiums they would typically face. Today's CHIP, the current CHIP program, bridges that gap.

I am honored to continue the fight to protect this program and ensure that Congress acts to extend funding for the current program before it expires at the end of September.

You may have noticed that I said today's CHIP, the current program. When CHIP started in 1997, it was a good program. It was started in the Senate by Senator Rockefeller, Senator Kennedy, and Senator HATCH. It was very bipartisan, and it passed overwhelmingly. Those of us who worked on it in the

House—Congressman Billirakis and I, as leaders on the Health Subcommittee, and others—made sure that it was bipartisan and that it worked very well. But understand that over the 20 years of CHIP, each time it has been reauthorized, we made it better. We extended the benefits because we have seen where the coverage gaps are. We made it more efficient, we made it work better, we have kept the bipartisan nature to it, and that is why I referred to it as today's CHIP, as the current program.

Providing health insurance to low-income children is not just the right thing to do, it is the smart thing to do. It is the right thing to do because these are families where the parents are working hard and taking responsibility but simply can't afford health insurance for their child. Today I was in Cleveland with a couple of people—Shonte Saunders and her daughter Amari. Ms. Saunders is a young woman with two children. Amari is 9 years old. Ms. Saunders told me she is working, raising her children, and she is in school studying to become a nurse at Cuyahoga County Community College. She is doing the right thing, but she said: If CHIP expires, I don't want to be in the position where I have to choose between taking my daughter to a doctor for an ear infection versus having to provide enough food to put food on the table, or a more serious illness or injury than that.

Why should she be subjected to that?

Listen to these numbers. Thanks to CHIP, the number of uninsured children has fallen by half. It went from 14 percent almost 20 years ago when Senator HATCH, Senator Kennedy, and Senator Rockefeller wrote this program in the Senate and Congressman Billirakis and I and others in the House wrote it to a record low of 7 percent. Because of today's CHIP, 10 million children—130,000 children in my State of Ohio alone—have access to health care they may not have received otherwise.

Over the past week I met with parents across Ohio. I met with Jennifer Huit in Cincinnati and listened to her story. In Dayton, I listened to a family talk about what CHIP means to them.

Think about this: It provides a sigh of relief for parents like Shonte and Jennifer, and not only for financial reasons. CHIP means better access for preventive and comprehensive care. Too often, if you are right on the edge and making \$12 or \$13 or less an hour and don't have Medicaid, think about the choices you know you have to make. You can't take your child to the doctor if they are only kind of sick. If you had insurance, you would take her in. But she is kind of sick, and it may get worse, but you will only take her in if it gets worse because you really can't afford those out-of-pocket expenses. Think of the tension and the difficult life that people generally have anyway at that income level. Think of how much more difficult that is. CHIP—which in Ohio is administered

through Medicaid—means that a child in Cleveland or Cincinnati or Gallipolis or Troy or Pickaway, OH, can see a family doctor when they need it, thereby preventing a costly ambulance ride and emergency room visit.

CHIP means a bunch of things. It means vaccines, shots, dental coverage, and better treatment if kids get sick. Think about this: It is not just the health care. It means they do better in school. It means they miss fewer days in school so they don't fall behind their classmates who perhaps have better health insurance. It means they perform better in school because they feel better. We know the stories of how a hungry or sick child can't focus on what they need to do in the classroom. CHIP means that children from Bowling Green will get the health care they need to become healthy, active adults.

We know that the current CHIP—today's 2015 version of CHIP—works not just because of the number of insured children under the program but because of the flexibility it provides States and the quality of care children receive.

Ohio's conservative Republican Governor supports CHIP. It is called Healthy Start in Ohio because the Governor and legislature have been given flexibility under CHIP to make it work for that State.

The flexibility that CHIP provides States is the result of 20 years of watching, observing, quantifying, and analyzing CHIP. We have had 18 years of experience in seeing what works best, and we have worked together to make improvements. As a result, under the current CHIP program, more children are covered and the coverage they get is better.

If we don't act, understand that CHIP—the authorization, the language, the law governing CHIP is in effect until 2019, but the funding for CHIP runs out in September of this year. You have to have both. You have to have the law governing CHIP—how it works, who is eligible, how the States have flexibility—but obviously you also need the money to implement it.

If Congress doesn't act now, first of all, Ohio, my State, would lose \$146 million in Federal funds in 2016 alone, and the Presiding Officer's State of Indiana would lose tens of millions of dollars in CHIP funding.

We know another thing: Whether it is Governor Pence in Indiana or Governor Kasich in my State, they need the flexibility of knowing what Congress is actually going to do. We should not wait until July or August; we should reallocate money for CHIP today. If we don't act, parents like Shonte and Jennifer may not be able to get the quality, affordable care for their children as States would start to roll back CHIP programs.

That is why I will soon introduce legislation to protect the program and extend its funding so it runs out at the same time as the authorization—the roadmap, if you will, of how CHIP will

work. If we let the program run out of funding, the number of uninsured children will increase, the quality of health care will decrease, and States will see a significant increase in cost-sharing services.

Providing health insurance to low-income children isn't just the right thing to do, it is the smart thing to do. If the program works, it works for children, it works for parents, it works for communities, and it works for our great country.

I call on my colleagues to work with me to extend funding for the current CHIP program before it is too late.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise today because I wish to speak about the importance of this DHS funding bill that is going to be before the body in the coming days. In particular, I wish to emphasize what I think is the important imperative that we pass what we are calling a clean bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security for the remainder of fiscal year 2015 through the end of September. That clean bill would be a bill that would fund homeland security without attaching additional items to it concerning immigration.

The support of this legislation was an initiative we were together on. We negotiated in December as part of a budget process by leaders of both parties in both Chambers, and the funding for DHS would have been an increase to help protect our borders and help protect our security by about \$1.2 billion above the enacted level for fiscal year 2014. But at the end of the year the decision was made by the House to not fund that piece and leave it separately and that is why we are now talking about whether we will fund the Nation's homeland security efforts and under what circumstances.

All 45 Members on the Democratic side, save only Senator REID, have written a letter saying let's make sure we fund DHS at the level we have already agreed to between the Houses. Then, let's not play politics over immigration issues; let's take up immigration separately. But the House bill that has been sent to us includes measures to begin to block or unwind actions taken by the President on immigration, and those complicate what all should agree is a national imperative, which is the need to fund homeland security. If we don't pass such a bill, that funding will expire on February 28.

I don't need to explain too much why homeland security funding is important, but let me make a few points. This Department was created after the attacks of 9/11, and its stated mission—while it employs an awful lot of people and does many complicated things, the mission is quite simple—let's keep our country safe, secure, and resilient against terrorism and other hazards. We see every day the kinds of terrorism hazards we are dealing with. The horrible shooting in Paris a few weeks ago and the shooting in Quebec a few months ago remind us of the dangers of terrorism, and now that we are in a war against ISIL—a jihadist terrorist enemy that has promised to carry out attacks on the United States—we should be very concerned about the mission the DHS performs and the need to provide funding.

The men and women who work for the DHS are quite a wide swath of our Federal employees. They are the TSA personnel who protect our transportation system, the Border Patrol agents who serve on our Nation's front lines, Customs officials who oversee the entrance of nearly 1 million visitors per day who come to the United States, and we need Customs agents to help process those visitors. Our DHS folks include disaster specialists—people who respond to hurricanes and other emergencies. Our Coast Guard, our Secret Service, and many of our cyber security professionals all work for the DHS and they work hard every day to carry out that mission of keeping our Nation safe.

Funding DHS is not just critical to the Nation's security, it is also critical to the economy because DHS is the third largest agency in the Federal Government by the number of employees. The impact of any shutdown or cessation of funding would reverberate through the country, from our Southwest border to our Nation's ports to every international airport that brings in either foreign commerce or foreign visitors who want to come and be tourists in our country.

Many DHS employees, as the Presiding Officer knows, call Virginia home, and a shutdown would impact their lives and would make it difficult for them to plan not only for their immediate needs but for an unknown period of time.

So as we are facing threats—and I think we all would agree—while we sometimes have differences of opinion about how to deal with threats, I think everybody in this body would acknowledge that the threats we are dealing with as a nation are not shrinking, they are growing. The challenges we are facing are not getting fewer in number, they are getting greater in number. To respond to threats, the DHS not only needs a good funding bill at an appropriate level, which we have already agreed to, but they need financial certainty and the flexibility to direct its resources as they can.

Let me give one interesting recent example of how DHS employees have