both sides of the aisle. I want to see that continue.

I hope no one believes we are finished with eight amendments. We are not. There are other important amendments to be considered. Members have brought them to the attention of both sides, and I hope as quickly as we can that we will schedule them for consideration and a vote and move forward.

Yesterday, what was fascinating was the fact that we branched off from this conversation about the Keystone Pipeline itself and the jobs—35 permanent jobs—that will be created for this Canadian corporation and started talking about some underlying, critically important issues. We spent a great deal of time on the floor discussing the environmental impact not just of the pipeline but of the Canadian tar sands which will be brought by the pipeline, if it is approved, into the United States for processing.

It is interesting what we have learned so far during the course of this debate. When the Democrats insisted that this pipeline's product—the oil that is refined and used for consumption—be sold in the United States, the Republicans voted no. The Republicans voted no. I have a lengthy memo on my desk of all of the Republican Senators who have come to the floor insisting that the Keystone Pipeline was going to create more gasoline, more diesel fuel, and help the American economy. Yet, when Senator MARKEY of Massachusetts offered an amendment to say keep the products coming from the Keystone Pipeline in the United States, the Republicans, to a person, voted no.

Then Senator FRANKEN came forward and said, Well, let's agree that if this is about jobs in America that the Keystone Pipeline will use American steel. That seems reasonable to me, and I voted for it. The Republicans voted no. They defeated the notion that we would use American steel to build this pipeline.

This pipeline is Senate Bill 1 for the Senate Republicans. It is their highest priority. One would think that if it truly is a jobs bill, they would want American steel to be used to build the pipeline; let our steel mills build this pipeline in the future, create the jobs in America, and they voted no.

Yesterday I offered an amendment as well. We know at the end of this pipeline, if tar sands reach the United States through this means or otherwise, it is a pretty nasty process taking the tar and sand out of the oil, and what is left over is a nasty product known as petcoke.

Petcoke is now being stored in three-story-high piles in the city of Chicago. I have seen it. And the city is trying to get to the point where it is at least contained and covered. Yet, the company that owns it, which incidentally is a company owned by the Koch brothers—what an irony—this company has resisted the idea of covering these petcoke piles, so this nasty black substance blows through the community in southeast Chicago. The city of Chicago is in a battle.

I tried to put in an effort yesterday so that we would establish standards for transportation and storage of petcoke, and the Republicans insisted it was a benign substance, it isn't hazardous, not dangerous, don't worry about it. If some of the Senators who voted against my amendment, tomorrow, God forbid, face this issue in their community, I think they will have a little different view of petcoke and what it can do to people, the impact it has on respiratory disease and asthma.

Yesterday I didn't prevail. But I can tell my colleagues how over the years, as I fought the tobacco companies and they insisted there was nothing dangerous about tobacco, I heard those arguments from industry just as we are hearing the petcoke arguments from the petcoke industry. Ultimately, good sense prevailed, public health prevailed, and we moved toward regulation of tobacco products. We should do the same—basic regulation—to protect the public from any negative impact on their health relative to petcoke.

The amendments continue today. Some of them are extraordinarily important. I hope we will continue to move toward the completion of this task in an orderly manner. I commend not only the leadership on the majority side, but I commend my colleagues too. We found over the past many years that the process of amendment would break down when one Republican Senator would stand up and say, I won't let any amendment be considered until my amendment is considered, No. 1. It even reached a point where Republican Senators would say, I won't let any amendment be considered unless I am guaranteed my amendment will pass. Well, when people take unreasonable positions and threaten filibusters, we break down the amendment process.

We have tried, now being in the minority, to be more constructive, and we have reached that goal so far this week. I hope we continue to aspire to it and I hope we can wrap this bill up next week in an orderly manner.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks around the world—particularly in Paris—the American people know that terrorism, sadly, is a threat to us even to this day. We count on one department of government as much if not more than any other to protect us—the Department of Homeland Security.

This is the Department which monitors the terrorist threats to our country on a minute-by-minute basis. This is the agency that provides the inspectors at airports and in many other places to try to thwart terrorism before it strikes. It is a critically important part of our government—one of the most important departments.

That is why it is curious to me that House Republicans insisted that the budget—the regular budget for the Department of Homeland Security—be held up until the end of February. They need their Department budget. They need to invest it to keep America safe. Yet, the House Republicans said no. They gave a continuing resolution to the Department, which basically lets them operate on a day-to-day basis with no certainty for the future. That is no way to run an agency, particularly one that is supposed to keep America safe.

Then, last week, the U.S. House of Representatives took another step and really revealed what was behind this strategy. They added five negative riders to this Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. Their riders are the subject of immigration. Of course, the Department of Homeland Security has a responsibility when it comes to immigration. These riders were onerous and they threatened the very passage of this important legislation, so much so that the President of the United States has issued a veto threat if the Republican riders from the U.S. House of Representatives are included in the bill when it passes the Senate.

The right thing to do, the smart thing to do, the thing to do to protect America is for us to pass the homeland security appropriation now so this agency has its money. We should remove the onerous and unfair riders that were attached by the House of Representatives. If we are to debate the negative aspects of immigration, let's save it for another day and not put this Department of Homeland Security at risk and the safety of America at risk over this political effort by the Republicans in the House of Representatives.

One aspect of the House measure, an amendment to the Department of Homeland Security appropriation, I find particularly troublesome. It was 14 years ago when I introduced the DREAM Act. It is hard to imagine it has been that long. But the notion behind the DREAM Act was if a child is brought to America by a family and is undocumented in this country and that child grows up in America, completes high school, and has no serious criminal problems in their background, they ought to be given a chance to either enlist in our military, to go to college, to get on a path toward legalization. That is the DREAM Act.

Originally the DREAM Act had some Republican sponsorship, but over the years that support melted away. Yet, many Republicans have said from time to time: I think the DREAM Act is fair; we just haven't enacted it into law. Because of that, 2½ years ago many of us appealed to President Obama to protect these DREAMers, these young people. Many of them completed school and had nowhere to go. Being undocumented, they didn't qualify for a penny of assistance in going to

college and, many times, if they completed college, they couldn't get a job because of their immigration status.

Back in 2012 President Obama created a program called DACA. The DACA Program said that if these DREAMers—these young people who might be eligible under the law I described—would come forward and register with the government and submit to a background check and pay a filing fee, they would be given temporary status to live in the United States without being deported, to go to school, to work.

We estimate that some 2 million young people could qualify for this program, and 600,000 have signed up—so far, 600,000. In the State of Illinois, 30,000 have signed up. They have come forward.

I have met some of these young people who have qualified under DACA. They are extraordinary young people. I went to Loyola Medical School in Chicago. At the medical school I believe there are 10, perhaps 12 students who are DACA-protected who are now going to medical school. There are two things to be said. First, they are extraordinary students. They had no chance to go to medical school before DACA, and now they do. They are well qualified to go to medical school. Secondly, they have only come to Loyola with the promise that after they receive their medical license, they will practice in underserved areas in Illinois and across America, whether it is rural areas or inner city. They are prepared to dedicate their professional lives to serving people who otherwise might not have access to medical care.

That is just one example. Let me tell you about some others. I would like to update the Senate on two people whom I have come to the floor and talked about in the past—Carlos and Rafael Robles. They were brought to the United States when they were small children. They grew up in suburban Chicago in my home State of Illinois. They were both honor students at Palatine High School and Harper Community College.

In high school Carlos was the captain of the tennis team and a member of the varsity swim team. He volunteered for Palatine's physically challenged program, where every day he helped to feed lunch to special needs students. Carlos graduated from Harper Community College and went on to attend Loyola University in Chicago, majoring in education. This is what one of his teachers said about him:

> Carlos is the kind of person we want among us because he wants to make the community better. This is the kind of person you want as a student, the kind of kid you want as a neighbor and friend to your child, and most germane to his present circumstance, the kind of person you want as an American.

After he received DACA protection—President Obama's Executive order—Carlos was able to work as a tennis coach at his high school and help pay his tuition.

After he graduated from Loyola with a major in education, Carlos worked as a teacher in a public high school in Chicago. I ran into him at a meeting last year, and he told me about his ambition to be a teacher. He is now attending graduate school at the Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy at the University of Michigan, where he is studying education policy. He is a bright and engaging young man who wants to make our schools more effective.

In high school, his brother Rafael was captain of the tennis team and a member of the varsity swim team and soccer team. He graduated from Harper Community College and now attends the University of Illinois, where he is majoring in architecture. One of Rafael's teachers said:

> Rafael is the kind of person I have taught about in my Social Studies classes—the American who comes to this country and commits to his community and makes it better for others. Raffi Robles is a young man who makes us better. During my 28-year career as a high school teacher, coach, and administrator, I would place Raffi in the top 5 percent of all the kids with whom I have ever had contact.

Since receiving DACA, Rafael has been a full-time student while also working at Studio Gang Architects, an award-winning architectural firm in Chicago. Rafael will graduate this spring with a 3.8 GPA.

In a letter to Congress, the Robles brothers shared their thoughts about efforts to overturn DACA. Here is what they said:

> We ask you today to see it in your heart to do the right thing, to listen, and to reward the values of hard work and diligence, values that made America the most beautiful and prosperous country in the world and that we're sure got you, as members of Congress, to where you are today in life. These are values we have come to admire and respect in the American people. We will continue to uphold these values until the last days of our lives. We hope eventually as citizens of the United States we will become part of a country we now see as home.

These two individuals, Carlos and Rafael Robles—extraordinary DREAMers—were brought to this country as children by their parents, undocumented with no future in America, and look what they have done with their lives. One has dedicated his life to education and has overcome the odds and graduated from Loyola University without any government assistance. Because he is undocumented, he doesn't qualify. Now he is going for a master's degree, again at his own expense. His brother is pursuing a degree in architecture.

Do you know what House Republicans say? Deport the Robles brothers. That is what their amendment to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations says. Deport these two young men. Send them out of this country despite the fact that they have worked so hard and succeeded in what they have set out to achieve.

The House Republicans want to deport the 600,000 just like them who have qualified under the President's DACA Program. And they have gone further—not a penny, they have said, for any additional young people to apply for the DACA Program. Two million young people, many of whom, like the Robles brothers, just want to make America a better place—the House Republicans say: Deport them. Further, they say: We won't pass the Department of Homeland Security appropriations to protect Americans from terrorism until you deport the Robles brothers and young people just like them.

What is wrong with this picture? Have the Members of the House of Representatives forgotten who we are as a nation? It is a nation of immigrants. My mother was an immigrant to this country. Her naturalization certificate is sitting right behind my desk upstairs. I am proud of it. She came to this country at the age of 2 from Lithuania and raised a family—a proud American citizen. Her son is honored to represent the State of Illinois in the U.S. Senate. That is my story. That is my family's story. That is America's story. That is the Robles' story.

Why do the House Republicans have such a vengeance against these young men and women who through no fault of their own found themselves in America and made the best of it and only want to make this a better Nation? It drives the House Republicans into a rage to think that the Robles brothers might stay in the United States and make this a better country. I don't get it. I don't understand their thinking.

I really would encourage the House Republicans to meet some of the DREAMers and get to know them. When they do, the images which perhaps they have in their minds would be dispelled quickly.

We have a job ahead of us. The Senate needs to pass the Department of Homeland Security appropriations and the sooner, the better. God forbid we face another terrorist attack. Let's not let it happen with this important Department facing the restrictions they have been facing because of this Republican strategy. Let's give them a full appropriation and tell them to do their best every single day to keep us safe. Let's not embroil their work in a political debate about immigration, which is what the House Republicans insist on. Let's do something different here in the Senate. Let's pass a clean Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. Take out the immigration riders. Save them for another day. Save them for amendments on another bill. Let's fund this Department, and let's get it done now. For the safety and security of this Nation, we need to come together on a bipartisan basis and put this political tactic by the House Republicans behind us.

I yield the floor and 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. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half.

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

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

REMEMBERING WENDELL FORD

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, many have now heard the sad news that one of the giants of Kentucky politics passed away last night. Wendell Ford first came to the Senate in the 1970s, calling himself just ''a dumb country boy with dirt between his toes.'' But over a distinguished two-decade career, this workhorse of the Senate would prove he was anything but.

I had the opportunity to watch my Senate colleague up close as he ascended to leadership in his party and established himself as a leader on issues of importance to my State. A proud Kentuckian who rose from page in the statehouse to Governor of the State, Ford shaped the history of the Commonwealth in ways few others had before him.

He never forgot the lessons about hard work he learned while milking cows or tending to chores on the family farm. This World War II veteran never backed down from a fight either.

We imagine he approached his final battle with the same spirit. Elaine and I, and I am certain I speak for the entire Senate, send our condolences to his wife Jean—Mrs. Ford, as Wendell often called her—and the rest of the Ford family at this difficult time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. 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. INHOFE. Senator ENZI was going to be here, so I am hoping his schedule will allow him to use his time this afternoon.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, yesterday we had an interesting debate on climate change in the Senate, and there were three separate votes. The first one I and virtually all the Republicans supported, the Whitehouse amendment No. 29, said climate change is real and not a hoax.

This is true. Climate has always changed, and I think there is an effort by those on the other side who are trying to promote the big Obama program that would cost $479 billion and not accomplish anything in terms of setting up a new bureaucracy of trying to say we are denying that climate changes.

As I said on the floor yesterday, climate has always changed. If we go back and read history, look at archeological findings, and read the Scriptures, it has changed since the very beginning of time. We know it is real.

The hoax is that somehow there are people so arrogant who are going to go along with the President's program to say: Yes, if we spend enough money we, the human beings, can stop the climate from changing. I think people do understand that is not going to happen. So I am very happy we were able to get it out so it cannot be used in a way that would be deceptive to the public—because the climate has been changing since the beginning of time.

The hoax I have referred to since 2002 is that man is going to be in the position to change climate. That is not going to happen.

What is interesting is these votes could have taken place any time over the last year. I hope I am not divulging something someone else is going to use, but we are on pace now to have more amendments and votes on this one bill—a popular bill—than we had on amendments in the entire year last year.

We were very critical of the majority and the fact that we were not doing anything here. I would go home this last year and people would say: What did you accomplish?

Nothing. We didn't have any votes. We didn't do anything.

We had 15 votes on amendments in the entire year last year. By the end of today we will have that many votes on amendments just in 1 week. So it is very significant that we are actually getting things done.

Why did the Democrats not have a vote on the Keystone Pipeline or on climate? Because voters don't care or because people have lost interest in that. They have caught on. They know that, despite the money that has been put in this thing by Tom Steyer—we have already talked about that on this floor—that went into midterm elections, the proglobal warming votes would be seen negatively by voters.

This wasn't true back in the 1990s. At that time they had everyone scared that global warming was coming and the world was going to come to an end. There was polling by the Gallup polls, and that was the No. 1 and No. 2 concern in America. Environmental concerns are now No. 14 out of 15 in America.

So that is where it is. That is why Tom Steyer has spent, by his own admission, some $70 million on the elections. He stated he was going to get involved in eight senatorial elections—and I say to the Presiding Officer, he knows which ones they would be—and they lost them all. But Tom Steyer is not out of money, and they are going to do what they can to try to resurrect this global warming as an issue.

So the Gallup polls—and not just the polls. The Pew Research Center said 53 percent of Americans either don't believe global warming exists or believe it is caused by natural variation. I don't have it here, but I do know there was a university that put together a poll of all of the television weather people and it came out to the same thing: It was 63 percent said either it doesn't exist or, if it does exist, it exists because of natural causes.

What do the American people care about? They are concerned about the deficit and they are concerned about jobs.

Yesterday on the floor we talked about the deficit. Under this President—not a believable figure but an accurate figure—he has increased the debt in America more than all Presidents in the history of America, from George Washington to George Bush.

So that is what people care about.

As chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, one of my top priorities in this Congress is to conduct vigorous oversight of EPA regulations and getting into President Obama's excessive regulation regime through numerous hearings. We are going to have hearings on these regulations. We actually have dates set already to have hearings so people will understand what the cost is of these regulations.

The Presiding Officer is from a rural State, as I am. I am from Oklahoma. When I talk to farmers—in fact, Tom Buchanan, president of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, said I can use his quote: Our farmers in Oklahoma—and I suggest all throughout America—are more concerned about the EPA regulations than they are all the other problems that are out there or anything that you will see in the farm bill.

He talks about the endangered species, that they can't plow their fields anymore in certain places because there might be some kind of a bug down there. He talks about containment of fuel on their farms. He talks about the water of the United States. That bill is probably the No. 1 concern of farmers.