

showing that over 2,600 Floridians have died from opioids in just the first half of 2016 alone. Over the entire year before, 2015, fentanyl, an opioid, killed 705 Floridians. Just in the first half of 2016, almost the exact same number, 704, died. We have a problem in the State of Florida, and there are a lot of other States that have the same.

Last month I went to a research institute down in Palm Beach County. They are using NIH grant money to research new nonaddictive opioid drugs. If they can come up with this, that is certainly all for the better to help people with pain and so that they are not being given an addictive drug. But we are not there yet, and we are using NIH money that is going into that research.

Last month I sent a letter to the Republican leadership pushing for more funding for the opioid fight and for the National Institutes of Health, or NIH.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2017.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER MCCONNELL AND SPEAKER RYAN: As negotiations over the latest stopgap government funding measure continue, we urge you to focus on securing substantial funding in the appropriations legislation currently being negotiated for two of our most essential national priorities: fighting the opioid epidemic and investing in our nation's biomedical research programs.

Every day, 91 Americans die from an opioid overdose, and despite the tireless work of many in our communities, this public health epidemic is only getting worse. Currently, only 10 percent of individuals who need specialty treatment for substance use disorder actually get it—not because we don't know how to help, but in large part because there aren't enough funds to provide these services. We need substantial additional resources to fight this epidemic and fund prevention, treatment, and recovery activities.

It is also essential that we increase our investment in the National Institutes of Health (NIH), our nation's premier research institution. NIH funding supports innovative, cutting-edge research that plays a critical role in the development of lifesaving cures for diseases. Our ability to fight Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, cancer, heart disease, and many other diseases depends on our willingness to invest in science. While investments in the NIH have consistently produced tremendous value, funding for the NIH has failed to keep pace with inflation over the last several decades.

It is essential to provide new funding to fight the opioid epidemic and support biomedical research at the NIH. This new funding should not fill in for cuts made elsewhere to opioid and NIH funding. It is also essential that opioid funding be distributed to the communities that need it most and that have been hardest hit by this terrible public health epidemic.

While past Congresses have made promises about providing states with additional funding to address the ongoing opioid crisis, ap-

propriations legislation like the pending budget deal is where the bill comes due. Americans are counting on Congress to live up to its commitments by supporting funding for the priorities that matter most in their lives. Funding to fight the opioid epidemic and support research into lifesaving cures through the NIH rank at the top of this list, and we urge you to include substantial additional funding for these areas in the appropriations legislation now being negotiated.

Sincerely,

Senator Elizabeth Warren, Senator Bill Nelson, Senator Benjamin L. Cardin, Senator Tom Udall, Senator Dianne Feinstein, Senator Debbie Stabenow, Senator Sherrod Brown, Senator Jeanne Shaheen, Senator Al Franken, Senator Richard Blumenthal, Senator Edward J. Markey, Senator Chris Van Hollen, Senator Margaret Wood Hassan, Senator Christopher Murphy, Senator Joe Manchin III, Senator Tammy Baldwin, Senator Cory A. Booker, Senator Tammy Duckworth, Senator Bernard Sanders.

MR. NELSON. So what we need to do is to take a comprehensive approach to helping our State and local governments respond to this opioid epidemic.

I was very happy to be an early part of putting together and sponsoring a bill called the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016 and of the funding included in the 21st Century Cures Act to start putting more resources into our States right away for this opioid epidemic. Those laws have resulted in Florida's receiving more than \$27 million to help our State respond to the opioid crisis. Yet a lot more action is needed, as you can see by just the first half of last year alone, with 704 people dying from opioid overdoses.

Last week, in Florida a local paper reported about how the opioid epidemic is affecting our Nation's children. In 2015 alone, 167 babies were born in opioid dependency in just one city—Jacksonville—contributing to Duval County's being tapped as having the second highest number of babies born addicted to opioids in the State. Isn't that sad that children come into this world and they are already addicted?

We are dealing with people's lives here. We are dealing with their health. The last thing in the world we ought to be doing is cutting the resources of funding to help people who are in such dire straits. I would urge our colleagues to think twice about supporting this disastrous Republican healthcare bill.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. CARDIN. 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.

PARIS AGREEMENT

MR. CARDIN. Mr. President, on December 19, 2015, in Paris, France, diplomats representing more than 190

countries finalized the world's most ambitious, comprehensive, and achievable multilateral agreement to combat climate change at the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change's 21st Conference of Parties, or COP21.

I led a delegation of 10 Senators to COP21 to bolster U.S. leadership and to provide confidence in the U.S. commitment to the global effort to fight the existential threat of climate change. The result was an agreement that has nearly universal support, with every party committed to reducing carbon emissions. The momentum coming out of COP21 felt unstoppable.

That momentum continued through 2016. On Earth Day, an impressive 175 nations signed the Paris Agreement. Six months later, and in less than a year's time, the Paris Agreement reached the threshold for entry into force. Up until recently, the United States has led this global effort. The strength of our commitment and diplomacy spurred global enthusiasm for the Paris Agreement.

Some have said that we are the first generation to feel the effects of climate change and the last generation who can do something about it. Climate change impacts are apparent in my home State of Maryland. Recently, Annapolis began experiencing routine tidal flooding. Today's generations of Smith Islanders may be the last as a rising Chesapeake Bay encroaches further ashore each year.

Around the world, climate change is expanding the range and duration of regional wildfire seasons, prolonging extreme droughts in the Middle East and Southern Africa, which I have witnessed firsthand, and has caused Bolivia's Lake Poopo to evaporate entirely, and entire island nations are being swallowed up by the South Pacific.

The good news is, acting to prevent the worst effects of climate change holds tremendous economic and job growth opportunities for our Nation. The world looks toward the United States for leadership, not just in terms of domestic emissions reductions but also in our private sector and academia for clean energy solutions to power the world. Maryland is positioned to be at the forefront of U.S. leadership in technology innovation.

For example, the University of Maryland, in partnership with the U.S. Department of Energy and a number of Maryland private sector companies like Redox Energy, are leading the way in developing commercial-scale, in-demand technology that the global energy market is demanding.

In 2015, global investment in renewable energy was nearly \$350 billion, which was more than the global investment in fossil fuel energy. The Department of Energy's 2017 U.S. Energy and Employment Report showed that nearly 1 million Americans work in the energy efficiency, solar, wind, and alternative vehicles sectors. This is almost five times the current employment in

the U.S. fossil fuel electric industry, which includes coal, gas, and oil workers. Even though gas and oil have hit record-low prices on the global market, current and projected price per watt for renewables is also low, making clean energy remarkably affordable and competitive in the market.

The United States stands at the crossroads of global clean energy and climate change leadership, and the policy path we take on these issues could not only shape the strength of our economic future but our overall standing in the world. Forward thinking domestic climate change and clean energy policy, including substantial investments in clean energy R&D and clean energy production incentives, have made the United States an incubator for clean energy investment and entrepreneurship.

We see these things in every State of the Nation—new innovators and investors in the clean energy sector.

Creating a robust domestic market helps U.S. companies develop tested records of accomplishment, skilled workforces, and scalable products to export around the world to a global energy market that is hungry for clean energy solutions. This is where domestic policy intersects with U.S. climate diplomacy, which is priming that export market by building good will and faith in U.S. capacity and commitment.

The United States must not squander the considerable time and effort it took to build the world's confidence in the United States when combating climate change.

The rejection of the Kyoto Protocol by the United States severely strained a wide range of diplomacy issues for the Bush administration. That is not just a Senator saying this. Let me quote Secretary of State Colin Powell, when he stated:

Kyoto—this is not talking out of school—was not handled as well as it should have been, and when the blowback came I think it was a sobering experience that everything the American president does has international repercussions.

That was General Powell warning us about the importance of international diplomacy and that our actions have consequences.

Hindsight on the impact U.S. participation in Kyoto would have had on the protocol's success and on the U.S. economy is another debate entirely—and we will leave that for a different day—but a clear lesson from the episode is that the United States must not underestimate how seriously the world takes the issue of international cooperation to combat climate change.

Should the Trump administration withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement, it will be an incredible insult to our global partners and severely tarnish the trust nations have in the United States. That distrust will bleed over into all areas of U.S. diplomacy and cooperation.

While the Paris Agreement does not have enforceable, binding provisions

that would punish parties for missing self-determined mitigation targets, nothing precludes other countries from acting outside the confines of the agreement to create uncomfortable conditions for nonmembers. It is worth noting here that if we were to pull out, we would be in a club with Syria and Nicaragua.

For example, in November of last year, immediately after the election and during COP22, the New York Times reported that leaders from other countries—so deeply offended by the President-elect's ill-informed rhetoric on climate change and the Paris Agreement—were contemplating implementing border tariffs on goods imported from nations failing to account for carbon emissions.

Staying in the agreement and continuing to advocate for what is in the best interests of the United States could prevent countries from taking such actions.

Many critics of the Paris Agreement sound as though they are stuck in 1997, echoing concerns about the 20-year-old Kyoto Protocol that are simply untrue about the Paris Agreement. The Paris Agreement takes a different approach to international climate change cooperation by creating an action model that allows for ambitious action and accountability through peer review.

The agreement takes a radically different approach to pollution mitigation that incorporates many conservative principles our Republican colleagues routinely espouse: increased transparency and universal reporting requirements for all parties. All parties, both developing and developed nations, commit to reducing greenhouse gas pollution. All parties determine their own greenhouse gas pollution mitigation commitments. Nationally determined commitments are non-binding.

Let me repeat that. The nationally determined commitments are non-binding. It is up to us, our country, to determine how we will meet our targets and when we will meet our targets, and the enforcement is solely within our own means. No international group can enforce any of these commitments on us. That was at the request of many Members of this body, and that was followed in the Paris Agreement.

The Paris Agreement was forged by the lessons the United States learned from the Kyoto Protocol process. Each addressed commonly criticized elements of the Kyoto Protocol.

I cannot stress enough how seriously committed leaders around the world are to the success of the Paris Agreement. For example, it is the top agenda item for both the upcoming G7 and G20 meetings. As such, we absolutely cannot underestimate how thoroughly insulted our friends and allies around the world will be if the United States retreats from the agreement.

Make no mistake, callously disregarding cooperation and partnership

with the global community on a crisis that is literally threatening the very physical existence of countries will have consequences for our foreign policy, diplomacy, national security, and U.S. economic opportunity in an undeniably globalized economy. Retreating from the Paris Agreement puts America alone, not America first, and being alone is tantamount to being last.

The expectation among our partners to the Paris Agreement is that the United States will remain engaged, although a common refrain among foreign delegations is that the world is moving ahead regardless. I take that to mean that if U.S. leadership falters, other countries will jump at the opportunity and fill the void we create and receive the gains which should have been ours.

U.S. energy policy should support the goals of the Paris Agreement. We have already seen hundreds of American corporations make commitments in the agreement's name. There is infinite potential from enhanced U.S. production of scalable and exportable clean energy technology that the world is demanding to power our collective future. If we do the opposite and retreat from the global effort to combat climate change, then we can expect to lose out on this economic growth potential because countries like Germany, China, and India will gladly take our place as the world's leader for clean energy innovation and finance. I will do what I can to protect against this loss.

It is in our national security interests for the United States to remain actively engaged with the world community to fight climate change.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, in December of 2015, nearly 200 nations gathered in Paris in order to reach an agreement that each country would make a commitment to the reduction of dangerous greenhouse gases that were warming the planet and causing more and more havoc across this entire world.

That agreement is something that was hard-won. It took the leadership of the United States because so much of the CO₂ that had been sent up into the atmosphere since the dawn of the industrial age was red, white, and blue. It called upon each nation to make a commitment, and they did. The countries making commitments equaled 80 percent of the world's greenhouse gas emitters.

The Trump administration has many advisers telling the President that he should pull out of this Paris Agreement, that he should cede leadership to

the Germans, to the Chinese, and to other nations rather than having the United States continue to be the leader. That would be very dangerous for our country because we would be ceding leadership in this clean energy revolution to other countries around the planet.

There are still many who do not understand the role this clean energy revolution is already playing inside our country. In 2016, we deployed nearly 24,000 new megawatts of wind and solar on our planet. To put it another way, in 2005, the total amount of solar energy that was deployed in the United States was 79 megawatts—79. In 2016, we deployed 14,000 megawatts of new solar power.

Wind—last year, we deployed another 8,000 megawatts in our country. We are heading toward a point where we have an incredible number of people who are working in these industries. Remember, there are no more than 65 to 75,000 people who are still working as coal miners in the United States. In Massachusetts alone, we now have more than 100,000 people who work in the clean energy sector. In wind and solar alone in our country right now, we have 360,000 people who work in those sectors.

By the year 2020, if we just continue at the pace at which we have been moving over the last several years, there will be 600,000 people working in the wind and solar sector. That is the future. That is where we should be going. Those are the goals we should be trying to reach.

Instead, what President Trump is saying is that the United States is a technological weakling, that the United States cannot do it, that the United States can't find the capacity to be able to meet this challenge, that we have to give up.

The President says he is going to revive the coal industry, a 19th century industry, instead of trying to have the United States be the leader in this world on the production of clean energy technologies.

Last night, I was at the Kennedy Library, and we were celebrating the 100th birthday of President John F. Kennedy. On that occasion last evening, the library presented to Barack Obama his Profile in Courage Award. Amongst other things that were cited was his commitment to dealing with this challenge of climate change that is affecting our planet and the role that the United States can and should play in the solving of that problem.

President Obama promulgated last year a Clean Power Plan. That Clean Power Plan was intended to reduce greenhouse gases in the utilities sector by 32 percent by the year 2030. President Trump has already said: We can't accomplish that. We can't figure that out. We don't know how to reduce those greenhouse gases.

In 1961, President Kennedy said that we were going to put a man on the

Moon in 8 years and return those pilots back to Earth safely. We had to invent new metals. We had to invent new propulsion systems. President Kennedy said that we were not going to do it because it was easy but because it was hard.

We were threatened by the Soviet Union for supremacy in outer space. President Kennedy challenged our Nation to respond to the threat of the Soviet Union, and we won.

Here we are, nearly 60 years later, with another challenge, a challenge that threatens this planet. President Trump says that as a nation we are not up to the challenge. As a nation, we can't figure out how to solve this problem, even though the solutions are already out there and being deployed across this Nation.

Another example of solutions like wind and solar: Elon Musk has a new all-electric vehicle that is going to cost \$35,000 and is going to be deployed next year; 400,000 of these vehicles are to be sold. That is a game-changing moment in the history of the automobile, going back to its invention. It is a game changer. To a certain extent, for existing industries, it is a game-over moment unless they get into this all-electric vehicle revolution.

What is Elon Musk doing? Elon Musk is creating a Darwinian, paranoia-inducing environment within which all of the rest of these automotive companies are now going to have to operate—go electric or perish economically as a company.

This is how far it has come: Right now, Tesla has a market value that for all intents and purposes is equal to Ford and to General Motors. That is how much the American people have given in terms of confidence in this company, in this man.

We can do it. It should be the President of the United States who is saying we can do it. The rest of the world expects us to do it.

Why do we continue to import oil into our country from Saudi Arabia? Why do we continue to import oil from other countries around this planet? Why can't the President set as a goal that we are going to have 100 percent renewables in our country by the year 2050, that we are going to accept it as a national challenge in the same way that President Kennedy accepted the challenge in 1961 to put a man on the Moon, to control, to dominate in outer space?

This is a letter to President Trump, which is in today's New York Times. The full-page ad says:

Dear President Trump,

As some of the largest companies based or operating in the United States, we strongly urge you to keep the United States Paris Agreement on climate change.

What are the names of these companies? Adobe, Apple, Danfoss, Facebook, Gap, Google, Hewlett Packard Enterprise, Ingersoll Rand, Intel, Johnson Controls, Mars Incorporated, Microsoft, Morgan Stanley, National Grid,

PG&E Corporation, Salesforce, Schneider Electric, Unilever, VF Corporation.

This isn't the President challenging companies in our country to respond to the challenge. These are the companies in America challenging the President to respond to the challenge. It is the Kennedy era on its head; it is like JFK in reverse. He is saying we can't do it when the private sector is saying we can.

Ultimately, this challenge to our competitiveness globally is something that Donald Trump is going to forfeit for our workers. This opportunity to create jobs and markets and growth is going to be something that we lose.

We need a President who is going to stand up for this stable, practical framework, which is giving an incentive to the private sector to solve this problem. We will be creating jobs while saving all of creation. That is what the winning formula is going to be.

This Paris Agreement is going to lead to increased competitiveness in jobs, in economic growth. By remaining a party to the Paris Agreement, rather than retreating, we will give Americans the opportunity to harness that can-do spirit and technical know-how to create new businesses and jobs. We will give our Nation the opportunity to be a leader in the global effort to address climate change. We will give America the opportunity to lead in this century and into the next.

I urge the United States to remain in the Paris Agreement. We can either be the leader or the laggard internationally in developing the new clean energy technologies that will drive our economy and help combat climate change.

It is a sad day for our Nation when the President of the United States is challenged by the private sector to step up, especially when he calls himself the CEO President of our country. He is turning his back on these innovative companies that want to be able to create jobs here in our country in order to save our planet. I pray for the well-being of our planet and that the President honors this commitment.

I think that the French made a huge statement yesterday in electing their new President, Macron. He was saying to the French people: We must engage to the rest of the planet. We must work with the rest of the planet.

The Paris Agreement was signed in France in December of 2015. That election yesterday, I think, should be taken as a signal that we should not be retreating from our global leadership.

I urge this administration to adopt an approach that does unleash further this wind and solar and all-electric vehicle revolution.

With that, I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

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

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

MR. CORNYN. Madam President, last week our colleagues in the House made a first necessary step to delivering on our promise to repeal and replace ObamaCare and to restore individual choice for a health insurance product that people choose that fits their actual needs, rather than one mandated by Washington, DC. They passed the American Health Care Act, a bill that provides relief to Americans all across the country. With the passage of the AHCA in the House, we have a way forward to do away with government mandating one-size-fits-all healthcare.

Now that the House has passed this legislation, it is up to the Senate to do our job and to keep our promises. To be specific, the promise President Obama made when the Affordable Care Act was passed—actually, he made many promises multiple times—proved not to be true. So in many ways, when President Obama promised that if you like what you have, you can keep it; that if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor; that if you like your plan, you can keep your plan—none of that was true, we have now learned.

I don't think it is an exaggeration to say that ObamaCare—the Affordable Care Act—was sold under false pretenses. So it is up to us to restore individual choice for healthcare products that people want that fit their needs, not one they buy because the government is holding a gun to their heads or threatens to penalize them unless they observe the government mandate to buy that healthcare.

You know, one of the biggest reasons for passing ObamaCare given at the time, back in 2010, was the number of uninsured in the country. Well, the fact is, there are still 30 million people uninsured under ObamaCare even though it has been the law of the land for the last 7 years.

I believe we can and we must do better to deliver affordable care that people choose, that meets their individual needs, and not healthcare they buy simply because the government is coercing them into doing so. We will work together with all of our colleagues who are willing to work with us. If that means Republicans are going to be working with 52 Republicans to get this bill passed, we will get it done and we will get it passed. Ideally, though, it would be better if our Democratic colleagues work with us. But so far, they have steadfastly refused to work with us even though they know that ObamaCare is in shambles and that people are finding they can't find an insurance company where they live because insurance companies are pulling out of those individual markets because they are simply losing too much money or people who can buy ObamaCare policies in the individual markets are finding that their premiums are going through the roof and that the deductibles are unaffordable,

thus effectively leaving them without effective coverage.

Even though our Democratic colleagues know that ObamaCare is melting down and is not serving the public the way they promised it would or, in fact, is a positive harm to them because of unaffordable premiums and deductibles, still, so far they are standing on the sidelines and unwilling to participate in this process. I hope that changes at some point in the near future in the interests of the people we represent all across the country.

IMMIGRATION LAW

Madam President, I want to spend the rest of my time discussing a specific problem that Texans are all too familiar with; that is, people breaking our immigration laws, and not just breaking our immigration laws but then coming into our local communities and committing additional crimes—assault, murder, rape, you name it—in those communities even after they have entered the country illegally.

This is a difficult issue and one that I don't raise lightly, but it is important that when we talk about sanctuary cities and criminal aliens—these are people who have not just violated the immigration laws, these are people who have doubled down and have no respect for our laws, and, frankly, they have no respect for the communities in which they live. They primarily target the minority community in which they live and work.

We do need to be clear-eyed about this, and we need to treat it seriously. We need to remember that our inaction has some real-life consequences. I have been glad to see the new administration focus on enforcing the law and restoring respect for the rule of law generally and taking quick action to help victims of this type of crime in particular.

I want to take a couple of minutes to tell a story about one particular victim who was really an American hero, one of my constituents who lost his life at the hands of a violent illegal immigrant. That would be Houston police officer Rodney Johnson.

By all accounts, Rodney Johnson was larger than life, standing about 6 feet 5 inches tall, with a smile just as big. He was a dedicated family man, a husband to fellow Houston Police Department officer Joslyn Johnson. They had three daughters and two sons. His wife even called Rodney “the glue that held the family together.”

Rodney was a hero not only to his family but to the local community as well. He was a hero for our country, too, because he was a veteran of the U.S. military police, the U.S. Army. Of course he was a hero for the State of Texas as a former corrections officer with the Texas Department of Public Safety.

A few years ago, Rodney ran into the flames of a burning building and saved the lives of several children. For that act of courage, he was awarded one of

the highest honors a law enforcement officer in Texas can receive, the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement's Medal of Valor.

Sadly, all of that changed in the fall of 2006. At about 5:30 p.m. on September 21, Officer Johnson pulled over a driver for speeding near Houston Hobby Airport. By all accounts, it appeared to be a routine traffic stop, but when the driver, Juan Quintero, could not provide Officer Johnson with a driver's license, he decided to take him into custody. What Officer Johnson did not know is that Mr. Quintero was a hardened criminal illegal immigrant with an extensive record of offenses, as well as deportations and repeated illegal entries into the United States. Even more tragically, Officer Johnson did not know that this career thug was concealing a 9mm handgun in the waistband of his clothing.

Officer Johnson followed protocol. He handcuffed the criminal suspect, placed him in the back of his squad car, and began writing a police report. But just then, Quintero managed to move his cuffed hands in front of him, reached for his concealed weapon, and opened fire in a cowardly surprise attack, literally killing Rodney Johnson by shooting him in the back.

Quintero was a dangerous career criminal who had no respect for our laws. He had no place in our country and had been deported numerous times by the Federal Government. But somehow he was free and on the streets alongside of our families and heroes like Officer Rodney Johnson. That should be an embarrassment to everyone who believes in the rule of law and believes that it is government's responsibility at the local, State, and Federal level to keep our communities safe.

This issue is not going to go away, as much as some of our colleagues would like to ignore it. There are countless other stories across the country of victims and their families who have suffered from some of the worst tragedies imaginable because of criminal illegal immigrants.

I am not talking just about people who have entered the country in violation of our immigration laws; I am talking about hardened criminals who target people in their communities for profit or for other reasons. I have spoken about a number of them from the floor before.

In addition to Officer Rodney Johnson, I could tell you the story of Javier Vega, a Border Patrol officer killed by two criminal illegal immigrants while fishing with his family. These criminals had been deported numerous times and committed multiple crimes.

I could tell you about Kevin Will, a Houston police officer killed by a drunk driver who had entered and was living in the United States illegally and who had been deported twice before.

I could tell you more about Josh Wilkerson, a teenager brutally killed by a criminal illegal immigrant in 2010,