

be open to the public because then the public would realize, I think, that we are not that far apart. Unfortunately, we are a week and a half later, and the parties have not even reached an agreement on a schedule to begin the negotiations. Now we have another group of people that say: We have something that is pretty close and we may file a bill, or you need to get on to the bill.

Let me tell you the problem I have with that bill or the concept of the bill. No. 1, has it been introduced? No. So it is "thoughtware." None of us can talk about the specific provisions because we don't have something we can score, look at, or understand the benefits and risks and issues associated with it and whether or not we can get the votes.

The question is, Does the bill have the support of the President? Well, I think you saw what was vetted on Thursday, which was not a specific provision, and that meeting last week didn't go too well on several different levels. We don't have an agreement.

The other question is, if you don't have an agreement with the President, you have to understand the process of the Congress. If the President were to veto the bill, and we are struggling to get 60 votes, now we would have to get 67 votes. Does anybody here honestly believe we will get 67 votes to withstand a veto override? So we have to get back to this one, to get the President behind it, because that is not going to happen. Even if that could happen, then we have to go to the House. It is not about a simple majority of the House Members. We have to think about a supermajority of House Members that would override a Presidential veto. Right now, based on the number of Members who are in the House—there are a couple of open seats—that is 288 votes. That isn't going to happen. That is not a very good scorecard. It is not a recipe for success.

I am one of the ones who want checked boxes next to a bill that the President supports, that the Senate will get 60 votes on, and the House will get more than half, so that we can solve the problem for the DACA population.

Things happen quickly here, and, hopefully, this is another example where they will. I hope my Republican colleagues recognize that voting against the funding bill is a bad idea. How do you work out of a shutdown? Almost certainly it will not end well. So I hope my Republican colleagues will vote for the spending bill, and I hope a majority or a good number of my Democratic colleagues will, so that we get the spending issue off the table. Then I hope that same group of people will come together and recognize that the gaps are not that hard to bridge for the DACA solution, that the border security measures are reasonable, that the changes in the elimination of the diversity lottery and a more reasonable way to allow merit-based immigration makes sense. We can deal with under-

represented countries to make absolutely certain that good hard-working people in those countries who want to come and live and work in America can do it. This is not a difficult thing to do.

It is almost as if people are going in the backroom trying to figure out how to make this more difficult than it needs to be.

I am telling and imploring the Members of the Senate, whether you are Republican or Democrat, vote for funding the Government. Vote for our soldiers. Vote for our veterans. Vote for the children who require these programs who are desperately in need of certainty. Then, quickly, get on DACA and vote for the Dreamers who need our support. Vote for border security so we can know who is coming across this border and we can make the Nation safer. These are commonsense, rational, and reasonable expectations, and if we lower the temperature here, if we treat people with respect, and if we actually not let the polar opposites impact what those of us in the center want to do, then we can avoid this crisis and we can do great things for millions of people.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before I speak—because Senator PERDUE wants to speak right after me—I ask unanimous consent that Senator PERDUE, assuming he shows up before I am done, be the next one in line to follow me.

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

#### DACA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to offer remarks about an issue of utmost important to this body and to the American people—the ongoing negotiations over the future of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA.

I should explain the justification for these young people. The children were brought here by their parents. Their parents crossed the border without papers, violating the law, but the children cannot be held guilty for the sins of their parents. That is why we feel it is very legitimate to do this humanitarian thing of legalizing DACA children—not in and of itself, but, as you heard from my colleague from North Carolina and you will hear from other people, the necessity of making sure that we have border security, that we do away with chain migration, and that we also do away with diversity visas—this is the scope of negotiations that ought to be going on to get a compromise for the humanitarian reason of giving certainty to these young DACA people.

Those things were narrowed at the White House a week ago Tuesday, not the famous Thursday meeting that you heard so much about last weekend but

the meeting of 23 Republican and Democrat Members of both the House and Senate. When you get a bicameral, bipartisan group of people together with the President—and you want to do that because you want to make sure that when you reach an agreement, the President will sign it—it seems to me that is a significant way to move forward. But things tend to take different routes around here, and I am here because of some routes that I think are very puzzling at this point—pretty much along the lines of what the Senator from North Carolina just stated.

Last week, speaking to my colleagues, I told this body that we still weren't any closer to a legitimate and fair deal that promotes and protects the interests of the American people in a lawful immigration system, and, at the same time, what is very important is providing a fair and equitable solution on DACA. But we also want to take care of the interests of the American people, particularly the safety of the American people when it comes to criminal aliens.

Since I made that speech a week ago, we made some progress in a meeting that went on at the White House, which I just told you about. In spite of the many events of these past 2 weeks, the pronouncement I just made that we don't have a legitimate, fair deal on one hand to protect the American people and, on the other hand, to deliver the humanitarian ends that we need for the DACA kids—that pronouncement still holds true.

Unfortunately, immigration has become the "Groundhog Day" of the U.S. Senate. Democrats, and even some Republicans, keep repeating the same mistakes that we have been making for the past 30 years, and they don't seem to be learning from them. I should probably tell my colleagues what I have learned in those 30 years.

Thirty years ago, when I voted for an immigration bill—the last great big reform of immigration—we had 3 million undocumented people here. In good faith, we thought we had secured the border because throughout the history of the country, from the beginning, it had never been illegal to hire an illegal alien, and for the first time, we made it illegal for our employers to hire someone who is undocumented, taking away the magnet to come to this country. We thought it would secure the border if they couldn't be legally hired, and we legalized 3 million people. We didn't take into consideration the whole industry of false documents in which, if I go to an employer and show him a false document and they believe it is a true document, then they are not guilty of hiring me, even though I am technically an undocumented worker, because I am using a fraudulent document.

What happens when you reward illegality? You get more of it. So instead of the 3 million people we had legalized, we now have an 11-million person issue. That is what I have been told.

We don't want to repeat those mistakes, and that is why, besides legalizing DACA kids, border security and doing away with chain migration are so important. One of the bombers in New York was here because of chain migration—the terrorist who was just about ready to—well, he didn't kill anyone, but he injured a lot of people. Then we have another person who was here on a diversity visa and killed 8 people and injured 12 while driving down the streets of New York. So we have a major problem we have to take care of.

The President is very interested in taking care of this problem, as he enunciated in that Tuesday meeting, which was bicameral and bipartisan and narrowed the issues so that it would be easier for us to reach an agreement here. Instead of dealing with 100 things, 4 are taken care of—DACA, border security, doing away with diversity visas, and doing away with chain migration.

We don't want "Groundhog Day" to happen again in the U.S. Senate because it has been happening quite frequently. In the last 30 years, we thought we could solve this problem once and for all by taking away the magnet for people to come here for jobs, and we would secure the border. Well, 30 years later, you can understand why the President wants a wall and more border security.

In recent days, several of my colleagues formed what can best be described as a poor man's version of the Gang of 8. The Gang of 8 is affiliated with a very bad bill called comprehensive immigration. It passed in 2013 and went nowhere in the House of Representatives because it was unrealistic. These six Senators have decided that they—and they alone—will come up with a solution to the DACA crisis. Now they are demanding that their solution—and no other solution—receive a vote or they will shut the government down at midnight tomorrow night. That is right. These Senators, along with many Democrats, are threatening to shut the government down unless this plan gets a vote.

Surely, if these Senators are willing to prevent basic services from being provided to law-abiding, tax-paying American citizens and legal immigrants, their plan must be something that could garner wide bipartisan support, pass the House, and be signed into law by the President. It is far short of those four things that were agreed to at the bipartisan, bicameral meeting at the White House.

What is actually in this grand plan these Senators have come up with? Well, as of today, neither I nor my staff have actually seen text of the bill they are promoting. Why are they threatening a shutdown of the Federal Government over a bill that almost no one has been given a chance to read, and why are they threatening to shut down the government when there is still plenty of time? The deadline is March

5 to come to a meaningful solution that can earn bipartisan support.

Well, here is what we do know about their proposal, from one-page summaries. The bill would provide a massive amnesty to millions of people who are in this country unlawfully—before border security, making the same mistake we did in 1986. Their proposal doesn't just provide status to the young men and women enrolled in the DACA Program, which everyone in this Chamber agrees should be done; it dramatically expands the scope, granting legal status to potentially millions of others, including those who knowingly violate the law. It is unthinkable to me that we should reward that unlawful conduct, and it is ridiculous that Democrats and some Republicans are turning the tables and making this last-minute demand when there was such a successful meeting at the White House a week ago Tuesday. It was bipartisan, bicameral, with the President leading the discussion and everyone agreeing that we would narrow the 100 issues down to 4: DACA, border security, diversity visas, and ending chain migration.

Surely then, in exchange for this massive amnesty, their proposal would provide significant border security, enforcement, and chain migration reforms. If you were hoping for that answer to be yes, don't hold your breath. Their proposal has a paltry amount of funding for existing border security infrastructure improvement. That is right—no new infrastructure.

Their proposal also doesn't add new legal authorities to make it easier for law enforcement to apprehend, detain, and deport dangerous criminal aliens. Now, I think they are somewhat embarrassed that they don't have some proposals in there that dangerous criminal aliens ought to be deported easier than they are today.

So I have to ask, is there a reason why these Senators don't want to make it easier to remove these dangerous criminals? Do they want to protect sex offenders? Do they want to protect child molesters? Do they want drunk drivers, gang members, like MS-13, human traffickers, and drug smugglers roaming throughout this great United States of America?

I can't imagine the answer to any of these questions is yes. If I am right, then they need to tell the American people why they refused to give our government the new authorities needed to remove these individuals who have endangered our communities. They either support removing dangerous criminals or they don't. There is no going in between.

Their plan also fails to truly end chain migration. In fact, in that one-page document I have seen, these Senators acknowledge their chain migration fix would only affect 26,266 visas per year. That is right, just a little above 26,000. So in exchange for a potential amnesty for 8 million people, they have agreed to eliminate 26,000

visas a year. I am no mathematician, but that doesn't seem to be a very balanced agreement to me. They seem to be making the same mistakes I made in 1986.

Finally, their proposal doesn't even end the Diversity Visa Program. Remember, this is one of four agreements in a bicameral, bipartisan meeting with the President of the United States that everybody left the White House with an agreement that we were going to break within those four.

This Diversity Visa Program, we all know, is subject to fraud and abuse, and colleagues on both sides of the aisle have long called for its elimination—and I mean elimination, not reallocation. The proposal they are floating around doesn't do that.

To sum it up, this proposal is heavy on amnesty, learning nothing from the 1986 mistake I learned a lot from. Too bad there is only a handful of us around the U.S. Senate from that time because there would be a lot more missionaries saying that what happened in 1986 shouldn't be repeated.

Also, more importantly, it is non-existent on security measures. This approach has been tried time and again, and that approach has failed. The American people simply don't want to provide a massive amnesty first and secure the border later. For those Members who think we can do amnesty first and security second, I think I made it quite clear: I think that is the wrong approach. I know because I have been here a long time, and I have been here at the time those mistakes have been made. We know they failed the goals we sought. I remember why it failed. Maybe—just maybe—if we actually provide safety first and then consider more comprehensive reforms later, we can break this repetitive cycle and end this immigration "Groundhog Day."

Maybe I ought to add to those four points that were agreed to at the White House. The President was promoting another step or two called comprehensive immigration reform, but get this done first. Secure the border first. If we actually provide security first, doing so would instill trust with the American people that we are dedicated to fixing this immigration issue, not simply delaying the same debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

#### FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, as an outsider to this process, one of the first realizations was that, as I got here, things don't always move in a linear fashion from point A to point B. Many times, the people who are trying to move an issue from point A to point B aren't interested in getting to point B.

I would like to talk tonight about one of those issues. I think we have a situation here where both sides in this body—and I dare say in the House—pretty much want the same thing, but