

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

I am afraid politics have gotten involved to where we are focusing more on the differences of what we might hope for than on what we agree upon. That is a shame because not only do we put a great confusion on these issues that I will talk about tonight, but we lose the confidence of the American people that we can even govern up here.

Last year, this President wanted to focus on getting the economy going. He wanted to focus on energy. He wanted to focus on regulations. He wanted to focus on taxes. Check the boxes. We did that. I believe we are seeing some of the early manifestations of that in the economy now, where 123 businesses just announced at the end of the year, year-end bonuses related to this tax bill that we passed last year. That is an example of where we can get together and make things happen.

I was in the Chair last night presiding over an hour and listening to conversations about a topic that I believe is very critical to where we are today. I heard several descriptions of a DACA bill but a bill no one has seen yet. It hasn't been presented. This is merely 1 day before we have to fund the government—before midnight tomorrow night.

In my opinion, I think most people in America believe it is irresponsible that Members of this body are threatening to shut down the Federal Government over this DACA issue.

Members of the other side of the aisle used to agree with that position. In 2013, the current minority leader said—and other people talked about this today: “We could say, ‘we’re shutting down the government . . . until you pass immigration reform.’ It would be governmental chaos.”

Well, that is what we are facing tonight. I just don't think there is any need for it because, honestly, if you want to solve the DACA situation, there is a deal to be done, but serious negotiations aren't being made right now because one side wants to create this issue and threaten to shut down the government, thinking they can get both, a financing deal that they favor, along with this DACA proposition. That is unfortunate.

Our men and women in uniform deserve better than that. You are an ex-officer. You know what I am saying. It is absolutely ridiculous that we are in the fourth month of this fiscal year in the middle of January—our fiscal year started October 1. It is absolutely ridiculous that we are sitting here today having not funded the government permanently for the balance of this year. No other entity that I know of anywhere—any business or any facet of operation—can do that except the U.S. Federal Government.

These two issues we are talking about have nothing to do with it and should not be tied together; that is, the DACA solution and funding the Federal Government. Given our global security crisis—and I do mean the word “crisis”

today—I think the world is more dangerous than any time in my lifetime. I can't think of anything worse than to tie up the funding for our men and women in uniform with an issue like this; that we all want to solve anyway.

I am shocked the Democrats would advocate that we shut down the government over a bill no one has even seen yet and an issue that has nothing to do with getting the government funded. Creating a false deadline for a DACA solution, I believe—and using it to hold military certainty hostage—is no way to govern. I think most people back home agree with that. That is what is wrong with this institution today. Both sides need to stop it right now. We need to get to a vote and fund this government.

#### IMMIGRATION

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I would like to make a few comments about the current immigration system. That seems to be the topic of the day recently. I want to tell you some of us have been working on this for years. Some in this body have been working on it at least the last decade. Three times in the last 11 years, this body has tried to solve this problem unsuccessfully.

I believe one of the problems with each of those solutions or attempts at a solution was they tried to be comprehensive. People are misusing that word today when they talk about what we are trying to do on this side. These three attempts, over the last 11 years, attempted to solve not just the illegal situation and the temporary work visa situation, but they also tried to solve the legal situation. They tried to solve all of this.

Today, what we are trying to do on our side is to solve just the illegal immigration system before we even talk about DACA. The legal situation is this: 1.1 million green cards are given out every year today. That is up from 300,000 in 1965, when this bill—the law we operate under today—was first passed. What we believe is, if we get this done, then the next step would be to move to the temporary work visas, where we give out 2.2 million temporary work visas every year. Those need desperate work. Both sides agree to that. Some categories probably need to be increased; others need to be streamlined. There might need to be a new category created, but that needs speciality work.

Then, of course, we have to deal with the people who are here illegally. Remember, 40 percent of the people here illegally, or thereabouts, came into this country under a legal temporary work visa or a student visa, or some other form of temporary visa and overstayed their visa. We are one of the few countries in the developed world that can't track overstays, but that is not what we are trying to do. We are trying to bring focus to an issue that will stop this continuing evolution of immigration problems.

I believe there is a better way, and there is a proposition to do just that. There was a meeting in the White House last week on Tuesday, and the President started out the conversation—it was bipartisan, bicameral. You heard my colleague from Iowa Senator GRASSLEY talk about this. As part of that meeting, I was moved by how the President introduced this topic. He said, with regard to the DACA situation, we need to develop a compassionate approach that demonstrates love in dealing with these young people who are here illegally but through no fault of their own. The President, in that meeting, defined the scope, and he brought a sense of urgency to this topic. He expects a result.

He undid what we believe was an illegal act by the past President in giving work status to these individuals, and said—now this is President Trump—he said: This is the responsibility of Congress to put a law in place to deal with this. I agree with that, but let's be very clear about what is going on right now. We are not debating what to do with the DACA individuals, mostly aged 15 to 36.

My colleagues spoke last night as though they are the only ones committed to solving the DACA problem. That is not true. People on both sides of the aisle—in this body and in the House—believe we need to solve this problem. These individuals did not break the law, their parents did. We all agree there is a solution to be had. Again, the question is whether we are going to solve DACA without dealing with the things that created it in the first place.

The President was very clear last week—and he has been consistent on this issue, as have those of us who have been working on this over the last year, this new, focused approach on legal immigration. The President made it very clear that any solution on DACA has to include border security—including a wall—an end to chain migration, and an end to this perverse diversity visa lottery.

If we don't actually solve what created this, we are going to be right back here in just a few years. That is the problem I have with the bill that is being discussed here, this so-called Graham-Durbin exercise. I just don't know why we would do that and knowingly put ourselves in the same position in just a few years.

Haven't we learned our lesson from what we did in 1986, 1991? We know kicking the can down the road on this is not going to give us any solution, but we have an opportunity because we have commonality in this body about what we need to do going forward with not only the DACA situation but this legal immigration system. There is a great deal of commonality in thought. I have done deals in the business world, and when you get this level of commonality, a deal should get done. There is a lot of symmetry here to be had if we would just talk with each other and