

of the Communications Decency Act even applies to those alleged to support the exploitations of others by human trafficking.

That is an invitation to Congress to act. It is clearly up to Congress to act. It is past time we update this 21-year-old law for the 21st century and allow victims who have had their most basic human rights violated to get justice against those who facilitate these crimes.

We have an opportunity this month during National Human Trafficking Prevention Month to fix this. We can and we must.

The Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, or SESTA, is a bill I introduced with my bipartisan colleagues—Senator BLUMENTHAL, who will speak later this afternoon, and Senators JOHN MCCAIN, CLAIRE MCCASKILL, JOHN CORNYN, HEIDI HEITKAMP, AMY KLOBUCHAR, and 18 other colleagues. As of this morning, that legislation has 64 cosponsors. It is totally bipartisan, supported by both sides of the aisle. It is popular: 64 out of 100 have already cosponsored it because it will fix this injustice with two very narrowly crafted changes to the Communications Decency Act.

First, it will allow victims to get the justice they deserve by removing the Communications Decency Act's broad liability protections the judge discussed, specifically for websites that knowingly facilitate sex trafficking crimes.

Second, it will allow State attorneys general to prosecute these websites that violate Federal sex trafficking laws. These changes will hold bad actors like backpage accountable while doing nothing to impair the free internet. In fact, they will protect websites that do not actively and knowingly engage in online sex trafficking.

The "knowing" standard is a high bar to meet. The California attorney general, Xavier Becerra, testified at the Senate Commerce Committee about that this fall. He said:

We have to prove criminal intent. We can't win a prosecution unless we can show the individuals we're prosecuting, like Backpage, had the intent—the knowledge—to do what they're doing. The legislation we have before you is very narrowly tailored. It goes only after sex trafficking.

The Stop Enabling Sex Trafficking Act passed the Senate Commerce Committee by a vote that was unanimous. It was bipartisan. It was unanimous, and the legislation has the support of an extraordinary coalition of law enforcement organizations, anti-trafficking advocates, trafficking victims, survivors, faith-based groups, and even some major tech players, although some in the tech community continue to be concerned. This includes the Internet Association, which now represents companies such as Facebook, reddit, Amazon, and others. It was endorsed by businesses, including Oracle, 21st Century Fox, Hewlett-Packard Enterprise, and the Walt Disney Company. Other companies such as IBM

and others have stepped up to support it.

Last year, 50 attorneys general across this country wrote a letter calling on Congress to amend the Communications Decency Act in the exact way we are proposing in this bill—50.

Again, in the Senate, a bipartisan group of 64 Senators has now cosponsored the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act. Those 60-plus cosponsors are significant because 60 is how many votes we need in the U.S. Senate if there are objections to the legislation to be able to get it passed. We already have that many Senators who have now put their names down. They said they want to be part of the solution to this tragic problem. They want to stop this increase in sex trafficking that unconscionably is happening in this country in this century.

So we shouldn't wait any longer to pass this bill in the Senate. Every day we do, those who sell women and children will be allowed to continue that, continue to profit, and victims will continue to be denied justice.

It is not an issue of politics or partisanship. It is about preventing exploitation and providing justice. I am hoping we can have a vote on this bill in the Senate this month, during National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month. This Thursday is National Human Trafficking Awareness Day. I urge the leadership to have the bill on the floor as soon as possible. We have every reason to act and no reason not to.

These victims deserve justice, and Congress should help provide it. Passing the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act is an opportunity.

Thank you.

I yield back my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I don't know whether it is four, five, or six, but some Senators would like to have colloquy on the issue of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, and I ask unanimous consent that we have that privilege.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DACA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise with my colleagues to offer remarks about the current status of the negotiations on the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA Program, as it is known in the U.S. Senate.

Unfortunately, this body still isn't closer to a legitimate and fair deal that accomplishes two goals: First of all, to promote and protect the interests of the American people in a lawful immigration system and, two, provide a fair and equitable solution on DACA.

Back in December, I introduced a bill, along with Senators CORNYN, TILLIS, LANKFORD, PERDUE, and COTTON. The bill, with the acronym SECURE Act of 2017, was a product of months of discussion between this Sen-

ator, these other Senators I just named, and the White House. Our plan, simply put, has five pillars.

First, based on the hard work and leadership of Senator CORNYN, our bill provided real, robust border security by mandating the construction of tactical and technological infrastructure at the border.

Second, our bill took meaningful steps to end the lawlessness of dangerous criminal aliens by cracking down on sanctuary cities, ending the misguided catch-and-release policies of the previous administration, and, finally, taking steps to address intentional visa overstays.

Third, our bill took steps to eliminate many of the "pull" factors that encourage people to immigrate illegally by permanently authorizing the E-Verify Program and by taking meaningful steps to reduce immigration court and asylum adjudication backlogs.

Fourth, thanks to the leadership and advocacy of Senators GRAHAM, PERDUE, and COTTON, our bill eliminated the phenomenon known as chain migration and made a major downpayment toward transitioning to a merit-based immigration system.

Fifth, and finally, our bill provided a bipartisan solution to protect undocumented young people brought to the United States as children by adopting Senator DUREN's Bar Removal of Individuals who Dream and Grow our Economy—that has the acronym BRIDGE Act.

Our plan was fair, serious, and bipartisan. Most importantly, it was and is pro-American. As I have continually said since the bill's introduction, this group of Senators is ready and willing to negotiate with our counterparts in good faith and to find an equitable solution to the DACA situation that incorporates our bill's five pillars of reform.

I said negotiate. I had at least one Democratic Senator infer that I could not negotiate in good faith because I did not vote for the Gang of 8 immigration bill in 2013. So, sadly, our good-faith offers have consistently been rejected by Democratic leadership. Instead, they decide to engage in a game of brinksmanship.

So I ask several questions: Why doesn't Democratic leadership negotiate with us? Because we refuse to simply pass what is referred to as the Dream Act, as is, with no proportional border security and interior enforcement majors. As the Democrats see it, it is take it or leave it, their way or the highway. This isn't good faith, this isn't negotiating, and that approach is doomed to failure.

I have to ask: Why do my colleagues in the Democratic leadership refuse to even consider measures that would beef up border security and interior enforcement? Do they want people to continue to immigrate to this country illegally? Do they want sex offenders and human traffickers to continue to manipulate

our porous border and enter our country unchecked? Do they want criminal illegal immigrants—people like Jose Zarate, who murdered Kate Steinle, or Eswin Mejia, who killed Sarah Root, to roam free in our country? Are they comfortable allowing criminal alien gangs like MS-13, whose motto happens to be “kill, rape, and control,” to continue to terrorize immigrant communities?

I am assuming—in fact, I am hoping—the answer to all of these questions is a resounding no. If that is correct, then why does Democratic leadership refuse to discuss the border security and interior enforcement provisions in the SECURE Act?

Despite the hysteria and the hyperbole you may hear from pro-amnesty, open-border immigrant advocates, the SECURE Act does not contain draconian enforcement measures. If anything, our bill contains the commonsense security and enforcement measures this body has been debating, discussing, and considering for years.

Our bill adds new Border Patrol agents, U.S. attorneys, and judges to make it easier to apprehend, prosecute, and deport illegal entrants and criminal aliens. We authorize money for critically necessary port of entry and exit improvements so we can know who is here, how long they are here, and when they left—if they left.

Our bill increases criminal penalties for human smugglers, these offenses that are committed by repeat offenders, often resulting in death, resulting in human trafficking, and including even sexual assault. We also increase penalties for criminal aliens who commit a crime of violence or a drug trafficking crime.

Our bill makes clear that individuals who engage in acts of terrorism, criminal gang members, aggravated felons, and drunk drivers are not admissible to our country, and makes it clear that they can be put into expedited removal if they somehow make it into our country.

Finally, our bill permanently authorizes the voluntary E-Verify Program, and it also provides incentives for employers to participate in that voluntary program. It doesn't make E-Verify mandatory. It just provides employers certainty by making the program permanent.

I hope, as I described these things, they are seen as commonsense measures. Why would my colleagues on the other side ever want to oppose those provisions? It wasn't that long ago that many Democrats supported border security and interior enforcement. I would like to list some quotes from recent Democratic Presidents who supported some of these propositions.

In his 1996 State of the Union Address, then-President Clinton championed his actions to crack down on illegal immigration. He proudly noted his administration was “increasing border patrol by 50 percent . . . [and] increasing inspections to prevent the hiring of illegal immigrants.”

In 2006, then-Senator, later President Obama spoke in favor of enhanced border security and enforcement measures. He acknowledged, even then, that “we need tougher border security, stronger enforcement measures . . . [we] need more resources for Customs and Border Agents, and more detention beds.”

When speaking in favor of the Secure Fence Act, Mr. Obama said: It would “certainly do some good” and would go a long way in “stem[ming] . . . the tide of illegal immigration in this country.”

Do my colleagues no longer agree with former Presidents Clinton and Obama? Do they no longer believe we need to stem the tide of illegal immigration?

My colleagues on the other side consistently talk about how DACA kids shouldn't be used as bargaining chips for any potential deal. What about the innocent American citizens they are using as bargaining chips? What about the thousands of victims every year of crimes committed by dangerous criminal aliens? Do the lives of these people not matter as well? Does the safety of these people, the happiness of these people, the well-being of these people deserve to be bargained away?

This group of Senators whom I have named who are going to participate in this colloquy remain ready and willing to negotiate in good faith and to make tough sacrifices in order to find common ground on this issue. Our counterparts need to be willing to do the same. I am asking them, pleading with them, in all sincerity, to sit down and have an honest conversation.

Let's strike a deal that is fair to all, including to law-abiding Americans. Any deal cooked up by this poor man's version of a Gang of 8 that doesn't have real border security, doesn't have real interior enforcement measures, and doesn't have the other pillars of reform in the SECURE Act—well, it is pretty simple: That is no deal at all, and I will not support that.

I yield the floor.

I call on my colleague, the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. TILLIS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, before the chairman leaves the Chamber, I wish to thank him for his leadership as chairman of the Judiciary Committee. He has done an extraordinary job of bringing people together to really come up with a solution to this problem.

This is a problem that has existed for years—almost two decades. The first DREAM Act was filed in 2001, I believe. It has been some 16 years, and they have failed to produce a result. Now, think that through. That was through President Bush, and it was through President Obama. It was actually at a time when, in 2009, not a single Republican vote would have been necessary to pass the DREAM Act. Yet my col-

leagues on the other side of the aisle could not produce a result. So we know we need to do something different.

There are things in the Dream Act that we need to file and put into a bill. In fact, it was instructed into a bill that I and Senator LANKFORD and Senator HATCH filed called the SUCCEED Act. It is a way to provide certainty for the DACA population, but it also needs to be paired up with reasonable border security provisions so that we get the broad base of support we need for enduring policy here.

There are some people who are talking about withdrawing from negotiations and trying to threaten a government shutdown to get something slammed into a year-end spending bill. But if you really care about the long-term certainty that we want to provide these young people who qualified under the DACA Program, the last thing you should do is to play politics and get something half baked into a provision that will always be a target of the next year-end spending bill. Why don't we do something crazy and actually sit down, check our Members on the Republican side and the Democratic side who have extreme views on this issue at the door, and solve the problem.

I have taken a lot of criticism after filing the SUCCEED Act because I had a lot of people who said that I was soft on immigration. Well, I respectfully disagree with some of my friends who are themselves Republicans and conservatives, because I don't think they have it right. I think that the young men and women who qualify under the DACA Program, who were brought to this country through the actions of their parents, through no fault of their own, deserve a respectful, compassionate, physically sustainable solution, and certainty. I have been working on it, and I have been taking the criticism ever since I filed the bill. I even had a congressional district in North Carolina censure me, saying, “shame on you,” for actually coming up with something that made sense.

One thing that I said, though, when we filed that bill, is that what we did in the SUCCEED Act had to be paired with reasonable, sustainable border security measures and interior enforcement measures—things that are important if we want to make sure that a decade from now, 15 years from now we are not back here again worried about a new DACA population that has come across the borders.

I have had some people insisting that having a secure border is not compassionate, that it is unfair, but I would actually submit to my colleagues that not having a secure border is irresponsible. Talking about not being compassionate, allowing things to occur with an unsecured border—to me, having a secure border is a hallmark of compassion. That is a little bit of what I want to talk about. So let's stipulate to that.

Working with Senator DURBIN—and, incidentally, Senator DURBIN and I

have been talking about this issue for about a year and a half—I knew that we were going to be here with the DACA Program and that we needed to work on it. So I reached out to Senator DURBIN and said that I am willing to try to come up with something that makes sense, but we have to be willing to accept something different from all of the random ideas and come with a compromise. We made progress in terms of how to deal with the DACA population, but some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are unwilling to talk about the reality that we should also put into place, and pair with what we do for the DACA population, border security and interior enforcement that makes sense.

Back in February I spent about a week down along the southern border. I was on patrol boats on the Rio Grande. I was riding horseback in certain areas of the border. I was out in the interior area where enforcement actions are taking place every night. I spent a lot of time down there. One thing that struck me was some of the briefings that we received from border security. I am going to get to what I consider to be the most heartbreaking last.

We want to talk about what is going on. We have people come to this floor—my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—and say: We must do something to address the opioid epidemic in this country. I agree. That is why I voted for the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. I spoke on the floor several times as a first step toward trying to get a handle on something that is poisoning almost 60,000 people a year—killing them. They are dying from overdoses in this Nation. The reality is that the vast majority—and we will get to a slide in a minute—of those illicit drugs, including heroin and fentanyl and the other kinds of drugs that are extracted from opium and are killing people, are coming across the southern border. We simply don't have the resources at our land ports and in the areas where drug smugglers cross illegally to stop them. The consequence of that in a State like North Carolina is that more people are dying from drug overdoses today than are dying from automobile accidents—about 1,400 a year. It is even worse in a number of other States.

We were at a land port in Laredo, and they were saying that on any given day, millions of doses are probably getting through because they are concealed. They are hidden in trucks. They don't have the capacity to inspect every vehicle. So they are coming across this border ostensibly legally—obviously, through the legal process of entry—but carrying illicit drugs, and we are only capturing a fraction of them. A part of what we are proposing in this bill is additional resources to interdict more of those drugs, to make it less likely that somebody could come across the border by use of a pickup truck or by using backpacks full of poison that will ulti-

mately get into the blood streams of people who will ultimately die—many of them, tens of thousands a year. That is a case—a compassionate case—for border security.

This is the number that I was talking about earlier: 15,469 deaths in 2016 alone related to heroin. A lot of these are coming across the border. But only about 1.5 percent of all of the drugs that are estimated to come across the border are being seized today. How do you actually increase this seizure rate? You put the resources and authorities in place so that the Border Patrol and Customs and immigration resources down on the border can actually find them, and arrest, charge, convict, and incarcerate the people who are poisoning the men and women and boys and girls in this country.

There is also another thing, and this is something that when I was down on the Texas border just stuck with me. I was on a 7,500-acre ranch, which is really, really small in Texas terms. I was talking with the ranch owner, who said that over the last 10 years, they had actually recovered 100 bodies on this ranch alone. If you do the math, that means they are finding a person who has died trying to come to this country illegally about every six weeks on this small ranch. Over the past 20 years, we have had about 10,000 people die crossing the border, and about 1,000 of them are children.

If we had a secure border, at least we would have the knowledge and the situational awareness to know where these people are so that they don't languish somewhere in the middle of nowhere after they cross the border or after they have paid somebody \$1,000, \$5,000, or \$10,000, in some cases, to carry them across the border. Then, they leave them. They take them across the border and then tell them that Houston is just a few miles away. Well, Houston is an hour-and-a-half plane ride away from where they cross the border.

So we need border security for the protection of people who are making the poor decision to come across. If we have a secure border, it is much less likely that any of them will ever attempt to do it, except for the legal ones. Then there is the other thing that is happening on the other side of the border. The 10,000 people who have died over 20 years are those whom we have identified—I am sure there are many more who we didn't—who were found on U.S. soil after crossing the border.

One other thing I learned when I was down in Texas is about the criminal actions and the criminal gangs, basically—they call them plazas and cartels—that basically run every mile of the border. If you pass through one of those plazas and you don't pay the toll, you are likely going to die. In one case, there were 72 people who were murdered because the human smuggler failed to pay the plaza bosses the so-called toll when he was supposed to get them across the border. So they or-

dered the execution of men, women, and children just to send a message. This is one of the many examples that we have.

So there is no question in my mind that of the 10,000 people who have died over the last 20 years on American soil, there were probably thousands or tens of thousands or more who have died in the hopes that they could get across the border.

If we have a secure border and if we work on our immigration systems, we can get for those parents and people who want to come to this country legally an opportunity to get here without harming themselves or harming their children. If that is not a compassionate case for a secure border, I don't know what is.

Now we are in the final stages of trying to negotiate a deal, and Chairman GRASSLEY did a wonderful job of summarizing what we have proposed as a starting position for negotiation with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I hope they will be willing to come to the table and negotiate in good faith and recognize that their approach over the last 16 years has failed. They promised the Dreamers a solution, and they failed to deliver. They have failed to deliver under a Republican administration. They have failed to deliver under President Obama, when they had supermajorities. We are not going to let them fail this time.

Giving the DACA population certainty, coming up with a solution that makes sense, getting a border that is secure, making sure that the poison that is coming across the border and killing tens of thousands of people a year is reduced, is, in my opinion, the scope that we need to negotiate to get to an agreement. If we have Senator DURBIN, Senator BENNET, and others who have negotiated portions of the immigration issue open their eyes to the broader opportunity to come up with a balanced policy that addresses the concerns on both sides of the aisle, we can be the Congress and President Trump can be the President who actually solve this problem and, along the way, make it far less likely that it will be another problem for another Congress to solve 10 or 15 years from now and that, then, may take 10 or 15 years to solve.

This will have an enduring impact. This will have a compassionate impact. This will provide certainty to the DACA population. This will allow me to go home and say: I did something meaningful to secure the border and protect our Nation. But we have to have people come together and negotiate in good faith. It needs to start this week, and we need to continue it until we come to terms.

People need to be willing to compromise and accept something less than perfect, because everybody's perfect conceptions of what we should do here have all one thing in common: They have all been resounding failures. They have been unkept promises.

Along the way, our homeland is not as secure as it can be, and people are dying in the process. Hard-working people who are eligible for the DACA Program are uncertain about their future.

So, again, I want to thank Chairman GRASSLEY for his hard work and his leadership and willingness to engage. I want to thank the President. I was with the President for an hour and a half last week, along with Chairman GRASSLEY and others. We are going to be meeting again in the White House tomorrow. Hopefully, we will be joined by our Democratic colleagues who have been invited to the meeting, and we will negotiate something that makes sense.

Now is the time for us to deliver. The empty promises of the past are insufficient. We need to provide an enduring solution, and an enduring solution is a fair solution for the DACA population and a responsible solution for border security. If we do that, I think we will look at this as something meaningful—something the Presiding Officer and I did when we came in here in 2015.

We got tax reform. That is meaningful.

We have been promising immigration reform forever. This is not all of it. We have more work to do. But this is a big first step, and it requires bipartisanship, compromise, and a genuine commitment to negotiate.

I hope my Democratic colleagues will take the invitation seriously, come to the table, negotiate an agreement we can all be proud of, and we can give the certainty that we should give to the DACA population.

I thank the chairman for the opportunity to speak on this and for his continued leadership on this issue.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the Senator has been a leader on this with his separate piece of legislation for a long time.

The next speaker is Senator COTTON; after that is Senator LANKFORD.

In the meantime, I yield the floor to my colleagues as I have a meeting to go to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I thank Chairman GRASSLEY for his leadership on this issue and for offering the SECURE Act, which I and some of the other Senators have supported.

I wish to continue this debate where Senator TILLIS left off. We have heard a lot today about the so-called DACA Program, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, and the negotiations in which we are currently engaged. Hopefully, those negotiations will reach a solution that will satisfy all the parties and give certain legal protections to the DACA population.

We have heard a lot today about border security and the wall. I want to focus on one other element of a needed, negotiated solution, and that is chain migration—putting an end, once and for all, to chain migration. When you

give legal status to an illegal immigrant, that is a permanent change in law; it will never be reversed. Therefore, you can't simply accept some window dressing at the border—1 year of funding for demonstration or pilot projects. You have to have a permanent change in return for a permanent change, and an end to chain migration will be one of the most important permanent changes to U.S. immigration law in 52 years.

What is chain migration? Under the current law, which dates back to 1965, if you are a citizen, you can bring any one of your relatives to this country, not just your spouse and your unmarried minor kids—your nuclear family—but also your adult kids and their spouses and their children and your adult brother and your adult sister and your parents and then their siblings and so on and so forth. That is why it is called chain migration. Each person is a potential link in a never-ending chain. The vast majority of people who immigrate to our country legally every single year do so for the sole reason that they just happen to be related to someone who is already here.

We have heard a lot of talk about the American dream in recent days—that we are a nation of immigrants; it is part of our core, and that is absolutely right. We are a nation of immigrants. We are a nation where blood ties are not supposed to dictate the path of your life, where you can fulfill your dreams. But we have an immigration system that does the exact opposite—an immigration system that favors the ties of blood, the ties of kinship, the ties of clan, and the ties of tribe. What could be less American than that?

As a result, we have also had a massive wave of low-skilled and unskilled immigrants, over the last 52 years. Today, of the million-plus immigrants who come here every year, only 1 in 15 comes here because of education, job skills, or a job offer. That means we have thousands and thousands of workers, with absolutely no consideration for what it means for the workers who are already here—the workers who are American citizens, who are earning a wage. In many cases, the most recent immigrants are going to face competition from the next wave of unskilled immigrants, so we are putting downward pressure on their wages—the wages of people who work with their hands and work on their feet, who hold the kinds of jobs that require you to take a shower after you get off work, not before you go to work.

Blue-collar workers have begun to see an increase in their wages over the last year for the first time in decades, and that is in no small part because of the administration's efforts to get immigration under control. But it is not enough to stop there.

The real question is, who should our immigration system work for? It should work for the American people, the American worker. It should be crafted for their benefit, not for the

benefit of foreigners. We should have an immigration system that fulfills the needs of our economy, that focuses on jobs and wages for American citizens here, whether your parents came over on the Mayflower or whether you just took the oath of citizenship last week. This is not some radical position. Liberal Democrats used to believe in that.

I understand that in this debate most of the attention is focused on the population of about 690,000 illegal immigrants who came here, through no fault of their own, as young children 15, 20, 30 years ago. I think the concern for them is very understandable. President Trump has shown it. My colleagues have shown it today. I share it as well.

President Obama did them a real disservice by unilaterally and unconstitutionally—therefore unsustainably—giving them legal status in this country to work. President Trump did the right thing by recognizing that President Obama lacked that authority and shouldn't have put them in that position. But nobody in the Senate—I think I can speak for my other 99 colleagues. Nobody is eager to see these people face deportation. Yet, at the same time, if we are going to give them legal status, we have to recognize that inevitably, as an operation of logic, there are two negative consequences that flow from that. You can say that you don't mind them, but you can't say that they don't exist.

First, as you have heard from so many others, you are going to encourage parents from around the world who live in poverty, oppression, strife, and war to illegally immigrate to this country with their small children in hopes of giving their children American citizenship sometime in the future. That is dangerous, and, in my opinion, it is immoral to offer those kind of inducements.

Second, as I have explained, you will create a whole new category of American citizens who can now get legal status for their extended families—to include the very parents who brought them here in violation of law in the first place. As part of this debate, we have often heard the old line that children ought not to pay for the crimes of the parents. Well, if that is the case, can't we at least agree that parents can pay for the crimes of the parents? They are the ones who created the situation in the first place.

President Trump has said, as I have noted, that he wants to protect the DACA population. But at the same time, he has said repeatedly: We must build a wall and secure our border and end chain migration. I agree that we have to build a wall on our border.

I have to say, it is a little amusing to see how our Democratic colleagues have changed their tune on this point. First, they were complaining for weeks that the President hadn't written a border security plan yet. They kept asking for a punch list. A punch list is what your contractor provides you when he is done building your home

but not quite done with every single technical spec. The administration provided that to them just last week.

Now they are complaining that it is too expensive: It is outrageous, in the words from the Senator from Illinois. I want to point out that although the President's proposal would cost \$18 billion—it is over 10 years, so \$1.8 billion a year—the Senator from Illinois has proposed a naked amnesty bill that would cost \$26 billion over 10 years. That is right; \$18 billion is too much to secure our southern border to build a wall and provide more agents and buy more technology, but \$26 billion to provide more welfare for illegal immigrants after they get amnesty is A-OK.

I would also point out that a lot of Democrats supported the Secure Fence Act just over a decade ago—building over 700 miles the physical barrier on our southern border. Maybe I can propose new grounds for starting negotiations. How about we simply agree as a baseline that we will fully fund the hundreds of miles of physical barriers that the Senate minority leader voted for just 12 years ago?

They also supported the so-called Gang of 8 bill 5 years ago, which also would have built hundreds of miles of physical barrier on our southern border. What has changed since then?

All that being said, building a wall will help stop illegal immigration, but it will not fix all the problems to the law itself. That is why I have said, as the President has said, we also have to deal with that second consequence—ending chain migration.

One trial balloon I have heard floated in recent days is that a negotiated piece of legislation could eliminate the immigration preference for the adult, unmarried kids of legal permanent residents, green card holders. That is perfectly fine. We should do that, for sure. But to act as if that alone would end chain migration is preposterous. It will delay a very small part of chain migration—only delay, only delay a very small part—about 26,000 of the more than 300,000 people who come here a year through family preferences. It doesn't even touch the preference for the adult, unmarried children of citizens or parents or siblings of citizens and green card holders alike.

In other words, once these young people in the DACA population become citizens, then they will be able to get legal status for their relatives, which means, far from stopping chain migration, it will actually accelerate the naturalization process and the chain we are trying to stop in the first place.

The time has come to end this foolish, unwise, and, indeed, dangerous policy, as we saw just a few weeks ago in the most recent attempted terror attack in New York, which had at its initiating point someone who had come into this country because of chain migration. Not a single advanced, industrialized nation has such a lax immigration policy as we do when it comes to immigrant families—not Canada,

not the United Kingdom, not France, not Germany, not New Zealand, not Japan.

If we are actually going to fix this problem—if we are going to do right by the American worker, if we are going to promote the American dream and American ideals, then it is time for these mindless family preferences and chain migration to come to an end.

I yield the floor, and I yield to my colleague from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, it is an interesting conversation we can finally have about immigration. This has been that topic which has been discussed for a while but not settled.

For 20 years, this body has talked about solving some of our immigration issues. National security immigration hasn't been a partisan issue until of late. Suddenly, when President Trump brings it up, we have a bunch of folks who used to be for border security but are now against border security because President Trump wants border security—with some of the exact same ideas that have been in the Gang of 8 bill or were in previous versions or were even talked about with a secure wall or fence before. Almost every Democrat in this body voted for the Secure Fence Act of 2006.

It is interesting to me the number of people who contact us saying: We do not want to build a wall. I have said: What about the 650 miles of wall that already exists and was put in place after 2006, which, by the way, President Obama, when he was Senator Obama, wholeheartedly supported and voted for?

This is suddenly a partisan issue. I am trying to help our entire body take a step back and say: Immigration should be a humanity issue and a legal issue, not a political issue.

I had a conversation with a friend of mine this weekend. We have known each other for years. He is a pastor. We started talking about the immigration issue. In that dialogue, he said to me: In the church, we look at every individual as an individual created in the image of God, and the church has a ministry to be able to reach out, regardless of legal status.

Then he said, right behind it: But, in government, we understand there is a different responsibility. The church engages with every person equally, but the government has the responsibility of looking at laws—what is legal and what is not legal—and helping abide by those laws and enforcing those laws.

He is correct. There is an issue of humanity in this. These are people caught in a system, and oftentimes those children in the DACA Program are caught in a gap in which literally they have no home country. They were brought as infants or as young children with a parent who violated the law but did so with a child who came in and has now lived in the country, in some cases 20 years, and they know only this coun-

try. They are literally caught in the middle. While we have great compassion, we are walking this interesting balance between compassion for people, which we as a nation have, and also consistency with the law. The law applies to every person. Whether you are the President of the United States or an undocumented individual who has come in, the law applies to everyone.

What do we do with this? The first thing I think we need to do is take a deep breath and pull the politics out of this and to say border security—in fact, security as a whole is not a controversial issue. I will tell you, as a U.S. Senator, I have the privilege occasionally of going to do interviews. Let me give you an example. CNN has a great studio in Washington, DC. When you go to the studio in Washington, DC, you go through the front door of a big building. There is a security person there, and they will check your ID before you go any farther. Not only will they check your ID, they make sure you are already preregistered to be there to visit with CNN because you can't just walk in. You have to notify them ahead of time you are coming, even if you are the person being interviewed. Then, there is a physical barrier between you and the elevators. Once the security guard clears you, you go through the physical barriers, but you can't go up the elevator because the security guard has to clear you to actually go up that elevator and punch in a certain code to go up to the floor. When you arrive at that floor, you are literally in nowhere land because everywhere around you are locked doors until someone comes in and clears you. You go to another security guard, and you sign in with that security guard, again check ID, and then you have an escort who takes you into the studio. That escort stays with you because as soon as your interview is done, they will smile at you and say: Your time is up. We are going to escort you out.

It is a shame CNN has to do that, but they do because not everybody who walks through their doors means to do them no harm. There are some people who mean to do them harm, and it is right for them to keep that level of security.

For that level of security that we talked about for CNN, all of us see that as rational—unfortunate but rational. I would say to us as a nation, why is that rational at CNN headquarters, and it is irrational for us to be able to do the same thing with our own borders? Not everyone who crosses our border is there to help us. We can all admit, there are some individuals—a few thankfully—who do mean to cross our borders and do us harm. We should be aware of that. We have half a million people a day who legally cross our border, our southern border, alone—half a million people a day who cross back and forth, who legally go through the system. They are doing commerce. They are visiting family. There are all

kinds of individuals who move back and forth through our gates legally every single day. We should ask the question: Why are half a million people moving through legally but yet there are thousands and thousands who are moving through illegally? What is the difference, and should we ask questions of some of those people? Should there be a physical barrier in some spots?

We have seen some places like in Yuma, AZ, when there wasn't a physical barrier and there is a large city right on the border and someone would cross the border quickly, commit a crime, and move right back across the border. When a physical barrier was put in place a decade ago in Yuma, AZ, the crime rate dropped dramatically in that area. The physical barrier helped and did reduce crime.

I have had people say, if you build a 30-foot wall, there will be a 31-foot ladder leaning against it. That is true, but it slows them down and gives enough time in remote areas or in heavily urbanized areas for people to be able to respond and be able to interdict those individuals. Walls don't stop people. They slow people down so you can actually do interdiction and ask: Why are you going over the wall rather than through the gates like half a million other people are doing today?

Why is that happening? That is not unreasonable, but it has become heavily politicized. We need to step back and remove this from a conversation about Presidents and about political parties and move it back to some basic, commonsense things—things this Congress used to do with wide, bipartisan support—things like a physical barrier. There should be a wall in certain areas of the southern border that don't have a wall right now. There should be areas of technology in other areas. There should be an area to have watch towers with cameras that are there. We should add some additional personnel. We are talking about 3,000-plus miles on our northern border, 2,000 miles on our southern border. That is a lot of territory to be able to cover. Some of those areas don't even have broadband access to it, so just getting information to the agents who work there takes a very long time or is unreliable. We do need to have some technology improvements in some of those areas. Should every part of our border have a wall? No, I don't think so. It shouldn't all have a wall, but in heavily populated areas, it probably should because that provides greater security, quite frankly, on both sides of the border.

Some of it is even more simple than that. There are areas where there are large amounts of cane that is growing up in the Rio Grande River, and the Border Patrol agents can't see on both sides of the river who is moving through because people can hide in the cane. Just eradicating the cane that is all through that area on the border, in the river area, would provide tremendous visibility. That would allow people to be able to see farther and, quite

frankly, stop some of the drug movement and allow for more interdiction in those areas. It shouldn't be that controversial. That should be common sense—adding technology, adding sensors, adding greater visibility, adding a wall in areas where a wall is needed, and in other areas that don't need a wall, we don't.

That is not just the issue. Some of the issue is fixing loopholes in the law that get exploited. There are some individuals who cross the border, and they know the rules. The coyotes in Central America who are actually humans smuggling them all the way through Mexico and getting them to the border have told them exactly what to say. When they encounter a Border Patrol agent, they say: Say these words, and you will get access to asylum, whether they are true or not.

The way it typically starts is, they say those words the coyotes have told them to say, and they actually get a quick hearing and what is called a notice to appear for another hearing, which is usually 2 or 2½ years later. They disappear somewhere into the American system, and we have no idea where they are. They are somewhere among 300-plus million Americans in some town, and we don't know where they are. The vast majority of them never show up for the court hearings, but they have a piece of paper that says "notice to appear," which also means they are given legal protections until that court date, and they can move around the country.

That is a loophole in our system. It should be fixed. Nowhere else would they do that. Why do we do that? We allow ourselves to be exploited. There are some words and phrases that we need to be able to clean up in the law and some things that need to be done. Again, that shouldn't be controversial. It should be security related. There should be some basic questions about how we are going to handle immigration.

We allow 1 million people a year to become citizens of the United States legally—1 million people a year. Yet the American system is also ignoring hundreds of thousands of others who are coming into the system illegally and pretending it is not happening. It is. For 20 years, this Congress has not paid attention to it.

Say what you would like to about President Trump, but he is pushing this Congress to do something it has not done in two decades—deal with the issue of border security. This body will have to come to agreement on that. The House of Representatives will have to come to agreement on that, and the President will have to be able to sign it or it will be just another Executive action that will not last very long. If we are going to have lasting, real change in border security, it has to go through the legislative process.

The President is pushing us to get that done before the first week of March. We had 6 months of time. Four

months of that has already run out. It is time to get that document finished, to deal with the basic things the President has asked for—border security, a legal status for those individuals who are in the DACA Program whom the previous President just put into deferred action status—that we will not arrest them, but they are in some sort of legal limbo in between. President Trump wants to have a permanent answer for all of those families. Dealing with things on border security, not just the wall but the other exceptions to it. The President wants to deal with the visa lottery, which is a system where the names of 50,000 people somewhere in the world are just randomly drawn out of a hat to be able to become American citizens.

Many of us said for a long time, that is a foolish way to do your immigration system. Our immigration system should be based on what we need in America—what jobs, what locations—rather than randomly pulling names of people around the world out of a hat. I understand there are millions and millions of people around the world who would love to be Americans, but in America, we want to be able to target those individuals who want to not just be Americans but want to be a part of us, not just culturally but economically, to be part of the fabric of whom we are, to make decisions for ourselves as a nation, and to do it not just in our own policy but also our own immigration policy. It is not too much to ask.

There are basic things that should be done. Dealing with the DACA students who are literally caught in a place where they have no home is a compassionate thing to do, but along with our compassion, we also need to uphold the law. Those kids should not be held to account for what their parents did, but their parents should not have the same access to the American system of being naturalized as the kids do—only because the parents did intentionally violate the law. They chose to break the law and bring their child with them when they did it. The child didn't make that decision. Now they are growing up in a place where they have no country. They should have a shot at being in our Nation. I do not believe the parents of those kids—who broke the law—should have that same access to our system. That may seem heartless, but I will tell you, that is the balance we have to have between compassion for people and upholding the law; that the law does apply to all people. Maybe there is a way to do some other work permits or some other things that could be there, but access to citizenship should be reserved for those individuals who are upholding the law, not violating it.

There are some DACA kids who have done some remarkable stuff, some DACA kids who are pretty amazing individuals. I ask folks in Oklahoma when I am home, if I could identify for you 700,000 people somewhere around the world who speak English, who are excellent students, who have stood up

every day in their school and pledged allegiance to the United States of America, who are in our military already, who are already working in our economy right now, are those the individuals you want to reach out to and be part of that 1 million people a year who become citizens? I have yet to have someone tell me: No, that is not whom we are looking for. Everyone says: That is exactly whom we are looking for.

I get to smile at them and say: They are already here. They just happen to have grown up in this country already, but they have no home and would love to call this one their home.

I would like to give them the opportunity to earn the ability to be naturalized—not automatic, to earn it—and go through the process, to get in line like every other person around the world, to get in line but not have to return to their home country because they don't know a home country, but get in line here to do it.

There is a way to be able to do this. The President has been the first advocate for that. There is a way to be able to actually answer the problems we have dealt with for 20 years on border security so we don't continue to have another DACA Program in 5 years, in 10 years, and over and over again as we are right now. Let's solve it.

Interestingly enough, in 2012, when President Obama announced the DACA Program, he made some pretty blunt, clear statements during that time period. One of them was, for individuals—this was in June of 2012—who are already here, he set a date. He said: For those individuals, our Nation wants to provide an opportunity to not be arrested, and we will work on your status, but for any future individuals who cross our border, you will not have access to this program.

That is President Obama who made that statement in 2012. While I have heard individuals say we should abide by the words of our Presidents, when President Obama made those statements to those kids in 2012, I would remind us as a nation, we should honor all of those statements, if we do any of those statements, including President Obama's statements saying that this will end, and people who are crossing our border will be returned to their home country.

As he announced publicly, there is a right way to be able to do immigration. Let's do it the right way. We already receive 1 million a year. Let's do it the right way, and you will find a very welcoming United States of America.

That is where I think we can go, and I hope in the days ahead we can finish out a negotiation and be able to resolve some basic things—not everything in immigration but at least the core issues of immigration and border security so we can resolve the issue not only for the kids in DACA but continue to be able to work on how we are securing our Nation for the future.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAN

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, before I turn to the main portion of my remarks, I wish to speak briefly on the situation in the Middle East.

The protests across cities in Iran reflect the failed leadership of a corrupt regime. The Ayatollah's negligence in denying the basic rights of his own people is inexcusable. Instead of allocating resources to care for families in need, the regime has chosen to use what economic gains it has accrued through the Iran deal to fund terrorism and sectarian violence in Syria, Yemen, Lebanon, and elsewhere in the region. I stand with the Iranian people in their demand for prosperity and freedom, and I call upon my colleagues in Congress to do the same.

REMEMBERING THOMAS S. MONSON

Madam President, I wish to devote the remainder of my remarks to honoring the memory of a dear friend, President Thomas S. Monson, a beloved leader whose love for God and his fellow man defined a lifetime of selfless service. President Monson passed away quietly last week, with friends and family gathered by his bedside.

Today, I join millions across the globe in mourning the loss of an extraordinary man whom, as members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, we have long looked upon as a prophet, seer, and revelator. I also wish to extend my deepest sympathies to President Monson's family, especially his children—Thomas, Ann, and Clark. Although we are saddened by President Monson's passing, we take comfort in knowing that he has been reunited with his wife Frances, his lifelong friend and eternal companion.

President Monson was born in Salt Lake City in 1927 to G. Spencer Monson and Gladys Condie Monson. Growing up during the Great Depression, young Tom was greatly influenced by his parents, who taught him the importance of taking care of others. From an early age, Tom displayed a remarkable concern for the most vulnerable among us, and throughout his life, he showed that concern and worked on solving problems for them.

When Tom was just a boy, he had two beloved pet rabbits, to which he tended every day, but when he heard of a destitute family in his neighborhood, a family so down on their luck that they had nothing to eat for Christmas dinner, Tom did what few little boys would ever do: He gave his two pet rabbits to his neighbors so they could have a nice Christmas meal. Yet, when little Tommy returned home to see his empty rabbit hutch, tears filled his

eyes, but these were tears of gratitude for the joy he had felt in helping others. Selflessness, service, and sacrifice—these would soon become the virtues by which Thomas Monson lived his life, and everybody who knew him knows that.

Following graduation from West High School, President Monson attended the University of Utah, where he met Frances Johnson during his freshman year. Around the same time, he joined the U.S. Navy and served in the waning days of World War II. After the war, he graduated cum laude from the University of Utah with a bachelor's degree in business management. Shortly thereafter, he married Frances in the Salt Lake Temple.

Following graduation, President Monson was hired by the Deseret News to work in the paper's advertising department. He worked in various positions for the newspaper and eventually became the general manager of the Deseret Press.

As he was just beginning his professional career, President Monson was called at the exceptionally young age of 22 to be a bishop of a Mormon congregation. That hardly ever happens in the LDS Church. In this position, he was charged with leading a congregation of more than 1,000 members. Then, at the age of 31, Tom was again called to a leadership position typically reserved for older men when he was asked to serve as president of the LDS mission in Canada and preside over a whole raft of young missionaries. When he was only 36, Tom was called as a member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, among the most influential positions in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. In 2008, he was sustained as president of the church, overseeing the day-to-day operations of a faith with millions of followers. The church witnessed record growth during his tenure as president, with more than 2 million men and women joining the ranks of converts of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Whether as a prophet, as an apostle, as a mission president, or as a friend, President Monson simply took care of people. One particular story stands out among the rest. When he was a young bishop, there were 84 widows in his congregation. During the Christmas holiday, he would visit each and every one of them, ensuring that they were all provided with a good holiday meal. Even after President Monson was released as bishop, he continued to stay in contact with each one of these widows—writing letters, making phone calls, and frequently visiting them in their homes. In fact, President Monson remained so close with each of these 84 widows that he eventually spoke at all of their funerals. That is a real record.

President Monson's example of intimate, individual ministry underscored what was most remarkable about his leadership. Although he presided over a church of millions, his focus was always on the one. Although tasked with