

can have a chance to earn citizenship. As for the parents of these young immigrants, nobody can deny the fact that they did break the law, and any bipartisan proposal on DACA cannot and will not reward them for this behavior.

I agree with the President when he said that dealing with DACA is a very difficult subject but that we must do so with heart. I believe that has been the case for those in this Chamber who have tried for 16 years to get a solution for these kids.

We have to prioritize border security measures, obviously, to determine which ones are sensible to include in a DACA measure. We will go beyond simply dealing with these DACA kids with some border security measures, but we have to find out which ones are sensible and make sense to include in this limited measure and table those that should be considered for the future.

I have been part of comprehensive immigration reform efforts in the past. I look forward to being part of comprehensive immigration reform efforts later this year, but this is not that. We have a very specific purpose to achieve before the 5th of March. The commitment we got was to have a bipartisan bill on the Senate floor by January 31. I believe we need to have that in order to have enough runway to get this done by March 5.

The White House, after much urging on our part, finally sent a list over as to what should be considered part of the border security plan. As I mentioned, many of these items need to be addressed. Maybe all of the items need to be addressed, but they need to be addressed as part of a larger, more comprehensive effort, not the limited fix we are going to do before March 5. I am all in when it comes to comprehensive immigration reform. I look forward to that debate. But we have to understand that we can't do it all before March 5 if we are going to protect these kids.

Some will say: Well, we get to March 5, if we can't do it, then we just kick the can down the road again with some other protection.

I think the courts have made it clear that what was done prior to this—the DACA Program itself—was not constitutional, and should we simply say we are going to extend that program now, it would be found unconstitutional by the courts. This is a real deadline, and we have to meet it. We have to focus specifically on protecting these DACA recipients. I think Republicans, Democrats, and the President all want this. The question is, Are we going to, just over the next couple of weeks, talk about bigger, broader issues that need to be dealt with but have no chance of being part of legislation?

In 2013, I participated in what was called the Gang of 8. We negotiated for 7 straight months nearly every night. We were in Washington. We as Members negotiated—and our staffs did as well—much longer hours and into the

weekends. Then we brought that piece of legislation to the Judiciary Committee, where we debated it for a couple of weeks. I think we amended it more than 100 times. Then we brought it to the House floor for another couple of weeks and amended it several more times before passing it by a vote of 68 to 32. That was a long process—hard-fought compromises in that legislation. To suggest that we can go through a similar effort in the next couple of weeks—it simply isn't going to happen. The list the White House brought forward is simply something that we ought to consider for comprehensive reform but not for this specific fix.

With regard to the border itself, we all know that we need additional infrastructure on the border. I represent Arizona. We have some 375 miles of border. Some of the border has good barriers in terms of fences. The closest thing we have approximating a wall is these old landing strips from World War II that we put on their end and cemented in. They are opaque. You can't really see through them. We have them in a number of the communities along the border. We have been taking them out because they are not very effective and putting fences in place of them because we need to have visibility to the other side of the border.

Most of what the President is talking about along the southern border is a fence. We do need more fences. In the Gang of 8 bill, I think we authorized 700 miles of additional and improved fencing. Nobody is suggesting we don't need additional infrastructure or barriers on the border. The question is, How much do we provide for it in this legislation?

The President has made a request in the budget for about \$1.6 billion for the coming year. I think that will result in about 74 miles of fence between Texas and California. I think that is a good place to start. How much we authorize going forward will be very much in debate.

I know that during the campaign, the President talked long and hard about building a wall, but every time he mentioned building a wall, he talked about Mexico paying for it. We all know—and many of us knew at the time—Mexico was not going to pay for that wall. They are not. That is why the President is asking for \$18 billion of U.S. taxpayer money to fund that wall. To suggest that the President hasn't changed his position and that we are dealing with a proposal that we have known was coming from the White House simply isn't true. It has changed. The President initially said that Mexico would pay for it. That is not the case. The U.S. taxpayers are going to pay for any infrastructure on the border. That is as it should be. If we are putting up the border fence, we ought to pay for it. To suggest that nobody has changed their position is simply not true.

Deals like this where you need 60 votes necessarily involve compromise.

No party, no individual is going to get everything they want. The White House will not get everything they want. The Democrats in Congress will not, and neither will the Republicans. This will be a compromise.

I am simply suggesting tonight—let's get real about the time involved between now and when we have to fix this and not think that we can simply kick the can down the road and put in some temporary fix, some kind of bridge later that will protect these kids. Those protections will run out on March 5 and may be done at that point. Let's get serious. Let's all get serious, Republicans and Democrats, and not come to the table with unrealistic expectations about what can be done and what can be part of this legislation. Let's have something that we can put on the Senate floor by the end of the month to leave sufficient time to get this fixed by March 5. I hope we can all work together on this, Republicans and Democrats.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to talk about another matter that will be before us in the days ahead. It should not be before us as it should have been done many months ago. In fact, if you want to count it by days, it should have been done about 100 days ago, as we have heard. That is the Children's Health Insurance Program, known by the acronym CHIP.

Most Americans know what the CHIP program is. It is a program that became Federal law a little more than 20 years ago in order to provide an opportunity for healthcare for those families whose incomes were a little bit too high, maybe, to have their children enrolled in Medicaid but those families did not have their children's healthcare paid for by their employers. You had a lot of families—a lot of middle-income families or families near middle income—who were caught in between and didn't have opportunities for healthcare. So CHIP was passed. For the most part, it was bipartisan. All of these years now—decades later—it remains bipartisan, but it is not reauthorized. Probably, the only two numbers I will get into tonight are 9 and 180. What do I mean by that? I will start with Pennsylvania.

So "180" means 180,000. That is the number of children, roughly, who were enrolled in the Children's Health Insurance Program as of December of 2017. If you look at it over the course of a year—of children becoming eligible and then maybe moving off of CHIP to some other insurance or having other changes—in Pennsylvania, roughly, in the last year, 340,000 children benefited, at one time or another, but the monthly number was 180,000 children just in

Pennsylvania, and “9” was representative of the 9 million children across the country who were enrolled in CHIP. When we have all of these debates about what has to get done in the next couple of days and between now and the middle part of January, I hope that 9 million number will be uppermost in people’s minds. Included within that are 180,000 children in Pennsylvania.

This is really not about a number or a program. It is about real people, real people’s lives. Every Member of the Senate has a constituent he could tell a story about or hundreds, if not thousands, of stories. I will just tell one tonight about a mom whom I met not too long ago, just about a week ago, Jennie Sheeks. Jennie is from Upper Makefield, PA. That is Bucks County, Southeastern Pennsylvania, just north of the city of Philadelphia.

Jennie told us about her son Kam-au. Kam-au is 8 years old, and he is enrolled in the Children’s Health Insurance Program. His brother and his sister have special needs and are Medicaid beneficiaries. So, in one family, you have an example of one child, thankfully, benefiting from the CHIP program and then two other members of that same family benefiting either from CHIP or the Medicaid Program. Thank goodness those programs are in place. Without CHIP and Medicaid, Jennie said her children would be uninsured because, even though both Jennie and her husband work full time, covering the whole family on her plan is too expensive.

This is another example of working families who depend upon these programs for their children. They need these programs. These programs aren’t theoretical. They aren’t some far-off Washington debate about timing and leverage and negotiations and back-and-forth. This is about their real lives right now. As I said, the CHIP program should have been reauthorized 100 days ago, and it is inexcusable that it is not being done now.

We all left here right after the tax vote. Everybody went back to his home State and, I am sure, had a great holiday season. Unfortunately, even though there was a little bit of a patch—a tiny, little patch made for this program—a lot of people left here with no worries at all and went back to their States and communities and neighborhoods, where there were a lot of other people worrying about whether they were going to get the kind of coverage for their children they should have a right to expect.

Back to Jennie and her son. What are they going to do without the Children’s Health Insurance Program? I cannot imagine—and few Senators or House Members can imagine—how Jennie and her son will get from here to there without having the Children’s Health Insurance Program. I cannot imagine what it must be like for Jennie to worry about how she will pay for her son’s care if he loses CHIP coverage. No parent should have that kind of stress

in his life when there is an existing program that covers 9 million kids that should be reauthorized.

When he was a public official, my father used to talk about people who had led lives of real struggle. We have all known them in our lives—people who have to work every day just to make ends meet in order to provide for their families and get through another day, another week, another month, another pay period. He used to refer to those Americans as leading “quietly triumphant lives.” My father’s words for those who struggle—“quietly triumphant lives.”

There are a lot of families out there who lead very difficult lives, and they depend sometimes on the Children’s Health Insurance Program or Medicaid or some other program just to get through another week, and I think about Jennie and parents like her who have to overcome so much to help their children—to love them, to care for them, to protect them, and to educate them. Even the most loving, caring, hard-working, and dedicated parent cannot provide the protections and the care health insurance coverage and quality healthcare can provide, the kind of quality healthcare from professionals that comes to that child because he or she has the protection of health insurance. Those parents—no matter how much they work, no matter how good they are to their children—sometimes cannot provide something as basic, obviously, as healthcare and, of course, the insurance coverage that makes it possible.

We have legislation ready today, the KIDS Act, that is bipartisan. It has already moved through the Finance Committee unanimously. I don’t think there was a single vote against it. If there was, it was not that loud a vote. I hope we can make these children a priority in the coming days, finally, at long last.

There were a lot of deals made in the tax bill, a lot of numbers moved around to get the tax bill done. I understand that is part of any legislation, but if a tax bill can get done in the U.S. Senate, we can certainly have a vote to get the Children’s Health Insurance Program reauthorized now that it is 100 days old.

I see the distinguished majority leader is here so I will wrap up tonight with the words of Jennie’s son Kam-au:

I was happy when I got health insurance because I knew I could go to the doctor if I got hurt or sick. When I didn’t have health insurance, I was a little worried . . . I think we should keep CHIP going so we can stay healthy.

No better words were uttered or spoken about the Children’s Health Insurance Program than Kam-au’s, an 8-year-old, who said CHIP should stay in place so we can stay healthy.

I agree. The American people agree. Let’s get CHIP done.

I yield the floor.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15

p.m. tomorrow, all postcloture time on the Campbell nomination be considered expired and the Senate vote on confirmation of the Campbell nomination with no intervening action or debate; finally, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent due to a flight cancellation out of my control when the Senate voted on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 370.

On this vote, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 370.●

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

MACOMB COUNTY, MICHIGAN, BICENTENNIAL

• Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I am proud to pay special tribute today to the people of Macomb County, MI, who are celebrating their county’s bicentennial this year.

The people of Macomb County symbolize the history, sacrifices, and character of people all across our country who have helped create the American middle class. They represent America’s diverse history of immigrants coming to this country to find the American dream. When it comes to hard work, the people of Macomb County are second to none. The county’s rich history has created a resilient people who put family, faith, and community first in their lives.

Macomb County was founded on January 15, 1818. Located on the shores of Lake St. Clair, the county is named in honor of General Alexander Macomb, a veteran of the War of 1812. The county was the third county founded in Michigan and, today, is Michigan’s third most populous county.

Macomb County is known for its innovation and impressive manufacturing might. It is a backbone of the American automotive industry. Fiat