

which means new jobs for local workers.

There are all of the companies that are boosting their base wages: Bank of Hawaii; Charter Communications, Incorporated; Berkshire Hills Bancorp; Rod's Harvest Foods in St. Ignatius, MT; Walmart; Cigna Corporation; Great Western Bancorp in my home State of South Dakota; Webster Financial Corporation; Capital One; Humana. The list keeps going and going and going.

Then there are the companies that are increasing their 401(k) matches, boosting wages, creating or expanding parental leave benefits, and improving health benefits.

Tax reform is already working for American workers, and as the benefits of tax reform accrue, we can expect more jobs, more benefits, higher wages, and more opportunities for American workers in the future. That is what tax reform was designed to do—to unleash the entrepreneurial spirit in this country and provide incentives for American businesses to expand and grow their businesses. In doing that, they will create those better paying jobs, those higher wages, and a better standard of living for American workers and American families. It is having the desired effect, and we are seeing it every single day in this country.

This is not only a short-term thing; this will have a long-term effect and be a change that will be good for the American economy and American workers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, about 20 minutes ago, our majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, tried to move debate along on an immigration bill, and I am puzzled that our minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, objected. The reason I am puzzled is, for a long period of time—maybe 10 years—some of the Senators on the other side of the aisle and even some Senators on our side of the aisle have been advocating for giving certainty to the young people who have been brought here by their parents whom we call either Dreamers or DACA people. They have been advocating for giving them legalization.

The majority leader, 2 weeks ago, promised the minority an opportunity to have a debate on that issue—the first debate on immigration since 2013, I believe. The majority leader, today, tried to carry out that promise and get this bill moving, and we had this objection. It is very puzzling.

I think it is legitimate to ask the minority leader, in his objecting to a unanimous consent agreement, why the objection is coming with regard to the very debate that he has, on his side of the aisle, been demanding of the majority for a long period of time. Hasn't the minority leader and the entire Democratic Party been asking for this debate? Yes, they have been.

Leader MCCONNELL has honored his commitment and allowed us to have an open, fair immigration debate this week. The key words are an "immigration debate," not a DACA-only debate, not an amnesty-only debate but an immigration debate. An immigration debate has to include a discussion about enforcement measures. An immigration debate has to include a discussion about how to remove dangerous criminal aliens from our country. A real immigration debate has to include discussions about how to protect the American people.

The leader has asked unanimous consent to allow us to start debating these issues, and the Democrats are refusing. Puzzling, I say it is, because they have been the ones to demand this debate. Why don't they want to debate things like sanctuary cities, as one example, which was asked for? Are they unprepared to discuss the vital public safety issues or is it more likely they are worried that some bills on enforcement on this side of the aisle could actually pass? Maybe that is the case, but it is no reason not to allow this body to start debate on this very important issue.

The American people deserve a real immigration debate about the four pillars we agreed to at the White House and not just a debate about the Democrats' preferred policy preferences. Yes, DACA is an important part of that discussion, but it is only one part. If the Democrats are insisting that we debate their preferred policies only, that is not a real debate at all.

We have filed an amendment that takes into consideration the four pillars that were agreed to at a bicameral, bipartisan meeting at the White House, with the President presiding on January 9. Those four pillars include: legalization and a path to citizenship, border security, the elimination of chain migration, and, fourthly, the elimination of the diversity visa lottery. Those all fit in, maybe not in detail and exactly the way the President might want it, but they fit into the four pillars as to which he said he would sign a piece of legislation.

I suggest to my other 99 colleagues that there is a provision that can pass the U.S. Senate, pass the House of Representatives, and be signed by the President of the United States because he has said he agrees with those principles. Other people have bills but not bills that can become law based upon what the President will sign or not sign.

Again, I think it is very puzzling that the Democratic leadership will not allow this debate to go forward, for it is something they have been asking for. More importantly, maybe it is quite the surprise that the majority leader would allow this debate to move forward, but that is how a consensus was met about 2 weeks ago on the issue of opening up government and having this debate and moving forward to a budget agreement. Those things have

been done. Now the leader is carrying out his promise. I hope the other side will agree to move ahead.

RECESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:28 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

BROADER OPTIONS FOR AMERICANS ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as people around the Nation listen to this floor debate, I am sure they can hear the divisions about immigration loud and clear. I know I can. Immigration policy is hard, it is emotional, and it has vexed this Congress for decades.

While the floor debate we are having right now can be trying and can be thrown off-kilter by one more ill-timed tweet from the President, we have to keep our eyes on the ball because as tough as it may seem right here, the stakes are so much higher for millions of people who live every day in this country, trapped in a broken immigration system. They face the constant fear of deportation, and they suffer from the threat of being ripped apart from their families, their friends, and the communities that they love.

Just like the deep divisions we see on this issue across the country, finding a path forward in the Senate, in the House, and all the way to the White House is not going to be easy, but tackling the tough issues and engaging in fair and honest debate is why we are here. Creating a more perfect union is why we are here. Finding a bipartisan path forward both to secure our borders and protect the futures of so many hard-working families is why we are here.

First, we have to agree to some basic truths. To start, Dreamers—hundreds of thousands of our friends and neighbors, our teachers, firefighters, service-members, and students—are not criminals. They are not MS-13 gang members nor are they the shadowy pictures depicted in disgusting campaign ads in the President's speeches.

They are not a drain on our economy. In fact, Dreamers are just the opposite, contributing in countless ways to our communities and enriching the lives of so many others.

So who are Dreamers?

Dreamers are determined; they are passionate; they are American in every way except on paper. They are fighting for the only lives they have ever known. They are fighting for their loved ones with everything they have, and they are trying to do it the right way.

A few years back, when Congress had fallen down on its job to fix the broken immigration system, Dreamers stepped up to work in good faith with the Federal Government—Dreamers like Jose Manuel Vasquez, who grew up in south Seattle. He didn't know he was not a natural born citizen until he went to get a driver's license. Thanks to the DACA Program, Jose Manuel was able to graduate from the University of Washington. He started a tech business, and he volunteers at local nonprofits.

Another Dreamer who grew up in Pasco, WA, described being 4 years old when he was taken to the airport to fly to the United States. He said that he was so young, he didn't understand what was going on. He only recalls being confused about why he couldn't bring all of his toys with him to his new home in America. Years later, after he enrolled in DACA, he said that he was able to quit working in manual labor and start working as a personal banker at Wells Fargo.

There are hundreds of thousands of Dreamers with similar stories. They came out of the shadows. They paid their taxes. They kept promises. They underwent background checks and did the hard work, even if only for a temporary shot at the opportunity so many others in this country have taken for granted.

What Dreamers are is the embodiment of so much of what this country was founded on. That is truth No. 1.

Truth No. 2: We all want to keep America safe, with commonsense border security measures, and for anyone to claim otherwise is merely making an attempt to muddy the debate so that critics can retreat to their partisan corners, fall back on hateful rhetoric, and try to stop a bipartisan bill from actually moving forward.

The reality is, no matter what political party you ascribe to, protecting and defending the safety of fellow citizens and preventing those who could do us harm from entering this country is something we all believe in and something we are all working for, which leads me to truth No. 3; that is, despite failed attempts in the past, today is a new day and a new chance to finally fix our broken immigration system for the Dreamers who call our country home. It is a new chance to honor our country's rich tradition of welcoming people from around the world who add to the rich tapestry of our Nation, who enrich our communities, and who will write the next chapter of our Nation's history. It is a new chance for my Republican colleagues to stand by their word and do what they said—work with Democrats in good faith to find a bipartisan path forward that will allow Dreamers to stay here in the country they call home.

I hope Congress finally has the will to see this through, to be a nation of laws and a land of opportunity. With the right piece of legislation, we can do both.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday we began floor debate on something that we have literally been talking about for years. I remember, after the election of 2012, meeting at the White House with then-President Barack Obama, with Speaker of the House Boehner, Leader MCCARTHY, Senator MCCONNELL, and others. The President was prepared to do something he had threatened to do, which we actually asked him not to do, and that is, to try to take unilateral Executive action to deal with the issue of these young adults who came with their parents, when they were children, into the United States in violation of our immigration laws.

We said: Please, President Obama, give us a chance to work with you to come up with a solution.

He listened and said: No. I am going to sign an Executive order or action, and I am going to go this alone.

Well, unfortunately for the young people who were the beneficiaries of this DACA Executive order, the court struck it down, so they were left in doubt and in some jeopardy, wondering, now that they had been granted a deferred action against deportation by President Obama, what their future would look like. So President Trump, upon the advice of General Kelly, who was then Secretary of Homeland Security, said: Give the Congress some time to deal with this.

Indeed, here we are with a deadline of March 5. All of the time that this President has been in office—since January 20 of last year—this has been basically living on borrowed time insofar as the DACA Program is involved. President Trump quite appropriately said that this is a legislative responsibility and that Congress needs to deal with this.

Well, here we are. The debate actually began on February 8, which is the date that Senator MCCONNELL, the Senate majority leader, agreed to initiate the motion to proceed on the debate. Of course, you will remember what happened. The government was shut down because our Democratic colleagues refused to proceed to deal with the continuing resolution for funding the government until there was some resolution of this DACA issue. So the majority leader said: We are going to deal with it starting February 8 if there is no other agreement, and it is going to be a fair and impartial process. Everybody's ideas are going to be aired, and people should be able to vote on those ideas.

Well, here we are. We started yesterday with cloture on the bill. Now,

under the Senate rule, there are 30 hours that will expire tonight at 11 p.m. or thereabouts, and we are waiting on our colleagues across the aisle to begin this process that they were so eager to initiate that they shut down the government.

So far, the majority leader came to the floor and made an offer at about noon today, saying: We will start with a vote on an amendment of your choosing, and then we will go to one of our choosing. We will go back and forth and have an orderly process so I can follow through on my commitment to keep a fair, equal, and orderly process.

Well, even though they were willing to shut down the government to bring us to this point, now they seem to be incredibly reluctant to actually have a vote on any of their proposals. It really is bizarre.

We all want a solution for these young adults. In America, we don't punish children for the mistakes their parents made, and we are not going to punish these young people, who are now adults, who have been able to go to college and, in many instances, become very productive people. We want to provide them an opportunity to flourish. Indeed, the President—notwithstanding the fact that 690,000 DACA recipients currently exist, he said: I will be willing to up that number to everybody who is eligible, whether or not they signed up. That is 1.8 million young people. Do you know what? We are not only going to give them deferred action, we are going to give them an opportunity to become Americans.

It is incredibly generous, but our colleagues across the aisle seem to be tripped up by their own plan and unable to respond to this generous offer.

The President has said: In return for the 1.8 million young people who will have a pathway to citizenship and predictability and stability and a great future for their lives, we are going to have to secure the border. We are going to have to do the sorts of things the Federal Government should have done a long time ago.

Coming from Texas, a border State, we have 1,200 miles of common border with Mexico. As we heard this morning in the world threats hearing in the Senate Intelligence Committee, the Director of National Intelligence said the transnational criminal organizations or cartels, which are commodity agnostic—they make money trafficking in people, drugs, or other contraband, and they are exploiting the porous nature of our border with our neighbor to the south, Mexico. Indeed, Central American countries are sending even their young children up to the border, exploiting a loophole in our law.

The President has also said that in addition to dealing with border security, he wants to change legal immigration to focus on the nuclear family—mom and dad and the kids. If other people want to come to the United States, then they can qualify

for various employment-based visas. They can come study as a student. They can come as a tourist. They can qualify for an H-1B visa as somebody who is highly skilled. There are other ways to come. But we are going to limit the number of visas and green cards based strictly on your family relationships.

Then the President said that he wanted to deal with the diversity lottery visa. This is perhaps the most difficult to understand visa our government issues. Basically, what we say is that there are 50,000 diversity visas, and for those countries that aren't otherwise represented, we are going to sort of spread those like bread on the water and welcome 50,000 people without regard to their background, their education, their other merits or qualifications.

Some have said, like the President—and I agree with him—that we ought to look at not only how immigrants can benefit from coming to the United States but also what qualities they have that they can bring us. Yes, we ought to compete for the best and brightest—for example, the 600,000 or so foreign students who come to our colleges and universities. What about focusing on those who graduate in STEM fields—science, technology, engineering, and math. There have been some folks who have said: Well, we ought to staple a green card to those people because we want to continue to attract the best and the brightest. We don't want to train them, educate them, and send them home, only to compete with us.

Well, those are some great ideas. We are not going to be able to have votes on bills unless our friends across the aisle will agree to get onto a bill. Preferably it is the bill that Senator GRASSLEY and others, including myself, have cosponsored, which will be filed this afternoon, based on those four pillars.

Coming from a border State, I have spent quite a bit of time in the Rio Grande Valley, down in Laredo, and over in El Paso, and I have learned a lot from the experts at the border, who would be the Border Patrol agents themselves. I have talked to people like Manny Padilla, who is the chief Border Patrol officer in the Rio Grande Valley, which is one of the most active regions in the country. His sector, at times, has been one of the busiest in the country, with some 200,000 apprehensions a year just in the Rio Grande Valley itself. I have seen the border firsthand, of course. It is vast, and the terrain varies widely, from portions where the Rio Grande River flows strongly, to ones where it has dried up, where there is hardly any water at all separating Mexico and the United States, and still others that include 3,200-foot cliffs along the riverbank, particularly out in the Big Bend area of West Texas.

I have also had the opportunity to welcome many of my colleagues who

don't come from border States to my State so they could become better informed about the nature and the challenge of border security. When you spend time there and speak to the local officials and people who live and work along the border, you realize the scale of the challenge we are facing in securing the border, as well as combating the cartels and people who are importing poison into the United States and unfortunately taking far too many lives as the result of drugs. You realize that a one-size-fits-all approach doesn't work. Generations of Texans know that too.

People who live in border communities are an invaluable resource, and we ought to be talking to them about what would work best to provide the security in a way that would also be helpful to their local community. I have mentioned before one of those down in Hidalgo, TX, where the Border Patrol said: We need some physical barriers to help control the flow of illegal immigration across the border.

The local community said: Well, we need to improve the flood levee system so that we can actually buy affordable insurance, so that we can develop our property at a reasonable cost.

Out of that came a bond election for a levee wall system that was a win-win. It provided the flood protection needed by the community, and it provided the physical barrier that the Border Patrol said they needed in order to control illegal immigration.

So there is an opportunity for a win-win here if we will just listen to the experts and we will talk to the local stakeholders and the people who live, work, and play along our border with Mexico.

I have also had many conversations with Hispanic leaders from across my State. One of them is my friend Roger Rocha, the president of the League of United Latin American Citizens, or LULAC, who has been courageous in putting his reputation on the line in order to find common ground and give DACA recipients an opportunity not only to stay and work but to eventually become American citizens.

Well, yesterday, I said there will be a process that is fair to everybody—that is what the majority leader guaranteed—and all of our colleagues will have a chance to have their proposals considered. Amendments will have a 60-vote threshold before they can be adopted. That is the rule of the Senate. What I am interested in is solving the problem, and that means not only finding a proposal that can get 60 votes in the Senate but one that can pass the House and be signed into law by the President.

I read this morning—when I got up and was making a cup of coffee and looking through the newspaper—that our colleague across the aisle, the Democratic whip, whom I have worked with and met with on this topic many times, said his goal was to get all the Democrats and 11 Republicans to get to

that 60-vote threshold. That was his goal in this legislation. What is missing is how he would propose to get this passed through the Republican majority in the House and signed by the President if it doesn't comply with the President's requirements that he laid out in his four pillars. I am not interested in a futile act; I am interested in actually making a law, which means passing the Senate, passing the House, and getting signed into law by the President.

Yesterday, a group led by Chairman GRASSLEY of the Judiciary Committee put forth a proposal that I believe can pass the Senate, can pass the House, and can be signed into law by President Trump. It is called the Secure and Succeed Act. The name itself is quite fitting. We have to secure the border, and we have to be able to provide for the future success of DACA recipients. It is not one or the other; it is both. The Secure and Succeed proposal provides a pathway to citizenship, like the President proposed, for 1.8 million DACA-eligible recipients, which is far more than President Obama ever offered. I mean, this is pretty incredible. What President Obama offered was DACA for 690,000 young people. This President has offered a pathway to citizenship for 1.8 million. Some people may think that is far too generous, but the President made that offer expecting to get border security and these other provisions done at the same time.

This legislation provides a real plan to strengthen our borders and utilize boots on the ground, better technology, and infrastructure. It reallocates visas from the diversity lottery system in a way that is fair, and it continues the existing family-based immigration categories until the current backlog is clear.

I am proud to cosponsor this commonsense solution, not because it is perfect—no piece of legislation ever is—but what it does is it advances the issue in a way that can pass the Senate so the House can take it up and the President can ultimately sign it. That is the only way I know to get something accomplished here.

Everybody needs to get to work. Our Democratic colleagues who voted to shut down the government over this issue now seem unprepared to meet the deadline they themselves insisted upon, even after the majority leader has provided a fair and open process for everybody to participate. So everybody needs to get to work. Our colleagues have known for a while that this was coming. They asked for this debate, but they have not yet filed any proposed legislation. I am wondering what the holdup is.

Here is the bottom line. I am not interested in gamesmanship for gamesmanship's sake, political theater for political theater's sake, or ideas that can't become law. As the President said 2 weeks ago, the ultimate proposal must be one where nobody gets everything they want but our

country gets the critical reforms that it needs. About 124,000 young people hope we can rise to the occasion. Just in my State alone, there are 124,000 DACA recipients who hope we can rise to the occasion and take advantage of the tremendous, generous offer President Trump has made in a bill he said he would sign into law if we were able to pass it in the Senate and in the House and get it on his desk.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, last September, President Trump took it upon himself to create an economic, humanitarian, and political crisis by rescinding the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, or DACA, without proposing a serious solution for the nearly 800,000 DACA recipients who now face deportation. These people and their families have had to endure fits and starts of uncertainty as Democrats and some Republicans have worked tirelessly to advance the Dream Act and other fair and reasonable compromises authored chiefly by my colleagues, Senators DURBIN and GRAHAM, also supported by the Presiding Officer, only to have President Trump and the Republican majority find every way to say no, or to stall the process.

This week, however, the Senate has an opportunity to address the panic and stress the President caused, not just for those on DACA and their families, but also for our Nation's businesses and our broader economy. I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for this chance for an open debate on a solution for Dreamers. In particular, I again thank Senator DURBIN, Senator GRAHAM, and Senator FLAKE for their advocacy and efforts to find a bipartisan compromise. I thank Leader SCHUMER for his leadership in pushing for a resolution, and Leader MCCONNELL for keeping his commitment to have this debate. I thank them all.

The basic facts of this debate are clear. The American people overwhelmingly support finding a solution for Dreamers that protects them from deportation and provides a pathway to citizenship for those who work hard and play by the rules. I believe that a bipartisan majority of my colleagues want the same thing. The question before us is whether the partisanship and raw feelings surrounding this debate will prevent a solution to this crisis from becoming law. So I urge my colleagues: Let us forge the bipartisan agreement that the American people want and the Dreamers deserve. Let us end this crisis. Then, after this bipar-

tisan show of good faith, let us again take up the kind of comprehensive immigration reform that many of us in this body have already voted to pass so we can fix our broken immigration system once and for all.

I do not believe, however, that solving the DACA crisis, which President Trump in a sense created, should come at the cost of radically restructuring legal immigration. According to the conservative Cato Institute, President Trump's immigration proposals in exchange for resolving the DACA crisis would result in an approximate 44-percent reduction in legal immigration. This would be the largest cut to immigration in nearly a century. In addition to the profound effects such a cut would have on American families, culture, and opportunities, it would also level a massive blow to the American labor force and economic growth.

According to the Cato Institute and the independent research firm Macroeconomic Advisers, slashing legal immigration by about half could initially cut our projected economic growth rate by 12.5 percent in the next year or two. That would be a significant blow to our economy, and it could lead to further reduced economic growth projections down the line due to the reduction in the size of the American workforce. And, just as our Nation faces a skyrocketing deficit due to the impact of policies like the Republican tax plan, the National Academy of Sciences estimates that immigrants, on average, contribute over \$92,000 more than they receive in government benefits over the course of their lives, and losing these American workers would only further shrink revenue that could help balance the budget.

If Congress decides to take on immigration reform of this magnitude, it must be in the context of bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform, and not in the context of resolving this crisis that has been prompted by President Trump.

Nor should this discussion suggest that a desire to do the right thing by Dreamers somehow indicates a lack of appreciation for the importance of securing our borders. I believe my colleagues on both sides of the aisle agree that border security is of critical importance to our Nation. I have voted to increase the vetting of visa applicants, to heighten security on international travel, and to increase support for homeland security and border control by billions of dollars. In Fiscal Year 2000, there were 8,619 Border Patrol agents on the southwest border. Today, there are currently just shy of 20,000. The Obama administration alone added more than 3,000 Border Patrol agents on our southern Border, doubled the amount of fencing, and added technological systems, including aerial and ground surveillance systems. Unlawful immigration began lessening under President Obama, and today, fewer people are entering the country illegally across the U.S.-Mexico border than in

the past 50 years. I believe in a strong border that continues to adapt the best technologies and tactics to keep our Nation safe. What I do not believe in, however, is symbolic action, like the construction of a wall that would drain taxpayer dollars without making Americans any safer.

There is a reason that Americans on both sides of the political divide have spoken out against deporting Dreamers. A great many of these young people are outstanding and accomplished, and our communities would feel the loss of all that they contribute. It is true that they were brought here as children outside the appropriate processes, but this was through no fault of their own. As they have grown up here, they have pursued higher education, started American families, worked hard and paid taxes, and stayed out of trouble with the law. They have passed background checks, been fingerprinted, paid hundreds of dollars in fees, and submitted detailed records to immigration enforcement officials whose job it is to prevent fraud and spot any criminals in the system. Indeed, DACA status is not blanket amnesty or an entitlement, but is something that must be earned and kept up.

Hundreds of DACA recipients served in the U.S. Armed Forces, like Zion Dirgantara, whose mother brought him and his brother from Indonesia to Philadelphia when they were young, and who did not know about his undocumented status until he applied for a driver's license. Last fall, Zion told the Washington Post that he was deeply affected when, at age 12, he watched the crash of United Flight 93 in his new home State of Pennsylvania on September 11, 2001, but he could not join the Army out of high school because of his undocumented status. Because of DACA, he was able to enlist in the Army, but both his status and his ability to continue serving his country hang in the balance during this debate.

Many of my colleagues have spoken movingly and eloquently about the Dreamers who have come forward to tell their stories. I associate myself with their remarks, and challenge my colleagues who have not met these young people in person to listen to their stories and perspectives. Over the last few months, I, and my staff, have had the opportunity to meet several very impressive Dreamers living in Rhode Island who have illustrated what the loss of DACA means to them and their families. I met one young woman studying at Brown University who needs DACA to ensure that she can stay here to attend medical school and help fill the shortage of doctors in America. Another young man I met told me that DACA, for him, means being able to drive to school and work every day to save up for advanced education.

These young people want to live productive lives and, indeed, according to the Center for American Progress, letting DACA expire completely would

cost our Nation's economy over \$460 billion over the next decade, including an annual loss to Rhode Island's economy of an estimated \$60 million. Finding a solution for these people is not just the right thing to do, but it also makes smart economic sense, and I believe that is part of the reason why the American people are largely in agreement on helping Dreamers.

I also wish to note that this same moral and economic sense applies to the need to provide deportation relief and legal status for qualified recipients of Temporary Protected Status, or TPS, and Deferred Enforced Departure. These individuals came to America from devastated parts of the world seeking safety and a fresh start, and they have become integral members of our community and our economy. Like DACA recipients, they have passed rigorous and periodic background checks, paid hundreds of dollars in fees, and demonstrated that they are not risks to public safety or national security. The average TPS beneficiary has been in America for 19 years and many have been here even longer. About 70 percent to 80 percent are employed, and they are collectively parents to nearly 275,000 American citizen children.

Since 1999, I have been fighting for a pathway to citizenship for Liberians who came to States like Rhode Island to escape two bloody civil wars and the Ebola virus outbreak. Some of these Liberian refugees have been fixtures of our community for nearly 30 years but, like DACA recipients, they could face deportation in a number of weeks because of the expiration of TPS and DED protections. Congress can and should include these populations in the solutions we discuss here this week.

Mr. President, I, along with many of my colleagues, have taken the tough votes to strengthen our border and ensure immigrants play by the rules. I have voted for the DREAM Act and for comprehensive immigration reform that passed in this body. I know that we can address this crisis if we choose to, but I also know that the only true path forward is real bipartisan compromise, not posturing or legislative gamesmanship. I urge my colleagues to support compromise legislation to address the specific crisis before us and, when we have done that, to begin earnest discussions on bipartisan and comprehensive immigration reform.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here for my 197th "Time to Wake Up" speech. My poster board is getting a little dog-eared, but we keep moving doggedly along.

Last week, I spoke about corporate America outsourcing its lobbying to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—a determined enemy of any action on climate change. When pro-climate companies support the chamber, they support its anti-climate lobbying, its anti-climate election spending and threatening, and they enable the chamber's anti-climate stranglehold with the fossil fuel industry on Congress.

The chamber is not alone in its anti-climate advocacy on behalf of corporate America. Another big Washington trade association obstructing climate action, despite having been a pro-climate action member, is the National Association of Manufacturers, often called NAM.

Over the last two decades, NAM has spent more than \$150 million lobbying the Federal Government, and each year, NAM lobbies extensively for the fossil fuel industry.

Here are some of the greatest hits of NAM's fossil fuel lobbying.

NAM lobbies to expand offshore drilling in the Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, Pacific, and Arctic. I wonder how many of its members want to be out there supporting offshore drilling in all those areas.

NAM advocates for the continued use of coal in the electric power and industrial sectors. There is not a congressional district left where a majority of voters don't want coal-plant emissions regulated. Yet there is NAM.

NAM lobbies to roll back fuel economy standards that save consumers billions of dollars at the pump. Never mind that the equipment that keeps cars cleaner is manufactured; the National Association of Manufacturers is opposed.

NAM sent what it calls a key vote letter to all Members of Congress urging repeal of a rule to protect streams from mountaintop removal coal mining pollution. More on that in a moment.

NAM urged the Trump administration to withdraw from the Paris Agreement. More on that in a moment too.

Finally, NAM opposes any efforts to put a price on carbon pollution.

Back to that key vote letter. "The NAM's Key Vote Advisory Committee has indicated that votes on H.J. Res. 38, including procedural motions, may be considered for designation as Key Manufacturing Votes in the 115th Congress." This letter warns Members of Congress to vote the way the group wants or risk losing out on its endorsements and all the campaign support that goes with it. Who knows—run up a bad enough score and NAM may support your opponent.

Well, you would think protecting streams and drinking water from pollution from coal mines would be nothing but common sense. Streams fouled by coal mining waste literally run orange. This is the actual photograph; this is not a black-and-white photograph that has been color-corrected. This stream is running orange. As one West Virginia woman whose local stream was

contaminated told the New York Times, "Orange is not the color of water." But NAM and its fossil fuel allies opposed those clean water protections. Why? Where is the manufacturing value in streams that look like that? Follow the money. Look at the National Association of Manufacturers' major donors. A lot of the usual suspects—coal companies, oil companies, and Koch-owned oil production companies.

But here is what is strange. There are also a lot of companies that care about climate and sustainability that fund the National Association of Manufacturers. Just look at the pharmaceutical and healthcare sector. Bristol-Myers Squibb, Eli Lilly, Johnson & Johnson, Novartis, Pfizer, and UnitedHealth all belong to and fund NAM. If you go on their websites, you will find them urging people to live healthier, longer lives. So why are they lobbying through NAM to let coal companies make streams look like this? You will find these companies, on their websites, touting their commitments to sustainability and to reduce carbon emissions. So why are they lobbying through the National Association of Manufacturers against climate policies they actually support?

The National Association of Manufacturers rather inexplicably opposes all serious climate action. In particular, it opposes putting a price on carbon emissions. It even funded a debunked study that claimed putting an economy-wide price on carbon would cost millions of jobs. It lobbied for a legislative amendment making it more difficult to begin pricing carbon. But look at NAM's own member companies that are already pricing carbon emissions. Archer Daniels Midland, Cargill, Corning, Microsoft, and Stanley Black & Decker all apply a price on carbon in their own internal management and accounting. They understand that pricing carbon doesn't kill jobs. They understand that pricing carbon makes economic and environmental sense.

Here in Congress, what we see is NAM claiming to represent them but actually carrying water for the fossil fuel industry and waging full-scale war on good climate policy. Just like with the chamber's pro-climate members, we see essentially no pushback when the ostensible mouthpiece for these companies lobbies against these companies' stated position. Why would you, as a big American corporation, take a position on a very big issue and then delegate your lobbying to an entity in Washington that is opposed to your stated position? Indeed, we see virtually no corporate lobbying by anyone for good climate policy. Even companies with an internal carbon price don't lobby for a carbon price.

The American Opportunity Carbon Fee Act, which Senator SCHATZ and I have introduced in the last two Congresses, would create an economy-wide price on carbon emissions, using market forces to dramatically reduce

greenhouse gas emissions, protect our future, and improve public health. It would be border adjustable to protect American companies from unfair competition abroad, and it would return all of the revenue it raised to the American people. Liberal and conservative economists agree that this is the best way to tackle climate change. But the National Association of Manufacturers, on behalf of its fossil fuel allies, opposes us. It protects at all costs the massive market failure that allows the fossil fuel industry to duck the costs of its pollution. That is market failure 101.

It is not just that. NAM opposed cap and trade. NAM opposed the Paris Agreement. NAM sued to stop the Clean Power Plan. NAM supports the climate deniers of the Trump administration. They have no alternative, no better idea, no other way that they want to address the climate crisis; they are just against any serious action on climate change.

Archer Daniels Midland, Cargill, Corning, Microsoft, and Stanley Black & Decker are members of NAM. All of them supported the Paris Agreement, but all this time, they continue to fund the National Association of Manufacturers. It doesn't make any sense. These companies are already pricing carbon. They know it is good policy. They support the Paris Agreement. Yet they fund the trade advocacy group that is pulling out all the stops to kill the policy they support and the agreement they support. I asked last week, and I will ask again: When is the cavalry going to get here?

Lots of pro-climate companies fund the National Association of Manufacturers' anti-climate crusade. It is bizarre, but it is true.

Intel says it "believes that global climate change is a serious environmental, economic and social challenge that warrants an equally serious response by governments and the private sector," but Intel funds NAM as NAM fights any response by governments.

KPMG has an entire practice area devoted to advising companies on the emerging risks and hazards of climate change, but KPMG funds NAM as NAM ignores and talks down those very hazards.

McCormick is focused on reducing its carbon emissions and, like a lot of good companies, even expects its suppliers to do the same, but McCormick also funds the National Association of Manufacturers.

Pernod Ricard is committed to reducing its carbon emissions, but Pernod Ricard funds NAM.

Procter & Gamble says:

As a global citizen, we are concerned about the negative consequences of climate change. We believe industry, governments, and consumers can work together to reduce emissions to protect the environment.

That is what they believe, but they fund the National Association of Manufacturers, which tries to stop any such effort.

Verizon is so concerned about climate change that it has reduced its own emissions by over 50 percent, but Verizon still funds the National Association of Manufacturers.

I could go on, but you get the picture. Company after company claims that addressing climate change is their priority, and many do great things—truly great things—inside their fence lines and in many cases even out their supply chains, demanding sustainability compliance out their supply chains. But here, where the rubber hits the lawmaking road in Congress, the corporate support is for groups leading the war against climate action here in Washington, and virtually none of the companies show up here on the other side.

It is not as though they say: OK, I will support the National Association of Manufacturers and their efforts to obstruct any climate action, but I am going to come down and make clear on my own, in my own lobbying, that we want climate action. I am going to offset the lobbying that this group I fund does against the position I espouse.

No, they don't do that. They almost never come in on their own to support good climate policy to counterbalance what their own advocates are advocating when their own advocates are advocating against them, which explains why the fossil fuel guys keep on winning here in Congress. It is easy to win when the other side doesn't show up or, if they do, shows up wearing your jersey.

Here is how bad it is. The National Association of Manufacturers and the chamber and the fossil fuel industry hired a bunch of Washington lobbyists to create a fake consumer group called the Consumer Energy Alliance. This fake consumer group then created a fake initiative in Kentucky called—these names are always so comical—Kentuckians for Solar Fairness. What is the goal? The goal is to support Kentucky legislation making it harder for consumers to sell rooftop solar power back to the big utilities.

NAM is behind this scheme. Why? If you are Johnson & Johnson or Cargill or Corning or Microsoft or KPMG or Procter & Gamble, why do you want to be associated with a scheme like this? Remember, this is ostensibly the National Association of Manufacturers. Out in the real world, there is a lot of manufacturing going on in renewable energy.

We manufactured offshore wind turbines in Rhode Island's waters. Rhode Island boat builder Blount Marine even got the contract to manufacture the new boat to get technicians out to service the manufacturer turbines. The framing on which our offshore wind turbines stand was manufactured in Louisiana. Solar arrays are manufactured and installed all around the country, providing more American jobs than coal. In Texas alone, solar provides nearly 9,000 jobs, and more than 1.6 gigawatts of solar capacity has been

manufactured and installed in Texas. Go to Iowa, where one-third of their electricity is from wind, and look how much ground-based wind turbine manufacturing and maintenance is going on—really good jobs.

Why is the National Association of Manufacturers so violently opposed to manufacturing in the renewable energy industry? Why does NAM get involved in a Kentucky utility regulatory issue with nothing apparent to do with manufacturing? Why is the National Association of Manufacturers exactly and perfectly aligned with the fossil fuel industry and not its own membership on so many issues?

In Washington, the fossil fuel lobby is relentless. They have a bad name and an obvious conflict of interest, so they like to do their political dirty work through groups like the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I get it. Disguise is an age-old tactic. But why does corporate America put up with having its trade association used as disguise to fight climate action and to get involved in State quarrels that benefit only the fossil fuel industry?

The effect of corporate America allowing its trade groups to be captured by fossil fuel interests is that corporate America is now, for all practical purposes, collectively united against climate action in Congress. Say whatever they say on their websites; do whatever they do within their fence lines or out their supply chains; sign whatever they sign by way of letters and advertisements; that is all good, but when it comes to Congress, where the lawmaking rubber hits the road, corporate America is collectively united against climate action, either through direct antagonism like the fossil fuel industry or by letting antagonists like the National Association of Manufacturers and the chamber be their lobbying intermediaries and erase their good climate policies by the time they get to Congress and replace them with the fossil fuel industry's climate denial or by simply ducking the fight and not showing up on game day.

If we are going to meet America's responsibilities and finally pass good climate policy, we are going to need everyone, including corporate America, to do their part. Right now, fossil fuel interests from corporate America are all over the field, armed and ready for battle, and the good guys are not even showing up at the game.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

RURAL HIGH-SPEED BROADBAND

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, a community built without access to drinking water would never be expected to grow and thrive. Parents wouldn't move their children to a home where they don't have running water for bathing and for drinking. Restaurants wouldn't be able to cook and keep their kitchens clean. Manufacturers

wouldn't build new factories where they couldn't access water for cooling and other types of processes. Simply put, a community without access to water would fail.

Being connected to high-speed broadband in the 21st century is as critical to the prosperity of rural communities as being connected to running water. I have seen it firsthand. While meeting with Michiganders in Barry County, we discussed recent economic development. Part of the county is seeing new construction of homes, the creation of new businesses, and an influx of young families. The other part of the county has seen much more limited growth. You can guess which part of the county is set up for broadband and which isn't.

My constituents from Barry County know that high-speed internet is the key to economic growth, educational opportunity, and access to limitless services, information, and ideas. Our rural communities and our Nation as a whole are now at a crossroads. We have the opportunity to level the playing field for all Americans by making the right investments, right now, in rural communities across our Nation. These towns are not connected to broadband by choice. They are not connected to broadband because it is simply too expensive to deploy in these geographic areas.

Local city councils in rural areas must struggle to fund broadband projects themselves or they struggle to convince providers that it makes economic sense to invest in their communities, especially in places where populations are small or spread out. While deployment can be expensive, high-speed broadband is not a luxury. It is critical infrastructure. High-speed broadband is critical infrastructure the same way that the pipes that carry our water and the wires that carry our electricity are critical infrastructure.

The Federal Government has a role to play in infrastructure when it comes to the national deployment of life-changing, critical innovations. We have been here before. In the 20th century, the United States faced a parallel challenge with the deployment of electricity. It took strategic Federal action to bring electricity to less populated rural areas. These commonsense investments raised our overall standard of living and spurred productivity in an agricultural sector that was at risk of falling behind urban-based industries.

If we can successfully electrify a nation, then we have no excuse for not connecting it to the internet in the modern era.

Rural electricity was the breakthrough in the 20th century. Universal high-speed broadband will be the breakthrough of the 21st century, provided we invest in it. Any serious national infrastructure package needs real Federal investment in rural broadband.

Unfortunately, the Trump administration's infrastructure proposal ut-

terly fails to recognize the urgency for robust connectivity nationwide, especially for communities caught on the wrong side of the digital divide. The administration's plan fails to provide any dedicated funding for rural broadband. Strategic Federal investments are needed to fill in the gaps for States and local communities struggling to keep up with the internet demands of today, let alone getting ahead of the connectivity demands of tomorrow. This administration's infrastructure proposal would only create more gaps.

Although the administration is advertising their infrastructure proposal as a \$1.7 trillion plan, \$1.5 trillion of it would fall on the backs of cash-strapped State and local governments. If this is all they are proposing, this is simply a lost opportunity. If this is all they are proposing, this administration is setting up our communities for failure.

What are they actually proposing? They are proposing toll roads and hiking State and local taxes. They aren't even being subtle about this. It is in black and white. The administration's plan says: "Providing States flexibility to toll existing Interstates would generate additional revenues."

Michiganders did not send me to the U.S. Senate because they want toll roads and higher local taxes. As a candidate, President Trump promised real Federal investment in communities across our great Nation. Now this administration is offering up State and local taxes and tolls to pay for roads, bridges, waterways, and zero dedicated dollars—zero dedicated dollars—for broadband expansion.

As I said earlier, any serious national infrastructure plan needs real Federal investment in rural broadband. Universal broadband means rural prosperity, continued economic growth, and international competitiveness. We must invest in this goal in order to reach it.

I urge my colleagues to join me in making real investments in rural high-speed broadband a top priority in any infrastructure legislation. All of our friends, family members, and neighbors in rural communities across our great Nation are counting on us to deliver this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I want to share with my colleagues a concern I have about a group of people who are legally in this country and have a similar problem as the DACA registrant Dreamers who we need to pay attention to. I am strongly in support of passing legislation to protect DACA and Dreamers. I will talk a little bit about that also.

There is a group of individuals who have been in this country for a long time—similar to the Dreamers—who know no other country but the United States of America. They are legally

here. They also have a date on their back as a result of the Trump administration, in some cases, not renewing what is known as temporary protected status; in other cases, it has deferred that decision making on the extension of temporary protected status.

In 1990, Congress passed legislation that authorized the creation of the TPS program. We recognized that there were times in which armed conflict or environmental disasters or other extraordinary circumstances would present itself where individuals would not be safe in their home country, and they would be permitted to legally come to the United States under this protected status. I would like to call it "humanitarian protected status" because these conditions have continued in many of these countries for decades.

Many of these people have been here for decades because the circumstances in their home country have not changed. Administration after administration has renewed their protected status, and they have been permitted to live here legally, to be able to work and go to school. They serve in our military. They have served our Nation very, very well.

The numbers are smaller than those of the Dreamers. The total number is approximately 437,000. The largest country by far is El Salvador, which is 195,000; Honduras, about 57,000; and Haiti, about 50,000.

I think Members of Congress are fully aware of the circumstances in Central America and recognize the fact that, for many families, it was not safe for them to stay in their countries because, if they had, their children would have either ended up in gangs or have been murdered and that the economic circumstances in these countries had not allowed for economic opportunities for their families. As a result, the United States welcomed them here in a protected status, and they have become part of our economy.

For the State of Maryland, this number is actually larger than the Dreamer category. We have 22,500 who are in the TPS status—97 percent from El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti. It has been estimated that this group has contributed \$1.2 billion to Maryland's GDP. They have been in our country for decades. The young people particularly know no other country than the United States of America. It would not be safe for them to return to their countries.

We have information about that, and I call it to my colleagues' attention. The process in going forward on extending the TPS status is that we first get the recommendation from our Embassy in the country itself. In this case, I had a chance to review the recommendations from the Embassy, and it is clear that our experts on the ground in the country felt that these families should be able to remain in the United States. There are many reasons for that.

One is the bilateral relationship with the country itself, in which the country has asked us not to return these individuals to the country because it cannot handle this population's returning to the country. They don't have jobs, and the infrastructure in the country will not handle that. I think we are all familiar with Haiti and how devastated it has been by storms. It literally does not have the capacity to be able to handle the return of the Haitians. It would be an incredible burden on the country of Haiti, and there are no jobs available for these individuals.

I think all are familiar with what happened with the returning of certain individuals to Central America. If we force deportation, make no mistake about it, the individuals who have been law-abiding here in the United States, who have been adding to our economy, who are part of our social fabric, and who believe that they are Americans will be returned to an environment in which they are going to be vulnerable to the intimidation of gangs, and they will be without employment. Many will have no choice but to choose to either join a gang or be subjected to the type of intimidation and violence that one's standing up to the gang brings not only to oneself but to the members of one's family. That is something that we should not be allowing.

There are also economic reasons for which there have been recommendations to continue this program. The challenge is that they now have dates on their backs because of the decision in some of these countries not to extend the TPS status by the Trump administration.

These are very similar circumstances to those of the Dreamers, but it doesn't quite have the same amount of attention around the Nation. These individuals are legally in this country. They came here legally, but they have been here for the same length of time, and they are part of our fabric, which is the same as the Dreamers. It is for that reason that the right result is to protect their legal status here in the United States and to give them a pathway to citizenship so that they can become legal citizens of the country they know as home.

S. 2144, the SECURE Act, was introduced by me, Senator VAN HOLLEN, Senator FEINSTEIN, and others in order to accomplish that. I hope that, during the debate that we are having here, we will find a way to incorporate protection for these 437,000 people who are legally here so that they know their futures are here and that they are protected in the workforce.

As I said, it is very similar to the Dreamer issue. We know that the Dreamer issue—the crisis, the March date that we are facing—was created by the President of the United States. The DACA Program was created by President Obama on June 15, 2012. Since that day, we have had about 800,000 people who have been registered under the DACA Program. They are

now legally working, attending schools, and are able to operate motor vehicles. They are, clearly, our future teachers, our doctors, our engineers, and our entrepreneurs. They are very much a part of our economy. In Maryland we have 10,000 who have registered under the DACA Program. They have contributed \$500 million to Maryland's GDP.

For so many reasons, it would just be common sense for us—I would think without too much controversy—to pass a bill that would say to, I believe it is, a total of 1.8 million: We know that you know of no other home but America. We welcome you. We are going to pass legislation that protects your status and gives you a pathway to citizenship.

We do that because America doesn't tear families apart. We don't say to people who know no other home but America that we don't want them to stay here. That is what we stand for as a nation. These are the values that make America the strong nation that it is. By the way, these individuals are contributing to the growth of our economy, and all of us benefit.

Over the last several months—over a longer period than that—I have been in the company of many of the Dreamers and many of the people holding TPS status. I have been at roundtable discussions during which we have had opportunities to listen to their stories about how they view America as their home.

One said that the best birthday present she ever received was when President Obama passed the DACA Executive order—when she knew that she had a future in America. Others have told us stories: Without the protection under the DACA Program, one never could have gotten a driver's license and, therefore, never would have had an opportunity to advance in our economy. Others have attended our colleges.

The interesting thing is that I have been in many meetings on college campuses in which, for the first time, students have recognized that their fellow student had been a Dreamer. They hadn't known that. They had just known him as one of their classmates in school. I have been in businesses when, for the first time, employees had discovered that one of their colleagues happened to be a Dreamer. They hadn't known that. They had just known him as a fellow employee.

This is widely supported. It is important for our economy and important for our values to keep the families together, and the American people support us on this. Poll after poll shows that Americans believe that those Dreamers should be protected here in the United States.

I include statements that I have received from Prince George's, Anne Arundel, Howard, and Montgomery Counties and Baltimore City school superintendents.

They wrote:

Maryland is a national leader in providing students with a world-class education. Essential to our success is our commitment to providing children in our schools with a safe and welcoming environment to learn. Termination of DACA will have direct and damaging effects on the Maryland students who are current beneficiaries.

It is a direct threat to Maryland's economic stability and safety, as it will strip students of their ability to work and drive legally, pay taxes, and pursue post-secondary opportunities. Parents who lose work authorizations will face deportation or be moved into a dangerous underground economy, causing financial uncertainty for their families and harmful stress on their children—our students. In addition the DACA decision could impact our ability to motivate our youth to remain committed to their education and pursuing college or careers, and will lead to worsening economic hardships of our DACA community.

I have seen many letters of support and many testimonies from both—those with TPS and the Dreamers—but I emphasize the one letter that I received from the Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force, which is co-chaired by the Montgomery County police chief, Tom Manger. What he said, I think, is very important. There are a lot of reasons we should be protecting TPS recipients and DACA recipients, but he wrote:

We are concerned that, absent action by Congress, the Dreamer population will be driven back into the shadows and be hesitant to report crimes or cooperate with investigations. Such an outcome would risk undermining community safety.

We are not safe by people going into the shadows. This is the United States of America. Why would we want people to try to hide from us? That is not the country we are. We do not create fear in the hearts of law-abiding citizens. These are law-abiding citizens. They have sisters and brothers who are U.S. citizens. They have other family members, some of whom are TPS recipients, some of whom are Dreamers, and some of whom are U.S. citizens. We don't tell families that we are going to tear them apart. That is not what America believes in. These are all individuals who have gone through security checks. These are people who have been law-abiding—complying with our laws—working, serving in our military, building this country.

I know that the first order of business is to make sure that the Dreamers are protected. I strongly support that and would vote for a bill on the floor right now, tonight, which has been introduced by some of our colleagues, that protects the Dreamers, in and of itself, with nothing else connected to it. We should do it, and it shouldn't be controversial. I also urge us to make sure that we take care of those who are in TPS status. It is a smaller group, and it doesn't have the same degree of national attention, but this is about the same values and the same economic concerns, the same families and the same issues.

I hope we can find a way in which we can include both the Dreamers and TPS recipients in protecting their status here in America and giving them

pathways to citizenship because it is the right thing for them, the right thing for their families, the right thing for our Nation, and the right thing for our economy.

I know that my colleague from Maryland is on the floor. He has been one of the great leaders on this issue. I know he has met with many from the community who are in both the Dreamer and the TPS status. I have joined him at meetings around Maryland in which we have talked to the families. Through the Presiding Officer, I personally thank my colleague for all of the work he has done in order to bring this issue to the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I start by thanking my colleague from the State of Maryland, Senator CARDIN, for his leadership on many, many issues but, especially, as we gather here on the Senate floor to discuss the Dreamers and immigration issues, including the folks who are TPS recipients. I thank him for his leadership in Maryland and around the country on these vital issues.

I think the country understands how important it is that we provide the Dreamers with a secure future. These are individuals who have grown up in our country. They know no other country as home. They have been in classrooms with our kids. They have pledged allegiance to the flag. They are now students in college or individuals working in businesses. Some of them are small business owners. Many serve in our Armed Forces. It would be disgraceful if, after welcoming these young people, we were to cast them away.

Unfortunately, last September, President Trump lit the fuse on the deportation of the Dreamers, and that clock has been ticking every day and every month as we approach the March 5 deadline. So we as a Senate—as Republicans and Democrats but, more importantly, as Americans—need to come together and finally do our work so that we operate as a body that can help solve problems in this country. Part of that is making sure that these Dreamers have a secure home and a pathway to becoming full citizens here in the United States of America.

Just the other day I was talking to the president of the University of Maryland. We have a number of DACA recipients who are there training to be engineers, training to be doctors, and people who are looking forward to participating in the only country they know, the United States of America.

I wish to turn now quickly to people who are here under what is called temporary protected status. These are individuals who are in the United States and could not return home because of disasters in their home countries, whether by earthquakes or hurricanes

or other events that made it impossible to return home because their homes had been destroyed or other circumstances had changed that made it impossible for them to return. We, the United States of America, granted these individuals temporary protected status. These are individuals who are in the United States legally, and many of them have been here for over two decades. In the case of El Salvador, we have most people who are here from El Salvador on temporary protected status since the year 2000. They have families here. They are small business men and women, and they are working productively in our communities. In the case of Honduras, it was even earlier, 1998.

Senator CARDIN and I and others have introduced legislation called the SECURE Act, which would also provide security here in the United States for these individuals on TPS status. Unfortunately, a series of decisions coming down from the Trump administration has put the future of these individuals in jeopardy.

The clock is also ticking on many of these people who have been here for more than 20 years toward deportation. These are individuals who are, again, working here legally and are contributing to our communities. I believe that as Americans we should recognize that it is important that we provide a secure future for them as well. That is why we introduced the SECURE Act.

So I am hopeful that as we debate a secure future for the Dreamers, we also find a way going forward to provide a secure future for those who are here under TPS.

It seems to me that the answer is in plain sight. The answer is making sure that Dreamers have a secure future, providing a path to citizenship as long as they meet all of the requirements, and that we ensure we have border security. I don't think there is a Senator in this body who does not believe that the United States has to have strong and secure borders. The debate has always been what is the smartest, most effective, most cost-efficient way to provide for border security.

I hope nobody is interested in wasting taxpayer dollars on things that don't work. It seems to me that we should be about the business of finding the most cost-effective way to ensuring that border security. As we do that, we should be listening to the experts as to what works and what does not work. Unfortunately, we have seen more focus in recent months on things that cost a lot of money but don't really significantly improve our border security. I am hoping that we can come together and have a rational conversation about how we can secure our borders in the most cost-effective way.

This is a moment for the Senate to really stand up and do its job. I think if you look at those two issues—a path forward for the Dreamers with a path toward citizenship for those who meet all the requirements and that we find a

way to do smart, cost-effective border security—then, that is clearly the way forward. I do hope that as we consider those two important priorities, we also come together and find a way forward for people who are here on temporary protected status, because in my conversations with Republican Senators, they recognize that for these individuals—who are here legally, working in the country, and having been here for an average of 20 years—we should find a way to make sure they have a secure future here.

We may want to look at ways to reform TPS going forward, and we can have that discussion, but for those who are here now and have been living in the United States for decades and working, let's find a way to provide a secure future for them as well. This is going to be a test for the Senate—hopefully, in the coming days, but if not, in the coming weeks, and I hope we can get the job done.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to proceed to H.R. 2579 be agreed to; that Senator TOOMEY or his designee be recognized to offer amendment No. 1948 and that Senator COONS or his designee be recognized to offer amendment No. 1955; further, that the time until 8 p.m. be equally divided between the leaders or their designees and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the amendments in the order listed, with 60 affirmative votes required for adoption, and that no second-degree amendments be in order prior to the votes; finally, that if any of the amendments are adopted, they become original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there have been meetings going on all day on a bipartisan basis to try to resolve the issue before us, which was the President's decision to end the DACA Program effectively March 5 of this year. I believe progress is being made. I hope we can continue along those lines. The proposed amendment by the Senator from Pennsylvania does not address this issue, and for that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 155, 261, and 469.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Adam J. Sullivan, of Iowa, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation; Ronald L. Batory, of New Jersey, to be Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration; and Raymond Martinez, of New Jersey, to be Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to consider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Sullivan, Batory, and Martinez nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume 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.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO KELLY McCUTCHEN

• Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, today I am proud to honor in the RECORD a dedicated Georgian who has devoted his life's work to our State.

Mr. Kelly McCutchen has spent the last 25 years of his career guiding the direction of one of Georgia's respected think tanks, the Georgia Public Policy Foundation. Most recently, Kelly served as CEO of the organization. Prior to taking the helm in 2010, he

was the organization's vice president, and he remains as a member of its board of trustees.

At the Georgia Public Policy Foundation, Kelly helped create the Civic Renewal Project that highlights the work of outstanding community-based organizations, the No Excuses program to recognize and study high-achieving, high-poverty public schools, and the foundation's award-winning statewide report cards on education, crime, and taxes.

In January 2018, the foundation was named one of the best independent think tanks in the 2017 Global Go To Think Tank Index Report. During his tenure, the foundation was also named No. 1 for "highest integrity" and No. 3 for "most knowledgeable among business organizations or State associations in Georgia" by James magazine in 2004.

A proud third-generation high honors graduate of the Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta, Kelly has also served on the Georgia Tech Alumni Association. He is a founder and served as governing board chair of Tech High, a math, science, and technology focused public charter school in Atlanta.

At the Georgia Chamber of Commerce, Kelly served on the education policy committee and the healthcare policy committee.

He chaired the board of the Healthcare Institute for Neuro-Recovery and Innovation Foundation and has also served on the Georgia Science and Technology Executive Committee and on the public policy committee for Metro Atlanta United Way. In addition, he is a policy adviser for the Technology Association of Georgia.

His service to our State has also been seen on the boards of Leadership Georgia and the Conservative Policy Leadership Institute.

Of particular significance to me as chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Kelly cofounded the Georgia Warrior Alliance, a nonprofit with the mission to make Georgia the national leader in programs supporting military veterans and their families.

Kelly's wife, Mary Kay Davis McCutchen, has been a dedicated companion and chief supporter of his work and civic engagement. Their son Kelly and daughter Caroline are college students who have wonderful role models to follow in their very special parents.

Kelly McCutchen is a Georgian whom I am proud to know and to call a friend. I applaud his service and wish him the very best as he continues his service to our State in his new role as executive director of the High Impact Network of Responsible Innovators. •

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 6:10 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 96. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure the integrity of voice communications and to prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimination among areas of the United States in the delivery of such communications.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4326. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standardizing Phytosanitary Treatment Regulations: Approval of Cold Treatment and Irradiation Facilities; Cold Treatment Schedules; Establishment of Fumigation and Cold Treatment Compliance Agreements" (RIN0579-AD90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4327. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Research and Engineering), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to activities under the Secretary of Defense Personnel Management Demonstration Project authorities for Department of Defense Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories (STRs) for calendar year 2017; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4328. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the President's fiscal year 2019 budget request; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-4329. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting proposed legislation entitled "Reclamation Title Transfer Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4330. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision" (FRL No. 9974-25-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 9, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4331. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air