

□ 1730

### HONORING THE LIFE OF COACH JERRY TARKANIAN

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart to mourn the loss and honor the life of my friend, Coach Jerry Tarkanian, who passed away this morning.

A leader and a role model, both on and off the court, “the Shark” was not only a legendary collegiate men’s basketball coach, but a pillar in the Las Vegas community.

As coach at UNLV, he led the Running Rebels to a 509–105 record over 19 seasons, four Final Four appearances, and an NCAA championship in 1990. In 2013, he was inducted into the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame, and a statue of him was placed outside UNLV’s Thomas & Mack Center, which houses the basketball court bearing his name.

Coach Tarkanian was known for giving young players a second chance. He supported numerous charities and programs that helped build character, life skills, and talent that fostered success in later life.

My thoughts go out to his wife and his family, and I am sure the coach is looking down and chewing on that famous towel in Heaven.

### STEELWORKERS REFINERY STRIKE

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Members, last Friday and Saturday I visited and walked with United Steelworkers union members who are on strike for health and safety issues in our east Houston congressional district.

Their jobs are very dangerous. They produce refined products and chemicals that our Nation needs. We have, sadly, lost lives recently in the industry, and to have men and women working 10-plus straight days for shifts of 10 hours is not reasonable.

These men and women work hard in a dangerous occupation, and they should not have to go on strike for safety. Safety is important to employees and companies. Let’s settle the strike with new safety standards so that no family has to worry that their loved one will not come home from work.

### HONORING JEROME “BIG DUCK” SMITH

(Mr. RICHMOND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in my continuing recognition of

Black History Month to honor Freedom Rider and civil rights legend Jerome “Big Duck” Smith. An active mentor of youth in New Orleans, he earned his nickname because there is usually a line of children waddling behind him.

From a young age, Big Duck was not intimidated by what he viewed as the racial norms in New Orleans. When he was 10 years old, he removed a screen that acted as a barrier between Black and White passengers on a New Orleans streetcar, causing some uneasiness. An older Black woman riding the streetcar took him off the car and told him “never, ever stop” and that she was proud of him for what he had done. This show of support would light a fire within him to fight for racial justice.

Jerome Smith would go on to become part of the Freedom Riders, a group that looked to desegregate bus terminals across the Deep South. Also, he helped found the New Orleans chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality, one of the big four civil rights organizations.

Today, Big Duck is the director of Tambourine and Fan, a youth organization in New Orleans that engages young people on the civil rights movement, leadership, and the importance of political engagement. His work for the civil rights movement and with youth throughout the city is an inspiration not only to me, but to the entire region. Big Duck embodies the never-ending struggle for justice and equality of opportunity.

### ELIMINATING ISIS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, over the last 24 hours, we have heard that a wonderful young woman from Arizona, whose family is now mourning, lost her life somewhere in Syria at the hands of a violent and barbaric group by the name of ISIS. I hope that it brings all Americans together around the importance of eliminating this dastardly group, and to begin to look inwardly to make sure that we attack this cancer at its beginning and to be able to stop the radicalization that comes about through the Internet and many of the young people in this country.

I introduced earlier this year the No Fly Foreign Soldiers Act to ensure that those who may leave this country and then attempt to fly back are, in fact, detected. There are many things we can do on the end of passing law, but we must also respond that we not attack any religion for just its beliefs and begin to educate people about the values of many different religions.

That is what this young American sought to do. She went to save the vulnerable. And so we must isolate ISIS as it is and stand with those who recognize the greatness of America and the

diversity of our religions and the diversity of the people.

I sadly offer my sympathy for the Muslims that were killed at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. We must fight those who are here attempting to do harm and must recognize that we have a goodness in our country and emphasize the fact that we live and can live in harmony. But ISIS must be our target, not those whose faith may be considered a faith that we do not understand or maybe even disagree with.

### STOP OBAMA’S EXECUTIVE AMNESTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOOLENAAR). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT).

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, on November 4, the American people spoke loudly and clearly on illegal immigration and President Obama’s repeated overreaches of his authority. Yet within weeks of the election, the President tried to singlehandedly rewrite America’s immigration laws by granting amnesty by executive decree to 5 million illegal aliens already in this country. It was a move that he previously said he had no constitutional authority to execute. He also acknowledged that only Congress could rewrite the laws. But he did it anyway.

In response, the House took a firm stand last month to pass a bill to stop the President’s illegal and unconstitutional decree that grants amnesty, work permits, and Federal benefits to illegal aliens. The bill fully funds the Department of Homeland Security for the rest of the year, but it also prohibits the Department from carrying out the President’s illegal act. Let me repeat that last line. This bill fully funds the Department of Homeland Security. It just says that in order to get that funding, the Department cannot break the law.

That is just common sense. The American people don’t want the Federal Government breaking the law, and it is up to Congress to make sure that no Federal funds are used illegally.

Yet today, Senate Democrats are currently united in opposing this bill. Recent polling shows that Americans overwhelmingly oppose the President’s

executive immigrations actions 58 to 36. I call on my Senate colleagues to support the Constitution and the rule of law and pass H.R. 240 as it was passed in the House.

The President's amnesty scheme is not only illegal, it is patently unconstitutional. It creates a dangerous precedent where future Presidents can ignore laws they don't agree with and expand their own power beyond its legal boundaries, threatening the very liberty of the American people.

Our constitutionally guaranteed liberties, our rule of law and economic opportunities are precisely the things that immigrants come to America to experience. Our Constitution, rule of law, and economic prosperity are precisely the things that we will be giving up if we allow the President to break our laws to give amnesty and work permits to those who are here illegally.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, about 5 weeks ago, Members of this body stood on the House floor and we all raised our hands and we all swore an oath of office to support and defend the Constitution. It is the same oath that Members in the other body, in the Senate, take. I think it is an oath that means something. It is not just window dressing. We have a responsibility to conform the actions of this body and to counteract actions of other branches of government if those actions are not consistent with the Constitution.

And so here we have an instance in which the President is on record 22 different times saying he does not have the authority to grant work permits unilaterally, 5 million of them, to people in the country illegally. He can't give Social Security numbers or benefits without an act of Congress. And yet, after losing the election, he did it. When he did it, a number of Members in his own party in the Senate said they were concerned about what he did, and they didn't think that it could be done by executive fiat and that changes to immigration law had to happen through Congress.

And so we are in a curious situation now because the House has passed a bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security but to constrain the President from acting illegally, because the government has to follow the law just like any other citizen. And you have a situation in the Senate in which the Democrats, including those seven Senators who said that this is problematic, they are blocking even having a debate on the bill. Forget about being opposed to the bill in its final form or if you don't get an amendment, they will not even let it come to the floor so it can be debated.

To me, this is the most important type of debate, when it goes to the central purpose of our oath: to support and defend the Constitution. I think they need to go on record about why they think this is constitutional. What lim-

its are there for the President in terms of exercising this executive power? Can he legislate lower tax rates? Can he legislate in the field of environmental law or workplace safety law that the Congress doesn't support?

I think what you are seeing is a dereliction of duty by those Senators who are unwilling to have a discussion and they are unwilling to debate. They are putting protecting the political interests of a President in their own party over their duty to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

If you were right on the issues and you knew that what he did was constitutional, then you should have no problem going to the floor and making that case to the American people. The fact that they are unwilling to do that, I believe, is proof positive that they know that case cannot be made, and, in fact, they would not be able to make it.

So I appreciate my friend from Georgia reserving this time. I think this is something that absolutely needs to have a thorough debate; and the American people overwhelmingly are opposed to what the President did, so let's debate it. If you don't like what we did, offer your suggestion, but the idea that you can go run and hide is something that is not consistent with our duties or with our oath of office.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fine remarks by the gentleman from Florida.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), the State from which our Declaration of Independence was passed and the very Constitution we are speaking about was debated and proposed to this great Union.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank my colleague from Georgia for organizing this very important discussion that we are having here today.

Three weeks ago, this House passed a bill to fund the lawful operations of the Department of Homeland Security. Our bill provides nearly \$40 billion for the protection of our Nation, with a \$100 million increase for border security and \$600 million more for Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Democrats in the Senate, however, now refuse to vote on funding these important programs because they are insisting on funding President Obama's unlawful amnesty order for 5 million illegal aliens.

The dollars that hardworking taxpayers send to Washington should not be used to fund any unlawful order, including President Obama's amnesty order.

And how do we know that the President's action is unlawful? Well, I remember what the President said repeatedly. For example, in 2011, the President said:

With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that is just not the case because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed. For me to simply, through executive order, ignore those congressional mandates

would not conform with my appropriate role as President.

Funding for the Department of Homeland Security runs out in 16 days. The House acted 21 days ago. It is time for the Senate to act.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

□ 1745

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Georgia, BARRY LOUDERMILK, for the leadership that he has shown in putting this event together where we on the House floor can try to help explain to the American people what is at stake here with the President's executive amnesty.

Mr. Speaker, in that vein, I rise to speak in opposition to President Obama's illegal and unconstitutional executive amnesty for illegal aliens. Why? Because I was elected by Americans to represent Americans in Washington, D.C. While, clearly, protecting the United States Constitution is the number one reason to fight President Obama's illegal and unconstitutional conduct, a close second reason is the economic welfare of American families searching for jobs that will empower them to take care of their own families.

In that vein, a report by the Center for Immigration Studies is very instructive. The Center for Immigration Studies did a report based on Federal Government data. It was collected from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Census Bureau. And this is what they found.

From the first quarter of the year 2000 to the first quarter of the year 2014, a 14-year period, with respect to people in America who are ages 16 to 65—and I will repeat that—ages 16 to 65, which is far and away the largest block by age of working Americans, the American economy for that 16 to 65 age group created 5.6 million net new jobs. Some would say that is pretty good—5.6 million net new jobs.

But do you know how many of those jobs went to American-born citizens? Do you know the answer to that question? Well, I would submit to you that every American citizen should—and they ought to be outraged by the answer. Of those 5.6 million net jobs created over a 14-year period in the United States of America for people ages 16 to 65, American-born citizens had a net loss of 127,000 jobs.

And you wonder why the polling data shows that Americans still believe they are in a recession. The answer is American-born citizens are still in a recession.

Well, who got those jobs? Well, according to the Center for Immigration Studies report, 5.7 million net job gains were by two groups: illegal aliens, plus lawful immigrants.

So look at the priorities of our Federal Government over the last 14 years.

Look at the priorities established by President Obama's executive amnesty. The priorities do not lie with American citizens. Rather, they lie with people of all kinds other than American citizens.

We had 127,000 net job losses, but that doesn't really tell the whole picture. We also had population growth in the 16 to 65 age bracket for American-born citizens during that 14-year period of time.

So do you know how many more Americans are unemployed today—jobless—in the 16 to 65 age bracket because of America's faulty, porous like a sieve immigration policies? Seventeen million.

And you wonder why our youth are despondent, you wonder why they are depressed with the job circumstances they face, you wonder why American families cannot earn a living with the wages that are now being paid. It is because there are so many people in the White House, on K Street, and other places who are lobbying the United States Congress to dramatically increase the labor supply by bringing in illegal aliens and lawful immigrants to suppress wages and to take jobs from American families. That is wrong.

Now, you have heard the argument often raised: Well, Americans won't do those jobs. Let me tell you about those jobs for a moment. We have got two categories: illegal aliens and lawful immigrants.

Well, you can make the argument that illegal aliens are seeking the blue collar jobs and that perhaps Americans won't do them at the suppressed wages now being paid.

With respect to lawful immigrants it is a different picture. Over those 14 years, in that 16 to 65 age bracket, American-born citizens lost jobs while lawful immigrants gained jobs in these fields: engineering, architecture, health care, sales, office staff. Those are good-paying jobs that when I was growing up American citizens used to be able to compete for and get but which are now being denied because of immigration policies.

Those are sobering numbers, those are startling numbers. So sobering, so depressing, that I challenged my staff. I said, This report can't be right.

So my congressional staff went to the raw data from the Census Bureau, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the Department of Homeland Security, and they confirmed that the Center for Immigration Studies data was correct. Which brings us back to President Obama's executive amnesty that does so much damage to American citizens.

The House has done its job. We have passed legislation to defund executive amnesty to prevent the President from doing what he has been doing. The problem, as has been the last 4 years that I have been in the United States Congress and hopefully won't be the case for the next 2 years, lies with the United States Senate.

Media reports say that we are in an impasse, that the Democrats are stand-

ing with illegal aliens and shunning American families and filibustering. And the Republican leadership is professing: We don't have the firepower, we don't have the 60 votes, we are stymied, we can't end this filibuster.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is another option.

Let's think back for a moment and let's look at HARRY REID when he was Senate majority leader and the power that he wielded. And what did he do? He said: I am not going to let the filibuster stop me from achieving my political goals. And he exercised the nuclear option. And then under HARRY REID you did not need 60 votes for appointments of Barack Obama-submitted appointees; rather, a mere majority would work.

Well, if HARRY REID and the Democratic majority can do that, if they can stand up for their beliefs, however wrong those beliefs may be, then where is our Republican Senate leadership, and why aren't they doing the same thing? We have 54 Republican Senators. MITCH MCCONNELL last time I checked is the Senate Republican majority leader.

All of our Senators have said they object to executive amnesty. Why don't they do the same thing in respect to bills that we have to pass to prevent government shutdowns, bills dealing with spending matters, and say only 51 votes are needed; no longer can a minority with a filibuster shut down the United States Government?

And so with that, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that it is time for the United States Senate to change their rules to reflect the will of the American people. And certainly if those rules can be changed for mere appointments by a President, they can also be changed to protect the United States Constitution and the separation of powers.

Mr. Speaker, I can't speak for any Senators or, for that matter, any elected officials in Washington, D.C., but I can speak for me and I can speak for the people of the Tennessee Valley of the State of Alabama. I vote to put the jobs and wage interests of struggling American families over the interests of illegal aliens. I encourage all Senators of both parties to do the same. Respect the wishes of the American people, act on behalf of the American people, and if you do that America will continue to prosper and the rule of law in America will continue to prevail.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for those passionate words.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield a portion of my time to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY), my freshman colleague.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Congressman JIM JORDAN and Congressman BARRY LOUDERMILK, for arranging this special session tonight to address a critical issue looming before our Nation.

Senator HARRY REID and the President are currently risking the full funding of our national security to protect the President's unilateral and unconstitutional executive action on amnesty.

On 22 occasions, President Obama himself said he did not have the authority to grant executive amnesty before flipping and denying the will of the American people and taking unilateral action anyway. This attitude follows a pattern of unilateral action, executive action, including the President's war on coal, and it must be stopped.

Now, Senator REID and his allies continue to block any consideration of the bill passed by the House to fund the Department of Homeland Security. This obstruction is intended to protect the President's unconstitutional executive amnesty.

Sadly, no one is surprised that this President would use this unlawful, unilateral action to pursue his own radical agenda. But now Senator REID and the President are edging closer to putting the American people in danger to protect that agenda.

The Constitution clearly gives the power of the purse to the United States House of Representatives—this Chamber right here. And the American people said clearly last year that they expect us to use our authority over spending to keep government operating in a responsible manner.

I call upon Senator REID, President Obama, and their Democrat allies to end this political gamesmanship. Instead, bring up the bill to fund Homeland Security for consideration and passage.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, as you can tell, we have people from all over this great Union that have risen here today to speak, not just from the South. I would like to yield a portion of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), my great friend.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman leading tonight's discussion on the floor. As we do so, we think about the people back at home and across this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are hurting. Americans are hurting because they are out of work, Americans are hurting because they lost jobs, they find they can't find new jobs. Families are hurting because of this. Families, Mr. Speaker, are also hurting because they are waiting for other fellow family members to be able to join them here in this country through the legal immigration process. They are patiently going through all the processes that we have set up in this country to process it, and they are hurting as they wait for their family members to join them.

As we come here to the floor today as Members of Congress, we understand that this government has to ensure that everyone plays by the rules, including this administration.

As Members of Congress, we are obligated to uphold the Constitution, and that is exactly what this House has done by defunding the President's unconstitutional actions in which he granted amnesty. Added to that, he provided working permits to over 5 million illegal immigrants, thereby creating additional problems for those Americans who are out of work and creating additional problems for those Americans who are waiting for their fellow family members to come into this country through the legal immigration process.

Mr. Speaker, the House has done its job. We have acted. We have fully funded—this is important—we have fully funded the Department of Homeland Security while at the same time undoing the damage the President's unprecedented executive amnesty is having on our Republic and, more important, on our American families.

The President's actions to grant de facto amnesty has broad-reaching consequences for many of my constituents and constituents all across the United States as well.

It is unfair. It is not only unfair, it is irresponsible to divert resources away from legal applications of those who, as I said before, are patiently waiting and going through the legal process of immigration to give it to those who have broken the law.

It is also reckless to reward those who have blatantly broken the law with work permits, allowing them to compete directly with those Americans and those American families who are hurting because they are out of work today and are finding themselves in a hard position to find work.

So because of this, Mr. Speaker, I call on our Senators who are blocking a vote on the bill: do not turn your backs on the millions of Americans who are struggling to find work, do not turn your back on those who have immigrated here legally, and do not turn your back on those who are still waiting to try to immigrate into this country legally as well.

□ 1800

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for the Senate to act. It is time for the Senate to end its obstruction. It is time to move this bill.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. I thank my friend from New Jersey for those appropriate words.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my good friend and freshman colleague from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we are rapidly approaching a crossroads regarding the President's executive actions that provide de facto amnesty for millions of illegal immigrants.

On February 27, the appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security runs out. Here are the facts:

The House has done exactly what the American people have asked. We have passed a bill that fully funds the De-

partment of Homeland Security, including broadly supported amendments that would defund the President's illegal executive orders.

Now the time has come for the Senate to engage. Sadly, they are not even debating the issue. Senate Democrats are now blocking the consideration of the bill. I strongly urge the Senate majority leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, to hold the line and to work diligently.

The President's overreach needs to be stopped. This is a constitutional issue, not an immigration one. Are we not outraged at such abuse? The President has violated his own words, attempting to enforce authoritative actions he repeatedly said he did not have. In fact, 22 times he has said he did not have the constitutional privilege to do so. This administration's opinion on other issues may continue to evolve or change, but may I remind him the Constitution has not changed.

I am calling on not only my constituents but on our fellow citizens across this land to let your voices be heard. Demand results from your leaders.

I would like to thank my colleague from Georgia for organizing this meeting to allow our voices to be heard in a very loud manner.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate all of the comments that have been made here today. As you can tell, this is not a party issue. This is not about Republicans or Democrats or conservatives. This is about our Constitution. This is about American principles and the rule of law, but, more importantly, it is about fairness. It is about the American Dream. It is about those who are working hard every day. It is about the children and our future.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the beautiful State of Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I certainly thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have cherished the privilege to chair the Subcommittee on the Constitution in this body, and throughout the Obama administration, I have been bewildered many times by this President's many casual dismissals of constitutional principle and the respect for the rule of law, itself, in America.

However, I now believe that the President's recent actions related to illegal immigration constitute a fundamental and seminal abrogation of his sworn oath to the Constitution. If left unchallenged, Mr. Speaker, this President's unconstitutional act could create a precedent that could threaten to place a permanent crack in the very foundations of this Republic. Consequently, the issue before us now is about far more than illegal immigration—it is about protecting the Constitution of the United States of America.

Now it is both the prerogative and the solemn responsibility of this House and of the U.S. Senate to uphold our own collective oath to the Constitution. Through the constitutional power

of the purse, we must stand with and for the American people and refuse to fund this unconstitutional action by this President. We must call upon the Senate to continue to hold multiple votes for cloture so that this Nation can discover and understand who it is who prevents us from doing our constitutional duty.

Mr. Speaker, failing that, we must now call upon the United States Senate to subordinate its own cloture rules to the United States Constitution and to use their rules to change their rules for that purpose if it becomes a choice between the Senate cloture rules and the United States Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, Daniel Webster once said:

Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution and to the Republic for which it stands, for miracles do not cluster; and what has happened once in 6,000 years may never happen again. So hold on to the Constitution, for, if the American Constitution should fail, there will be anarchy throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, our duty is clear.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. I thank my good friend from the Grand Canyon State. No truer words have ever been spoken.

Mr. Speaker, many of us sat in this very room back in January, and we listened to the President as he gave his State of the Union Address. He outlined a complete program, from the cradle to the grave, of what government would do—take over the rights of individuals. Many of us heard from citizens across the Nation that they were opposed to that. Mr. Speaker, if we allow this President to continue on legislating from the Oval Office, I would submit there is nothing standing in the way for him to implement every one of his plans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this key issue to us on the floor tonight.

Mr. Speaker, in November, the voters sent a very loud message to Washington, D.C. Now, they elected a lot of Republicans, but I tell my Republican friends that they weren't affirming our principles so much as they were desperate for a check and a balance against a President whose policies were frightening to them but also whose actions lay outside the bounds of laws that he was constrained by and constitutional constraints on his actions also. He, himself, admitted that multiple times, maybe more than 20 times, saying: I don't have the right to do it—as his own party chastised him and tried to force him into these executive actions, which he ultimately took. He said at one point: I am not the emperor.

Are we now to believe that he declares himself to be such? That is the basic question that faces us now.

The people of America want this institution called Congress—the House and the Senate together—to operate properly. I think, as much as anything else, the voters were expressing discontent that 380-plus bills from this

House were stalled on the other side of the Capitol, never making their way in any form to the floor of the Senate.

The people expect to see the issues up here and wrangled about. They want the tension between the two parties' different ideological points of view pulling at the fabric of the ideas in front of us. They are not so much concerned about the next bill. They are concerned about our vision for America and where we would take it, and they are frightened of a President who himself would take on actions which they knew were contrary to the good of the future of the country and that were certainly outside the boundaries of the laws which restrain even the President, because this country believes that not even the President is above the law.

So the questions before us are very critical. There are some who are saying: You all in the House have passed a DHS bill, and it is all your way or no way. I beg to differ. We sent our version of a Keystone pipeline bill to the Senate. The Senate made significant changes. They sent that back, and, just today, we sent the bill with the changes, the changes that were brought by Democrats in the Senate. The Senate Democrats allowed the bill to come up for debate. They amended the bill. There are more amendments in this one bill than have been heard in the previous year, total, so the system is working properly. We just sent that bill to the President. We are going to ask him to sign it or to turn it down. The people will have an opinion now about the outcome of whether the President signs it or doesn't sign it.

In contrast, look at what is happening with the DHS bill. The Senate Democrats, under HARRY REID, are saying: No, we are going to block it again. There is no debate, and there is no discussion, and there are no more ideas that are going to come in front of this Senate. I think that the American people are going to have the same opinion that they had about REID's blocking all of the bills that came from the House before. I think that to be the case.

At any rate, we in the House have passed our bill. The Senate should either obstruct or move forward. There are many fashions to do both, but the American people are looking and judging because they desperately want an institution that functions. They are not really significantly interested if it functions for Democrat rule or Republican rule. I think what they want is a system that is passing commonsense legislation, guaranteeing that the future of this country will be solid and sound. Then we can build a healthy economy, where everyone has got opportunity and where everyone has a chance to succeed based on the merits of his work.

That is not what this President is putting in line, and that is the question before the House now as the Senate twice has rejected or has, maybe, even three times rejected the opportunity to debate the issue. I just calm-

ly tell the American people that we are here, prepared to do the work you sent us to do. We will continue to do it. All you have to do is express your opinions to this body.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from Representatives of the people of this Nation from all across the country. So far, I have yielded to Representatives from Florida, Alabama, West Virginia, New Jersey, North Carolina, Arizona, and New Mexico.

Now I yield to a good friend and patriot from the State that has seen and has participated in creating so much of the history of this Nation. He is the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. I thank Mr. LOUDERMILK for putting this together this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I was thinking about the situation we are in, and it came to my mind that there is a reason that the legislature is supposed to make the laws. There is a reason that we have a debate and that we discuss all of the different facets, because what also came to mind is the fact that the folks who have been legalized by the President's unconstitutional action will now get a Social Security number. With that, it will allow them to qualify for the earned income tax credit. As well, many will qualify for the child tax credit. Now, the IRS Code, Mr. Speaker, allows taxes to be amended back 3 years, and these folks who have just now received their Social Security numbers will be able to receive this payment retroactively.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker: Where is the fairness in that? I mean, what is fair about an illegal amnesty bonus? a bonus for breaking the law? What is fair about an immigrant's standing in line, coming here legally, wading through the process, only to watch somebody come right around him into this Nation, getting a Social Security number and, not only that, getting paid for doing that?

What is fair about hardworking, tax-paying Americans knowing that they can't get a break on their taxes because that money has got to go to somebody who came here expressly to break the law? What is fair about all of the children of all of these hard-working, tax-paying Americans being saddled with debt for the rest of their futures and their children's futures and those of their children's children for the sake of an illegal amnesty bonus? It is a bonus for breaking the law. What is fair about that, Mr. Speaker?

Now it is in the Senate, and the Senate is saying: Well, maybe the House should send another bill. The House sent a bill. It is the will of the House. It is the Senate's turn. With all due respect, if you don't want to vote for the bill, we get that. Vote "no." You can explain that to your constituents—you can explain that to your voters—but it is more important to you to pay somebody a bonus for coming here illegally. You can explain that.

The point is that they don't even want to have the vote. They are making sure there will be no vote. We are saying give this bill its chance; give it its day. If you have got a better idea, if you have got a different idea, that is great. That is wonderful. Let's see it. Pass your bill and send it over, and we will work together to pass something along.

I would say this to the leader of the Senate: It is time you make the rules, Mr. Leader. If now is not the time to change those rules in favor of the Constitution, when is the time? Instead of being concerned about 40-some years of tradition and of the way we run the Senate—instead of being concerned about that—how about being concerned about hundreds of years in favor of the Constitution? When President Obama didn't like the rule, apparently, even though he said 20 times or so that he had to abide by the Constitution, he just changed it. He just disregarded it.

□ 1815

And when HARRY REID didn't like the rule—a couple hundreds years of votes in cloture and the nuclear rule in the Senate—he just changed it. Right?

We are not asking to change it all the time, but when it comes down to a constitutional crisis, when it comes down to a division of powers, do you want to stand up for a bonus for acting illegally, for breaking the law, or do you want to stand up for the Constitution?

If that is not the time to change the rules for the President's unconstitutional executive action, if that is not the time to change the rules, Mr. McCONNELL, when is the time? The time is now.

Pass a bill. Whatever your bill is, have a vote, "yes" or "no," send it to the House, and we will work it out. This legislation, this issue demands your attention. It demands a vote. It deserves a vote. The American people need to know. They deserve to know where their elected representatives in the Senate stand, not to just not vote on anything. They didn't send them there to just not vote. They sent them there to make a decision, "yes" or "no."

We get it. If you want to vote "no," good for you. You explain that. If you want to vote "yes," great. But have the vote. There is no reason to not change the rule if it gets us to a vote and upholds the Constitution. As a matter of fact, if it takes changing the rules to uphold the Constitution, this is one Representative of the Fourth District of Pennsylvania who thinks it is worth it.

With that, Mr. Speaker, again, I ask you: What is fair? What is fair about giving these bonuses to people who just received a Social Security card and who have been operating outside of the law for years? They receive their Social Security Card and they get a bonus.

You try that. Having worked here as a person who was born in this country,

you try to work under the table and then just apply and see if you will get a bonus from the IRS. Let me tell you what you get, Mr. Speaker. You will get a visit from the IRS, but it won't be for a bonus.

Think about fairness, Mr. Leader in the Senate. Change the rules. Let's move this bill forward.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, as you can see, this is a very passionate issue for many of us—not just because of politics but because this is about the heart of our Nation. This is the basis, the foundation of our Nation.

I now yield to a good friend and another freshman colleague from the great State of Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. I thank my colleague for yielding. I am pleased to have this time on the floor to talk about this important issue that faces our Congress.

On more than 22 occasions, President Obama has told audiences that, on the advice of his counsel, his attorneys, he could in fact not do what he has just proposed to do last November of 2014.

He stated that he did not have the statutory authority to defer deportation of over 5 million people who are in our country illegally, thereby granting them rights to drivers' licenses, work permits, Social Security, and health benefits.

For example, in 2013, the President stated that implementing immigration "reform" through executive action was "difficult to defend legally" and "not an option." He has repeatedly told the American people that he is a President, not a king, not an emperor.

Mr. Speaker, I will place in the RECORD the 22 times that the President has uttered these words that say that he does not have the authority to take executive action on immigration.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S TWENTY-TWO STATEMENTS ON HIS LACK OF AUTHORITY TO HANDLE IMMIGRATION POLICY BY EXECUTIVE ACTION

With the White House poised to grant executive amnesty any day now despite the American people's staunch opposition, on Sunday President Obama was asked about the many, many statements he made in the past about his inability to unilaterally change or ignore immigration law. His response was astonishingly brazen: "Actually, my position hasn't changed. When I was talking to the advocates, their interest was in me, through executive action, duplicating the legislation that was stalled in Congress."

This is a flagrant untruth: "In fact, most of the questions that were posed to the president over the past several years were about the very thing that he is expected to announce within a matter of days," reported The New York Times. "[T]he questions actually specifically addressed the sorts of actions that he is contemplating now," The Washington Post's Fact Checker agreed, awarding President Obama the rare "Upside-Down Pinocchio," which signifies "a major-league flip-flop." Even FactCheck.org piled on.

President Obama is once again trying to mislead Americans, but he can't run from what he's said over and over (and over) again. Not only are Americans not stupid—they can read:

1. "I take the Constitution very seriously. The biggest problems that we're facing right

now have to do with [the president] trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all. And that's what I intend to reverse when I'm President of the United States of America." (3/31/08)

2. "We've got a government designed by the Founders so that there'd be checks and balances. You don't want a president who's too powerful or a Congress that's too powerful or a court that's too powerful. Everybody's got their own role. Congress's job is to pass legislation. The president can veto it or he can sign it. . . . I believe in the Constitution and I will obey the Constitution of the United States. We're not going to use signing statements as a way of doing an end-run around Congress." (5/19/08)

3. "Comprehensive reform, that's how we're going to solve this problem. . . . Anybody who tells you it's going to be easy or that I can wave a magic wand and make it happen hasn't been paying attention to how this town works." (5/5/10)

4. "[T]here are those in the immigrants' rights community who have argued passionately that we should simply provide those who are [here] illegally with legal status, or at least ignore the laws on the books and put an end to deportation until we have better laws. . . . I believe such an indiscriminate approach would be both unwise and unfair. It would suggest to those thinking about coming here illegally that there will be no repercussions for such a decision. And this could lead to a surge in more illegal immigration. And it would also ignore the millions of people around the world who are waiting in line to come here legally. Ultimately, our nation, like all nations, has the right and obligation to control its borders and set laws for residency and citizenship. And no matter how decent they are, no matter their reasons, the 11 million who broke these laws should be held accountable." (7/1/10)

5. "I do have an obligation to make sure that I am following some of the rules. I can't simply ignore laws that are out there. I've got to work to make sure that they are changed." (10/14/10)

6. "I am president, I am not king. I can't do these things just by myself. We have a system of government that requires the Congress to work with the Executive Branch to make it happen. I'm committed to making it happen, but I've got to have some partners to do it. . . . The main thing we have to do to stop deportations is to change the laws. . . . [T]he most important thing that we can do is to change the law because the way the system works—again, I just want to repeat, I'm president, I'm not king. If Congress has laws on the books that says that people who are here who are not documented have to be deported, then I can exercise some flexibility in terms of where we deploy our resources, to focus on people who are really causing problems as opposed to families who are just trying to work and support themselves. But there's a limit to the discretion that I can show because I am obliged to execute the law. That's what the Executive Branch means. I can't just make the laws up by myself. So the most important thing that we can do is focus on changing the underlying laws." (10/25/10)

7. "America is a nation of laws, which means I, as the President, am obligated to enforce the law. I don't have a choice about that. That's part of my job. But I can advocate for changes in the law so that we have a country that is both respectful of the law but also continues to be a great nation of immigrants. . . . With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that's just not the case, because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed. . . . [W]e've got three

branches of government. Congress passes the law. The executive branch's job is to enforce and implement those laws. And then the judiciary has to interpret the laws. There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply through executive order ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President." (3/28/11)

8. "I can't solve this problem by myself. . . . [W]e're going to have to have bipartisan support in order to make it happen. . . . I can't do it by myself. We're going to have to change the laws in Congress, but I'm confident we can make it happen." (4/20/11)

9. "I know some here wish that I could just bypass Congress and change the law myself. But that's not how democracy works. See, democracy is hard. But it's right. Changing our laws means doing the hard work of changing minds and changing votes, one by one." (4/29/11)

10. "Sometimes when I talk to immigration advocates, they wish I could just bypass Congress and change the law myself. But that's not how a democracy works. What we really need to do is to keep up the fight to pass genuine, comprehensive reform. That is the ultimate solution to this problem. That's what I'm committed to doing." (5/10/11)

11. "I swore an oath to uphold the laws on the books. . . . Now, I know some people want me to bypass Congress and change the laws on my own. Believe me, the idea of doing things on my own is very tempting. I promise you. Not just on immigration reform. But that's not how our system works. That's not how our democracy functions. That's not how our Constitution is written." (7/25/11)

12. "So what we've tried to do is within the constraints of the laws on the books, we've tried to be as fair, humane, just as we can, recognizing, though, that the laws themselves need to be changed. . . . The most important thing for your viewers and listeners and readers to understand is that in order to change our laws, we've got to get it through the House of Representatives, which is currently controlled by Republicans, and we've got to get 60 votes in the Senate. . . . Administratively, we can't ignore the law. . . . I just have to continue to say this notion that somehow I can just change the laws unilaterally is just not true. We are doing everything we can administratively. But the fact of the matter is there are laws on the books that I have to enforce. And I think there's been a great disservice done to the cause of getting the DREAM Act passed and getting comprehensive immigration passed by perpetrating the notion that somehow, by myself, I can go and do these things. It's just not true. . . . We live in a democracy. You have to pass bills through the legislature, and then I can sign it. And if all the attention is focused away from the legislative process, then that is going to lead to a constant dead-end. We have to recognize how the system works, and then apply pressure to those places where votes can be gotten and, ultimately, we can get this thing solved." (9/28/11)

In June 2012, President Obama unilaterally granted deferred action for childhood arrivals (DACA), allowing "eligible individuals who do not present a risk to national security or public safety . . . to request temporary relief from deportation proceedings and apply for work authorization." He then argued that he had already done everything he could legally do on his own:

13. "Now, what I've always said is, as the head of the executive branch, there's a limit to what I can do. Part of the reason that deportations went up was Congress put a whole lot of money into it, and when you have a lot

of resources and a lot more agents involved, then there are going to be higher numbers. What we've said is, let's make sure that you're not misdirecting those resources. But we're still going to, ultimately, have to change the laws in order to avoid some of the heartbreaking stories that you see coming up occasionally. And that's why this continues to be a top priority of mine. . . . And we will continue to make sure that how we enforce is done as fairly and justly as possible. But until we have a law in place that provides a pathway for legalization and/or citizenship for the folks in question, we're going to continue to be bound by the law. . . . And so part of the challenge as President is constantly saying, 'what authorities do I have?'" (9/20/12)

14. "We are a nation of immigrants. . . . But we're also a nation of laws. So what I've said is, we need to fix a broken immigration system. And I've done everything that I can on my own[.]" (10/16/12)

15. "I'm not a king. I am the head of the executive branch of government. I'm required to follow the law. And that's what we've done. But what I've also said is, let's make sure that we're applying the law in a way that takes into account people's humanity. That's the reason we moved forward on deferred action. Within the confines of the law we said, we have some discretion in terms of how we apply this law." (1/30/13)

16. "I'm not a king. You know, my job as the head of the executive branch ultimately is to carry out the law. And, you know, when it comes to enforcement of our immigration laws, we've got some discretion. We can prioritize what we do. But we can't simply ignore the law. When it comes to the dreamers, we were able to identify that group and say, 'These folks are generally not a risk. They're not involved in crime. . . . And so let's prioritize our enforcement resources.' But to sort through all the possible cases of everybody who might have a sympathetic story to tell is very difficult to do. This is why we need comprehensive immigration reform. To make sure that once and for all, in a way that is, you know, ratified by Congress, we can say that there is a pathway to citizenship for people who are staying out of trouble, who are trying to do the right thing, who've put down roots here. . . . My job is to carry out the law. And so Congress gives us a whole bunch of resources. They give us an order that we've got to go out there and enforce the laws that are on the books. . . . If this was an issue that I could do unilaterally I would have done it a long time ago. . . . The way our system works is Congress has to pass legislation. I then get an opportunity to sign it and implement it." (1/30/13)

17. "This is something I've struggled with throughout my presidency. The problem is that I'm the president of the United States, I'm not the emperor of the United States. My job is to execute laws that are passed. And Congress right now has not changed what I consider to be a broken immigration system. And what that means is that we have certain obligations to enforce the laws that are in place even if we think that in many cases the results may be tragic. . . . [W]e've kind of stretched our administrative flexibility as much as we can[.]" (2/14/13)

18. "I think that it is very important for us to recognize that the way to solve this problem has to be legislative. I can do some things and have done some things that make a difference in the lives of people by determining how our enforcement should focus. . . . And we've been able to provide help through deferred action for young people. . . . But this is a problem that needs to be fixed legislatively." (7/16/13)

19. "My job in the executive branch is supposed to be to carry out the laws that are

passed. Congress has said 'here is the law' when it comes to those who are undocumented, and they've allocated a whole bunch of money for enforcement. And, what I have been able to do is to make a legal argument that I think is absolutely right, which is that given the resources that we have, we can't do everything that Congress has asked us to do. What we can do is then carve out the DREAM Act folks, saying young people who have basically grown up here are Americans that we should welcome. . . . But if we start broadening that, then essentially I would be ignoring the law in a way that I think would be very difficult to defend legally. So that's not an option. . . . What I've said is there is a there's a path to get this done, and that's through Congress." (9/17/13)

20. "[I]f, in fact, I could solve all these problems without passing laws in Congress, then I would do so. But we're also a nation of laws. That's part of our tradition. And so the easy way out is to try to yell and pretend like I can do something by violating our laws. And what I'm proposing is the harder path, which is to use our democratic processes to achieve the same goal that you want to achieve. . . . It is not simply a matter of us just saying we're going to violate the law. That's not our tradition. The great thing about this country is we have this wonderful process of democracy, and sometimes it is messy, and sometimes it is hard, but ultimately, justice and truth win out." (11/25/13)

21. "I am the Champion-in-Chief of comprehensive immigration reform. But what I've said in the past remains true, which is until Congress passes a new law, then I am constrained in terms of what I am able to do. What I've done is to use my prosecutorial discretion, because you can't enforce the laws across the board for 11 or 12 million people, there aren't the resources there. What we've said is focus on folks who are engaged in criminal activity, focus on people who are engaged in gang activity. Do not focus on young people, who we're calling DREAMers. . . . That already stretched my administrative capacity very far. But I was confident that that was the right thing to do. But at a certain point the reason that these deportations are taking place is, Congress said, 'you have to enforce these laws.' They fund the hiring of officials at the department that's charged with enforcing. And I cannot ignore those laws any more than I could ignore, you know, any of the other laws that are on the books. That's why it's so important for us to get comprehensive immigration reform done this year." (3/6/14)

22. "I think that I never have a green light [to push the limits of executive power]. I'm bound by the Constitution; I'm bound by separation of powers. There are some things we can't do. Congress has the power of the purse, for example. . . . Congress has to pass a budget and authorize spending. So I don't have a green light. . . . My preference in all these instances is to work with Congress, because not only can Congress do more, but it's going to be longer-lasting." (8/6/14)

Further, notwithstanding the President's own legal argument to the contrary, Mr. Obama's supporters argue that he simply is doing what Presidents Reagan and Bush 41 did. This statement is simply not true. Instead, President Reagan and Bush responded in a statutorily acceptable matter to an ambiguity in a specific law and did not seek to circumvent or prevent enforcement of the law as it was written.

I supported recent House legislative action to defund the President's executive actions based on the facts above, as well as my view that Congress must

in fact fix our broken immigration system by legislation.

The separation of powers argument here is clear. In article I of the U.S. Constitution, Congress is granted the enumerated power of setting uniform law for naturalizing our citizens.

Mr. Obama's approach violates this provision by both exceeding his constitutional authority as well as his sworn obligation to faithfully execute the laws as passed by Congress.

While we are all familiar with the Executive's obligation to faithfully execute, we must focus on the cynical distrust that doing the opposite causes among our citizens.

James Madison in Federalist 51 discussed the need for each branch of government to guard against overreach by another. "When such an overreach occurs," Madison stated, "ambition must be counteracted by ambition." And clearly, our government works best when each branch stays within its prescribed boundaries.

Supreme Court Justice Kennedy argued this in a recent separation of powers case before the court when he said:

Liberty is always at stake when one or more of the branches seek to transgress the separation of powers.

As a matter of principle, as a matter of our role in Congress, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to stand up for the proper separation of powers and assert that Congress alone can debate and enact such sweeping changes to our immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, Members seeking to reform our broken immigration system should support our efforts to rein in this tyranny of the Executive. Only then can Congress work together to craft the proper solutions to fix our broken system. Only then will Congress come together and insist on a border that is secure and fully functioning as a cornerstone of our homeland security.

With a land, sea, and air border that knows who and why people are entering our beloved Nation, we can then turn our attention to those many connecting facets of our system: visa overstays; lack of a balanced, well-staffed, and functioning guest worker program; adequate welcome and legal openings for those facing persecution; speedy adjudication for those aliens who are detained; opportunities for needed workers, professors, and students in our universities; and finally, a process for handling those among us who remain outside our legal tax and societal systems.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to stand up for the first branch and our constitutional prerogative. Take action on our Homeland Security bill and send it back to the House.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Again, Mr. Speaker, you can see that Representatives from all across the Nation have stood here today and represented the people of this Nation on how important this issue is.

Mr. Speaker, we live in one of the most dangerous times in American history. Innocent American citizens are targeted by extreme Islamic terrorists at home and around the world.

On September 11, 2001, even the sanctity of our homeland was proven to be vulnerable. And now, an organization considered too evil and too extreme by other terrorist organizations is calling for homegrown terrorists to carry out unspeakable acts of violence against innocent Americans—acts which we have witnessed in the past year.

Since 2001, there have been more than 60 coordinated terrorist plots against Americans on American soil. These perpetrators of evil planned to execute their violence in the places where innocent civilians live, work, and play. They have targeted civilians on aircraft, at military installations, mass gatherings of citizens, sporting activities, restaurants, and shopping malls—the very places where Americans should expect to feel safe and secure.

However, the current administration continues to deny the ideology that motivates these acts of evil. When a known sympathizer to terrorist organizations chooses to carry out his evil acts against coworkers, it is passed off as workplace violence. When our Embassy in Benghazi was invaded and officials of the United States Government were slain at the hands of known terrorists, it was spun as a violent response to a YouTube video.

When a military pilot of an allied country was murdered in the most horrific and painful way, the President referred to the perpetrators as a cult of death, not extremist Islamic terrorists.

With the rise and the expansion of ISIS, our citizens, military, and first responders are in more danger than ever before, and we must be vigilant to protect our citizens and our national interests.

Following the terrorist attacks of 9/11, our government recognized that the threat of organized and well-planned acts by international terrorist organizations required new and dedicated resources to protect American citizens. In response, the Department of Homeland Security was created, and resources were allocated by Congress to protect our homeland from future devastating acts of terrorism.

Since the turn of the century, terrorists have plotted over 60 attacks against our Nation. Thankfully, more than 50 of these were thwarted by U.S. law enforcement and our intelligence community, while others were stopped with the cooperation of law enforcement from other nations.

In the past several months, the threat against America has grown exponentially. ISIS is one of the most well-funded, the most organized, the best armed, and the most ruthless terrorist organization in the history of the world.

Even al Qaeda, which planned and executed the most devastating attack on

American soil since the Japanese raid on Pearl Harbor, pales in comparison to the organization and resources of ISIS.

Recently, ISIS has expanded well beyond traditional communication tactics used by other terrorist organizations and has engaged in an effective Internet and social media campaign to recruit foreign fighters to join their ranks. They are purposefully, Mr. Speaker, targeting our youth by using popular video games to appeal to thrill seekers. They are promising that these young people can live out the fantasy world that they experience in their games.

Today, we are experiencing what may be the largest convergence of terrorist activity in history. As a result of the growth and the recruitment of ISIS, foreign fighters are swarming to Syria to join the ranks of the international jihad.

While it is virtually impossible to stop every act of terrorism against Americans, I believe the Department of Homeland Security, our military, and law enforcement agencies have done an exceptional job. However, we are only days away from the current funding of the Department of Homeland Security expiring, which, even according to this administration, could put us at grave risk.

During the first week of this 114th Congress, the House of Representatives took quick and decisive action to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security will continue to function at full capacity. We passed a funding measure that would ensure that all public safety functions within the Department are fully funded so that the agency can fulfill its mission.

Unfortunately, a few Senate Democrats are filibustering this bill and are keeping it from even coming to the floor for consideration. The Democratic Party is putting our national security at risk through their insistence that the President be able to grant 5 million illegal aliens legal status so they can receive work permits, tax refunds, and public assistance.

The President's recent executive order on amnesty places the safety of every citizen in jeopardy and eliminates job opportunities for hard-working Americans. At a time when millions of Americans are struggling simply to make ends meet, the President should be focused on providing American jobs, not introducing millions of new laborers into the workforce. Since the President assumed office, he has already issued almost 5.5 million work permits to foreign laborers.

The Senate now has the perfect opportunity to protect the safety of all Americans by approving House Resolution 240, a bill that would defund the President's executive order on amnesty, yet they refuse to take up this commonsense measure and do what is right for the American people. By not taking action, the Senate is relin-

quishing control to the President to continue carrying out these actions without the consent of Congress.

Today, my office and the office of every Member of Congress received a formal request from the White House to authorize the President to use military force to fight against ISIS. It is ironic that, on one hand, the President is asking to send our young men and women overseas to fight against terrorism but, on the other hand, he and Senate Democrats are willing to put our security at risk at home so he can, without constitutional authority, satirize the American workforce with foreign labor who have entered this Nation illegally.

□ 1830

Instead of working to strengthen our economy and secure our jobs for American citizens, the President seems to be more concerned with providing jobs for illegal immigrants.

He has even threatened to veto the Keystone pipeline, a bill that we just passed here just a couple of hours ago. He has already threatened that he is going to veto this bill with one stroke of his pen, a bill that would create more than 40,000 jobs; but with another, he is willing to add 5 million illegal immigrants to an already struggling job market.

Mr. President, the American people are hurting. Many families are spending countless hours around the kitchen table discussing how to pay their bills and live within their means. These families should not have to compete for jobs with those who are not legal U.S. citizens.

The American people should be calling on the Democrats in the Senate to stop their filibuster of H.R. 240. It is time for the President, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Senate to put the American people first and help hard-working Americans find jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TROTT). The Chair will remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair and to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

#### THE ISSUE OF TRADE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the opportunity to utilize the time allotted to the Democrats in the House to speak to the issue of trade. There are many who see this issue as an important issue.

Others are now beginning to understand some of the dynamics as they relate to free trade versus fair trade and just what the dynamics of some of the last decades were, as recent past history has indicated, as they relate to