

above special interests, no matter who holds control of Congress or the White House.

### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 61—HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF PEGGY CHARREN

Mr. MARKEY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 61

Whereas Peggy Charren was born on March 9, 1928, in New York City;

Whereas Peggy Charren founded the Action for Children's Television in 1968 to promote educational television programming for children;

Whereas under the extraordinary leadership of Peggy Charren, the Action for Children's Television grew to a strong organization of more than 20,000 advocates for children;

Whereas Peggy Charren and the Action for Children's Television worked tirelessly for decades to establish youth-friendly educational programming standards for television for children;

Whereas Peggy Charren and the Action for Children's Television played a central role in the passage of the Children's Television Act of 1990, which established standards for children's television by requiring television stations to serve the educational needs of children in the United States;

Whereas Peggy Charren was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom on September 29, 1995, by the 42nd President of the United States for her leadership in reforming television for children in the United States;

Whereas Peggy Charren remained a powerful voice for television programming for children over the course of her entire life, constantly fighting for the interests of the youngest viewers in the United States; and

Whereas the content of television for children in the United States has been forever altered for the better thanks to the remarkable efforts of Peggy Charren: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, That—*

(1) the Senate—

(A) honors the lifetime of service by Peggy Charren to the children of the United States;

(B) recognizes the lasting contributions made by Peggy Charren to the children of the United States and educational television programming worldwide; and

(C) requests the Secretary of the Senate to prepare an official copy of this resolution for presentation to the family of Peggy Charren; and

(2) when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of Peggy Charren.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 62—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING ON FEBRUARY 8, 2015, AS "NATIONAL TRIBAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK"

Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. THUNE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. UDALL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 62

Whereas there are 37 tribal colleges and universities operating on more than 75 campuses in 16 States;

Whereas tribal colleges and universities are tribally or federally chartered institutions of higher education and therefore have a unique relationship with the Federal Government;

Whereas tribal colleges and universities serve students from more than 250 federally recognized Indian tribes;

Whereas tribal colleges and universities offer students access to knowledge and skills grounded in cultural traditions and values, including indigenous languages, which enhance Indian communities and enrich the United States as a whole;

Whereas tribal colleges and universities provide access to high quality postsecondary education opportunities for American Indians, Alaska Natives, and other individuals living in some of the most isolated and economically depressed areas in the United States;

Whereas tribal colleges and universities are accredited institutions of higher education that effectively prepare students to succeed in their academic pursuits and in a global and highly competitive workforce;

Whereas tribal colleges and universities have open enrollment policies, and approximately 20 percent of the students at tribal colleges and universities are non-Indian; and

Whereas the collective mission and considerable achievements of tribal colleges and universities deserve national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, That the Senate—*

(1) designates the week beginning on February 8, 2015, as "National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week"; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate support for tribal colleges and universities.

#### NATIONAL TRIBAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 62, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 62) designating the week beginning on February 8, 2015, as "National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 62) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 338 AND S. 339

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I understand that there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 338) to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

A bill (S. 339) to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 entirely.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

#### APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 93-112, as amended by Public Law 112-166, and further amended by Public Law 113-128, the appointment of the following to serve as a member of the National Council on Disability: Neil Romano of Maryland.

#### ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2015

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. Tuesday, February 3; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein, equally divided, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half; that following morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 6, H.R. 203, the Clay Hunt SAV Act, with the time until 12 p.m. equally divided, and following the use or yielding back of time, the bill be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill. I ask consent that the Senate recess following the vote until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Reserving the right to object, during the Keystone debate, the Energy and Natural Resources Committee chair said we

should get beyond the discussion as to whether climate change is real—

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask for regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CORNYN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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, I renew my unanimous consent request. I have conferred with the Senator from Rhode Island and yield to him for purposes of asking a question.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Reserving the right to object—it is not in the form of a question—but, as I said, during the Keystone debate, the energy committee chair said we should get beyond the discussion as to whether climate change is real and talk about what do we do. I will not take more time now than to say that I hope we soon do get to that question: What do we do?

With that, I will not object.

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

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, who I understand is en route.

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

Mr. CORNYN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, tomorrow we will vote on whether to proceed to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill, which fully funds the Department of Homeland Security and includes the law enforcement priorities that were agreed to on a bipartisan basis in the House. It is indeed a clean bill. The House of Representatives has voted to fund fully homeland security, as the President has requested.

Now, it is not a perfect bill. Republicans and Democrats and individuals on both sides have different priorities on some matters, but they did come to an agreement to fund all of the programs of the Department of Homeland Security and on how much they were funded—activities and actions that are authorized, however, by the laws of the United States.

So this bill will not deny a penny of funding. In fact, it says: Mr. President, spend the money on enforcing and following the law. Spend the money on enforcing the Immigration and Nationality Act as passed by Congress—that is the law of the United States of America. Spend the money to let our law enforcement officers carry out their duties as prescribed by the laws.

Yet our Democratic colleagues say they are going to block this bill—that they will all stick together and not even let it come to the floor of the Senate. Why? Why would they do that? Because, they say, they want to give the President the funds, apparently, to spend on his unconstitutional and unlawful Executive amnesty. They will not allow the bill to even be voted on, and without a vote in the Senate, the funding for Homeland Security does not go forward. They are not going to allow it to be voted on because they want to protect the President in his assertion of an unconstitutional and illegal power to order duly-constituted enforcement officers of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to carry out unlawful activity.

The President is not entitled to spend taxpayer dollars to implement a system of immigration that Congress—representing the American people's wishes, let me add—rejected just last year. Surely our Democratic colleagues will not block the Senate from proceeding to this bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security. If they are unhappy with the language of the bill of the House of Representatives, if they think the President wrongfully or rightfully, using legitimate powers, could direct them to provide Social Security numbers, Medicare participation, earned income tax credit money from the Federal Government and the right to work in the United States when the law says they are not entitled to be employed in the United States, then they can offer an amendment to the bill and bring it up on the floor of the Senate to strike that language if they think it is so bad.

Of course, if you think about it, that would be a stunning event; would it not be—the Senate taking language from a bill or striking language from a bill that restores the separation of powers as properly understood by the Framers and preventing the President from violating law and the constitution. They are going to vote against that? Maybe that is why they choose not to have this bill go forward. Maybe they do not want to confront the issue.

I am going to quote Senator REID in a moment because he said we ought to

confront the issue square-on. All right, let's do so. I suspect Senator REID, though, and his team are not so interested in having votes and being held accountable for their votes.

Our colleagues would have the right to offer amendments. Senator MCCONNELL is allowing amendments. He is going out of his way to allow amendments and changing the terrible state the Senate had found itself in under the leadership of Senator REID. Consistent with the rules of the Senate, those amendments can be brought up, and a motion to strike this language is certainly appropriate.

It is an untenable position—untenable constitutionally, untenable because it is contrary to the will of the Members of the House and Senate who oppose the President's action—Republicans and Democrats. Perhaps most importantly, it is untenable politically because the American people strongly reject it. So why would any Senator—Democrat or Republican—when the very integrity of the Congress is under assault by an overreaching executive branch, not want to assert congressional authority at this point?

We are coequal branches of government, and the President does not have the authority to enforce a law that was never passed—indeed, a law that was explicitly rejected by the Congress of the United States—and grant amnesty to people who are unlawfully here, provide them work authorizations, a photo ID allowing them to apply for any job in America, with Social Security numbers and the right to participate in Social Security and Medicare. That is what the President's actions are going to do.

This is not prosecutorial discretion—nowhere close to prosecutorial discretion. It is an Executive fiat. It is an imperial act. As the President himself said repeatedly: I am not a king; I am not an emperor. When dealing with this very issue, he told people over a period of years—20 times—that he did not have the power to do this. But then he changed his mind. Under pressure from certain political interest groups and because he couldn't get Congress to vote for the bill he wanted, he just decided to do it on his own.

This is an unthinkable overreach. It is a matter of great national importance. The American people were engaged in this. They were following this issue. The President couldn't get the constitutional process to give him the power he wanted, so he just did it anyway.

Why can't it be stopped? I get asked that. What is the matter with you people in Congress?

Well, we had seven Members on the Democratic side of the aisle, still in this Senate today, who said the President overreached. They said he shouldn't have done this, and it should have been done by the legislature, by the Congress, not by the President. Yet are all seven of them going to vote with Senator REID and become part of