

now since I introduced the DREAM Act. The DREAM Act—I described it earlier—gives young people brought to the United States at an early age, who had no voice in what their families were going to do, to come to this country and eventually find their way to legal status.

At one point even the House Republicans said they supported this so-called DREAM Act. Time and again we have faced filibusters stopping the DREAM Act from passing in the Senate, but it was part of comprehensive immigration reform. This DREAM Act all started with this young lady, Tereza Lee, Korean, brought to the United States at the age of 2, grew up in a poor family in Chicago, had an amazing musical talent and was accepted to the Manhattan Conservatory of Music and the Julliard School of Music. Because she was undocumented she had no place to go.

Her mother called our office. Her mother, who incidentally worked night and day in a dry cleaning establishment in Chicago said: What can we do? The law had no real answer, other than to say to this then-18-year-old girl: Go back to where you came from for 10 years and try to come here legally.

That was the law. I introduced the DREAM Act. Since then we have seen a growth in support for this because it is only fair. We cannot, should not, hold children responsible for the decisions and wrongdoing of their parents. These kids deserve a chance. That is what the President's Executive action is about. That is why the action by the House Republicans was so reprehensible.

Tereza Lee, incidentally made it. She went to the Manhattan Conservatory of Music. She ended up not only getting a bachelor's degree, she did not receive any government assistance. She had friends and sponsors who stepped in to pay for it. She played at Carnegie Hall. She is now working on her Ph.D. in music.

She is now an American citizen, by virtue of the fact that she married this young American jazz musician. They are living in New York and recently had a baby.

I could not be prouder of Tereza Lee and what she has done with her life. There is a picture with her mom and dad. Her dad passed away. He had a serious medical illness that could not be treated adequately because he does not qualify for any kind of government health insurance. They did not have the money to provide him the care he needed.

But Tereza Lee's story is one that inspires me every day to come to this floor and remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, these are real human beings we are talking about. These are not political pawns. These are young people who deserve a chance to become part of the future of America. Sometime soon, I hope very soon, maybe even this Friday, the President of the United States is going to announce his Executive order.

He is going to say that, as he did with DACA, the Deferred Action Program, he is going to give more undocumented people in this country a chance. It will be a narrow category, not as broad as we would like it—at least some of us would like it—but it will be consistent with what every President of the United States has done since President Eisenhower.

It is fair. It is just. It recognizes our birthright as Americans, as a nation of immigrants. It says we are willing to stand and fight for fairness. I would hope—I would just hope that a few Republicans will stand and acknowledge this. I hope a few of them will join us in a bipartisan recognition that our broken immigration system cannot be fixed if the Congress of the United States—particularly the Republican House—refuses to even call the bill for a year and a half.

Instead, the President is using his authority and doing the best he can to make this Nation of immigrants proud again that we are welcoming a new generation of people who will make us even stronger in the future.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREE- MENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order be modified so that the following nominations be added following Executive Calendar No. 1056: Executive Calendar Nos. 966 and 967, with all the other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes in morning business.

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

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I am glad I got to the floor to listen to my friend, the Senator from Illinois, the majority whip, make his remarks. It reminds me of his great passion and commitment to the DREAMers and to the cause of repairing our broken immigration system.

While he and I differ on the details, and the feasibility of passing comprehensive immigration reform, we have been trying to do this for—laboring with this for at least the 10 or 11 years that I have been here. We have been unsuccessful. What does that tell us? It tells us we need to try something different. We need to break this down into smaller pieces. In the House, Speaker BOEHNER I know has made this pledge to the President and others. I know Senator MCCONNELL, the new incoming majority leader, believes immigration reform is important and we ought to use our best efforts to make progress.

But unfortunately the message the President of the United States has sent is he is giving up. To listen to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who support this unprecedented Executive action by the President that is going to be announced on Friday, they have given up. They have given up.

What the Senator from Illinois did not say is even the President's deferred action order involving these young people—by the way, I support providing them an opportunity to become American citizens and productive members of society. I think we are all better off—these young people who are not culpable, they did not commit any offense or crime, they came with their parents, and we are much better off. They are much better off. Their families are much better off.

Our country is better off if we find a solution—which I am confident we could do. But the message the President has given and our Democratic friends have given is: We give up. We are not going to do our job as legislators.

We are going to let the President, with the stroke of a pen, provide an Executive amnesty to millions of people and create an awful lot of harm in the process.

The tragedy is we are a nation of immigrants and proud of it. Our rich, diverse heritage would not have been the same without the contribution of immigrants who have come from around the world, contributions that have become part of the very fabric of our lives and our society.

Millions of foreign-born immigrants who have come to the United States legally have become successful, patriotic citizens of the United States. We have been the beneficiary because of the opportunities that our Nation provides that nowhere else on Earth provides, and that is the opportunity to pursue the American dream.

But part of what makes the American dream possible is the rule of law. It is our Constitution. It is not Presidents getting frustrated with Congress, issuing an Executive order, defying the Constitution, and ignoring his oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. That undermines the American Dream.

So I listened to my colleague and friend from Illinois saying that this is a question about: Are immigrants good for America or not?

I stipulate they are good for America. As a matter of fact, my ancestors weren't born in the United States. We all came from somewhere else.

This is really, at bottom, whether the President, when he put his hand on the Bible and he took a sacred oath to uphold and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States, whether he really meant it or whether he had his fingers crossed behind his back.

Like many of my colleagues, I have had the privilege of participating in naturalization ceremonies all across my State, where I have seen individuals from Vietnam, India, Mexico, and

from countries all around the world take the oath of allegiance to the United States of America. It is an inspiring and heartwarming occasion and, of course, many of them have taken that oath while wearing the uniform of the U.S. military, where they have served with honor and dignity as they await approval of their citizenship.

One of the first bills I passed when I came to the Senate was with Ted Kennedy of Massachusetts, the liberal lion of the Senate. What we did is we passed a simple piece of legislation that expedited the process whereby immigrants who serve in the military can become American citizens. That was one of the first bills I was a part of that passed when I came to the Senate.

Of course, these naturalization ceremonies represent a proud day, not only for these new Americans but for all Americans and for our Nation as a whole, where we welcome new citizens with open arms to this country to find a better life for themselves, for their family and, in the process, for all of us.

But the President has now threatened—and he is the one who has made the threat: If you don't do it on my timetable, according to the terms I prefer, I am going to do it myself.

He said that time and time again. There is no President who has abused the authority to issue Executive orders more than the current occupant of the White House. All Presidents have issued Executive orders since President George Washington, but no one has held Congress and the Constitution in such contempt that they feel as if Congress is irrelevant—except when I need them to appropriate money or to help them serve my purposes.

But the President is going to take steps in the coming days that would send men and women—such as those I have mentioned—who came, playing by the rules, pursuing legal immigration to the United States. He is going to basically tell those folks: Get to the back of the line.

We are the most generous country in the world when it comes to naturalization—almost 1 million people a year. But the President is going to tell the people who have been waiting patiently in line, playing by the rules: Get in the back of the line. I am going to put millions of people ahead of you in front of the line who have not played by the rules.

Well, it is a sure way to send a message to the rest of the world that our country does not enforce its own laws, which is an essential part of who we are, and where everybody, from the humblest to the most exalted in our country, are all bound by the same laws, whether you are President of the United States or whether you are one of these new Americans who takes an oath to uphold and defend the laws and the Constitution of the United States.

I have to say, because I come from a big State that sees disproportionate negative consequences of illegal immi-

gration, this is a sure way to continue to reward the criminal organizations that get rich on the status quo. The 60,000 unaccompanied children that came from Central America that were part of this humanitarian crisis we had last summer continue to come, and the criminal organizations that continue to profit from this money-making operation are continuing to get rich. It encourages children to take a perilous journey, for many of whom it ends in kidnapping, sexual assault or death to get to the U.S. border.

The worst part is we just had a national election, as we do every 2 years. I have been in Congress when my side of the aisle wins elections, and we have had a pretty good election. I have been here when we lost, as we did in 2008. But that doesn't mean we can give up on our job, which is to legislate.

One of the saddest parts about what the President is going to do is he will poison the well and make it much harder, if not impossible, for us to do the sorts of things for which a bipartisan, bicameral commitment exists to do, which is to make serious progress on our broken immigration system. I am not sure whether we will be able to do as much as I would like to do or the Senator from Illinois would like to do, but we all know the status quo is unacceptable.

The President seems intent on provoking a constitutional crisis by adopting policies that he previously said were illegal. He said he didn't have the authority to do it time and time again. Now he has totally done a flip-flop of 180 degrees saying: I have discovered I now do have the authority. I was wrong when I said I didn't have the authority to do it. He seems intent on exacerbating partisan polarization and weakening democratic accountability.

We are the ones who are responsible for making these decisions, and we are accountable to our electorate, our voters. Unfortunately, it is going to make it much harder for us to make necessary progress on a number of different matters next year.

The President says we haven't acted on his timetable in a way that he prefers, so he is going to go it alone. But just think for a moment about the larger implications of that argument.

Every President in history has clashed with Congress. That is part of what we do. That is what the separation of powers is all about. It forces us to build consensus as opposed to pursuing our own agendas, and that is important. That is essential. But failing to get your way in Congress doesn't mean the President can simply override Congress with the stroke of his pen.

There is broad support for passing a series of commonsense immigration reform bills. I know the Speaker has said that publicly. The majority leader in the House, Congressman MCCARTHY, I believe, believes that, and I certainly do. The incoming majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, has told me he does

as well. But what there is no support for, other than purely partisan support, is what the President is proposing to do.

So in other words, if the President were willing to negotiate in good faith—and, yes, when your proposal is that I want everything I want or I want nothing, you frequently get nothing. You always get nothing because nobody gets everything they want, and it requires genuine compromise and it requires hard work. Nothing sustainable or meaningful will ever be done in this place without bipartisan support. We have learned that lesson time and time again.

But the President seems absolutely allergic—allergic—to good-faith negotiating and genuine compromise. In fact, I am not even sure he likes the job he ran so hard to get elected to, because that is part of his job—to work with Congress in a bipartisan way to achieve genuine consensus and compromise where possible.

He is claiming now, apparently, on Friday in Las Vegas, a right that no other President has claimed and, in fact, that he said he did not have, time and time again.

I know the White House Counsel's office is preparing a convoluted legal case to justify the President's actions. Most Americans will correctly view this as an abuse of power.

Earlier, I asked the President to think about the human costs of encouraging another massive wave of illegal immigration. My State is disproportionately affected, given our 1,200-mile common border with Mexico. It is not only people coming from Mexico; it is from Central America and around the world. But I urged him to think about all the men, women, and children from Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador who have suffered terrible violence and, indeed, some have died during their long journey through Mexico from Central America.

I urged him to think again about whether what he is doing inadvertently rewards and helps fund the criminal organizations that are creating such havoc in Mexico and in parts of Central America.

I can only hope the President will reconsider. I certainly am not optimistic because now the White House is leaking press reports about this announcement on Friday. But I believe his unilateral action, which is unconstitutional and illegal, will deeply harm our prospects for immigration reform. It will be deeply harmful to our Nation's tradition of the rule of law and deeply harmful to the future of our democracy.

Many Democrats believe, as I do, that this is a mistake. The President should heed their advice, stop making threats, and respect the Constitution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

NET NEUTRALITY

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I rise today to call the Senate's attention to one of the most important economic issues before us, and that is the issue of Net neutrality.

We face a pivotal moment in the fight to preserve an open and fair Internet. Last week, the President called on the FCC to protect the bedrock principle of Net neutrality.

A strong, open Internet is one of the best ways to protect the innovation that supports millions of American jobs. It is one of the best ways to protect the competitiveness of the digital economy.

Now the FCC is working on formulating ways to protect a robust Internet. We know that the FCC received over 4 million comments on the issue of Net neutrality, and it registered many concerns by the public in making sure that we protect what has been a great resource for them.

They have spoken. They want to protect innovation, and they want to protect a free Internet.

Consumers should know for a fact that their Internet service is being held to the same standards as everywhere else. But we know now there are concerns about the concentration of players in the cable and large telephone market as it continues to develop. Maybe two providers will provide as much as 85 percent of the provider market, which raises concerns to many consumers.

Today I am calling on the FCC to take forceful action that adopts the strongest rule possible to provide maximum protection for consumers—maximum flexibility to promote the Internet economy.

I encourage the FCC to adopt robust and durable rules to prevent locking, throttling, fast lanes, and to safeguard transparency for consumers. These rules should apply both to the wired and wireless broadband networks so that your Web browser, your personal computer, your apps on your phone, all are treated in the same way.

This important policy would provide certainty to startup and business communities the same way as it will to support the Fortune 500 companies. In other words, we will treat an entrepreneur who started their company in their garage the same way we treat a big multinational corporation.

We need to send a clear message: We do not want artificial toll lanes on the innovation economy of the future. It is my hope the FEC arrives at a conclusion next year and issues these rules. The Internet has been an engine for unprecedented economic growth for our country. Today, the text-up sector represents 3.9 millions jobs, according to Pew Research, and it is continuing to grow. It really does represent the American entrepreneurial spirit.

YouTube was created in a garage in San Mateo; Facebook launched in a dorm room in Cambridge, MA; Amazon—when Jeff Bezos came to Bellevue,

WA—has now become a juggernaut in downtown Seattle for new growth and development. These companies might have started in a garage, but they are supporting thousands of jobs across our country.

So today we want to make sure the Internet is not under attack by those who would prefer a pay-for-play system. The biggest telecom companies are trying to write the rules of the road that would crowd out some of these opportunities for unique entrepreneurs to continue to grow the application economy of the future. That is why we can't allow Internet service providers to set up fast lanes for those who can pay and slow lanes for those who can't. Our innovation economy depends on equal access for ideas.

Between 2007 and 2012, development of applications for smart phones and tablets created over 466,000 high-tech jobs and generated more than \$20 billion in annual revenue. A tiered Internet system would put all of that at risk. It would allow Internet service providers to cut back from the deals to determine what information America can access on line.

We live in an economy based on speed, and a tiered Internet system would give the power to set speed limits to those few Internet service providers and what they wanted to do. This has a major ripple effect. Imagine your doctor examining a patient via telemedicine or a student trying to access a report through a university server, all of this put at challenge by whether they have fast access.

As an editorial in the *Seattle Times* said: America's democracy is in trouble when information is throttled or controlled by a few. The FEC must reverse this shameful trend.

What they are really trying to say is that creating additional barriers is tantamount, in my mind, to creating a tax on the Internet. A tiered Internet provider would have the range of control, and it means that individual users could be challenged. Strong Net neutrality rules will help maintain the same Internet we have today, and that is why the FEC should act.

Across the country, innovators, entrepreneurs, are experimenting with different app designs and different content creation and they rely on this open Internet to pursue those new business models. Nearly every startup relies on understanding that their product can reach any user connected to the Internet. So allowing Internet service providers to erect toll lanes would threaten the fundamental nature of the Internet and every business plan of every startup that relies on the consumer's ability for equal access to content.

We must do better than what has been done so far, and I encourage this body to make sure we too are going to stand up and protect the American spirit of entrepreneurship by making sure that Net neutrality is the law of the land.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Rhode Island.

(The remarks of Mr. WHITEHOUSE pertaining to the introduction of S. 2940 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank my colleague for allowing me the extra time, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for up to 15 minutes.

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

RETIREMENT OF STEVE BACCUS, PRESIDENT OF KANSAS FARM BUREAU

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, agriculture is the lifeblood of my home State of Kansas. It drives our economy, but more importantly, it offers our citizens a way of life that is unique in today's world.

Within that industry I often encounter thoughtful, committed men and women who work every day to raise their families, run their businesses, serve their neighbors, and provide a better future for the next generation. Those qualities are found in Steve Baccus, who for the past 17 years has served on the Kansas Farm Bureau Board of Directors and for the last 12 served as its president.

Kansas Farm Bureau is our State's largest general farm organization, with nearly 105,000 members. Under Steve's leadership, the organization has influenced policy and politics, promoted rural values, and worked to show an increasingly urban population how food is produced and why technology is indispensable to feeding a hungry world.

Steve is a native Kansan, a veteran, a husband, a father of five, and a grandfather. His fourth-generation family farm in Ottawa County produces wheat, corn, soybeans, and occasionally a sunflower or a bit of sorghum.

I met Steve now many years ago when he was on his local farm bureau board, and we grew to be friends over the years. He was always someone I could count on to give trustworthy advice and counsel.

As agricultural issues repeatedly come to the forefront of debate in Washington, DC—from trade and energy, to the economy, overregulation, and the farm bill—Steve has worked to make certain the voices of Kansas farmers and ranchers are heard in the Nation's Capital.

Steve's passion for improving the lives of Kansans and advocating for the future of our rural State has always impressed me. His service on the Kansas Farm Bureau board was inspired by Steve's deeply held belief that there is a better future ahead for Kansas agriculture and for our State. He has always been selfless in his service, often