

NOMINATION OF SARAH R. SALDANA TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair report the Saldana nomination, Calendar No. 1084.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sarah R. Saldana, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, my colleague from Texas has just stepped off the floor. He has spoken at some length about his position on this nomination. With the utmost respect for my colleague from Texas, I wish to address the same issue.

We disagree on many political issues, but we are truly friends, and we work together on the Senate Judiciary Committee. I respect him very much, even though we disagree on this issue. I just wanted to express my respect for the senior Senator from Texas before I speak about the nominee to be Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security.

I am at a loss to explain the position of the Senator from Texas and the Republican Party of America when it comes to the issue of immigration. What are we to make of what they tell us when we talk about immigration? Without fail, they say to us: First and foremost, we must have enforcement at our borders. Once we have secured our borders from the inflow of illegal immigrants, then—and only then—can we discuss fixing our broken immigration system.

How often have we heard that? I have heard it every time the Republicans address the issue of immigration: First, fix the border, and then we will talk.

It was about 540 days ago—on the floor of the Senate—when we called up an immigration reform bill for consideration. That immigration reform bill was put together—a comprehensive bill—by Democrats and Republicans. I was one of eight who helped to put that bill together. We sat down for months and negotiated that bill.

The Republican side of the table had JOHN MCCAIN of Arizona, former Republican candidate for President; JEFF FLAKE of Arizona, a border State Senator with passionate feelings about this issue; MARCO RUBIO, one of the two Hispanic Members of the Republican Senate caucus; and LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina, a man who is an attorney, works in the Air Force Reserve in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, and is a conservative by every measure. Those were our four on the Republican side. On the Democratic side we had Senator CHARLES SCHUMER, chairman of the Senate immigration subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee; BOB MENENDEZ, of the Presiding Officer's State of New Jersey

and a Hispanic leader; MICHAEL BENNET of Colorado; and myself.

We negotiated not for weeks but for months. We laboriously went through every aspect of immigration in America, and, to the amazement of ourselves as well as the public, we reached an agreement, a compromise. I was not happy with parts of the bill. Some of it I didn't like at all, and I thought other parts were excellent. That is the nature of a compromise.

We brought this bill to the Senate Judiciary Committee and opened it up for amendment. We said to Republicans and Democrats alike: Improve it if you can. There were scores of amendments that were offered in that committee.

The bill was favorably reported from the Senate Judiciary Committee and came to the floor of the Senate, where once again it was amended. One amendment, offered by Senator CORKER of Tennessee and Senator HOEVEN of North Dakota, Republicans, dramatically increased border enforcement.

We currently spend more on immigration enforcement than on all other Federal law enforcement efforts combined. We have made a huge commitment, and the Hoeven-Corker amendment increased it with 700 miles of fences, more personnel than ever, to the point where they could literally have an agent every 1,000 feet along the southern border.

Are we serious about border enforcement in our comprehensive bill? Yes, we are. We adopted the Hoeven-Corker amendment. Although some said we were overdoing it, we adopted it in the spirit of compromise and offered it on the floor for passage. On the final vote, we had 68 Senators who voted in favor of comprehensive immigration reform. There were 14 Republicans who voted for it, along with the Democrats, which made a majority of 68, and we passed the comprehensive immigration reform bill.

Sadly, the senior Senator from Texas voted no. He voted no on comprehensive immigration reform. We did our job. We had a bill endorsed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO. This bill was endorsed by faith leaders all across the United States and had the support of the civil rights community as well as conservatives such as Grover Norquist. We passed it. It is what the Constitution said we had to do.

We sent it through the Rotunda and across the Capitol to the House of Representatives, where it fell into this dark and gloomy pit never to be seen again. We have waited about 540 days now for the House of Representatives to at least acknowledge it, maybe even debate it, perhaps change it or even offer it on the floor of the House of Representatives, but no, they chose to do nothing. In the view of the House of Representatives, we have a broken immigration system. Yet they decided to leave it untouched.

So the President said time and again to Speaker BOEHNER: When are you

going to accept your responsibility when it comes to fixing this broken immigration system?

The Speaker kept saying: Give me some time. Give me some time. Give me some time.

Eighteen months passed, and the President said: I am sorry. I have to do something. If you are going to do nothing in the House of Representatives when it comes to immigration, I must do something as President.

He went into an effort—I know because we spoke—of research to determine what previous Presidents had done when it came to immigration by Executive action. He started off somewhat skeptical, and he said as much publicly, as to the limits of what he could do.

He said: I need to carefully research this, and he did. He found that some 11 Presidents have engaged in Executive action on immigration, and so he set out to do the same, to carefully construct Executive action to deal with our broken immigration system, all the while knowing the Republicans in the House of Representatives, and many here in the Senate, were going to do nothing when it came to immigration.

He issued his Executive action a few weeks ago. What did it say? It said: If you have been in the United States at least 5 years and come forward and register with this government by giving us your name, your address, and vital information, we will then submit you to an extensive criminal background check to determine whether you have done anything while in the United States or before that makes you ineligible to stay. If you fail that initial criminal review, you are gone—no questions asked. But if you pass it and are prepared to register with this government and pay your fair share of taxes for working in the United States, you will be given a temporary work permit that must be renewed, as we review every several years whether you are still eligible to stay. That is the Executive action that has driven the Republicans to distraction.

The notion is that this President is going to try to fix a broken immigration system by at least guaranteeing that those who are here working legally have no criminal background problems and are paying their fair share of taxes. They are so distraught over this that they have come up with a strategy that is incredible.

The Republican Party, which has insisted time and time again that border enforcement is their highest priority, have—in protest to this Executive action by the President—decided to do two things. First, they passed a spending bill in the House of Representatives which funded all of the Federal Government with a budget for the next year except for one agency. Which agency would that have been? It turned out to be the Department of Homeland Security, which is responsible for border enforcement. The party that is dedicated

to border enforcement as the starting point for an immigration discussion starts off by tying the hands of the agency responsible for border enforcement when it comes to their budget.

Why would you do that? If you truly want the border enforced and you want people there doing their job, why would you limit their resources? Why would you make it more difficult for them to operate? But the Republicans—in protest of the President's decision—insisted on it. That was the first thing they did, and now we are seeing the second part of the Republican strategy, which is in protest to the President's Executive action.

They are prepared to stop the nomination of Sarah Saldana to become an Assistant Secretary leading U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. That title describes what she would do, but for the record she would be responsible for making certain that the people who are protecting our border are doing their job right and spending their money well, and it turns out she is eminently qualified to do it.

I will read a quote from Sarah Saldana's confirmation hearing:

Ms. Saldana [is] the first Latina United States Attorney in Texas history, and only the second woman to hold that position in the 135-year history of Texas' Northern District. . . . In her role as U.S. Attorney and prosecutor over the past decade, Ms. Saldana has served our state with honor—fighting corrupt public officials, organized crime, sex traffickers, and other dangerous criminals. Throughout her career, Ms. Saldana has developed a reputation for her decisive and fair temperament and her commitment to excellence.

What is the source of this glowing tribute to Ms. Saldana? It turns out the source is the Senator who just left the floor, the senior Senator from Texas who announced today he is voting against her.

After making this statement, he is voting against her. Why? He said because she would aid and abet this President of the United States in implementing his Executive action.

Elections have consequences. I noted that President Obama was reelected by the people of the United States of America and given the responsibility to lead this great Nation. He has asked for a team to do that, and whether I agree or disagree with any given policy of this President, it is clear the American people said: Mr. Obama, lead this Nation.

He has asked for help to lead this Nation, and it is help long overdue. Do my colleagues know how long it has been since we filled this critical spot to protect our border from unlawful immigration? Over 2 years. July of 2012 was the last time this spot was filled. There have been objections to those people who have been suggested by the President over and over again, by the same political party that insists border enforcement is their highest priority. Yet they will not fund the agency responsible for it in a systematic, orderly way, and they refuse to fill the vacancy

of the person responsible for administering this border enforcement.

I am at a loss to explain this. It appears to me their feelings about this President have reached a point where they are not thinking clearly. They cannot announce on one hand that first we must have border enforcement and then fail to fund the agency. They cannot announce that first we need to make sure we stop the flow of undocumented immigrants and then refuse to fill the position responsible for administering that responsibility. Yet that is exactly what they want to do today.

I hope good sense will prevail. I hope Ms. Saldana is given her chance to serve this Nation. I am certainly going to support her in that process. It is time we have a Senate-confirmed head of this agency, and it is overdue for us as a Senate and a House of Representatives to address comprehensive immigration reform.

The Republicans who are critical of the President's Executive action when it comes to immigration, in the words we learned in law school, do not have clean hands. They have failed to support immigration reform. They have failed to call on the House of Representatives. They have failed to fund the agency responsible for border enforcement, and they want to fail today in even filling the spot to administer it. Leadership requires that we step forward with the President and do what is necessary.

I see the minority leader and my colleague from Utah are on the floor. I will close by saying that President Obama, when he announced his Executive action, said to his critics on the other side of the aisle: There is a way to deal with this issue and to stop this Executive action. Pass a bill.

We have waited over 500 days for the House of Representatives. I hope we don't have to wait much longer.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

STAFF SERGEANT DANIEL T. LEE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today I rise to honor the life of a brave soldier in the U.S. Army Special Forces from Kentucky who gave his life to defend his country. SSG Daniel T. Lee of Fort Wright, KY, was killed on January 15, 2014, in Afghanistan from wounds received during combat action in the Parwan Province while searching for militants wanted for recent attacks on Bagram Air Base. He was 28 years old.

For his service in uniform, Staff Sergeant Lee received many awards, medals, and decorations, including the Bronze Star Medal, the Purple Heart, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, the Army Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Iraq Campaign Medal,

the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, two Noncommissioned Officers Professional Development Ribbons, the Army Service Ribbon, two Overseas Service Ribbons, the NATO Medal, the Combat Infantryman Badge, the Basic Parachutist Badge, and a Special Forces Tab.

Danny's mother Frances Lee has this to say about her son:

Danny became consumed with being all that he could be; not only in Special Forces but as a father, husband, brother, and son. He never lost his sense of humor and was rarely without a smile. His smile was infectious even in dire times.

A northern Kentucky native, Danny's childhood was filled with friends, family, and sports. He was a member of the Beechwood diving team from the age of 5. In the eighth grade, he transferred to Turkeyfoot Junior High School and began playing football. He also played basketball, baseball, and softball.

Danny graduated from Dixie Heights High School in 2003 and moved to Tennessee "for a fresh start," says Danny's mother. He began working for a Knoxville electrical company but soon moved to Lowe's hardware chain, where he got a job as a manager in Crossville, TN.

His mother said:

While in Crossville, he enlisted in the U.S. Army, a move that took all of us by surprise. We packed up the house and off he went to Fort Benning. He is the only person I have ever heard say that he loved basic training!

After enlisting in the U.S. Army in October of 2007, Danny completed basic training at Fort Benning. His first assignment was with the 2nd Squadron, 1st Cavalry Regiment at Fort Lewis, WA. While serving in the 1st Cavalry Regiment, Danny deployed to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2009.

Daniel's service in Iraq compelled him to join the elite ranks of some of our finest fighters in the Armed Forces. Danny's mother said:

Upon his return from Iraq, he became a man with a mission. That mission was to become a Special Forces Green Beret.

Danny began his Special Forces training in March of 2011 and ultimately earned his Green Beret when he graduated as a Special Forces communication sergeant. To earn that Green Beret, Danny attended Airborne School at Fort Benning and went to Qualification School at Fort Bragg, NC. For approximately 20 months he completed a series of rigorous classes covering skills and tactics such as languages, leadership, navigation, survival, evasion, resistance, and escape.

While in Qualification School, Danny also married his wife Suzanne, whom he met while stationed at Fort Lewis. Danny graduated from Special Forces training in May 2013, and he and Suzanne had a child, Daniel Roderick, in July of that same year.

In August 2013, Danny was assigned to C Company, 2nd Battalion, 3rd Special Forces Group, Airborne, based in Fort Bragg. In September of that year,

he was deployed to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

After Danny's death, the Kentucky General Assembly appropriately designated a portion of Kentucky Route 1072 in northern Kentucky's Kent County as the "Sergeant Daniel Tyler Lee Memorial Highway."

We are thinking of Danny's loved ones today as I recount his story for my colleagues in the Senate, including his wife, Suzanne; his son, Daniel; his parents, Frances and Daniel Patrick Lee; his sister, Jamie Hahn; and many other beloved family members and friends.

The motto of the U.S. Army Special Forces, of which Daniel T. Lee was a proud member, is "de oppresso liber" or "to liberate the oppressed."

As an elite member of the Nation's Armed Forces, with service in both Iraq and in Afghanistan, Staff Sergeant Lee certainly fulfilled a mission to the best of his ability. The Commonwealth of Kentucky and the U.S. Senate are both grateful for his service and for his sacrifice.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the nomination of Sarah Saldana to be in charge of Immigration and Customs Enforcement within the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

As we all know, the President of the United States recently announced he will take unilateral Executive action on immigration. In so doing, he has circumvented the democratic process, and he has broken the law and subverted our constitutional order.

It is incumbent on every Member of this body, no matter what their politics or what immigration policies they might prefer to enact, to oppose that usurpation of legislative power and to defend the rule of law. Fulfilling that duty—the duty to defend the rule of law and our constitutional order—leads me to oppose Ms. Saldana's nomination to be the Director of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or ICE, as it is commonly known. Although I respect her and respect her record of public service, including an admirable and independent streak she demonstrated as U.S. attorney, I am concerned that she has also demonstrated that her commitment to the rule of law may falter where the Immigration and Nationality Act is concerned.

In response to a question raised by several members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, including me, Ms. Saldana said that she agreed with DHS Secretary Jeh Johnson that immigrants who enter the country illegally and have now been targeted for the so-called deferred action program have "earned the right to be citizens." That is bold. This is an extraordinarily bold assertion on her part.

No doubt Congress could and many people think Congress should ease the path to citizenship for some aliens,

some immigrants who are currently here unlawfully, but to assert that citizenship—not just the right to remain here for a time but full-blown citizenship—is a matter of right and that it has been earned by the very act of breaking our immigration laws is an unacceptable view for a person who has been nominated to be the head of our Nation's immigration enforcement office, but, as I told the Senate last week, this seems to be precisely the mentality of this administration.

Although President Obama has repeatedly denied clearing a path to citizenship for those who have crossed our borders illegally, his denial is false, and he knows it. A 2010 Department of Homeland Security memorandum explicitly contemplated this very thing. We see some evidence of this. There was a 2010 memorandum within the U.S. Department of Homeland Security—one that made it all the way up to then-Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano—that explicitly contemplated using a legal device called parole to enable aliens who crossed our border unlawfully to become citizens.

Now, the law makes it possible for aliens with U.S. citizen children who have been paroled into the United States to adjust their immigration status and become green card holders, but parole is supposed to be very rare. In other words, there is a way to get here but not by use of parole.

Federal law—specifically INA S. 212 (d)(5)(a)—forbids the President, forbids the executive branch of government from paroling aliens into the country except for under very limited circumstances, including "urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit." That is the text of the statute enacted into law by Congress. But now, despite denying having cleared the path to citizenship, the administration has begun granting parole to beneficiaries of deferred action under the very thinnest of pretexts: The President's policies now allow deferred action recipients to get advanced parole so long as they have a client meeting or an interview or some academic research to perform overseas—hardly an urgent humanitarian crisis. When they get back from their trips, these same individuals would then be paroled into the country and will eventually become eligible to adjust their status and get green cards—exactly as the 2010 DHS memo suggested.

All of this, of course, is illegal. But it is worse than illegal; it is illegitimate. If Congress decides to make it easier for illegal immigrants who have children here to obtain citizenship, then so be it, but that is a decision for the American people through their elected officials in the legislative branch of the Federal Government to make. If the President dislikes the law, he, as any other citizen, must ask this body to change the law—must ask Congress to change that law. He has no more right than anyone else who lives in this

country to ignore or change the law outside the constitutional process.

But the President and this administration have talked themselves into doing just that. They can try to rationalize that action—to us and perhaps themselves—only by donning the mantle of moral indignation. It isn't just that it would be prudent or merciful to reform our immigration regime. Instead, the administration's argument is that those who flout our laws have, by the very act of flouting them and by the very act of breaking them, earned some kind of moral entitlement to have the law changed or at least to have the law ignored. If Congress will not oblige them, they will do it themselves. They will draft a law called an Executive order that overturns national immigration policy as established by law and passed by Congress, and they will announce it at a press conference. There will be no debate; there will be no amendments; there will be no vote. In short, there will be no democracy.

We have passed through the looking glass. And to see how far we have gone inside, observe: Today, the President asks us to install as custodian of our border a person who evidently believes that crossing our border illegally earns you the right to vote. The Constitution gives the Senate the responsibility to give the President advice about his Executive nominations and ultimately consent.

My advice is this: The President should not proffer a nominee for the job of executing our immigration laws who affirmatively supports subverting those very same laws, those same laws she would be called upon to enforce and implement and execute if, in fact, she were confirmed to this position. But that is exactly what the President does. That is exactly what the President has done by submitting this name to the Senate for confirmation. I cannot and will not give my consent.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CYPRUS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak on two separate and distinct topics. The first is about Cyprus.

This year marks the 40th anniversary of the Turkish invasion. We hoped it would have brought a fair settlement to the Cyprus question; that would have brought an end to a 40-year-long occupation and division of the island by Turkey.

There is always cause for optimism and room for faith that the realization of a reunified Cyprus is in the near future. Global and regional dynamics

have made the reunification of Cyprus a priority, driven in part by Cyprus's newly found energy resources. This is particularly true in light of Russia's Machiavellian-like power plays in Central Europe that have placed Cyprus and Israel at the forefront of the discussion of European energy security.

The natural resources that have been discovered this year in the eastern Mediterranean offer both Greek and Turkish Cypriots alike a powerful incentive to reach an agreement. Cyprus can play a pivotal role in regional energy security. But the dynamics have again changed, which is why I rise today to express my grave concern over the Republic of Turkey's incursion into Cyprus's exclusive economic zone.

On October 20, Turkey sent a Russian vessel—the *Barbaros*—into Cyprus's exclusive economic zone to stop the Government of Cyprus from exercising its lawful and sovereign right to explore the natural gas within the exclusive economic zone. In the days following, Turkey dispatched warships to support the *Barbaros* in its illegal activities, where they remain to this day.

The incident is merely the latest in a long series of violations on the part of Turkey against Cyprus's sovereign right to explore and exploit its natural resources within its own exclusive economic zone. Turkey, of course, also illegally occupies, with 40,000 Turkish troops, the northern portion of the island and has for 40 years prevented any meaningful reconciliation efforts.

This map, from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, shows the positions of the Turkish ships in red. They are sitting between the island of Cyprus and its own ships in its own exclusive economic zone.

There is no doubt in my mind that Turkey's actions have endangered peace talks between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots that began in February with a joint communique issued by the two communities. That communique committed to finding a durable solution based on a bizonal, bicomunal federation with political equality. But because of Turkey's bullying practices, peace talks are now on hold. For peace talks to resume, Turkey must immediately withdraw its ships operating in and around Cyprus.

The international community has been abundantly clear in supporting Cypriot President Nicos Anastasiades in recognizing Cyprus's right to explore the resources within its economic zone and in condemning Turkey for this blatant violation.

On November 13, the European Parliament adopted a resolution strongly condemning Turkey's "illegal and provocative actions" in Cyprus, stressing that "the Republic of Cyprus has the full and sovereign right to explore the natural resources within its exclusive economic zone."

Turkey's recent actions in Cyprus are only one instance of its belligerent and bellicose rhetoric and backsliding on peace and democracy. In recent

weeks, President Erdogan and his Cabinet have used unusually belligerent and anti-Western rhetoric to attack the West. He actually said—and I am amazed at the rhetoric:

Americans look like friends but they want us dead—they like seeing our children die.

He said: They like seeing our children die. This is the President of Turkey. He also said:

Women are not equal to men. Our religion has defined a position for women: motherhood.

Erdogan said this at a summit in Istanbul on justice for women.

He went on to say:

Some people can understand this, while others can't. You cannot explain this to feminists because they don't accept the concept of motherhood.

He then went on so far as to say that Muslims discovered America, not Columbus.

He has vowed to make lessons in the Arabic alphabet Ottoman language compulsory in high schools—a highly symbolic move which enraged secularists who proclaim he is assuming an increasingly extremist agenda.

These statements, along with Turkey's illegal actions in Cyprus's exclusive economic zone, are a dramatic escalation of Turkey shifting away from democracy and its partners in the West, and in my view requires an immediate and forceful response.

The Cypriot people need a strong voice on this issue. They need us to demand President Erdogan to immediately withdraw from Cyprus's exclusive economic zone so reunification talks can resume.

Cyprus's leaders deserve credit for trying to change the dynamics and return to talks. They also deserve credit for being an ally and advocate of America's interests.

Cyprus's active role in supporting counterterrorism efforts, terror financing, and the removal of chemical weapons from Syria have not gone unnoticed to this Senator. Cyprus is clearly positioning itself as part of the Western security architecture and is a resource, advocate, and an ally for our interests.

These developments have led the White House to play an active role on behalf of Cyprus, and I was very pleased to see our former colleague and now Vice President—Vice President BIDEN—visit in May and to hear of his commitment to resolving the Cyprus question. I share his support for the confidence-building measures in Famagusta that would benefit both sides and accelerate progress toward a final settlement where Cypriots control their destiny and their territory, and where at the end of the day any settlement is from the people of Cyprus, by the people of Cyprus, and for the people of Cyprus, and Cyprus alone.

To that end, I recently sent a letter to President Obama urging his continued engagement on the issue of reunification of the island and the restoration of human rights for all its citizens. I

also wrote to Ambassador Power urging her active involvement in the extension of the island's U.N. peace-keeping operation, and I was pleased when the extension was formalized at the end of July.

I hope President Erdogan, now that his election is behind him, will use this opportunity to play a renewed role in finding a fair settlement. We all appreciate that any progress will depend on a true commitment by the Turks to the peace process.

As the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I believe the United States is committed to supporting Cyprus as a friend and ally. So as we mark the 40th year of a divided Cyprus, let us hope and pray that a fair and mutually beneficial settlement will be reached very soon and that, once again, the island will be reunited. Above all, let the warship and let the other ships that do not belong in Cyprus's waters be removed and removed now.

Mr. President, at this time, I would like to switch the topic to the nomination of Sarah Saldana, and I want to reiterate my strong support for Sarah Saldana, a woman eminently qualified to serve our country and to lead ICE as our next Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security.

The junior Senator from Texas began this long legislative weekend engaged in his own political battle, wholly dependent on a strategy of obstructionism, delay, and some quixotic fixation on preventing the Senate from exercising its constitutional responsibility to legislate and ensure that critical leadership positions for our Nation are filled in a timely manner.

Unfortunately, some of my friends on the other side have joined in the politics of obstructionism. Now they want to prevent a duly elected President from filling a position they themselves feel is of paramount importance. They have railed about the need for strong Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and now, given the chance finally to confirm a Director of ICE to give them the strong enforcement they have demanded, they refuse, they obstruct, they delay, and they reverse their positions from when they voted for her to be a U.S. attorney. They now use her nomination to score political points with their base because they disagree with the President's politics—not with the qualifications of the nominee, but with the President's policies.

Sarah Saldana is qualified, and Senators CRUZ, CORNYN, SESSIONS, and everyone on the other side of the aisle know it. I think they have said so themselves. She currently serves as the U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Texas. She is the first Latina U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Texas and would be the first Latina to head ICE.

In 2011, she won bipartisan approval to serve as the U.S. Attorney in the Dallas-based Northern District of Texas. Senators JOHN CORNYN and Kay Bailey Hutchison at that time of Texas

backed her for that post. She has been endorsed by the law enforcement community, including the Major Cities Chiefs Association president and the Philadelphia Police Department Police Commissioner Charles Ramsey.

She is an effective, qualified, competent, outstanding U.S. attorney. In fact, the senior Senator from Texas, my friend Senator CORNYN, has praised her as being “tough, smart and fiercely independent.” Now she is being denied confirmation for that same toughness, intelligence, and independence. Why? Because—surprise of all surprises—she happens to agree with the policies of the President who nominated her; just as Attorney General Herbert Brownell agreed with President Eisenhower in 1956 when he paroled foreign-born orphans into the United States for adoption; just as Attorney General Edward Levi agreed with President Gerald Ford in 1976 when he granted extended voluntary departure to Lebanese citizens; just as Ed Meese agreed with Ronald Reagan in July of 1987 when he shielded Nicaraguan refugees from deportation, and later when he shielded Polish nationals from deportation; and in October 1987 when President Reagan protected from deportation the minor children of parents legalized in the 1986 immigration law; just as Attorney General Richard Thornburgh agreed with George Herbert Walker Bush in November of 1989 when he protected Chinese nationals from deportation after Tiananmen Square, and in February of 1990 when President Bush extended President Reagan’s family fairness policy to spouses and unmarried children, all undocumented at the time; and just as John Ashcroft agreed with President George W. Bush when he expedited nationalization for green-card holders who enlisted in the military in 2002.

So this isn’t a fundamental Republican policy issue backed by history or by the facts, it is a modern-day extreme conservative issue driven by politics, despite the facts contrary to their own history. The fact is they do not agree with the President on just about anything—certainly not on immigration, as proven by the statements we have heard on this floor.

I want to be very clear. We cannot judge the qualifications of Sarah Saldana to run Immigration and Customs Enforcement based solely on the fact she agrees with the policy decisions of the President who nominated her. That is an absurd and completely illogical standard. We judge nominees based on their qualifications, their integrity, their record, and their willingness to serve the Nation.

The fact is we don’t deny confirmation to score political points. We may disagree on the issues, but we cannot raise the political bar so high in this Chamber that we no longer are able to carry out our constitutional mandate of advice and consent. I don’t believe that is what my colleagues will suggest, but that appears to be how they

are judging this nominee and why they have chosen to hold up confirmation of so many nominees. They have raised the political bar so high as to deny any ability for this President to fill key positions in government and in our embassies abroad—all to score political points and diminish the ability of this President and this institution of government.

Sarah Saldana is more than qualified to head Immigration and Customs Enforcement. She is more than qualified to oversee the agency my Republican colleagues fully support, which is responsible for enforcement of immigration laws, national security, drug smuggling, human trafficking, cyber security, and child exploitation.

She will direct the agency that tracks down people without documentation—that is what my Republican friends want. Yet they have set the political bar so high that they have made it impossible for them to get what they claim to want most when it comes to immigration policy—that is immigration enforcement. The illogic of their position is just mind boggling.

The Senator from Texas comes to this floor for one purpose, and one purpose only, in my view—to rail against the President, to castigate him for doing what his own party’s iconic Ronald Reagan did when he was President, George H.W. Bush did when he was President, and what every President has done to defer deportations when keeping people’s lives and families together were in the balance.

My friend from Texas wants to join his House colleagues and score political points with the most extreme elements of his party. So be it. But I wish to remind everyone that this isn’t a game. I would say to the junior Senator from Texas that instead of floor theatrics and playing politics, it is time to step up and govern. It is time to confirm Sarah Saldana and put her in charge of Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Let’s do the work we were sent here to do.

I say to my friend from Texas what I have said before on this floor. There is a simple antidote to Executive action. It is to have our friends in the House of Representatives pass immigration reform. Pass it. Call it up for a vote. That is the end of it—not disinformation and misleading speeches about what the President’s action does and does not do or blocking this nominee.

Let’s be clear. The President’s Executive action will not grant anyone legal status or citizenship. It is not a free pass. But it will clear the way for many to come forth out of the shadows, register with the government, pass a criminal background check, get a work permit, pay taxes, and no longer live in fear of having their families ripped apart.

As a result of the President’s actions—which is replicated actions by 11 Presidents for the last 60 years on 39 different times—more Border Patrol

will be sent to the southern border, more felons will be deported, more people will pay taxes like the rest of us, and more families will stay together. Those are all goals and values I think we would want to espouse.

The fact is, the Senate is being prevented from conducting the people’s business. For some Members that is the goal. For them it is all or nothing. For them it is an ideological war that can only be won or lost. For them it is not about governing; it is about winning.

So I would say to my colleagues, there is a very important difference, and that difference is the basis of millions of Americans who expect us to work for them. They don’t care if we win or lose political battles. They want us to help them with their battles in their lives for their families. That is what they want. It is what they deserve. I ask my friends to help us do the people’s business.

Our agencies have waited long enough. They need positions filled by qualified appointees, and Sarah Saldana is more than qualified. So I urge my colleagues to confirm this nominee and fill the position that is responsible for law enforcement activities that keep our country safe.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the work that Congress still must do regarding America’s ongoing war against ISIL, and I am glad to follow my colleague, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who has played such a critical role in initiating the first major step that Congress has taken. I want to talk about that step and the steps in which we would continue to engage.

It was my strong hope as of December 2014 that Congress would have spoken by now with a clear voice regarding ISIL and authorizing the military action commenced by President Obama on August 8. While that has not occurred, action taken by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week finally moves the body into the sort of good-faith legislative process regarding this ongoing military action, and it is my hope the process will be completed early in 2015.

I first began speaking about this issue in the spring of 2013. I had grown deeply concerned that the administration, as did the previous administration, was using the 2001 Al Qaeda authorization and the 2002 Iraq authorization to justify military actions significantly beyond what Congress had intended when those authorizations passed. So during an Armed Services hearing in May 2013, I told administration witnesses that any decision to introduce U.S. forces into Syria would require, in my view, a new authorization.

I was pleased when President Obama sought congressional approval for military action in Syria in August 2013, and

I believe the Senate Foreign Relations Committee vote at that time helped lead to the ultimate destruction of the Syrian chemical weapons stockpile—one of the largest stockpiles in the world.

There is an important lesson. The President's determination that U.S. military action is necessary is made more powerful when Congress joins in that decision.

In June of this year, when it became apparent that the advances of ISIL in Iraq and Syria posed a threat to humanitarian values, to regional allies, to U.S. citizens and embassies and to our broader national interests, I publicly argued and encouraged the administration to address the threat—but only using military force after consultation and approval by Congress.

Make no mistake. ISIL is a major threat. But Presidents cannot constitutionally start military action without Congress unless there is a direct and imminent threat to the United States.

In this instance, with ISIL's activities occurring halfway across the globe and with the administration admitting that the organization poses no imminent threat of attacking the United States, a new congressional authorization is necessary.

Now, I regret that the administration started military action—what President Obama called going on offense against ISIL—in August without congressional approval. The White House asserts that the current action is justified by the 2001 and 2002 authorizations, but most outside observers and most Members of Congress believe the current campaign against ISIL needs its own legal authorization. The White House has not proposed authorizing language, and so it is up to Congress to do the job of providing a legal framework for this war.

I introduced a proposed authorization for war against ISIL within days after President Obama addressed the Nation on television on the evening of September 10. Since then, I have been working to have the matter heard—first in the Foreign Relations Committee and then by the full Senate. I have been greatly assisted in my effort by many colleagues, none more so than the chairman, Senator MENENDEZ, who has passionately worked to advance this item in the business of the Senate.

The pace of our efforts has been frustratingly slow. But last week, after a series of hearings and business meetings, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted on an authorization to authorize the ongoing military action.

The authorization is a sound product that does a number of things. First, it authorizes and describes the military campaign against ISIL. Second, it establishes a 3-year duration of the authorization, with the ability for reauthorization if the Congress determines it to be in the national interests. Third, the authorization repeals the 2002 Iraq authorization and sunsets the

2001 Al Qaeda authorization in 3 years as a mechanism for forcing Congress to review and revise that Al Qaeda authorization.

Finally, what we did last week places limitations on the use of U.S. ground troops in the war on ISIL in accord with President Obama's clear pledges to the American public and our considered judgment that the U.S. role should be primarily to assist ground troops from the region in battling the region's own extremist violence.

After reporting the authorization out of committee, Senator MENENDEZ filed it as an amendment to the omnibus budget bill with numerous cosponsors, including me. That was entirely appropriate because the budget contained funding for the ongoing operation against ISIL. But the amendment was not allowed, and, thus, in all likelihood, we will adjourn our 2014 session without taking action beyond the SFRC vote.

But just as the SFRC vote in August 2013 played a significant role leading to the destruction of the Syrian chemical weapons stockpile, I believe the authorization we passed last week will also have a significant effect. It becomes the first formal action by Congress in providing a legal framework for the war that, until now, has been carried out without any clear legal authority. It will be the basis for our discussions in January as we complete the necessary work of authorizing this military action.

It is my hope that the authorization passed in Senator MENENDEZ's committee will be introduced early in 2015, with dozens of cosponsors, and ultimately enable a full congressional vote on this most important matter.

I do believe the dialogue in Congress since August—since the President initiated unilateral military action on August 8—does offer some important lessons.

First, not surprisingly—and especially as a Virginian I have to say this—the Framers of our Constitution had it right—Framers such as Mason, Madison, and Jefferson. We shouldn't go to war without congressional approval. Unilateral action by the Executive without congressional support deprives the public of the full debate necessary to educate everybody about whether military action is in the national interest.

Just as importantly—maybe more importantly—it is unfair to send American troops into harm's way without a clear political consensus supporting the mission. We have already had three Americans who have lost their lives in Operation Inherent Resolve.

Congressional debate and approval expresses a support for the mission. But the lack of clear congressional support subjects an ambivalence about whether military action is a good idea or bad, and that is not healthy when we are asking people to risk their lives.

Second, when a President decides that military action is needed, the

events of the last few months demonstrate it is best for the President to propose a draft authorization to Congress. When the President spoke to the Nation on September 10, he should have sent a draft authorization of the war against ISIL to Congress immediately. A clear definition of the proposed mission by the President is the best way to encourage full congressional debate and build the national consensus in support of the proposed mission.

Now, if a President does not propose an authorization, that doesn't give the Article I branch—the legislature—a pass from our constitutional obligations. We cannot let the lack of Presidential action slow us down in doing our job. But the process works better if the President initiates military action with a clear proposed authorization of Congress.

Third, the administration's reliance on the 2001 and 2002 authorizations in prosecuting this war on ISIL without congressional action demonstrates the profound need to revisit those authorities, because using a 13-year-old authorization crafted in different times for a different circumstance under a different administration for a different bit of geography with the support of a vastly different Congress to justify a new war 13 years later is not the way the Nation should make the great decision about whether to go to war. That is why the repeal of the 2002 authorization and a significant revision of the 2001 authorization is so important.

Finally, the events of the last months revealed yet again the weaknesses of the War Powers Resolution of 1973, an act whose provisions have been ignored by Presidents and Congresses of both parties since the ink was dry on the original. This fall, as an example, the President provided Congress notice of the start of military action as provided by the 1973 act, but then he completely ignored the 60- and 90-day timeline for ceasing military action and instead continued military operations in a unilateral way. It is time to update the 1973 law so it will work, for gosh sake. Senator MCCAIN and I have introduced a significant revision of the law to improve the consultation between Congress and the President on matters of war, to define the magnitude of conflict that should trigger a required congressional vote, and to set out mandatory timelines for congressional action.

I am fully aware that a better, more consistent process for initiating war will not make our security challenges easy ones. The world is a difficult place. We have bellicose authoritarian regimes—North Korea and Russia—we have non-State actors such as ISIL or Boko Haram or the al-Nusra Front or Al Qaeda. It is a complicated security situation that we have right now, and if we have a better process it will not make those security challenges easy, but I maintain—and my belief has grown stronger with every day I have

been in this body—that the absence of a process for making decisions about war coupled with the twin pathologies of Executive overreach and congressional abdication make it harder for us to do the right thing with clarity and with speed.

The events of the last month show that America can make decisions about war in a better way, and it is my hope we will address this important issue promptly as we reconvene in 2015.

Thank you.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HETKAMP). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIBUTE TO DON MARFISI

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, over the past few years I have had the great privilege, along with Dr. TOM COBURN, to chair the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. Our committee has many responsibilities, one of those being oversight of the Department of Homeland Security.

The Department of Homeland Security was created just shy of 12 years ago—a young organization compared to most other agencies. It was established in 2003 following the terrorist attacks of 9/11. It brought together under one umbrella 22 different and disparate agencies. Trying to form one unified agency has not been easy. There have been growing pains aplenty. Our current Secretary Jeh Johnson, Deputy Secretary Ali Mayorkas, and their leadership team have made great strides in addressing challenges, and I am confident their hard work will continue and pay off.

Behind the leadership team at the Department of Homeland Security are the more than 200,000 men and women who go to work each day to fulfill one critical mission, to create a safe, secure, and resilient place where the American way of life can thrive. Whether these employees are encountering terrorism, securing our borders and our airports, responding to natural disasters or bolstering our defenses in cyber space, few other agencies and employees touch the lives of Americans on a daily basis more than does the Department of Homeland Security.

As chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, I have had the great honor and pleasure of meeting with many of these men and women and learning more about their work, learning about their families, their frustrations, and their dedication to the service of our Nation. We have also heard the Department of Homeland Security leadership from across the Department, including Secretary Jeh Johnson, sing their praises and describe the mission-critical work they perform day in and day out in

communities across America and around the world.

A young man named Don Marfisi of Kansas City, MO, is one of those employees. I wish to take a few minutes to talk about him and to acknowledge his service. Don grew up in Omaha, NE. He is the son of a civil servant and homemaker. His father worked for the city of Omaha, his brother worked for the Department of Justice, and his son currently works for the Metropolitan Community College in Kansas City, MO. Clearly, public service is a deep tradition in his family—and from what I hear, it is something Don takes to heart.

Don began his Federal service more than 24 years ago as a supply clerk with the U.S. Department of Agriculture Farm Service Agency in Lincoln, NE. Four years later, in August of 1998, he joined the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice. After a little over 1 year there, he was transferred to Citizenship and Immigration Services in the new Department of Homeland Security. Within Citizenship and Immigration Services, Don works at the National Records Center where he is responsible for logistics, procurement, and property management. We can still find him there today. In fact, his colleagues consider him a “cave pillar,” having worked at the Center since opening day.

What does the National Records Center do exactly? According to the Department, it is the keystone to the recordkeeping of the agency for which he serves. We call it USCIS—housing millions of paper records that have been centralized into a single state-of-the-art facility. The Center where Don works improves the integrity of USCIS’s recordkeeping and dramatically reduces the time it takes to retrieve a file or paperwork, meaning faster application processing for an agency charged with overseeing our immigration system.

Don’s current job title, mission support specialist, doesn’t do his work justice. Colleagues say Don is not just a support specialist but an integral part of the National Records Center’s mission support team and plays an important role in nearly all the logistics-related projects executed at the center. In this position, he develops and administers best practices for Federal procurement and property management. While he avoids the spotlight, he is highly valued and sought out for his expertise in the asset management field.

Don’s colleagues told me, “Through his painstaking attention to detail and timely responsiveness . . . he has provided a superior level of customer service to local employees and other stakeholders.”

Don’s attention to detail ensures that folks within Citizenship and Immigration Services have the tools and resources they need to get their job done. Don’s critical eye and expertise

in procurement is also credited for saving the government and the taxpayers over \$500,000 in fiscal year 2013 and over \$800,000 to date in fiscal year 2014. Let me repeat that: Don has saved the American taxpayers in the last 2 fiscal years \$1.3 million.

His service and stewardship don’t end there. At the same time he is saving the Department and taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars, he is also finding a way to give back. Along with the money he has been able to trim off the Federal deficit, he has managed to arrange the contributions of nearly \$800,000 in equipment to local schools through the GSA Property Disposal Program. Through this program he ensures that unused or older government equipment goes directly to local schools. Because of his efforts, computers and other equipment that would otherwise be trashed are recycled and used to boost education and raise student achievement in schools across the country.

As one can imagine, educators, communities, and the students themselves who receive the equipment have been overjoyed with the generous donations. But don’t take my word for it. In 2012 the Miami R-1 School District, in Amoret, MO, a small K-12 school located on the Missouri border in the middle of cornfields and cow pastures, received \$45,000 worth of recycled technology equipment.

Sharon Knuth, the school’s technology administrator, wrote to Don saying that her district was “blessed by the GSA Property Disposal program.” She added:

We are limited in our funds and budgets so we do not always have the chance to purchase the latest technology equipment. Because of your generosity, we will put the computers, monitors, speakers and plugs to good use. . . . We will grow and prosper only because we found some great friends like you who gave us support along the way.

Another school in Chadwick, MO, thanked Don for the “blessing”—that is their term—of this new technology they received through his efforts. But there is more. Don was also a member of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Inclusion’s Minority Serving Institutions Program team which facilitated more than \$1 million in computer equipment donations in the past fiscal year 2014.

Don has been recognized for his extraordinary accomplishments in years past. In 2013, for example, he was recognized as USCIS Employee of the Year and as one of the National Record Center’s Employees of the Quarter. Yet despite these great accomplishments and high praise from his colleagues and from people all over the country, Don insisted that every award he has received is a team award. When he learned he was gathering such high praise for his work, his response was:

Being recognized for your efforts is appreciated, however, I’m the fortunate one, I get to reuse items and give—two things I enjoy doing.

Like a true leader, this man is humble.

Don remembers something that I learned from Department Secretary Jeh Johnson during his confirmation. I learned that one of Secretary Johnson's guiding principles is a lesson from Dr. Benjamin—known as Bennie—Mays, former president of Morehouse College, who said: "You earn a living by what you get; you earn a life by what you give."

Think about that for a second, and then think about this man right here and all the giving he has done throughout his career and his service to our country. I just have to say to Jeh Johnson, the Secretary of the Department, that you have a remarkable employee. You are blessed with a lot of remarkable employees, and Don is certainly at the top of the list.

Don's service doesn't end at the Department. He has a couple of other critical roles. He is a husband and a dad. He and his wife Pam have been married for 30 years. He has a son, Josiah, and daughter Anna. When he is able to find some well-deserved downtime, he enjoys watching a Big Ten team, the Nebraska Cornhuskers, with his family.

I have to say that as a proud Ohio State graduate, we enjoyed playing you guys this year and look forward to next year—maybe you guys will get some revenge next year.

To Pam, Josiah, and Anna, thank you for sharing your husband and dad with us. He has done extraordinary work for our country and for a lot of communities. We are proud of him, and I bet that you are as well.

Finally, I say to Don Marfisi—on behalf of my colleagues, Democrats, Republicans, and a couple of Independents as well, and the folks who work here in the Capitol, even the pages who are sitting at the bottom of the Presiding Officer's desk—we all thank you for what you do for us every day, for your service, and for your immeasurable generosity to our great Nation.

I also wish to thank Alejandro Mayorkas. Ale is the Deputy Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. We were meeting with a number of employees at the Department of Homeland Security. They were discussing how to raise morale, although that is not their day job; it is an additional responsibility they have undertaken. The folks at the Department of Homeland Security—for the 12 years it has been in existence—has suffered from low morale, and sadly, still does. I think that is starting to change.

I am an old Navy guy, and I like to say that things that are hard to do are like changing the course of an aircraft carrier. I think the aircraft carrier is starting to turn at Homeland Security.

One of the keys for an organization to do well is to have great leadership. As the Presiding Officer knows, at the beginning of this year, there were gaping holes in the top ranks of the Department of Homeland Security. One of the things Dr. COBURN, the committee, and I did—when the administration

would nominate a candidate with good leadership skills—was to bring those nominations to the Senate and debate them and vote them up or down. We have made great progress this year, and I am grateful to Senator HEITKAMP for being so supportive and a big part of that process.

We have a vote this afternoon on another critical nomination. Sarah Saldana is a U.S. prosecuting attorney. She leads our operation in the northern part of Texas and oversees 100 counties in her great State. She tries to make sure the Federal laws are enforced across her counties.

She has been nominated to be Assistant Secretary at the Office of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, also called ICE. It is a huge job with tens of thousands of employees who work all across America.

I hope when we debate her nomination—she has been supported very graciously by JOHN CORNYN, the senior Senator from Texas, who introduced us to her at our committee hearing—our colleagues will join together in supporting her nomination.

We have this photograph here, and I said earlier this is Don Marfisi in the middle, also known as Pam's husband.

I will be coming to the floor about once a month to talk about this department, which doesn't get the kind of credit it deserves, and the people who work there don't get the credit they deserve. We are trying to make sure that changes, and part of changing the course of the aircraft carrier is to say thanks to the good people at the Department. Don is one of many employees who deserves our thanks.

In this photograph to my right, this handsome young man is Ethan Cole. Ethan is the supervisor for the work that Don and these folks do.

We have here Terry Sloan. She is the Deputy Director of the National Records Center, and we are proud of her and her services. Standing next to Terry is another TC—we have TOM COBURN, TOM CARPER, and Tom Cioppa. I think when this picture was taken, Tom was the Director of the National Records Center, and now he is the District Director of the Chicago District.

Not long ago Ale Mayorkas and a number of Homeland Security employees were paying us a visit. The reason I mentioned Ale is because of a story he told us about a visit someone made to NASA headquarters. I can't recall if it was during the evening or weekend, but it was during off hours. As they were going through one of the big buildings at NASA, the visitor came across a guy who was a custodian. The visitor said to the custodian: What do you do here? The janitor looked him right in the eye and said: I am helping to put a man on the moon.

The people at Homeland Security, including Don, are helping to ensure that our country is safe and secure. We are in their debt.

With that, I am looking to see if there is anyone else trying to speak. I

understand the Senator from South Dakota may be emerging from the Republican cloakroom and looking for a moment to shine. If he doesn't get out here fast, I will just note the absence of a quorum and will let him call it off when he gets here.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NEW ERA IN THE SENATE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, the American people made one thing clear in November, and it was this. They are ready for change in Washington. The Senate Republicans are too. In fact, I think even some Senate Democrats are ready for a change in Washington.

When the Republicans take the majority in January, things will look very different here in the Senate. The start of our majority will mark an end to the dysfunction that has characterized the Senate under the Democrat's leadership. Under Republican leadership, the Senate will return to regular order.

We will once again empower the committee chairmen to start the legislative process. Bills will be drafted in committee with input from Members of both parties before the bills are fully debated on the Senate floor, and Members of both parties will be able to offer amendments, which is in strong contrast to the Democratic Senate, where the minority party has been almost entirely prevented from getting amendment votes.

History shows us that the Senate functions best when all Members are allowed to have amendments and votes. In the early years of the Reagan administration, President Reagan aggressively pursued tax cuts that faced opposition from Republicans as well as Democrats. However, after 2 weeks of debate and consideration of 141 amendments, the Senate passed the bill by an overwhelming vote of 89 to 11.

In President Reagan's second term, the Tax Reform Act of 1986 saw 3 weeks of debate on the Senate floor. After the consideration of 109 amendments and 24 rollcall votes, the bill received 97 votes in the Senate.

These are just a couple of examples of a Senate functioning as our Founders intended. An open amendment process softens division among Members and builds bipartisan support for major legislation. The result is reforms which are not only historic but longstanding.

In addition to returning to regular order, the Senate will also focus on its oversight responsibilities. Our job is not just to pass legislation. We also have a responsibility to take a look at all government programs and existing legislation to make sure the government is doing its job in the most efficient and effective way possible.

Whether it is the IRS targeting conservative groups or a Department of Veterans Affairs that is failing our veterans, Senate Republicans will conduct aggressive oversight to hold unelected bureaucrats and executive branch political appointees accountable for their actions.

Finally, and most importantly, Republicans are going to change the Senate's priorities. No longer will the Senate's time be tied up with partisan legislation designed to please the Democrats' far left constituencies. Instead, Americans' priorities will be our priorities—jobs, the economy, and the middle class.

As even the third-ranking Democrat in the Senate admitted recently, Democrats have not done too well at focusing on the people's priorities.

The senior Senator from New York said:

Unfortunately, Democrats blew the opportunity the American people gave them. We took their mandate and put all of our focus on the wrong problem—health-care reform.

Republicans do not intend to blow the opportunity the American people have given us. We will get right to work on legislation to create jobs, grow the economy, and expand opportunities for hard-working Americans. We will take up the dozens of jobs bills that have passed the House but have been collecting dust on the Democratic leader's desk here in the Senate.

We will take up legislation to improve the Keystone XL Pipeline and the more than 42,000 jobs that it would support. We will work with the President to reauthorize trade promotion authority to open new markets to American farmers and manufacturers and make sure that American goods are competing on an equal playing field internationally.

We will take up legislation to improve flexibility for working families so Americans can meet their responsibilities at work while still having the time they need for their families at home. And, of course, we will take up legislation to address ObamaCare.

The President's health care law is not only making our health care system worse, it is also hurting our already sluggish economy. Senate Republicans want to repeal and replace this law with real health care reforms—reforms that will actually lower costs and improve America's access to care.

In the meantime, however, we will chisel away at the law's most damaging provisions—provisions like the medical device tax, which has eliminated thousands of workers' jobs in this industry and is driving up the price of lifesaving devices such as pacemakers and insulin pumps, and the 30-hour workweek, which is forcing employers to cut workers' hours and wages in order to afford ObamaCare-mandated health care costs. We will also work to repeal the health care law's individual mandate. The Federal Government should not be in the business of forcing Americans to buy a gov-

ernment-approved health insurance product.

Finally, Republicans will tackle some of the big challenges that need to be addressed if we are going to put our country back on a path to long-term prosperity. We want to make our Nation's costly and inefficient Tax Code fairer and simpler for families and businesses. We also intend to take up regulatory reform.

Recent regulations released by the President's EPA illustrate just how pressing the need is to reform our country's out-of-control bureaucracy. Just one of the recently proposed EPA regulations—the President's national energy tax—would eliminate tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of jobs and devastate entire communities. No executive agency should be able to damage our economy in that way or to destroy the livelihoods of so many hard-working Americans. It is time to get America's regulatory agencies under control.

Republicans heard what the American people said in November, and we are not going to let them down. January 6 marks the start of a new era in the Senate. The Republican majority will focus on the American people's priorities: creating jobs, growing the economy, and increasing opportunity for middle-income American families. We hope the Democrats will join us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio be allowed to speak directly after the conclusion of my remarks.

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

KLAMATH BASIN

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I rise today to address a key unfinished piece of business that is extremely important to the Klamath Basin of southern Oregon.

The Klamath Basin Act has still not been enacted as of the close of this Congress. In that failure, Congress is missing a critical opportunity to put in place a locally developed solution to a longtime water dispute. This failure creates a substantial risk of catastrophic consequences for our ranching and farming families—risks that were entirely avoidable.

Let me start by telling my colleagues what an amazing place Klamath Basin is. Klamath Basin is one of the natural wonders of the American West. It has one of the biggest salmon runs in the Pacific and part of one of the largest continuous blocks of wild rivers and wildlands on the Pacific coast. It is one of the most important migration points in the Pacific coast flyway for bird migration. It is an important place for duck hunters up and down the west coast.

The Klamath River itself charts a path to the south of Crater Lake—an amazing natural wonder where a crater

created by a very large cascade volcanic mountain that blew its top—and the California Redwoods to the south. It connects the Great Basin geology, the cascading volcanos, and the deep and majestic rivers and canyons along its way. Amidst this natural wonder, in its basin lies some of the most fertile and productive agricultural land in the northwest, generating \$600 million a year in barley, potatoes, onions, mint, and, as we can see in this photo, beef.

The settlement of the Klamath Basin by pioneers from the east and the subsequent development of farming and ranching in the Klamath Basin has a storied history. The first White explorer thought to enter the area was John Freeman, on his way to play a notorious role in taking control of California during the Mexican-American war. The first White settlers were the pioneering Applegate family, scouting an easier southern route for the final stages of the Oregon Trail. Agriculture was, of course, a major focus of settlement efforts, and even some of the more recently developed agricultural lands played into key moments in American history when part of the Klamath Reclamation Project was developed by the Federal Government and offered as homesteading opportunities to veterans returning from World War II.

Of course, this region had a history long before settlers from the East came to it. It was already inhabited by Native communities who have lived in the Klamath Basin for 10,000 years and who have a deep connection to this amazing place. The Klamath and Modoc Tribes have inherited oral histories of the eruption of Mount Mazama 8,000 years ago, which formed today's Crater Lake. The tribes on the lower river in California—the Yurok, the Karuk, and the Hoopa—talked about having firepits in home sites still in use today that have been carbon-dated as being in human use many thousands of years ago. In the Klamath County Museum, there is on display the oldest sandals in the world that we have ever discovered made of sagebrush.

The early history of settlement from the East led quickly to conflict. John Fremont's expedition led to a violent battle with the Klamath Tribes. The opening of the Applegate Trail through the basin led to conflict between the Modoc Tribes and White settlers along the Lost River. The resulting Modoc War—a dark chapter in our Nation's persecution of tribes—led to a standoff where the Army held a few dozen Modoc families under siege in barren, hostile lava beds for months.

Unfortunately, for too much of recent history, conflict has continued to define the Klamath Basin.

In the 1950s the Federal Government terminated Federal recognition of the Klamath Tribes, converting their 2 million-acre forested reservation into a combination of national forest lands and private lands.

In the 1970s conflict erupted between the lower river tribes and Federal fisheries managers of the tribes' rights to harvest fish they have harvested for thousands of years. Very soon after, farmers, ranchers, and tribes initiated litigation over water rights, and that litigation has been going intensely until very recently. On the one hand, tribes want to be assured of their rights to continue fishing practices they have passed down from generation to generation for thousands of years. Farmers and ranchers want to be sure they will have the water they need to sustain the operations their families depend on for success.

For decades the tension over water has been accentuated in times of drought, culminating most famously in a standoff in 2001 that made national news. During that 2001 drought irrigation water for the Klamath Reclamation Project was shut off to protect endangered fisheries. Thousands of people gathered in Klamath Falls in sympathy with the farmers. There was civil disobedience, and people were worried about the possibility of violence.

When Vice President Cheney intervened and guaranteed water deliveries rather than fish protections, the result was the largest fish kill in U.S. history. Meanwhile, agriculture was damaged. Families saw major losses, and some had to sell their farms. There were no real winners.

At the time, many people thought that these issues were intractable and that the arguments and lawsuits would continue interminably, perhaps for generations to come. But a number of years ago a group of leaders in the community had the boldness to start rethinking how they framed their quest for water and the water wars. Their briefing to me was one of the first briefings I received as a U.S. Senator. I was surprised to see individuals representing parts of the community who had often been bitter enemies together. They were talking about sitting down and hammering out a different vision for the future to replace the lose-lose water battles of the past with something different: greater reliability of water for farmers and ranchers and protection for the tribes and their fishing rights and better health for the stream. We had leaders from many different parts of the community sitting down together because—they said to me: Senator, the only folks who are winning right now are the lawyers. They wanted to change that.

I was skeptical that groups who had battled for so long could sit down and work out an agreement. As we say in the West, whiskey, that is for drinking, and water, that is for fighting. But these folks said: We are going to pursue a different path.

I pledged that if they were able to develop a solution, I would do everything I could at the Federal level to help implement it. They defied the expectation of every cynic by coming up with a remarkable plan that solved an array of

complex problems. The irrigators committed to reducing the total amount of water they take from the river from a variety of conservation practices. They are working collaboratively with the community and the tribes to restore habitat. In exchange, they get certainty and predictability for guaranteed amounts of water. The tribes and conservation groups and fishing organizations agreed to stop challenging these irrigators' water allocations. In exchange, they get a community partnering to restore natural resources that are of cultural and economic importance to the tribes and to help them reacquire some of the land they lost 50 years ago.

Complementing all of this and augmenting the natural resource restoration is a plan to remove four antiquated dams and open up new habitat for fish. The private utility that owns these dams agrees that the best business decision is to remove these dams. So this is a win-win situation, or actually a win-win-win-win situation.

Let me give an example of this in terms of water looked at from the perspective of the agricultural community. This chart shows, over a variety of years—2010 through 2014—what the actual deliveries were in acre-feet, thousands of acre-feet, 189,000 acre-feet, and what they would receive in the settlement: substantially more; substantially more in 2011 and substantially more in 2013. So this also provides more water for the refuge, and we can see a change of positive water for the refuge as well.

This is why everyone is coming to the table and finding a path that works better during difficult times for all of the major goals of water management in the region.

The deal is a lifeline for farming and for ranching: tens of thousands of additional acre-feet added and in some cases 100,000 acre-feet of water in some areas; at the same time, stream flows for fish, removing obstacles for migration of the fish, improving habitat. It is a truly remarkable deal.

Community leaders not only developed a visionary agreement, they also remained dedicated to this agreement during some difficult drought years in 2010 and 2013 and low water in 2014. So they could have been shattered, the coalition could have been blown up by these difficult drought years, but instead they viewed it as reinforcing why they needed to come to an agreement to save the ranching and the farming and improve the fish and restore important provisions for the tribes. They have continued to work together while we here in Congress have not acted. Also, they worked on an additional agreement to bring in additional ranchers from the upper basin into the agreement, and that worked as well. They worked to dramatically reduce the cost of the habitat restoration investments that the original plan called for. They drafted a bill with no new spending. The entire agreement was

challenged by the litigation of the water rights in that the adjudication of these water rights was finally completed and, for the most part, the Klamath tribes were awarded water rights to time immemorial.

That is a powerful tool. The tribes could have walked away from the table. They could have taken this enormous control over water rights and said the agreement hasn't been implemented; we are walking away and going to use these water rights with maximum leverage.

They created partnerships. They pledged to work together, as all of these groups have, advocating not just for themselves but for the collective future of the community and collective stakeholders.

Quite frankly, this is a remarkable development in what is happening with all of these stakeholder leaders sticking together. Congress is key, however, to passing legislation that implements the provisions of this plan.

It is time for Congress to act. The Senate did its work. The Energy and Natural Resources Committee held hearings under the leadership first of Senator WYDEN and Senator MURKOWSKI, then under the leadership of Senator LANDRIEU and Senator MURKOWSKI. Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator WYDEN, and I were able to negotiate bipartisan revisions of the bill addressing significant and legitimate concerns that had been raised.

We modified Federal authority related to dam removal and requiring Governors to sign off and giving Congress a 1-year period to veto a decision to take out a particular dam. We removed provisions that the Congressional Budget Office said might contribute to the deficit. The Energy and Natural Resources Committee voted the bill out of committee on a bipartisan basis.

The community leaders have gone to work getting even broader statements of support. The Klamath County Chamber of Commerce endorsed the bill. The Klamath County Farm Bureau has endorsed the bill. The Klamath County Cattlemen's Association and the statewide Oregon Cattlemen's Association have endorsed the bill. The Klamath Falls City Council has endorsed the bill, and the Oregon Water Resources Congress has endorsed the bill.

The Senate has been ready to act, but the U.S. House of Representatives has not. Here we are in the last days of this Congress unable to complete this bill. So today I am calling upon our leaders in the House and in the Senate to work together to make this an item of immediate action when we start our new session in January.

The tribe is held back on enforcing its water rights, and the stakeholders have stayed together, saying they were

going to support the multiple provisions for themselves and their partners. But that cannot last forever. Congress has to act to seal the deal. Without cooperation, this vision, so carefully, diligently, and painfully constructed over years of involvement of community stakeholders, will fall apart. What that will do is put the entire farming and ranching community in great jeopardy. We can see hundreds of families lose their water in a matter of months due to Congress's failure to act.

This community has done everything right. They have put aside longstanding tensions and conflicts. They sat down time and time again to work out these complicated provisions. They sought the help of the Interior Department which came and signed off on the agreement. They sought the State government and the Governor to sign off on the agreements. They solicited local support. They put aside damaging rhetoric during times of intense drought over the last couple of years, and they hung together. They have done everything we could have ever asked a group to do to prepare for this legislation to be passed, yet it has not been passed because the House of Representatives has not been ready to act.

We must not let this opportunity escape. We must come back in January with support from the Senate and from the House and complete this deal. This opportunity might not come again.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize that when in a region great work has been done to resolve a longstanding conflict, they need Congress to step in and seal the deal, make the agreement real, and implement the agreement. We must give it the utmost attention and help make it happen for the health of the stream, for the welfare of the tribes, for the success of the farming community, for the conditions that make ranching a vital component of the Klamath Basin—for all of these reasons.

I certainly pledge to come back and work toward that end and look forward for us early next year to not be here on the floor lamenting the fact we have failed to complete this agreement but to be here thanking all of those who came together to seize this critical opportunity.

I yield the floor to my colleague from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the Senator from Hawaii be recognized.

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

TRIBUTE TO JAY ROCKEFELLER

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor one of my best friends in the Senate and a long-time public servant whom I greatly admire, JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV.

In 1964, in Athens, OH, President Johnson went to Ohio University, and he said:

Poverty hides its face behind a mask of affluence. But I call upon you to help me to get out there and unmask it, take that mask off of that face of affluence and let the world see what we have, and let the world do something about it.

Several months later, JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV, 27 years old, came to West Virginia as a VISTA volunteer. Well-educated and well-connected, JAY ROCKEFELLER could have chosen any career he wanted. But to him, it was about public service.

This year marks JAY's 50th year in public service. He found himself in Emmons, WV. Emmons, WV, is a small town. JAY didn't shy away. JAY didn't keep his distance. He wanted to know the people he was going to be working with, and he set out to do that. For 2 years, he worked alongside the people of Emmons for accessible health care, for education, for opportunities. His work included dismantling and moving a condemned elementary school from a neighboring town onto a flatbed truck, and establishing it in Emmons as a community center.

JAY never forgot that, JAY, who in this Chamber sits across the aisle from me at this desk. I was sitting here 2 weeks ago and JAY was talking about Emmons. He said going to Emmons—and I will quote from his farewell speech 2 weeks ago to the Senate:

That set my moral compass and gave me direction. Where everything in my real life began. Where I learned how little I knew about the problems people face. I was humbled by that lesson.

He went on to say:

My time in Emmons was transformative. It explains every policy I pursued and every vote I have cast. It was where my beliefs were bolted down. And where my passion met my principle.

Fifty years ago, JAY learned those lessons. For 50 years, as a VISTA volunteer, as a State legislator, as the Secretary of State, as the Governor of West Virginia, and as a Senator for 3 decades from West Virginia, he learned those beliefs. They were bolted down, and he practiced those beliefs.

In 1966, he was elected to the West Virginia House. Two years later, JAY had an opportunity that most people I know would not have refused.

Robert F. Kennedy was assassinated—the Senator from New York at that time. In June of 1968, the Governor of New York, Nelson Rockefeller—JAY ROCKEFELLER's uncle—offered that appointment to the U.S. Senate to JAY ROCKEFELLER. The Governor offered that position to JAY ROCKEFELLER, and his answer to his uncle was: No, thank you. I want to earn a seat some day in the U.S. Senate.

That is what JAY set out to do. He reminded us a few weeks ago:

Important undertakings can't be half-hearted. You have to commit your whole self—almost like pushing a heavy rock uphill. With both of your hands you push, because if you let up for a split second with either hand, you and the rock go tumbling backwards into the abyss.

JAY had a chance to prove that in this body over 20 years ago. He pushed that rock uphill to fight to protect retired coal miners' promised health care benefits. It is easy for Members of this Senate who have good titles, who are well paid, who dress like this, who don't really need to go out and listen to the public very much, to forget people like union coal miners or nonunion coal miners.

He called this "the greatest moment of my career." JAY threatened to keep the Senate in session. He was going to do whatever it took—22 years ago, over Christmas, over New Year's, whatever it took—to make sure his colleagues didn't leave town before passing the 1992 Coal Act. Because of his legislation, more than 200,000 coal miners and their families have kept the benefits they were promised.

He spearheaded efforts to ensure workplace safety. I have talked to JAY after coal-mining disasters when miners are killed in one of the most treacherous, difficult, and dangerous jobs we can imagine. I can see the pain in his face because he knows people who work in the mines and he has listened to them.

When Lincoln's staff wanted him to stay in the White House and win the war and free the slaves and preserve the Union, Lincoln used to say, I have to go out and get my public opinion bath. That is what JAY did. A son and grandson of privilege, JAY understood that he served the public best when he got his public opinion bath and when he went out and listened to people. He fought against unfair trade practices, and he fought against tax policies that shipped jobs overseas. He reinvigorated the steel caucus, fighting for an industry that clearly has been victimized by unfair trade practices.

Most importantly in JAY's career—and the thing I think he is most proud of—was another lesson he learned in Emmons, WV. He learned that many of the community school-aged children had never been to a doctor, they had never seen a dentist before because their families simply didn't have the money. Because of that, JAY made accessible, affordable health care for children part of his lifelong mission. He believes that health care is a right and not a privilege.

He championed Medicaid expansion, and he championed this new health care law. It has JAY ROCKEFELLER's fingerprints all over it. That is why hundreds of thousands of people in my State are grateful to JAY ROCKEFELLER, because hundreds of thousands of people in Ohio now have health insurance who didn't have it before. Hundreds of thousands of families have benefited for a couple of decades because their children had health insurance. Again, this is because of JAY ROCKEFELLER.

In 1997, he devoted much of his time and career at that point to help write the Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIP. Because of CHIP, 8 million

children across this country—some of them in Emmons, WV, and some of them in my hometown of Mansfield, OH—now have access to health care, health care that they would not have otherwise. He continues that fight always on health care.

I want to close with this. I have seen a lot of Senators come and go. I have seen a lot of Members come and go. I have seen a lot of public officials come and go. There can be a shortage of humility in these jobs. As Members of the House and Members of the Senate, sometimes we are a little puffed up about our titles and about the power that many of us have, and we are caught up in the way we are treated. People are often obsequious to Members in Congress, and all of that.

What stands out to me—it is even more remarkable when you consider his family and what he came from—is JAY ROCKEFELLER's humility. Here is the best example, I think. I found out almost by accident what JAY, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, would do regularly during his time in the Senate is he would send all the staff away, he would send the press away, and he would go to someone's home or community center or rec center or labor hall and he would sit with a number of veterans and listen to their stories. He would take notes and help those individually who might need help. Most importantly, he was listening to their stories.

It reminds me of another story from Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln's staff watched him, during one of his public opinion baths, talk to a number of people who were pushing him on something that mattered to them personally.

His staff wanted to send them away. Lincoln said, "No, I am not going to do that." Then Lincoln said—about these people who were talking to him, ordinary citizens outside the White House or anywhere else the President of the United States may have been—Lincoln said: They don't want much. They get so little. Each one considers his business of great importance. I know how I should feel if I were in their place.

I can see JAY ROCKEFELLER meeting with veterans, many of whom had never been thanked for their service. Many of them were suffering from war-time injuries from their time in the service, coming back to West Virginia and eking out a living. I can see JAY ROCKEFELLER saying the same thing: They don't want much. They get so little. Each one considers his business of great importance. I know how I should feel if I were in their place.

Going back 2 weeks ago to JAY's farewell speech across the aisle at this desk, he called upon us to remember that "our north star must always be the real needs of the people we serve." JAY used his farewell speech to exhort us to do better on behalf of miners, on behalf of veterans, on behalf of single parents, on behalf of children, on behalf of sick people, people who do not always get a fair shake in life.

He found his north star in public service, a career he chose because he wanted a mission to complete, a cause to believe in, a dream to follow. He found that mission. He found that cause. He found that dream in Emmons, WV, in 1964. It never left him. That is my friend JAY ROCKEFELLER. For all of that we are so grateful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Sarah Saldana to serve as Director of the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, better known as ICE.

Before I proceed, I would like to thank the good Senator from Ohio for his tributary remarks regarding JAY ROCKEFELLER, an uncommon man of the people.

Prior to supporting Ms. Saldana's nomination in the Judiciary Committee, I did have a chance to meet with her. Growing up in a large family near our southern border in Corpus Christi, TX, Ms. Saldana managed to overcome hardship and become the first Latina U.S. Attorney in Texas history.

Sarah Saldana is fully qualified to serve as ICE's Director. She is a senior Federal law enforcement official for a border State district that spans almost 100,000 miles. Ms. Saldana has been on the ground in Texas and fully understands the complexities and challenges we face with our immigration system.

Republicans and Democrats agree that our immigration system is broken. Until recently, we also agreed, Republicans and Democrats alike, that Sarah Saldana needed to be confirmed as the Director of ICE. However, now Republicans are playing politics with this nomination to a critical homeland security agency. ICE is responsible for important law enforcement issues that make us all safer and has been without a permanent Director for over a year.

ICE's 19,000 people are responsible for enforcement of our immigration laws, for drug interdiction, for fighting child exploitation, and for keeping us safe from national security threats. The Senate needs to do its job and let Sarah Saldana get to work as the permanent Director of ICE. I understand that some of my colleagues on the Republican side now oppose Sarah Saldana because of the President's Executive order on immigration.

President Obama's Executive action allows millions of fathers, mothers, and students to step out of the shadows, pass background checks, work legally, and pay their taxes. The President's action is rooted in the reality that our immigration system is broken and that we need to exercise prosecutorial discretion on who to go after with our limited resources.

As Director of ICE, it is Ms. Saldana's responsibility to focus on homeland security resources on deporting felons and other criminals who have crossed our borders. It is simply not possible for the Federal Govern-

ment to remove all 11 million undocumented persons in this country.

That is another point on which most Republicans and Democrats agree. We have to prioritize the resources we have. That is what the President's order does. It prioritizes deporting felons, not families. Let me repeat that: Deporting felons, that is all we need to do, not breaking apart families. President Obama's action is grounded on precedent and Executive powers.

Every single President since Eisenhower has used Executive action to provide discretionary relief from deportation. Nonetheless, the President's critics have relentlessly attacked the legitimacy of his action. Some of my colleagues have emphasized that we must enforce our immigration laws and secure our borders in their opposition to Ms. Saldana.

Ironically, my Republican colleagues are opposing the nomination of the Director of an agency responsible for these very things: securing our border and enforcing our immigration laws. Some Republicans do not even want to fund the Department of Homeland Security at all.

Those who are concerned about immigration enforcement and border security should ask themselves: How does opposing Sarah Saldana's nomination and putting DHS funding in question make our borders more secure? How do these actions ensure effective enforcement of our laws? They do not.

If you want to truly and permanently address our broken immigration system, we need Congress to work together to pass comprehensive immigration reform, which the American people overwhelmingly support. It has been over a year since comprehensive immigration reform was passed on the Senate floor. Congress must continue working to pass commonsense, humane reform that puts families first.

As the President himself has said, Executive action does not replace congressional action. To those in Congress concerned with what he has done, we need to step up. We need to pass comprehensive reform. But in the meantime, we need to confirm Sarah Saldana so she can get on with the job at ICE.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on her nomination.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now recess until 2:15 p.m.; that following the 2:30 p.m. votes, the clerk report Executive Calendar No. 1150, the Blinken nomination, and the time until 5 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.