

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 12) was agreed to.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 596

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 596) to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCONNELL. I now ask for its second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 5, 2015; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day. I further ask that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 240, with the time until 11:30 a.m. equally divided in the usual form, and that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture vote and the motion to proceed to H.R. 240 be waived.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the cloture vote on the motion to proceed will occur at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow morning.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator STABENOW and Senator SESSIONS.

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

The Senator from Alabama.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we are in an odd world. Our Democratic colleagues continue to have the gall to suggest and state that the Republicans are blocking funding for homeland security in America when nothing could be further from the truth.

I guess they have gotten away with blaming Republicans for blocking things, so they just keep on saying it. But the House has fully funded all the legal policies and programs within Homeland Security, and they sent the bill over here.

What did they do? They simply said: You can't take money out of homeland security enforcement for immigration and border security, and spend it on activities that violate the law, that undermine immigration law, that in fact are contrary to immigration law—that the President has said he intends to do no matter what Congress does, no matter what the American people want. He says he is going to do it anyway. They simply say we are not going to fund that.

So it comes over to pass. It fully funds the Department of Homeland Security. It doesn't change any of the laws in Homeland Security—and they say this is being obstructed by the Republicans.

But look. What does the media say about it? How is it being reported?

Here is Politico: "Democrats filibuster Department of Homeland Security bill." That was yesterday. And that is exactly what is happening. They are filibustering the bill and saying Republicans are blocking it, when all that the Republicans are saying is: Let's get on the bill. We can't even get on the bill so amendments can be offered because they are filibustering the motion to proceed to the bill, blocking us even getting on the legislation so amendments can be offered.

If they are not happy with anything in the bill—the language the House put in or anything else—they can offer amendments to deal with it and strike it out.

That is what Politico said.

How about the New York Times. They are always favoring Democratic immigration policies. This is their headline: "Senate Democrats Block Republicans' Homeland Security Bill." Isn't that true? That is exactly true.

How about the Atlantic. I think this is almost amusing: "The New Democratic Obstructionists." That is the headline in their publication.

So I would push back at this. Are we through the looking glass? Are we down the rabbit hole into never-never land? Where are we?

My good friend Senator SCHUMER, one of our able advocates here—and I really admire him. But this is what he said earlier today:

The right wing of the Republican party is risking a D.H.S., a Department of Homeland

Security, shutdown to get their way on immigration.

This is how Senator SCHUMER framed it:

They're saying take our hard right stance on immigration or we won't fund national security.

He goes on to say:

We think the American people are on our side. We're willing to have that debate.

Well, why don't we have it? Why don't we bring the bill up and let's have the debate if he wants to offer amendments contrary to what the House did?

But remember, the House didn't do anything but say we are going to spend money on all the programs in Homeland Security. It didn't defund any of them. It didn't change any of those rules.

So, is it really true? Do only right-wing Republicans want to end the President's unlawful actions? No, no, no. That is not what the truth is.

Why don't I share with our colleagues here what many of our Democratic Senators have said about the President's unlawful action. Here is what the junior Senator from Indiana said:

It is clear the immigration system in this country is broken, and only Congress has the ability to change the law to fix it . . . I am as frustrated as anyone that Congress is not doing its job, but the President shouldn't make such significant policy changes on his own.

That was just November last year.

The senior Senator from Missouri said:

Our immigration system is broken, and I support a comprehensive plan to fix it, but executive orders aren't the way to do it.

The senior Senator from West Virginia:

I disagree with the President's decision to use executive action to make changes to our immigration system.

The junior Senator from North Dakota:

I'm disappointed the president decided to use executive action at this time on this issue. . . . It's Congress' job to pass legislation and deal with issues of this magnitude.

Isn't that true.

The junior Senator from Maine:

I also have constitutional concerns about where prosecutorial discretion ends and unconstitutional executive authority begins.

Well, I share that thought.

The junior Senator from Minnesota:

I have concerns about executive action. . . . This is a job for Congress.

The senior Senator from Virginia:

. . . the best way to get a comprehensive solution is to take this through the legislative process.

So are those right-wingers? Are those people who can't be trusted to put the public interest first? Are they exaggerating? Are they somehow all in error to question the power of the Presidency to execute this policy?

No, and I will cite one more national leader that is well known. I would cite President Obama himself, who on 20