

the business today. Today the business is still flourishing, as it always has. In fact, the new Atlanta Dome Stadium, which will house the Falcons, is a \$1.3 billion stadium in which the company was integrally involved.

Our city has lost a great friend, a great African American, and a great entrepreneur—so great, he was recognized by the Atlanta Chamber as its first African-American member and its second African-American president. He has been recognized by the Butler Street YMCA, the Atlanta and Georgia Business Council, and almost every entrepreneur group there is for his contributions to business and his contributions to investments in the State of Georgia.

It is with great sad tomorrow night that I will go to Ebenezer Baptist Church and be a part of the wake ceremony for Mr. Russell. But it is with great pride that I rise today on the Senate floor to make sure the RECORD indelibly recognizes the life, the times, and the contributions of Herman J. Russell.

REMEMBERING CARL SANDERS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, on Sunday night a great Georgian and a personal friend of mine passed away from this life. At the age of 89, former Governor Carl Sanders died in Atlanta, GA, at Piedmont Hospital.

Governor Sanders was Governor of Georgia from 1963 to 1967. I was at the University of Georgia as a student from 1962 to 1966, so my college years paralleled his gubernatorial years, where he made a remarkable change in the politics and lives of the people of Georgia.

Everyone remembers what the 1960s were like in the South in terms of segregation. Most of the Governors in the South—like Governor Wallace from Alabama—were segregationists. But Carl Sanders came forward as a Governor who wanted to help bring people together, who wanted to help bring Georgia and the South through a turbulent time, to see to it that African Americans rose to equality not just in the way they were recognized but in the ways the laws were created. In fact, it was Carl Sanders who came to Washington in 1964 to meet with Lyndon Johnson and help form the foundation for the civil rights laws that passed later in the 1960s.

Carl Sanders was born in Augusta, GA. He went to the University of Georgia on a scholarship and played football, and he left the university to go fight in World War II and was a fighter pilot. He came back from World War II, graduated from the University of Georgia, and then graduated from Georgia Law School. He practiced law and was elected to the State legislature and then to the State senate and then Governor of the State of Georgia. He was Governor from 1963 to 1967.

Back then, Georgia Governors could not succeed one another, so he had to

wait 4 years to run for a second term. He did wait 4 years and he ran for a second term, and he lost ultimately to the President of the United States, Jimmy Carter. But he was never a loser; he was a winner. And in everything he did, whether it was government or business or family life, whatever it might be, Carl Sanders excelled.

He was such a wonderful man to share his wisdom and knowledge. About once every 6 or 8 months he would have three or four of us over to his office, at the age of 89, treating us to lunch and talking about the good old days but also talking about the future. Carl Sanders was not about the past, except for memories; he was about the future for its hope and its prosperity for people.

Carl Sanders will be remembered for a lot of things, but in Georgia, most importantly, he will be remembered for what became at first a junior college system but is now a 4-year college system which has every Georgia citizen within a 45-minute drive of a State university system facility. His passion as Governor was education. His legacy in Georgia will be education. He contributed greatly to our State and greatly to the future and the prosperity of the people of the State of Georgia.

It is with a great sense of sadness but a great sense of pride that I pay tribute today on the floor of the Senate to a great Governor of Georgia, a great citizen of our country, and a great American—the Honorable Carl Sanders, former Governor of the State of Georgia.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in morning business.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it has been 511 days since the Senate passed bipartisan legislation to reform our broken immigration system. Fourteen Republicans joined the Democrats in supporting a measure which covered what I believe are the major challenges facing America when it comes to immigration in the 21st century.

There was an amendment adopted by Senator CORKER, and I believe Senator HOEVEN cosponsored it. Their amendment would have strengthened our border security to unprecedented levels.

At this moment in time, we have more Federal law enforcement officials on the border between the United States and Mexico than the combined population of all other Federal law enforcement agencies. It is a massive commitment which would have been enhanced even more by the comprehensive immigration reform bill.

For those border State Senators, we would have reached the point where—from Galveston to San Diego—we

would have literally had available a law enforcement agent every half mile 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. It is a massive investment, and it passed the Senate 511 days ago.

That same bill addressed some serious issues about agriculture workers in Illinois, California, Texas, and all across the Nation. Growers are telling us they are having a difficult time bringing in the workers who will do the backbreaking, hard, physical labor necessary for agriculture. This bill addressed it. In fact, the bill was endorsed by both growers as well as those who do the work. It was an amazing political achievement.

It also addressed the issue of H-1Bs. Why in the world do we bring the best and brightest from around the world to the United States for advanced degrees, advanced education and then welcome them to leave? If they stayed and worked to create jobs and new businesses and new innovations in America, we could build our economy. The bill addressed it.

As important as all of those issues are, the bill addressed 11 million undocumented people in America—11 million, and that is just an estimate. The bill said those who were here undocumented—who had been here for several years—could step up, register with the government, pay their filing fee, submit themselves to a background check, pay their taxes, and then be reviewed annually for years to make sure they were still complying with the laws of the United States.

They would not qualify for government benefits or programs during this period of time, but they could work their way to legal status. That bill passed the Senate on a bipartisan basis with 68 votes. The bill then went over to the House of Representatives where, sadly, it languished. Nothing happened.

The Speaker of the House refused to call the bill up for a vote. In fact, he refused to call any aspect of the bill up for a vote. He refused to call it in committee for any consideration or debate, and then he let it languish. There were times when the House Republican leadership tempted the White House and others by saying: Well, maybe now we can call it up for a vote. They never, ever did. We have waited 511 days, and here we are today.

This evening, President Obama is going to announce an Executive order to address immigration. He has waited patiently, and America has waited patiently for the Republicans in the House of Representatives to step forward and accept this responsibility, but they have refused. They have refused to fix this broken immigration system, and you can bet as soon as the President issues his Executive order, there will be a chorus of complaints that this President has gone too far by using his Executive authority to address this issue.

You won't hear the facts from the critics. You won't hear from the critics that every President since Dwight

David Eisenhower—I believe 11 different Democrats and Republicans—have issued Executive orders relating to immigration. President George Herbert Walker Bush basically said—by Executive order—that we are not going to prosecute 1.5 million undocumented immigrants in America. He used his prosecutorial discretion. That is the kind of thing which we have come to expect from Presidents, and we expect Congress to complain about it. That has continued.

Here is what we believe President Obama will announce today. The details are just starting to emerge in press reports. He is going to announce that we are going to push for accountability in immigration. Senator MARCO RUBIO was on the bipartisan panel that put together the comprehensive immigration reform bill. He said something that was very pressing, and I wish to refer to it at this moment. He said for those who criticize amnesty, doing nothing is amnesty for those who are here in the United States and undocumented. Doing nothing is amnesty.

What President Obama is going to suggest—instead of amnesty—is accountability. Here is what he will say. Those who have children who are American citizens and have been here at least 5 years will have a chance to step forward and register with the government, pay the filing fee for processing, submit themselves to a criminal background check, and pay their taxes.

The President says, if you will do that—under his order—it is my understanding it will say you can legally work in America. They will not become a citizen nor will they have legal status beyond the work permit, but they don't have to fear deportation. They are down the list and are not considered a dangerous person who should be deported.

The highest priority for those who will be deported are those with criminal records, and they should be deported. There is no room in the United States for anyone—let alone undocumented—who come here and commit a crime.

Secondly, if you have repeat offenders and those who violated the legal system, they will be in the second category.

The third category of those who meet the criteria I mentioned will be given their chance.

This is about accountability. This really says to those who wish to say: If you will play by these rules, we will give you a chance to stay and work.

What is the reason? We want to deport felons; we don't want to deport families. We want to deport criminals; we don't want to deport children. We will focus our efforts on the borders on those who are trying to come across and those who are here and should leave. That means more resources would be put into enforcement, and it also means that those who are here will be registered. We will know who

they are, where they are, where they are working, and we will know that they are paying their taxes to stay in this country.

The alternative from the Republican point of view—for 511 days—is to do nothing. That is an unacceptable alternative.

There is a better alternative to an Executive order, and the President will be the first to say it, and that is that this Congress—on a bipartisan basis—rolls up its sleeves and tackles this issue. We should. That is why we were elected. To do nothing, as the House has done for 511 days, is unacceptable. To stand by the sidelines and criticize this President for using his Executive authority—the same Executive authority used over and over again by Presidents of both political parties in the field of immigration—is not constructive.

There is one other thing that is even worse. Some Members of the other party are suggesting they are prepared to shut down the Government of the United States over this issue. If the President uses his legal authority, they have threatened to shut down the Government of the United States.

We saw that last year when the junior Senator from Texas took the floor and said he was going to close down the government over the issue of the Affordable Care Act. It was a terrible strategy. A lot of innocent people were hurt. It cost our government and our economy dearly. It was a politically desperate act which I hope will not be repeated ever again—certainly not when it comes to the issue of immigration.

If there was ever a time for us to stand together—both political parties—and solve a problem, this is it. Standing on the sidelines and complaining—which is what we have heard over and over again from the House Republican leadership and continue to hear when it comes to the President's Executive order—is not the kind of constructive policy the American people need.

I applaud the President. He is going to take a lot of grief for this—for using his Executive power—but thank goodness he is stepping up and addressing the problem. Where others have walked away from it, ignored it, and come up with every excuse on Earth, he is directly addressing the problem. And now it is time for us in the Congress to do the same thing.

We are going to come back after Thanksgiving and will be here for at least 10 days. Speaker BOEHNER, leader of the Republican House, has the authority to instantly call to the floor of the House this bipartisan immigration bill which passed the Senate. There is no excuse. If he is going to criticize the President for using his power to solve a problem, then the Speaker should use his power to address that same problem. Call the comprehensive immigration reform bill before we leave at the end of this year. Bring it up for a vote in the House. I think it will pass.

If it passes, and we do—by legislation—a much broader review and change in the immigration reform bill, we will have done what we were elected to do. We will have served this Nation, and we will have set out to repair this broken immigration system.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am glad I came to the floor and heard my friend and colleague, the majority whip, from Illinois, and his explanation for how it is clearly within the President's authority to issue this Executive order he plans on announcing tonight. The basic problem is the President himself has said repeatedly he doesn't have that authority. He said it repeatedly. We have all seen the clips on TV and online. He said he doesn't have the power to do it. He was right then, and he is wrong now.

There is a right way and a wrong way to solve problems. The right way would have been during the first 2 years, after President Obama won the election in 2008 and his party commanded 60 votes in the Senate and a majority in the House of Representatives. If this had been a priority for him, he could have done it then.

Instead, on a party-line vote, he chose to jam through the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare—and we see what a disaster that has been. It was not just me. I was a skeptic. I didn't think it would work. While the goals were laudable and worthy, I just didn't think the Federal Government had the competence or certainly the ability to reconfigure one-sixth of our economy. But the President did it, his party passed it, and it enjoyed no bipartisan support.

That is one of the basic problems with what the President is doing today. The reason why it is so important to follow the Constitution—which requires passing legislation affecting 5 million people through both Houses of Congress and forces us to negotiate and build consensus—is because those are sustainable policies.

If you try to do things on a “my way or the highway” basis or on a purely partisan basis, those are not sustainable because we know that as time goes by, today's majority will be tomorrow's minority. Now a Democrat occupies the White House. Perhaps next time a Republican will occupy the White House. Who knows. The point is that only objectives we pursue through the legislative process according to the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America that are done on a bipartisan basis through that natural census-building that is required in order to reach our goals—those are truly sustainable policies. And when the President decides to do it through an Executive order, exercising powers that he himself said he does not have, what are people supposed to think?

I heard my friend from Illinois say, Well, it has been 511 days and Republicans haven't swallowed the comprehensive immigration reform bill that has come from the Senate. They are not required to swallow it. They can pass legislation or not on their own timetable. The old joke is that the opposing party is our adversary, but the Senate is the enemy. That is the joke in House circles. So there is a natural rivalry between the House and the Senate. They are not expected nor required to accept what we pass, nor are they required to do it on our timetable. I believe Speaker BOEHNER and Majority Leader MCCARTHY are committed, as am I and the incoming majority leader come January, Senator MCCONNELL, to making progress on an incremental basis in this important area. It has to be thoughtful, and we have to have full-some debate with everybody participating in the process.

There are important questions. What impact is the President's Executive order going to have when the unemployment rate is still at 5.8 percent nationally and when the percentage of people actually looking for work is at a 30-year low because many people have given up because of the slow-growing economy? What is the impact of these 5 million—or however many additional work permits the President presumes to have the power to issue—what is the impact going to be on competition for jobs with the economy growing slowly and jobs in short supply? What is the impact of the President's Executive order going to be on household median income? We know wages have been stagnant for the middle class because of this slow-growing economy. What is the impact of millions of additional people competing for jobs in the economy going to be on wages?

I would like to have the answers to those questions.

I would also like to know if the President has the power—which he said he doesn't have but now apparently he has changed his mind—to issue this kind of Executive order affecting 5 million people? What about the other 6 million people who are in the country who did not come in in compliance with our immigration laws, who either overstayed their visas or came across the border illegally?

I come from a border State. We have 1,200 miles of common border with Mexico. We encountered what was described as a humanitarian crisis because we had this magnet known as the impression that we would not enforce our laws that encouraged people to make that treacherous journey from Central America across Mexico. Many of these immigrants lost their lives, were sexually assaulted or kidnapped and held for ransom—very dangerous circumstances in the hands of the criminal organizations that basically control this business. This is a business for them. But if the President has the authority to do this for 5 million, why not the 11 million? How does he explain

his action to the 6 million people who will now see these 5 million getting preferential treatment? And how in the world does he explain it to the people who have waited patiently year after year trying to do it the right way? The President has effectively bumped them out of the line and bumped 5 million people ahead of them.

I have every confidence that if we were able to do this in a thoughtful, deliberative sort of way, we could find a compassionate and satisfactory outcome for the people who made the mistake of entering the country illegally or who have overstayed. I believe in proportionality. We don't give the death penalty for speeding tickets. So I think there is an appropriate way to address this, but it is not by an amnesty. I call it an amnesty because, basically, there is no reconciliation process. In other words, when a person makes a mistake—and we all make mistakes and we all understand the aspirations and hopes immigrants bring to the United States because they come here for the same reason people have historically come here, and that is for the American dream. We understand that. But we also understand that when somebody has made a mistake, they need to own up to it and they need to reconcile themselves to lawful authority because, otherwise, the attitude is the law doesn't matter, and it is the law that protects all of us no matter who we are, where we come from, or how we pronounce our last name. And when we have a lawless process, as we do now and which this Executive order does nothing to fix, what that does is perpetuate lawlessness and chaos, and it also continues to enrich these criminal organizations that are more than happy to charge people \$5,000, \$6,000 a head to make that treacherous journey.

Beyond all of the issues I just addressed, this is a terrible precedent. Again, I understand now the President has decided—and some of our Democratic colleagues say, Well, this is the same thing George Bush did and this is the same thing Dwight Eisenhower did. Well, it is not, and the President knew that when he said he didn't have the authority to do this previously. Now he has changed his mind. Now the argument is they issued Executive orders essentially implementing bipartisan legislation such as the 1986 amnesty that Ronald Reagan signed. There were Executive orders taken in furtherance of that consensus position based on the legislation. However, never has any President purported to have the authority to, out of whole cloth, do what this President says he is going to do.

Where does he get the authority to issue work permits? I understand he can prioritize prosecution and deportation, and he has, but where does the President get the authority to issue work permits for millions of people?

This is rocking people's fundamental confidence in their government. We elect Presidents to faithfully enforce

the laws, including the Constitution of the United States. That is the oath the President takes when he is sworn in: "I do solemnly swear." These laws, of course, are beyond the Constitution drafted by Congress. It is "Schoolhouse Rock." Bills start in the House, and in the Senate they have to be reconciled and then sent to the President. That is civics 101. Maybe we need a new course called remedial civics 101 for those who have somehow forgotten how the Constitution is written and how it actually is implemented in the form of the legislative process.

Of course, if the President objects to what Congress sends him, that is when the negotiations start. He can veto it. We can vote to override it if we have the votes. If we don't, we are back to square one and we have to start that negotiation again.

I have never seen or even read of a President who seems so detached, so disinterested in actually engaging in this process set out by the Constitution. This President says if he doesn't get his way, I have a pen. I have a phone. I am going to go it alone. Well, that is a provocation to the other branches of government which say, Well, we are not irrelevant in this process and we may have something to say about it. I think we will see some of that in the very near future with regard to the way appropriations are made and what functions of government fund it.

I heard my friend from Illinois say, People are even threatening a government shutdown. That is not true.

I take that back. The Democrats are saying that. No Republican has said that. It is just not going to happen. It shouldn't happen and it won't happen.

I love it when our friends in the other party like to tell us about our own internal politics. I was at the White House with the President and bicameral, bipartisan leadership and our Democratic friends said that the House of Representatives can't pass any immigration reform bill. Well, I don't know how they know that, unless they have some insider wisdom that is not obvious to the people who actually work there and have the responsibility to make it work.

What I know and what I believe is that there is a good-faith desire to try to solve this problem, but not by what I call the "pig in the python" approach. In other words, we tried that with the Affordable Care Act, a 2,700-page bill involving trillions of dollars of expenditure done purely on a partisan basis and it didn't work. I think there is an understandable aversion to trying to do things in a comprehensive sort of way. So why not break it down into pieces and do what we can, because there are a lot of different pieces that enjoy bipartisan support.

I think the precedent the President is setting is very dangerous, because if he purports now to have this power which he previously said on numerous occasions he didn't have, what about future

Presidents? What about policies others may not like? Even if a person believes this is a pretty good idea—a person might say, The President is trying to act because obviously this is a controversial issue and things aren't moving fast enough, so I like what the President is doing. Suppose a person says that. Well, just think about the possibility that a few years from now when we have an election, we have a new President, and what if that President says, Well, President Obama purported to exercise this massive Executive authority in defiance of the Constitution and the laws, so I guess I can do it, too.

This is not the kind of political system we want. This is not good for the American people. We do not want a system in which each party, when they happen to be in power, takes their turn abusing Executive authority. We do not want that. I would have thought there are enough people who love this institution known as the U.S. Senate and believe it has an indispensable role in our government who would say, Wait, Mr. President, don't do it, because we may like the policy, but this really is an end run around the Constitution and the role that is appropriately played by both Houses of Congress and the Executive.

But, apparently, there are few, if any, folks on the other side of the aisle who believe that our tradition and our constitutional system of legislating is worth preserving—at least in this instance.

I have spoken at some length about the practical consequences of the President's amnesty, but those consequences also bear repeating since the eyes of the country are now focused on what the President is going to announce tonight. We know from recent experience that the President's unilateral amnesty will be communicated to people in other countries as a signal that they can all come in. That is what happened with the unaccompanied children; 62,000 of them I think the number is, roughly, from Central America since last October. The reason there was a flood and a humanitarian crisis, as described by the President and the administration themselves, is because the signal was the green light is on and people can come to the United States.

People need to come legally. As long as they get here, they can stay. This is because it undermines one of the basic premises of effective law enforcement, and that is deterrence. In other words, we don't want to just try to stop people after they break the law. Actually, it is too late to stop them. What we like to do is deter people from even thinking about breaking the law and, in this instance, even making that perilous journey.

There is going to be a surge, an uptick, of some type of an illegal immigration. People are going to see this as a further signal it is OK to come, and they don't need to comply with the law, they don't need to wait. They can

just come. If they are one of the lucky ones, they get to stay because this President or somebody will issue a further pardon.

As I said earlier, this is also a major boom to the cartels and other gangs who control Mexico's smuggling networks. It will almost certainly lead to thousands of people who committed crimes in this country gaining legal status. It will also, as I said earlier, punish people who played by the rules and waited patiently in line trying to immigrate to the country legally. It will punish them by putting them in the back of the line.

Let me just repeat this because it is important to me. America is the most generous country in the world when it comes to legal immigration. We are the beneficiary of the brains, the ambition, the hard work of people who come here from all over the globe. All of us weren't—or almost all of us, our ancestors were not born in the United States. We came from somewhere else. Mine came through Ellis Island from Ireland after one of the potato crop famines in the 19th century. So we understand both the desire to pursue the American dream in this country and the benefits that accrue to our country as a result of legal immigration. That is why we are such a generous country when it comes to legal immigration, but the current chaos associated with illegal immigration has a number of very negative consequences.

I mentioned a moment ago my State has 1,200 miles of common border. It gets attention every once in a while as it did when this humanitarian crisis involving these unaccompanied minors occurred, but it happens day after day that people are detained coming across the southwestern border from all over the world.

I met a young man about 6 months ago when I was down on the border who had emigrated from Bangladesh. I wondered how in the world did he get here from there. There were a number of other Senators and Congressmen with me. We asked the Border Patrol: Can we ask him? They said: Sure.

It turned out he spoke enough English. I asked: Well, how much did it cost you to get here?

He said: Six thousand dollars.

I said: How did you get here?

He said: I had to transit eight countries to get here.

That is a pretty complicated itinerary for anybody even under normal circumstances, but what it demonstrates is there are networks not just in Central America and Mexico but around the world that feed people into this network in order to immigrate to the United States illegally. What we are doing is nothing about that. Last year people were detained at the southwestern border from 140 different countries. If someone goes down to the outside of Falfurrias, TX, down in South Texas, they have rescue beacons the Border Patrol has put out. If someone made this long trip from Central Amer-

ica through Mexico in the hot weather, let's say, and they are dehydrated, they are worried about their life and their health, they can actually go hit this rescue beacon and the Border Patrol will come pick them up which is maybe not their first choice, but it is better than dying from exposure.

The languages of those rescue beacons, the ones I saw outside the checkpoint at Falfurrias, TX—they are in English, Spanish—that doesn't surprise anybody. The third language is Chinese. Chinese is not a native language for most—for anybody, I bet, in Brooks County, TX. What it demonstrates is that there is a pipeline coming across the southwestern border from all over the world. It doesn't take a lot of imagination to see what a potential threat that is from a public safety standpoint.

I know there are people who scoff at the idea of enhanced border security. The Senator from Illinois said we have enough Border Patrol to have one every half mile, 24 hours a day. This would be a way to try to secure the border. It has to be a combination of technology. It has to involve boots on the ground, and in some places—this is controversial along the border—we need to have what they call tactical infrastructure, fencing in some places, particularly in urban areas where it is easy to sprint across and be lost in a crowd before anybody discovers them.

Last year there were roughly 414,000 people detained coming across the southwestern border—414,000 from more than 144 countries. Does that sound as though we solved the problem of border security? No.

We are also sending mixed messages, as I said earlier, in terms of deterrence because people keep coming because they think they have a pretty good shot of making it in, and then the President issues an Executive order.

I wish to mention one other issue that has a particular impact on communities in my State of Texas, because we are on the frontlines of this issue, which is cost to the local taxpayer. I know the distinguished Presiding Officer is a former mayor. The cost of health care, law enforcement, and education fall not primarily on Federal taxpayers, they end up falling on local taxpayers, including the taxes they pay for their school district or their city or their county, the emergency health care provided to the local emergency room and of course law enforcement costs.

Believe me, people who come across the border are not all coming for the right reason. There are people who exploit our poorest border with criminal intent on their mind. They are dangerous, and so law enforcement has to take special precautions. That costs money. It costs the local taxpayers.

The Federal Government has been abdicating its responsibility along the border for a long time. I, for one, have to chuckle when my friends from non-border States want to tell me and tell

my constituents about our backyard because frankly, to put it in a nice way, they need more information because they don't know what they are talking about.

Most of my friends in the—this is understandable. We all understand our States and our regions. We know them better than other parts of the country that perhaps we haven't been to, but most of my colleagues—I get the impression that their knowledge of the border is from movies they have seen or novels they have read, not from the facts on the ground or studying statistics issued by the Border Patrol or the Department of Homeland Security.

There is a right way and a wrong way to do what the President is purporting to do. The right way to do it is in accordance with the Constitution which requires both Houses to pass legislation and try to reconcile those in a conference committee and then send them to the President.

There are regular negotiations taking place all along the way, but there are enough areas of consensus that I believe we can make true progress. We have not been able to do it through a comprehensive bill because I think there is enormous skepticism, not just about Washington but about Congress as well as about comprehensive bills having unintended consequences.

Take the Affordable Care Act. The President said: If you like what you have, you can keep it. Your prices will go down, not up. That ended up not being true. When that happens people are skeptical. What are they trying to sell us next? The best way to deal with that, it seems to me, is to break it down into smaller, transparent pieces, and then move the pieces across the floor in the House and the Senate, and let's get them to the President.

After we have done that one, two, three, four times, I think people will then say: Well, you know what we have just done is immigration reform in an incremental sort of way. It is not going to satisfy everybody. Again, if your demand is I want everything I want or I am not going to take anything, we know what happens when people lay down those sort of ultimatums. You get nothing.

While there are areas on the immigration topic, which admittedly is controversial, it is challenging, but it is our responsibility to address these challenges and these difficulties and do the very best job we can. The answer is not—and it can't be—a Presidential abuse of power.

As I pointed out earlier, when we try to do things on that basis, just like if we try to pass legislation on a purely partisan basis, it doesn't work. It is not sustainable. It is a provocation to the people who have been carved out of the process to try to do what they can to defend their role in the process, and that is what I worry about.

I remember being at a conference not that long ago when James Baker III and Joseph Calafato spoke. They

talked about the importance of bipartisanship. Not that I am ever going to get the Presiding Officer to agree with me on everything I believe and he is not going to agree with me on everything I believe, but they made the point when it comes to some of the most challenging topics, bipartisanship solutions are the only ones that are actually sustainable.

What happens is after the next election, the party that was pushed out of the process and run over then says, OK, we are going to try to repeal everything they did because we didn't vote for it and we don't support it. That commends itself to my way of thinking to a recommitment of bipartisan accomplishment. I am committed to that.

I know from talking to colleagues across the aisle that after 4 years of being shut out of the process themselves in the Senate, they are going to enjoy the new Congress come January because they will be able to participate in the process. If people have a good idea, they can come to the floor and talk about it. They can offer their idea and get a vote.

Nobody is guaranteed to win every time, but people should have a right to get a vote and to raise the profile of the issues they care most about and the people they work for care most about.

I wish the President wouldn't do this. It will not work. It is unconstitutional. It purports to exercise a power he himself said he does not have, but he seems determined to do it nonetheless.

I believe the American people will react negatively to this President's claim of authority to issue this amnesty, and I believe then the next step is for Congress to do everything we can to stop it and then to do it the right way, not the wrong way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, the words of Cicero are powerfully relevant 2,077 years later: When, President Obama, do you mean to cease abusing our patience? How long is that madness of yours still to mock us? When is there to be an end to that unbridled audacity of yours, swaggering about as it does now? Do not the nightly guards placed on the border, do not the watches posted throughout the city, does not the alarm of the people and the union of all good men and women—does not the precaution taken of assembling the Senate in this most defensible place—do not the looks and countenances of this venerable body here present, have any effect upon you? Do you not feel that your plans are detected? Do you not see that your conspiracy is already arrested and rendered powerless by the knowledge that everyone here possesses of it? What is there that you did last night, what the night before—where is it that you were—who was there that you summoned to meet you—what design was there which was

adopted by you, with which you think that any one of us is unacquainted?

Shame on the age and on its lost principles. The Senate is aware of these things; the Senate sees them; and yet this man dictates by his pen and his phone. Dictates. Aye, he will not even come into the Senate. He will not take part in the public deliberations; he ignores every individual among us. We gallant men and women think that we are doing our duty to the Republic if we keep out of the way of his frenzied attacks.

You ought, President Obama, long ago to have been led to defeat by your own disdain for the people. That destruction which you have been long plotting ought to have already fallen. What shall we, who are the Senate, tolerate President Obama, openly desirous to destroy the Constitution and this Republic? For I passed over old instances, such as how the IRS plotted to silence American citizens.

There was once such virtue in this Republic that brave men and women would repress mischievous citizens with severe chastisement than the most bitter enemy. For we have a resolution of the Senate, a formidable and authoritative decree against you, Mr. President. The wisdom of the Republic is not at fault, nor the dignity of this Senatorial body. We, we alone—I say it openly—we, the Senate, are waiting in our duty to stop this lawless administration and its unconstitutional amnesty.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL RURAL HEALTH DAY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to recognize National Rural Health Day. I would like to take a moment to recognize our rural health care providers and all they do for this country.

Approximately 62 million Americans live in rural areas and they depend on an ever-shrinking number of health care providers. Rural providers play a very important role in improving the health of their communities and supporting local economies.

I thank our rural providers—individuals, hospitals, and clinics—for all they do. Rural providers support a population that makes invaluable contributions to this country through food production, manufacturing, and other vital industries.

Yet more people in rural areas are living below the poverty line than their urban counterparts. Rural hospitals are struggling to continue providing care due to declining payments, many exacerbated by the Affordable Care