

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, last Wednesday, President Obama made a statement that is troubling to me. I think those of us who believe in Executive leadership and honest leadership, where leaders talk directly to the people about the serious problems we face, have to be troubled by this trend with this administration. Sometimes it makes me fear for the future of the Republic. He accused Republicans of “defunding the very operations that are involved in making sure we’ve got strong border security.” He said Republicans are blocking funding of that. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The House of Representatives—the Republican House—has passed a bill with \$40 billion, funding fully, as basically the President requested, all the agencies in the Department of Homeland Security. It has one little catch to it; it bars the President from taking money from the Department of Homeland Security that is supposed to be used to enforce the law and using that to grant amnesty and to undermine the law. The House bill is not in any way undermining the security of the United States of America, the ability for Homeland Security to protect us from terrorists. In fact, it strengthens that ability because it keeps the money there and uses it for those purposes, whereas right now the President is spending over \$100 million to create a structure across the river that would hire 1,000 new people in Homeland Security to process amnesty applications for people who violated the law and to give them the right to have earned income tax credit benefits, a Social Security card, the ability to take any job in the American economy that maybe an unemployed American would like to have or a recent immigrant with a green card would like to have. No, this person who entered the country now unlawfully gets to take that job under this policy. Congress did not fund that. But it funded the laws of the agency. The President, as he said himself 20 times, had no power to do this.

So what is happening now in the Senate, colleagues? Our Democratic colleagues now unanimously, it appears, are blocking even moving to the bill that funds Homeland Security. So I ask, with all sincerity, how can it be said that the Republicans are failing to fund the operations making sure we have strong border security? How can that be made a statement by the President of the United States?

I think we need to keep talking about that. We should not allow these modern-age politicians to go to the American people with false stories about what is happening. The Democratic Members of this Senate are systematically blocking the bill we would like to see come to the floor that fully funds Homeland Security. They have been given the right, as Senator MCCONNELL has repeatedly stated—which Senator REID never did—they have been given the right to offer any amendments they would like that are relevant and germane to the bill. So I would say this is a most serious thing with me, and I believe the American people need to understand it.

The House bill will not deny a single penny of funding for legitimate lawful operations of Homeland Security. It will be spent on enforcing the law, enforcing the Immigration and Nationality Act that was actually passed by Congress.

What the President is attempting to do is to create and execute a law Congress rejected. He asked the House to pass this law and the House said, no, they did not agree with this policy and rejected it. So he is executing it anyway.

Senate Republicans have attempted to move the bill to the floor three times, and each time it has been blocked by our Democratic colleagues because the bill does not fund the President’s unlawful Executive amnesty that he admitted 20 separate times he did not have the power to do.

Congress, colleagues, is supposed to spend the taxpayers’ money wisely. Congress should not fund any program, no matter how much the President wants it, that they believe is bad policy. More importantly, more clearly, no Senator should vote to fund a Presidential policy that violates the law, that violates the Constitution, that distorts the relationship between the Congress, which makes laws, and the President, who is supposed to execute only the laws Congress makes. So that is where we are at this point.

The President is not entitled to spend taxpayer money to implement a system of immigration that Congress has rejected. An article in yesterday’s Washington Times is further indication of where we are in this world of politics. It was reported that the Department of Homeland Security is spending taxpayer money to set up hotlines for illegal immigrants to call in to with any complaints they may have about immigration law enforcement officers if they think the officers have violated their “rights” under President Obama’s Executive amnesty—not violating their rights under law—but the President has told them this and sent out this message to the stakeholder groups.

Now who are the stakeholder groups? I suppose they are the activist groups. That is how they refer to them: stakeholders. So they send out this message: If you are not happy with the way the

Federal agency is executing my policy but indeed those agencies are attempting to enforce the law as written, then you have a “right” to call in to this hotline, and I will get on them, and I will see that they do it.

So how do the officers feel about this? National Border Patrol Council vice president Shawn Moran said this in a response. First, let me tell you, the Border Patrol officers in the USCIS—the Citizenship and Immigration Services officers—have opposed the President’s Executive amnesty. Their association has laid out how it will make the problem worse, it will increase the risk of terrorist attacks, and otherwise further degrade the integrity of our legal system. They have been clear about this. We ought to listen to them. They enforce that law repeatedly. That is their duty. They have opposed bills that they think may look good on the surface but once they have read them and found out the bill will not work effectively, they speak out against that, which is very helpful, and I am glad they do.

Well, this is what Mr. Moran said:

Instead of supporting our agents, this administration had decided it is more important to find new ways to solicit complaints and invite ridicule against them.

The American people have to know that the Obama administration’s dereliction of duty relating to our immigration system did not begin with this recent decree. From the day he took office, the President has relentlessly and systematically, colleagues, friends, the American people, dismantled immigration enforcement. It is far more serious than you would imagine.

My office has compiled a 49-page baseline timeline of nearly 200 specific entries and events that occurred since 2009 detailing how the law of the United States has been undermined by directives and orders from the President of the United States. It is step by step. This one person alone, the President, has acted against the will of the American people and undermined the law in America.

Just briefly, I will mention the first event that came to my mind. When he took office in early 2009, I believe in the State of Washington, the officers, doing their duty, enforcing the law that says a business cannot hire somebody unlawfully in America, investigated a business in Washington, discovered quite a number of people unlawfully in America, and were to commence action against the business for violating plain law that is still on the books and has not been repealed. And what happened? Immediately, the President intervened. He told them: No. Do not do this. And he told the activist groups—the La Razas and the other activist groups that were engaged in pushing him on this issue—essentially, he told them: Look, I am going to honor the promise I made to you during the campaign—that is the way I would interpret it—not to allow this kind of lawful activity to happen in the future.

So from day one, the law officers of our country got a clear message. What was the message? If you go out and enforce the law, you will get in trouble. If you do not say anything and do not do anything and stay back and lay back and not enforce the law, everything will be OK. That began the situation.

Here are just some of the highlights that I circled and looked at.

This was the Bellingham, WA, case I just mentioned, detaining 28 illegal immigrants who were using false, fake Social Security documents.

On January 29, 2009, in April of 2009, and June of 2009, the Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano delays the E-Verify deadlines. E-Verify is a system by which businesses are supposed to check a person's Social Security Number to find out if it is valid before they hire them. Many times we know people have used false Social Security Numbers to get work. She delayed that. Then she delayed it again in April, and delayed it again in June.

In June of 2010, the ICE union—the Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers—they are three basic groups: the ICE group, there is the Border Patrol group, and the Citizenship and Immigration Services group that processes the paperwork. The ICE union cast a unanimous vote of “no confidence” in the agency Homeland Security leadership, including ICE Director John Morton and Assistant Director Phyllis Coven, citing “the growing dissatisfaction and concern among ICE employees” that they “have abandoned the Agency’s”—ICE’s—“core mission of enforcing United States Immigration Laws and providing for public safety, and have instead directed their attention to campaigning for programs and policies related to amnesty.”

He said the policy of this government—not what we as sworn officers are supposed to be enforcing, but the policy of our leaders is to spend all their time campaigning for policies related to amnesty and undermining enforcement.

ICE officers went so far, colleagues, as to file a lawsuit in Federal court contending they were being ordered to violate the law by their supervisors. A judge expressed sympathy for them but eventually decided they didn't have standing to proceed with the case, but I think it is still on appeal.

In 2011, at a roundtable with amnesty advocates, President Obama admitted his deportation statistics were misleading. Indeed, they have been. They claim they have increased deportation, but that is totally incorrect. They finally had to admit it.

In February of 2012 President Obama slashed the budget for the 287(g) Program, a program that I helped advocate for and moved forward when I came to the Senate 10 years ago. It simply says the Federal Government will work with State and local law enforcement officers to train them in the things they can legally do to help the Federal officers enforce the law. It is a per-

fectly sensible program, and it is very popular. A number of States have taken quite a step toward it. It was working in an effective way, and they canceled it after he took office.

They announced the delay in the biometric entry-exit visa system in February of last year. An inspector general audit revealed declines in workplace enforcement of substantial amounts as a direct result of White House policies, and they admit the Obama administration manipulated deportation data.

In March of last year a new report revealed that the ICE officers—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair, and I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute to wrap up.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. It was revealed that ICE released 68,000 convicted criminals in 2013. These are convicted criminals.

In May of last year the Deputy Chief of Border Patrol revealed that the border surge was incentivized by the administration's policies.

As I said, there are 49 pages of this.

I would point out that we are ready to bring the bill to the floor and allow amendments to the legislation passed by the House that fully funds Homeland Security and ensures that the money is spent for enforcement and not to dismantle the law.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

BOTTICELLI NOMINATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, Senator ALEXANDER and Senator ENZI are here on the floor. I want to briefly address the nominee we will be voting on this afternoon and then turn to the matter the three of us wish to address.

Today the Senate is going to vote on the nomination of Michael Botticelli to be the next Director of National Drug Control Policy. I look forward to working with our Nation's next drug czar just as I have with previous drug czars.

Drug abuse is a serious problem in my home State. Kentucky is the fifth highest prescribing State when it comes to pain killers, and we have the Nation's third highest drug overdose mortality rate, with many deaths driven by prescription pain killers.

Heroin abuse is also a problem in the Bluegrass State. Heroin deaths accounted for 32 percent of the drug overdoses back in 2013, and they continue to climb. The epicenter of the heroin problem is located in the northern region across the river from Cincinnati, although I am hearing more and more from constituents that drug abuse is rising in other parts of the Commonwealth as well.

All told, the Kentucky Office of Drug Control Policy reports that about 1,000 Kentuckians lose their lives overdosing on drugs every year, which is more than we lose in fatal car crashes.

There is another reason I am pleased to welcome prior drug czar Gil Kerlikowski to tour Kentucky. We had him there a couple of years ago to take a closeup look at the problems we face. He visited Louisville, Lexington, London, and Pikeville—four communities, both urban and rural, across the State. He met with Kentuckians who worked to tackle this issue from every single angle—public health officials, medical professionals, law enforcement officials, drug courts, members of the business community, and Kentuckians involved with prevention. The drug czar's visit helped focus more Federal attention and Federal resources on this issue, and in a time of strained budgets, the extra attention and those extra resources are particularly important.

I am also pleased to report that Mr. Botticelli plans to visit Eastern Kentucky soon. He also plans, at my invitation, to visit Northern Kentucky this spring. Visits such as these help ensure continued Federal focus on Kentucky's drug problem, and I look forward to working with the next drug czar to move closer to the day when drug abuse is no longer ravaging our families and our communities.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. ENZI pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 8 are printed in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

BOTTICELLI NOMINATION

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of Michael Botticelli in our effort today to confirm him as Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

The State of Massachusetts, like too many other regions of this Nation, is being ravaged by the scourge of prescription drug and heroin addiction that is breaking apart families and burying communities under a mountain of despair. Massachusetts experienced 114 deaths in December, and that doesn't count our biggest cities, such as Boston and Worcester and Springfield.

Drug overdose deaths fueled by prescription pain killers now claim more lives than car accidents nationwide. Approximately 100 Americans die from an overdose every day.

As a Senator from Massachusetts, I have a deep appreciation and respect for Michael Botticelli's accomplishments addressing addiction during his nearly two decades serving in the Massachusetts Department of Public Health. He is a public health and drug policy pioneer, and he lived in my hometown of Malden, MA, while he did this job.

Immediately prior to joining the Office of National Drug Control Policy as Deputy Director, Mr. Botticelli was the director of the Bureau of Substance Abuse Services at the Massachusetts