



CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION REPORT

THE CONSERVATIVE CAUCUS FOUNDATION, INC.
March 2015

PETER THOMAS, PRESIDENT

Obama's Amnesty Program Lacks Any Support in US Law

The U.S. Constitution clearly states at the beginning of Article I that all legislative power is vested in Congress. The President is assigned the responsibility of carrying out the laws passed by Congress, and is given the opportunity to recommend (but not to make) changes in the laws.

Does the November 2014 action by President Obama, granting potential “deferred action” status to more than four million illegal aliens, fall within these constitutional boundaries or did the President’s policy change the law, in violation of the Constitution’s separation of powers? The Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) of the Department of Justice has given its opinion that the President has the necessary authority (see their November 19 Memorandum). Jeh Johnson, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, relied heavily on the OLC opinion in his November 20 memo directing DHS agencies to carry out the new policies, incorporating some of its wording verbatim. However the weakness of the OLC’s reasoning makes it appear that their approach was not to provide an objective evaluation, but rather to construct a defense of what the President already intended to do.

OLC admits that while “prosecutorial discretion” is a well-recognized attribute of the president and his subordinates, it does not grant unlimited discretion to the executive branch. It cannot be used to “attempt to effectively rewrite the laws to match its policy preferences.” It also cannot follow a course “so extreme as to amount to an abdication of its statutory responsibilities.”

OLC denies that the deferred action policy goes so far as to reach this forbidden ground, but it relies heavily on the doubtful argument that Congress has implicitly granted broad authority to the president in this area. Considering that Congress has never passed a law establishing deferred action, such a claim should be based on clear and unquestioned precedent, but this is exactly where the OLC memo falls short.

The OLC cites four recent pre-Obama examples of deferred action for “particular classes of aliens”. However, these were cases in which deportation was to be postponed because existing circumstances made it possible or even likely that those affected would soon receive the status of legal residents. Students who temporarily had no valid student visas when Hurricane Katrina caused their schools to shut down, abused wives and children seeking a transition to permanent legal status, widows and widowers of citizens (Congress was about to pass legislation granting them a path to citizenship), and visa applicants under the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act were very different categories from those proposed by President Obama. They merely needed a delay while they obtained their

legal status. Furthermore, few of the people in these categories had originally entered the U.S. illegally.

The OLC also mentions the 1990 Family Fairness program of President George H. W. Bush, which provided deferred action for spouses and children of those who had been granted amnesty by the 1986 law. What the OLC does not mention is that this program was a temporary measure while legislation was in the works to make their legal residence permanent (legislation which was passed that same year). It is also worth noting, because it reflects on the credibility of the OLC, that the memorandum cites the thoroughly discredited claim that the Family Fairness program covered 1.5 million people, while the true number is less than 150,000.

The OLC also points to a few cases where Congress has allowed the executive branch some leeway in deferring action on people who are subject to deportation, but none of these precedents is remotely similar to the new deferred action program, and none involve people who illegally entered the United States. Two post-September 11 laws allowing citizenship for family members of US citizens who died in the terrorist attacks or in later combat did provide for deferred action, but once again this was intended as a temporary delay while they made the transition to citizenship.

OLC even concedes that deferred action is supposed to be a “temporary” suspension of deportation, which was the case in all these examples. Had they been unable to obtain legal status, they would have been subject to deportation. For example, a Katrina-affected student who chose not to return to school would have been sent home. However, Obama’s deferred action, while limited to three years at a time, may be extended and is not to be followed by either legalization or deportation. It is intended to be at least indefinite, and the arguments used in its favor are only consistent with the intention of a permanent change in status.

Another key point is whether the new deferred action program is one that grants deferral to a whole class of people, or merely provides for DHS to make a case-by-case decision on the applicants. OLC is very clear in saying that only a case-by-case approach can be valid. It defends the new program, saying “The guarantee of individualized, case-by-case review helps avoid potential concerns that, in establishing such eligibility criteria, the Executive is attempting to rewrite the law by defining new categories of aliens who are automatically entitled to particular immigration relief.” Unfortunately, the OLC’s evaluation takes at face value the claim that each application will receive a thorough review. The Obama administration has estimated that as many as 4.1 million people may apply for deferred action, a far greater number than DHS has ever had to deal with, and a number which is likely to swamp the Department’s ability to check out each one. Adding the necessary resources to carry out an effective case-by-case review would require an appropriation by Congress, and without such an appropriation, the review process is likely to be a worthless farce. Asking for an appropriation would also expose the fact that this program does not have the support of Congress, and is in fact a rewriting of the law by the President in the face of Congressional refusal.

It is no surprise that a Federal district judge in Texas granted an injunction to prevent Obama’s amnesty program from going into effect. The law simply does not support the program, and the OLC has been unable to come up with a convincing argument.

Is the IRS Cover-up Starting to Unravel? Criminal Charges Appear Possible

From the beginning, a thorough investigation of the IRS targeting of conservative groups has been handicapped by thousands of “lost” emails, especially those of Lois Lerner, who headed the division overseeing applications for nonprofit status. The IRS claimed that the emails had accidentally been destroyed, and that no back-ups were available.

Now the Inspector General for Tax Administration has found the back-ups that supposedly did not exist. The “lost” emails are being recovered and sent to Congress to assist the ongoing investigation.

According to Inspector General Camus, “They were right where you would expect them to be.” The liberal Washington Post reported that “the IRS’s technology specialists told investigators that no one from the agency asked for the tapes. His comments raised doubts about whether the IRS did its due diligence in trying to locate Lerner’s emails, or possibly greater troubles.”

That alone justifies the Inspector General’s statement that “There is potential criminal activity.”

However, the story does not end there. There is more evidence of a deliberate and broader cover-up. The plaintiff in a lawsuit against IRS discrimination, True the Vote, attempted to require the IRS to look for back-up tapes in the location where they were eventually found. However, the Department of Justice aggressively and successfully prevented that.

The IRS, the Department of Justice, members of the White House staff – the scandal has now implicated many in the Obama administration. How high will it go when the truth is revealed?

Follow TCCF on the Internet

TCCF’s studies and other useful information are now available on our website, www.tccf.foundation. Please bookmark this site and check it regularly for new information.

The Constitutional Budget, analysis of proposed congressional legislation, and links to other important documents and information will all be found at tccf.foundation.

Constitutional Budget Project Resumes Its Work

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution lists the governmental functions which were delegated to the Federal government. James Madison, in Federalist 45, stated that “The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined.”

However, especially since the early twentieth century, the Federal government has steadily expanded its functions beyond those that were delegated. Federal taxes and spending

have vastly increased over that same period. Although the Federal courts have occasionally struck down one of these programs on Constitutional grounds, Federal judges have generally chosen to turn a blind eye to the Constitution.

The Constitutional Budget Project of The Conservative Caucus Foundation (TCCF) periodically examines portions of the President's proposed budget to determine the constitutional status of current spending programs.

So far, our examination of President Obama's proposed budget for FY 2016 has found the following:

	Unconstitutional Amount
Department of Education	98%
Department of Housing and Urban Development	98%

The detailed, program-by-program, findings of the Constitutional Budget Project are posted on TCCF's website (tccf.foundation). You may also receive a free copy by calling, writing, or emailing TCCF's headquarters.

TCCF Members Support Defunding Obama's Amnesty

The November issue of *Constitutional Action Report* asked TCCF members about Congressional action on Obama's amnesty program. The results were heavily in favor of having Congress refuse to provide any funding for amnesty.

The Republican leadership in Congress made an attempt to carry out this policy. A bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) but prohibit spending on amnesty passed the House with nearly unanimous support from Republicans. In the Senate, every Republican except Dean Heller of Nevada voted for it, but Heller and the Democrats successfully filibustered the bill and blocked an attempt to hold a conference committee. The liberal position was consistent throughout – no compromise, ever. They would only vote for a bill that gave them 100% of what they wanted.

The Republican leadership could have stood firm. They could have taken their message to the public that elected them, pointing out that Republicans had voted for funding DHS, and Democrats were responsible for a shutdown. Instead they surrendered. Though a large majority of Republicans voted against amnesty, enough joined with Democrats to pass it.

Congressional Action Now Poll November-December 2014

Should Congress vote to prohibit all funding for President Obama's policy of granting amnesty to illegal aliens?

Yes 98% No 2% Undecided 0%

CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION REPORT is a publication of
The Conservative Caucus Foundation, a 501(c)3 public policy
organization
which, since 1976, has worked
to safeguard our God-given
rights to life, liberty, and property.
Contributions to TCCF are tax-deductible.

Editor
Charles Orndorff

Board of Trustees
Peter Thomas *President*
Scott Stanley *Secretary*
William H. Ball, Jr. *Trustee*