

not want us to legislate in this way. They want us to get things done. They want us to actually find common ground. And on homeland security we have made the hard choices on where the dollars ought to come from and where they ought to be prioritized.

But if the loudest voices get their way and hold this funding hostage, not only would it make our country more vulnerable to terrorist threats but a DHS shutdown would jeopardize our national security by disrupting other important programs, such as grants to train local law enforcement and to protect our communities. And as many as 240,000 people responsible for frontline security—more than 80 percent of DHS employees—will still have to show up to work—they just won't get paid for it. Many of them in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

This is a threat to the homeland, it is a threat to our law enforcement, it is a threat in terms of our ability to respond to crises with FEMA, and there is threat even without those potential tragedies of the normal course of an American citizen as they pass through airports and other venues. Ultimately, for an agency that has been under some strain, these 240,000 people who are working hard to protect our homeland have to provide for their families.

This is not the way this body should operate. I want to commend the majority for trying to say we will bring back an open process. But the notion that we will have a repeat of what we saw when we self-inflicted damage upon this whole economy when we shut down the government a few years ago because of an unwillingness of a few to compromise—if that is repeated now around homeland security, it would be a dreadful mistake.

#### TRIBUTE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEE ANTHONY REGALBUTO

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I come to the floor to continue a tradition that was begun by my esteemed former colleague, the former Senator from Delaware, Ted Kaufman. Senator Kaufman would come to this floor from time to time to celebrate members of the Federal workforce who exemplify excellence in public service. In that tradition I want to honor a great Federal employee: CAPT Anthony Regalbuto.

Captain Regalbuto is a constituent of mine from Burke, VA. He currently serves as the Chief of the U.S. Coast Guard's Office of International and Domestic Port Security. But, in fact, Captain Regalbuto has spent his entire adult life in service to the Coast Guard, with 31 years on active duty and more than 12 years as a civilian—a total of 43 years of service. In this role he has been responsible for addressing the security weaknesses facing our Nation's ports. He has also assisted other countries with improving the safety of their own ports.

More than 90 percent of the imported goods of the United States go through

our ports. The security risks facing the ports are many, and workers such as Captain Regalbuto help ensure they remain safe and secure from threats. For our Nation's ports to remain safe, we must ensure our foreign shipping partners follow established international port security requirements. So part of Captain Regalbuto's job is to make sure foreign countries that want to conduct business using U.S. ports adhere to these requirements.

Captain Regalbuto has developed a solution—a model code that countries could use as a guide to strengthen their own laws to improve the security of their ports. He also oversaw the creation of the Maritime Security Risk Analysis Model. It helps the Coast Guard analyze and address major port security weaknesses by measuring a variety of factors. This risk analysis model has helped the Coast Guard evaluate more than 30,000 potential targets and 100,000 attack scenarios across the country.

Furthermore, this data has helped to efficiently allocate more than \$2.7 billion in grants where they can best help improve port security and get the best bang for the taxpayer dollars.

CAPT Anthony Regalbuto is just one of many Federal employees. He also happens to be a Federal employee who would potentially be affected by Department of Homeland Security funding, which is the current issue on the floor of the Senate.

One of the challenges, even as we move past this particular debate, is to make sure in these tight budget times—going back to the comments of the Senator from Indiana—that we husband our resources. We are going to have to do more with less. One of the things that is terribly important—as someone who has spent more time in business than I have in politics—if you want your workforce to do more, you find ways both psychically, monetarily, and through appropriate review to reward them.

Too often Members come to this floor and sometimes tend to demonize our Federal workforce. Too often over the past few years the Federal workforce is the first to receive the cuts in funding. If we are going to make sure our country remains strong, we want to make sure folks such as Captain Regalbuto keep our ports and keep our homeland safe. We need to recognize their service and, by all means, make sure we don't put in particular the DHS through another ill-fated, politically driven government shutdown.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

(The remarks of Mr. HATCH pertaining to the introduction of S. J. Res. 6 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I 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. SESSIONS. Mr. 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. Mr. President, the House of Representatives has voted to fully fund homeland security, as the President has requested. It sent a bill to the Senate that fully funds all the lawful policies and programs in homeland security. The bill will not deny a penny of funding. In fact, it says, spend the money, but on enforcing the laws of the United States. Don't spend money undermining the laws of the United States. Don't spend money in violation of the laws of the United States. Don't spend money in violation of the established policies of Congress, which rejected the President's ideas that he is now executing. And don't spend money in violation of the will of the American people who overwhelmingly oppose the President's unlawful Executive amnesty.

That is what we are talking about today, and my colleagues continue to suggest that somehow Republicans are not funding the Homeland Security Department. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Our colleagues have now voted to block going to the bill. If they don't like some of the provisions that came over from the House, well, let's get on the bill and let's have some relevant amendments and let's vote on it. That is what Congress is about. That is the way we are supposed to do business here.

But our colleagues have gotten spoiled. They think they can block anything and turn around and blame the Republicans for it and that somehow everybody is going to agree with them.

Look, the American people get this. The President is not entitled to spend money to implement a system of immigration that Congress, representing the American people, rejected. If our Democratic colleagues are unhappy, then, as I said, they can offer amendments.

I feel it would be a stunning event if the Senate removes language from a bill that simply restores the separation of powers and prevents the President from overreaching in violating the Constitution. But if they want to bring up amendments that would allow the President to do this activity, let's do it, let's bring it up, and let's vote on it. Perhaps they might win it. But I think it is untenable constitutionally and it is untenable legally, because it is contrary to the law and the will of the American people.

My good friend Senator SCHUMER is one of our able Members of this body. He spoke earlier today and he said: The

right wing of the Republican Party is risking a DHS—Department of Homeland Security—shutdown to get their way on immigration. They are saying: Take our hard right stance on immigration, or we won't fund national security.

That is not so, Senator SCHUMER. Give me a break. Come on. You are blocking the bill. The House has voted to fund homeland security. It is on the floor. We need to pass it, and we will give you an opportunity to offer your amendments if you are not happy with it. It is absolutely not so that they are doing that.

So how is it being reported? Republicans frequently complain they don't get fair reporting in the press, but let's look at this:

U.S. News and World Report, today: "Senate Democrats Block Bill Undoing Immigration Actions." That is the headline, "Undoing Immigration Actions." Those are President Obama's unlawful actions. So they are defending his actions, not defending homeland security.

How about this one, USA Today: "Democrats again block efforts to derail immigration order." The effort would derail the President's unlawful Executive amnesty—but it funds homeland security, as the article makes clear.

Fox News: "Senate Dems nix debate on Homeland Security bill, blocking it, in protest over immigration."

Who is blocking the bill?

Politico: "Democrats filibuster Department of Homeland Security bill."

That is exactly what is happening. The bill has passed the House. It is on the floor. We are trying to bring it up. We are trying to have debate. We are trying to have amendments. And they are blocking the bill—according to Politico, no rightwing publication.

The Washington Post: "Senate Democrats block DHS spending bill targeting Obama's immigration actions."

The Atlantic. This is a good one. For those of us who have been around here a long time, and I think for reporters who cover it, this is really humorous, to have our Democratic colleagues, having complained for years about what Republicans do. This is the headline in the Atlantic: "The New Democratic Obstructionists."

Here is the headline in the New York Times: "Senate Democrats Block Republicans' Homeland Security Bill."

So I would say, colleagues, the American people know better. The media knows better. They know who is blocking this bill. They know that the Congress of the United States—that the House of Representatives and the Senate is not required to fund any program it doesn't like.

It is absolutely not required, and it has a duty not to fund Presidential expenditures that are illegal. The Department of Homeland Security is provided funds to enforce the laws of the United States. The President right now is tak-

ing money that was sent to Homeland Security to enforce laws and he is re-directing it and moving it over to a building just across the river in Crystal City, hiring 1,000 persons to process applications of people illegally in the country and to provide them the earned-income tax credit, which is a direct check from the United States of America, provide them a Social Security number, the right to participate in Social Security, legal status in the country, the right to work in the country, and participation in Medicare, when the law of the United States says if someone is here unlawfully, they cannot work. So that is what this is all about.

I just want to push back. I urge my colleagues—at least seven of my Democratic colleagues have said they oppose President Obama's actions. When do they have a clearer chance to confront that action and demonstrate with conviction that they meant what they said than on this vote?

It allows the bill to come forward. It allows us to have a vote. It allows anybody in the Senate to offer amendments that would be relevant to the bill. I feel strongly about that.

I see the Senator from New York. I think she was in line to speak before I was, and I was able to grab a few minutes. So I would just say this. Colleagues, please review your position on this. Let's move to this bill. Let's fund Homeland Security. Let's discuss and have amendments and vote on the President's Executive order, and the one who wins the votes, so be it. That is the way the Congress of the United States works.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to do the right thing and pass a bill that would fully fund the Department of Homeland Security, without the politically driven riders that are the focus of this debate.

Protecting our country from terrorist attacks should be our top priority in Congress and we should not be playing games with Homeland Security funding. That is the least our constituents expect of us. I know that for many of my colleagues the question of immigration is a very contentious one and an important one worthy of debate. We should have that debate without risking the safety of our families by once again putting an immigration bill on the floor of the Senate.

But this funding bill for such a vitally important part of our national security is simply not the place for an ideological debate. If we fail to pass and fund the Department of Homeland Security, the consequences for our safety could potentially be devastating. Take for example the Urban Areas Security Initiative. This is the program that helps our cities pay for things such as surveillance equipment,

secure communications systems, training for law enforcement personnel, all in order to increase our security and prevent terrorism. These grants ensure that all of the places terrorists have targeted and will continue to target are able to effectively prevent those violent acts from happening.

New York City is my home State. It is the No. 1 terror target in the Nation. It relies on the urban security program to keep its millions of residents and tourists safe. It also relies on our Homeland Security network to stop the plans of would-be terrorists.

Since 9/11, New York City has thwarted at least 16 terrorist attacks, and it has done so because of the constant support the Department of Homeland Security provides. If we cannot pass this bill, the Urban Areas Security Initiative and the extensive network of security systems in New York City would lose their funding, and every visitor to an urban area in this country, including right here in Washington, DC, would be less safe.

If we cannot pass this bill, not only would our security suffer, but the inspectors at our ports would not be paid, our security personnel would not be paid, and our Border Patrol agents would not be paid. If we don't pass this bill, then we have failed at our most solemn responsibility, to keep the American people safe.

I urge all my colleagues to please put politics aside, vote to pass a bill free of divisive policy riders and fully fund the Department of Homeland Security.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the rest of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to pass a clean Homeland Security funding bill for fiscal year 2015. This is an issue of national security, and we cannot allow politics to divert attention from our responsibility as Senators.

The majority in the House sent the Senate a bill with five poison pills that they know will prevent the passage of this legislation. Yesterday and again today, my Senate colleagues and I sent a clear message that these politically divisive immigration provisions have no place in this bill.

I urge my colleagues to dispense with any further delays and allow for an up-or-down vote on the bill as originally drafted.

The Department of Homeland Security funding bill—created in the wake of 9/11, as Senator DURBIN reminded us earlier—is not the place to litigate immigration policy; rather, those issues are appropriately addressed in a comprehensive immigration bill, and I hope

the House will draft and vote on that type of legislation soon.

The recent executions of the Japanese and Jordanian hostages by the terrorist group ISIL and the attacks in Paris, Ottawa, and Australia serve as reminders of the very real threat we face.

Each day we delay in providing adequate, reliable resources to the Department of Homeland Security, we undermine the Department's efforts to defend the home front. That is why I am calling on my colleagues to take up and pass a clean bill.

My colleagues on the Appropriations Committee Senator SHAHEEN and Vice Chairwoman MIKULSKI have introduced a clean DHS funding bill that reflects the bipartisan agreement reached between the House and Senate appropriators. This bill funds a wide range of programs that keep Americans safe and secure.

For example, the clean version of this bill funds a host of counterterrorism, intelligence, and security functions; investments in cyber security defense technologies and personnel, investments to detect and protect against biological threats, research and development of nuclear detection technologies, TSA and Coast Guard operations to keep our skies and our waters safe. The clean version also funds \$6 billion in disaster funds to help States, localities, businesses, and individuals rebuild after a natural disaster, staffing nearly 24,000 Customs and Border Protection officers who ensure legitimate travel of individuals who seek to enter the country, and staffing 20,000 Border Patrol agents who protect the 6,000 miles of our land border and 2,000 miles of coastal waters.

Department of Homeland Security Secretary Johnson has been clear that while the Department operates under the current CR, it cannot fund key homeland security initiatives.

A short-term CR would prevent the Department from awarding new disaster preparedness grants that support our local emergency responders. It would delay the hiring of more investigators for cases related to human trafficking and smuggling. It would also prevent the Secret Service from training for the next Presidential election, and the list goes on.

We cannot expect DHS to do long-term strategic planning with short-term funding measures. The Department needs reliable funding to operate efficiently and effectively.

The House majority is unfortunately playing politics with our homeland security because the President has taken an action that every President since the 1950s has taken: He has provided commonsense direction to our immigration enforcement efforts.

The President's Executive actions on immigration are fundamentally aimed at keeping families together, making our communities safer, and using our resources efficiently. It is hard to understand how someone could oppose that.

The President's actions will ensure that our immigration enforcement efforts are used to secure the border, prevent threats to national security, and protect public safety. These should be our top priorities, and I support those efforts, but if Members of the House take issue with them, they should draft and adopt immigration reform, just as the Senate did on a bipartisan basis 18 months ago.

Our path forward is simple: Pass a clean funding bill. If my colleagues want to fix our broken immigration system, then let's take up a bill, but let's not use this critical funding bill to play partisan politics.

The dedicated men and women of the Department of Homeland Security deserve better. The American people deserve better. Let's put aside politics and let's pass a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. ALEXANDER pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 67 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### RECOGNIZING THE HENRY CLAY CENTER FOR STATESMANSHIP AND THE KENTUCKY DISTILLERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, last night I had the honor of speaking at a bourbon event hosted by the Henry Clay Center for Statesmanship and the Kentucky Distillers' Association here in Washington, DC. This event was for Kentuckians and by Kentuckians and featured the so-called "Bourbon Barrel of Compromise" that had been delivered from Ashland, the Henry Clay Estate in Lexington, KY. I would ask that my remarks at that event last night be entered into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Feb. 3, 2015]

#### LEADER McCONNELL'S REMARKS AT BOURBON EVENT

Thank you, Robert [Clay, co-chairman of the Henry Clay Center for Statesmanship].

It's a pleasure to be here to celebrate the spirit of Kentucky—literally. Tonight we honor two of Kentucky's most important gifts to the nation: the drink that is Bourbon whiskey and the revered statesman Henry Clay. I'm glad to be here to talk about both.

There are a lot of good Henry Clay stories, but let me share one of my favorites—a story that demonstrates Clay's sense of humor and quick wit.

On one occasion, a long-winded colleague of Clay's, Alexander Smyth of Virginia, was giving a speech. He turned to Clay in mid-speech and said disdainfully, "You, sir, speak

for the present generation; but I speak for posterity."

Without batting an eye, Clay retorted, "Yes, and you seem resolved to speak until the arrival of your audience."

Taking that wisdom to heart, I will be brief.

I want to thank the Henry Clay Center for Statesmanship and the Kentucky Distillers' Association for hosting this grand event—not only tonight's affair, but shipping a barrel of Bourbon whiskey from Henry Clay's estate in Ashland to Washington, DC, just as the Great Compromiser reportedly often did some two centuries ago.

The history of Bourbon whiskey and the legend of Henry Clay have long been intertwined. It is said that whenever Clay went to Washington, he carried a barrel with him, to "lubricate the wheels of government."

Clay is also credited with writing the first historical recipe for the mint julep and introducing it to the public in this very hotel.

He recorded in his diary his own method for making the cocktail. Clay called for "mellow bourbon, aged in oaken barrels" and also instructed that "the mint leaves, fresh and tender, should be pressed against a coin-silver goblet with the back of a silver spoon."

The historical record also shows that Clay used Bourbon as an aid to legislating. One observer from that era recalls witnessing Clay and fellow Senate great John Calhoun sipping whiskey in the Old Senate Chamber.

Together they would drain their glasses behind the vice president's chair—and Clay, with good humor, would say to Calhoun, "Well, Mr. Senator, I will admit that you have had the better of me today; but I'll be your match tomorrow."

Legend also holds that Clay's oratorical skills were often enhanced by his consumption of Kentucky's favorite beverage. Some have said that it is the lime in the water used to make Kentucky Bourbon that lends both Bourbon whiskey and Clay's oratory their special flare.

Whatever it may be that gives Bourbon whiskey its unique taste, Kentucky is proud to be the birthplace of Bourbon.

The drink itself is named for Bourbon County, where the product first emerged. Kentucky produces 95 percent of the world's Bourbon supply, and Kentucky's iconic Bourbon brands ship more than 30 million gallons of the spirit to 126 countries, making Bourbon the largest export category among all United States distilled spirits.

Bourbon also gives much back to Kentucky. It is a vital part of the state's tourism and economy. Many a visitor to the Commonwealth has traced the famous Kentucky Bourbon Trail. And the industry is responsible for nearly 10,000 jobs in our state.

And both Bourbon and Clay have one thing in common: They excel at bringing people together in a spirit of compromise.

I'd like to think that this Kentucky spirit of compromise lives on in the Senate today. With the new Senate of the 114th Congress, it's great to see some real debate on the floor of the Senate once again.

It's been great to see both sides able to offer amendments once more.

I know many of the Democratic Senators are glad to be able to give more of a voice to their constituents too. I believe they welcome our vision of a Senate where we're doing some real legislating.

A more open Senate presents more opportunities for legislators with serious ideas to make a mark on the legislative process. It can give members of both parties a real stake in the outcome. And it helps lead, I hope, to greater bipartisan accomplishments down the road.

Just because we have a Republican Congress and a Democrat in the White House