

Seven and a half million got it through Medicaid. All of that expense and all of the hardship President Obama caused on American families—families who have suffered as a result of the President's health care law—and most of the net gain in coverage is people who went onto Medicaid?

The American people didn't ask for this. If President Obama actually talked with a real representative sample of Americans, he would know that. But he doesn't. He only hears what he wants to hear. He disregards the rest. He didn't do that last week. He still refuses to listen to people who have been hurt by his law.

It is time for the President to be honest with the American people about the ways his law has harmed them. This is it—New York Times, Sunday, February 8, "Insured, but Not Covered: New policies have many Americans scrambling."

It is time for the President to start working with Republicans to give people the kind of health care reform they wanted all along—access to the care they need from a doctor they choose at a lower cost. That is what the American people are demanding, and that is what they deserve, and that is what Republicans are going to give them when we get the opportunity to do so. It is time for President Obama to join us.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we are running out of time until the Department of Homeland Security shuts down, and the majority doesn't seem to have any real plan to avoid it.

There are 17 days left—with a week of recess in between—until tens of thousands of DHS workers are furloughed, fire grants to local fire departments are no longer sent out, and training local first responders in handling terrorist attacks stops dead in its tracks. Yet each day comes with a new round of finger-pointing from Republicans eager to pass the buck to the other Chamber.

The distinguished majority leader, my friend, Senator MCCONNELL, and my friend from Tennessee, Senator ALEXANDER, and many other Republicans in this body have said it is time for the House majority to come up with a new plan. The House of course says it is the Senate majority that needs to act again. This morning Speaker BOEHNER, astoundingly, said the House

would not pass another DHS bill. He is tied in such a knot he can't move, even though he knows his failure to move risks a government shutdown.

The House of course says it is the Senate majority that needs to act again, and yesterday the majority leader said the onus was now on the House to fund DHS. This morning the majority leader said the onus is now on the Senate. We have all kinds of Abbott and Costello behavior going on. The funny thing is the finger-pointing is not at the Democrats. They are pointing at each other as to who is to blame.

The American people are getting whiplash from listening to the Republican leadership on this issue. The Republicans need to sort out the divisions within their own caucus before they deflect any blame on Democrats, because while Democrats remain united in both Houses in support of a clean bill, the Republican majority is busy playing a game of hot potato with national security funding.

The disunity and delay has led a few Republicans to start talking about a continuing resolution that would guarantee another cliff and more brinkmanship and underfund DHS in the meantime. Delaying this same standoff by a few weeks or months isn't a very good plan B. It is hardly a plan at all.

Secretary Jeh Johnson described the CR for DHS this way: "It's like going on a 300-mile trip with a five-gallon tank of gas."

Let me give a few examples of why a Republican continuing resolution is a very poor plan B.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, will my friend from New York yield for a question?

Mr. SCHUMER. I will yield for a question when I finish my remarks, just as he was nice enough to yield to me a few days ago.

First, without a bipartisan full-year bill, the Secret Service cannot move forward with the critical reforms recommended by an independent panel of experts made after the White House fence-jumping incident.

Second, we can't upgrade the biometric identification system that prevents terrorists from coming into the country. Republicans and Democrats negotiated an additional \$25 million for DHS to upgrade the system that allows them to stop terrorists from coming through an airport or on a cargo ship and into the United States. A CR does not provide that funding.

Third, Secretary Johnson has said the Department will be constrained by a CR from improving security along our southwest border and maintaining the resources we added to deal with last summer's border crisis. Some say, Why does a CR constrain all of this? Because it is just ratifying last year's funding, and when new situations have emerged—new terrorist threats, new trouble on the border—we can't change the budget. It makes no sense. No company would simply pass last year's budget when they are experiencing new

challenges; neither should our government.

In short, a CR just doesn't work. It is not how we should be funding the Department of Homeland Security.

So we implore our Republican colleagues: Don't shut down the Department of Homeland Security, don't set up another shutdown, and don't underfund the men and women who work 24/7 to keep us safe. Pass a clean appropriations bill and give the people on the frontlines of defending this country the tools they need to get the job done.

I will be happy to yield for a question to my good friend, the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask my friend from New York—I don't hear any Republicans talking about a shutdown and I don't hear any Republicans talking about a continuing resolution. I just hear Republicans talking about taking up the bill the House has passed, which is a \$40 billion appropriations bill and having a vote on it. But isn't it true that Democrats are united in blocking our ability to even consider that \$40 billion appropriations bill?

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my friend for the question. It is nice to see him standing on the Democratic side. I hope he tries it again. If he likes it, he might do it more often.

I would say this: We all know what Speaker BOEHNER did. The hard right in the House said we want to force the President to undo his Executive order. They know if they put it on the floor alone, the President might veto it, so they attached it to Homeland Security and they basically say to the President, the only way we will fund the Department of Homeland Security is if we include these unpalatable riders, which the President has said he would veto.

So there is a simple solution.

That would force a shutdown. What the House did is say if we don't do it our way, we are shutting down the government. That didn't work 2 years ago—and that effort was led by the junior Senator from Texas, not my friend, the senior Senator from Texas—and it is not going to work today. Everyone knows what our colleagues in the House did. They are playing hostage. They are holding a gun to the head of America and saying unless we do it their way, they are going to shut down the government. That is why they attached it.

Let me repeat to my dear friend from Texas: No one objects to debating what the President did on Executive orders. We welcome that debate. It is the act of tying it to funding the government—the same thing they did with ObamaCare a few years ago—that says we are going to shut down the government unless we get our way.

So the logical solution—and I will yield in a moment—is very simple: Pass the Department of Homeland Security bill. If they don't want to shut

down the government, pass a clean Homeland Security bill and then the majority can put immigration on the floor and we can debate it.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, again, I don't hear any Republicans talking about shutting down the government. Indeed, the deadline, as I understand, is February 27 for this appropriations bill. What we are having is a discussion about the President's abuse of his authority under the Constitution by issuing the Executive order. I understand we disagree about that—and we ought to have that debate—and the public I think would insist that we honor our oath by making sure we protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, including against Presidential overreach.

I ask my friend, is it going to be the consistent position of our Democratic friends in the Senate that they are going to block us from even getting on the bill so that then they can offer amendments to strip out the parts they don't like? That is the way the Senate is supposed to work, but it doesn't work that way when Democrats are filibustering this \$40 billion appropriations bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my colleague from Texas for his good question. I agree with parts of what he said. First, I agree that we disagree on the President's Executive order.

Second, I agree we ought not debate it in a hostage-taking situation. Our colleagues in the House may not have used the word "shutdown." It doesn't matter. Their actions speak louder than words. When they attach these proposals to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill and say we are not going to fund Homeland Security unless we get some of these proposals, that is saying we will shut down the government unless we get our way. Sure, they will not shut down the government if we vote for all of their extraneous immigration provisions, and then next time they will attach something else and then something else. But they are using the threat of a government shutdown to try and get their way. That has not worked in the past and it will not work today.

So we Democrats are not blocking any debate. We are happy to debate funding the Department of Homeland Security. We are happy to debate immigration. Challenge us. Pass Homeland Security, put immigration on the floor, and see if any Democrat tries to block that debate. We welcome that debate. We think we will win that debate. I know my good friend from Texas disagrees with that.

But that is not the issue. The issue is again that unless Democrats do it our way, we are shutting down the government. That is what the House did and so far that is what the Republican majority in the Senate is going along with. That is government shutdown. That is hostage-taking. That hasn't worked in the past and it will not work now.

It is unprecedented. The junior Senator from Texas came up with this kind of thinking, and unfortunately too many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle go along with him, either out of conviction or for some other reason.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one last question? He has been very gracious, and I appreciate it.

Mr. SCHUMER. Of course. I enjoy these debates.

Mr. CORNYN. While I don't agree with his answers, I appreciate the spirit in which we are actually having a discussion. But I wonder if he can explain to me how it is that the majority is blocking Department of Homeland Security funding when the House has passed a \$40 billion bill. Republicans have been united in voting to proceed to get on the bill and then allowing an amendment process where the minority can then move to strike the provisions they don't like. That is the way the Senate is supposed to operate.

How is it that Republicans are blocking Department of Homeland Security funding under those circumstances? I don't understand that.

Mr. SCHUMER. I would just ask the rhetorical question—and I thank my colleague—why did they attach these provisions, inimicable to the President, inimicable to us, to the Department of Homeland Security bill, which has nothing to do with it? It was not because they wanted a debate, not because they wanted to fund Homeland Security. There are easy ways to do that. They wanted to say that unless we do it their way, they are not going to fund Homeland Security and they are going to shut down a major portion of the government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE. The Senator from Mississippi. Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are indeed, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes.

TRIBUTE TO MALCOLM BUTLER

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I rise briefly today to recognize the extraordinary story of my fellow Mississippian Malcolm Butler, who hails from Vicksburg, MS, and attended Hinds Community College. Mr. Butler, a cornerback for the New England Patriots, made the game-winning interception in Super Bowl XLIX on February 1, 2015.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Rick Cleveland.

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

[From the Daily Journal, Feb. 3, 2015]

VICKSBURG'S BUTLER RISES UP AS MISSISSIPPI'S LATEST NFL HERO
(By Rick Cleveland)

You wait in line, easing around one car-length at a time. Finally, you roll down your

window and the voice over the microphone says, "Welcome to Popeyes. Can I take your order?"

Malcolm Butler was that voice, the one who asks you if you want your chicken spicy or mild, your tea sweetened or unsweetened.

Before he became a Super Bowl hero, Malcolm Butler worked the to-go window at Popeyes. That was after nobody much had recruited him out of Vicksburg High School. That was after he was kicked off the Hinds Community College football team after a campus altercation.

"Welcome to Popeyes, can I take your order?"

Well, sure, I'll have a pass interception on the goal line to win the Super Bowl.

Malcolm Butler's story is for everybody who makes a huge mistake. Who flunks the big exam. Who gets kicked out of school. Who gets fired. Who gets told they aren't quite good enough or tall enough or fast enough.

Malcolm Butler, Super Bowl hero.

Twenty-six seconds remained. The Seattle Seahawks had second-and-goal at the New England one-yard-line trailing 28-24. The Hawks needed three feet, 36 inches for victory.

There were 22 players on the field. Would Russell Wilson, the great star from Wisconsin, give it to Marshawn Lynch, the irrepressible one from Washington, or throw to Doug Baldwin of Stanford? Would they run behind James Carpenter of Alabama or Justin Britt of Missouri? Who would make the big defensive play: Vince Woolfork, the monster out of Miami, or Dont'a Hightower of Bama?

So many questions, just one answer.

Only heaven or Pete Carroll knows why the Seahawks didn't give the ball to Lynch, but they did not.

No, they ran out of the shotgun. They didn't even fake it to Lynch. The Seahawks ran a straight pass. Ricardo Lockette split out wide to the right behind Jermaine Kearse. The call was for Kearse to clear a path for Lockette to run a simple slant pattern.

Malcolm Butler never let it happen. Later, he would say he saw what would happen before it happened. He saw it in his mind's eye. Butler didn't let Kearse get in his way. He broke in front of Lockette before Russell even released the ball. And then, somehow, he caught the ball during the collision.

Malcolm Butler, Super Bowl hero.

SUMMON THE HEROES

Mississippi has produced so many over the years. Jerry Rice starred in three Super Bowls. Eli Manning was the MVP in two of them. Brett Favre led the Packers to a Super Bowl title. L.C. Greenwood sacked Roger Staubach four times in one Super Bowl. The great Willie Brown of Yazoo City once returned a Fran Tarkenton Super Bowl pass 75 yards for a Super Bowl touchdown. Walter Payton helped the Bears shuffle to a Super Bowl ring.

But Jerry Rice was the greatest receiver in the history of the game. Eli Manning's pedigree is known to all. Favre was in the process of winning three straight NFL MVPs. Greenwood was part of Pittsburgh's Iron Curtain. Willie Brown might be the greatest corner in the history of the sport. Payton was Payton.

Malcolm Butler? After they let him back on the team at Hinds, he had no Division I scholarship offers. He played his college football at West Alabama, formerly Livingston. When he finished Livingston, 32 NFL teams had a chance to draft him. None did.

But Malcolm Butler kept working, kept believing.

Against all odds, he made the team, worked his way into the rotation and made