

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 irpressible 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

the biggest play in the most important game. Thus he joins Mississippi's remarkable Super Bowl pantheon.

Willie Brown, L.C. Greenwood, Walter Payton, Jerry Rice, Brett Favre and Malcolm Butler.

Malcolm Butler.  
Super Bowl hero.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, Rick Cleveland is the executive director of the Mississippi Sports Hall of Fame and Museum. This story appeared on February 3, 2015, in a number of newspapers, including my hometown of Tupelo's Northeast Mississippi Daily Journal. The article points out how Malcolm Butler overcame adversity, how he went from working at a Popeyes fried chicken restaurant to being the hero of this year's Super Bowl.

My home State of Mississippi has a long and storied football tradition. Gridiron legends such as Archie Manning, Eli Manning, Michael Oher, Jerry Rice, Walter Payton, Brett Favre, and a host of others from the Magnolia State are included in this list. As Rick Cleveland points out in the article, Malcolm Butler now joins Mississippi's remarkable Super Bowl pantheon.

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.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mrs. MURRAY pertaining to the introduction of S. 469 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield the floor.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, it is my understanding that we have someone coming down in about 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized shortly after 2:25 p.m. I wish to lock that in—Senator HOEVEN and then me.

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

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### KEYSTONE PIPELINE

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I would like to speak on the subject of the Keystone XL Pipeline. The Keystone XL approval bill which we passed in the Senate will be voted on this afternoon in the House. I believe the House will pass the bill with a strong bipartisan majority, just as we did in the Senate.

This bill is about energy, it is about jobs, it is about economic growth, and it is about national security through energy security. I have been on the floor in the Senate talking about all these issues as we worked on this bill. The Keystone XL Pipeline approval bill was the first bill we took up in the Senate in this Congress, S. 1. I think there were on the order of 250 amendments filed on the bill and we voted on more than 40 amendments with rollcall votes. We debated, Senators brought forward their amendments, and we voted on the bill and the bill passed, as I say, with a strong bipartisan majority.

Now the House will vote, as I say, this afternoon on the bill as well. I think it is remarkable that today is the day we will pass the bill completely through the Congress. I think it is remarkable because it is on the very same day the President has sent to the Congress an AUMF, authorization for use of military force, to deal with ISIS. It is on the very same day the President has sent us an AUMF, authorization for use of military force, to actually send our soldiers, our men and women, our combat resources to the conflict in the Middle East, the very same day we are passing legislation that will help our Nation with the production of more energy, not only in the United States but also working with our closest friend and ally, Canada.

This pipeline is about the infrastructure we need to help us move to energy security, meaning that we produce more energy than we consume. Today in the United States we consume about 18 million barrels of oil a day. Of that total, we produce about 11 million barrels a day, and we import from Canada about 3 million barrels a day. So if we do the math, that means there are about 4 million barrels a day we need to import from other countries. We get about half of that from OPEC, roughly 2 million barrels a day. The Keystone XL Pipeline will move 830,000 barrels a day. Some of that will be produced in Canada, some of it will be produced in the United States, but it will move 830,000 barrels a day to our refineries. That is almost 1 million barrels a day we don't have to import from somewhere else.

So go back to the math. I just said we were importing from countries other than Canada 4 million barrels a day, half of that from OPEC—about 2 million barrels a day. This project is almost half of what we are importing from OPEC right now. That is why I say it is remarkable on the very same day that we are working to build en-

ergy security for this country, where we are working to develop the infrastructure we need to move oil from where it is produced to where it is refined and consumed in this country, we are also dealing with the conflict in the Middle East. OPEC—we are getting oil from the Middle East and we are dealing with conflict in the Middle East. Let's break that cycle, right?

At the point that we produce more energy than we consume, we are more energy secure. It is not only about growing the economy and creating jobs, but that means we don't have to get oil from OPEC anymore. That is one more reason we may not have to be involved in a conflict in the Middle East in the future. So here we are in a bipartisan way in the Congress doing the work the people sent us to do in the Senate and in the House on a project that has overwhelming bipartisan support, on a project where all six States on the route of this pipeline—Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas—all of the States have approved it.

They didn't have to particularly hustle because they had 6 years to do it. The administration has held up this project for 6 years. Here we are with something that Congress overwhelmingly supports on a bipartisan basis. All six States that have this pipeline have approved it, and the American people overwhelmingly support it.

In poll after poll, 65 to 70 percent of the American public said, yes, build this infrastructure, create an energy future where we produce the oil and gas we need in America and we work with Canada. We the American people don't want to rely on OPEC or the Middle East anymore for our energy. We don't want to have to import oil from the Middle East. That is what this legislation is all about.

On the very day we are approving this bill through Congress, we are getting the President's request for the use of military force. He is sending that agreement to us and, I believe the President is saying to us, Congress, join with the Obama administration to work to deal with the terrible problem of ISIS, and we need to do that.

We are going to give that AUMF, authorization for use of military force, careful consideration. I think the Congress will work its will. Then we will, together, as representatives of the American people—the Executive and the legislative branch—work to defeat ISIS.

Just as the President is sending that document today, we are sending him a document. We will be sending him a law dutifully passed by both the Senate and the House in a bipartisan way and saying, Mr. President, we need you to work with us too. Just as you want Congress to work with you on an authorization for use of military force, we want you to work with us on behalf of the American people who have spoken loudly and consistently that they want energy security.