

Let's roll up our sleeves, and let's work out a Department of Homeland Security bill and pass it. Let's not hold that agency hostage. Let's not just renew them every couple of months. As the Secretary of DHS said yesterday, that is like getting a car and only giving it five miles of gas at a time. It just doesn't work. So get real. Let's negotiate a DHS spending bill.

I know our Senator from Maryland, the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, and the Senator from New Hampshire, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security of the Committee on Appropriations, are eager to sit down and pass a bill that we can all agree on in terms of funding Homeland Security, and then we can debate immigration. Then we can debate immigration—but no hostage taking and none of this bullying. None of this: If you don't do it my way, I am going to hurt a whole lot of innocent people. That didn't work in 2013 when Republican numbers plummeted after they tried to shut down the government, and it won't work today.

We will not allow a government shutdown. We will not allow hostage-taking. We will ask our colleagues to get reasonable, do things the way they used to be done, debate each issue on the merits. They have the floor. They can debate any issue they want and move forward.

I will say one other thing to my Republican colleagues: The junior Senator from Texas has you tied in a knot. I say that to Speaker BOEHNER as well: Speaker BOEHNER, the junior Senator from Texas has you tied in a knot. Now you are going to have to find a way to untangle it. We will not be bullied. We will not be told we have to negotiate because you seek to hurt innocent people and hurt our security. We will move forward.

So let me suggest the way to go forward: Let's put a good, clean Homeland Security bill on the floor. Let's make America secure. Then, separately, we are happy to debate immigration to the Republican Party's heart's content, but let's stop this govern-by-crisis mentality, especially when national security hangs in the balance.

So I urge Speaker BOEHNER, I urge Senator MCCONNELL to come to their senses, end this wild goose chase and let us vote on a clean bill forthwith.

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. NELSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. NELSON. Madam President, I wish to talk about the necessity of having an appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security and the fact that it is being held up over

the issue of folks in the House of Representatives who do not want to appropriate money for the actions that the President has taken in trying to improve a dysfunctional immigration system. Holding up the funding for the Department of Homeland Security appropriations is absolutely ridiculous, in the opinion of this Senator.

The fact is the clock is ticking because the funding runs out in just a couple of weeks—February 27. What does the Department's name imply? Keeping the homeland secure.

In one regard, that means cyber attacks. Doesn't it occur to someone that we have had an extraordinary number of cyber attacks recently? Most everybody will remember Sony. People were attacking us because they wanted to stop the expression of free speech, in this case with regard to a movie the Sony company had produced. Because they got in and got all of the personal data and were manipulating the internal controls of the company with this cyber attack, it is the Department of Homeland Security that is charged. Hopefully, if we can ever pass a cyber security bill that can be signed into law, the portal through which the early warnings will come will be the Department of Homeland Security. By the way, that cost the Sony corporation about \$100 million.

How about what happened to all of the customers of Target: Addresses, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses were taken from 70 million Americans who were customers of Target.

How about Yahoo: Passwords and user names were exposed to cyber attacks.

How about eBay: Users' passwords, because of a cyber attack, had to be changed because they were compromised.

How about a number of major banks, including JPMorgan Chase: Seventy-six million households and seven million small businesses' accounts were affected by the attack.

How about Home Depot: Six million accounts were put at risk.

That ought to be enough to continue the funding of the Department of Homeland Security, but there is a lot more.

Most folks understand that TSA, which checks us as we go through the security at airports, at seaports—TSA is a part of the Department of Homeland Security. Are we going to cut off the funding for TSA—TSA that is now trying to stop the new kind of attacks with nonmetallic explosives?

Remember, because of our intelligence apparatus, working through liaison partners in other countries, about 2 years ago a cartridge in a printer was discovered ultimately going onto an airplane that was bound for the United States—that was a non-metallic explosive. We were fortunate we got that, but they continue.

These folks who are trying to attack us all over the world are trying very ingenious ways to avoid the security,

and we rely on TSA—especially at American airports—to protect us.

We simply in a couple of weeks can't afford for the appropriations to stop.

How about immigration, U.S. Customs and Border Protection: Again, another responsibility of the Department of Homeland Security, and we are going to cut off the funding on what kind of folks are coming across our borders and what kind of folks we are going to be checking and rechecking and what kind of things they are bringing into the borders.

There are a lot of people who want to get into this country to do us harm. That is the responsibility of the Department of Homeland Security.

So it is not only ridiculous to this Senator, it is almost silly. But the problem is it is tragic, and it could be horrendous given the fact that people around the world are trying to harm us as we try to protect ourselves in our national security every day.

This is a debate we should not be having. Unfortunately, it is a condition our politics have come to, and we need to stop that condition.

I leave the Presiding Officer on a happier note. As the Senate goes into recess at the conclusion of my remarks, happily all of the Senators are going to a bipartisan luncheon where we are going to talk about things we can do together. Indeed, that is the happiest thing I have heard today.

Madam President, as I yield the floor, I understand that pursuant to the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. FISCHER).

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 2:45 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I come to the floor in my position as the vice chair of the Appropriations Committee to urge the Senate to pass a clean Homeland Security appropriations bill.

Yesterday the Senate rejected a procedural vote to take up the House Homeland Security funding bill. This is not about debating the weeds over this bill versus that bill. There are two distinct differences. The House bill has the funding for fiscal year 2015 in it that would take care of every single agency under the Department of Homeland Security to defend and protect the Nation, but at the same time it is loaded with five immigration riders that we call poison pill riders because the President said if legislation to fund Homeland Security passes with these five immigration riders, he will veto the bill.

The President wants to fund an appropriations bill, and so do I. The House Homeland Security bill, if taken up by the Senate, would simply be a delaying tactic. We would talk, we would debate, we would offer lots of amendments on immigration, and after we got lots of amendments on immigration it might go to the President. The President would veto it, and it would come back, and after all is said and done, more would get said than gets done. We have to pass the funding for the protecting of the homeland.

Yesterday the entire world was gripped with poignancy and sorrow about the ghoulish murder of a Jordanian pilot. The threat of terrorism is in the world—attacks by ISIL on people, the possibility of a lone wolf in our own country, a cyber attack in retaliation because we dare fight back against ISIL or because we are willing to challenge some of the other international predators directed at us. We have to protect the United States of America. That is what the Department of Homeland Security does. The Department of Defense protects us over there; the Department of Homeland Security protects us here.

After 9/11—one of the worst days in our country's history—the Congress came together, and we passed legislation to create the Department of Homeland Security so we could take every agency that was involved in protecting the homeland and put them under one umbrella so they could look out for us. Now we need to look out for them. Every day we ask men and women to serve in the Coast Guard, in the Secret Service, in the Border Patrol protecting our borders, in Customs making sure fraudulent products such as counterfeit drugs are not crossing our borders into our country. Now we need to pass that bill. We need to make sure we do not have a shutdown or a slamdown when the funding expires on February 27.

In December when I chaired the committee, in the closing hours of the past Congress, I worked with my subcommittee chairman, Senator Landrieu, the vice chairman of homeland security, Senator COATS, and we put together a crucial funding bill that totalled \$46 billion to invest in agencies that protect us. It was \$1 billion more—\$1 billion—than the continuing

resolution. We could have taken up that bill then, but there was a desire, because of controversy over the President taking Executive actions on immigration, not to do it. So now here we are in February. Now it is our time to fund a clean Homeland Security bill.

Immigration is a serious policy issue. I don't dispute that. It deserves serious debate. But don't add it as a series of riders on the funding bill; rather, let's take up immigration separately.

I remind our colleagues that in the last Congress this Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill, only to have it die in the House. So we say let's pass our bill again, let's have the House take it up, and let's have a real debate on it, but in the meantime, we will have funded the Homeland Security bill.

This isn't BARB MIKULSKI talking about more government spending. Every past head of the Department of Homeland Security has urged the Senate to pass a separate bill. Tom Ridge, the original chief executive of this agency; Michael Chertoff, who also served under President Bush; and Janet Napolitano are calling for it, and so am I.

Right now our Coast Guard is out there safeguarding our waterways. We in Maryland just love our Coast Guard. We love them because, No. 1, they are always there for search and rescue; No. 2, they are always there to protect our bay. Whether it is against a possible oilspill or drug dealers trying to sneak up the bay, they are there. We also know how brave they were. We all recall how, with helicopters, they went in and rescued people during the horrific Hurricane Katrina, and they do it every day.

Then there is the Secret Service. The Secret Service is in the process of reforming itself. They need to protect the President, the Vice President, the First Families. But you know what—they are also out there being the government G-men, fighting things such as credit card fraud.

Then there are the cyber warriors protecting our critical infrastructure—our banking, our power grid.

Then there is FEMA, which right now is responding to disasters, whether it is a blizzard or a hurricane.

Then there are State and local responders. One of the programs I am so proud of in the Department of Homeland Security is the Fire Grant Program. The Fire Grant Program is a competitive grant program—not an earmarked program, a competitive grant program—where local fire departments, particularly those in our rural communities, can apply for a grant to buy the necessary equipment they need to protect them so they can protect us.

I know the Presiding Officer is familiar with this in Nebraska. Turnout gear for a firefighter—the respiratory equipment to protect their breathing, the telecommunications, the fire-retardant/repellent material—can cost as

much as \$1,000 to \$2,000 per firefighter. They cannot do this with pancake breakfasts. They cannot do it with fish fries and chicken dinners. They need the help of their own government to help them.

So I say let's pass a clean Homeland Security bill. Let's stop terrorist threats. Let's secure our borders. Let's safeguard our waterways. Let's make sure we are protecting our homeland and move to a clean bill.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between the parties.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Thank you, Madam President.

I was very pleased to hear the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Senator MIKULSKI, who has done such great work on the committee in putting together the bipartisan agreement that was negotiated last December with the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Congressman ROGERS. That was a bill which, as the Senator pointed out, funded the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security to keep people safe, to address emergencies, to try to protect us from cyber security threats—a whole range of efforts at the Department.

I want Senator MIKULSKI to hear a comment that I understand was made by the House Appropriations Homeland Security Subcommittee chairman JOHN CARTER, who is a Republican from Texas. When he was asked about what the outcome of this debate would be on funding the Department of Homeland Security, his comment was, "Ultimately, there may be a clean bill."

Well, I say to Senator MIKULSKI, if the House Republicans and the chair of the subcommittee in the House are acknowledging that ultimately there may be a clean bill to fund the Department to do what was negotiated by you and Congressman ROGERS last December, doesn't it make sense that we should get a clean bill done as soon as possible so there is certainty for the Department of Homeland Security so they can continue the planning efforts and they can continue to address the threats to our national security? Shouldn't we just get this done now and stop this ideological fighting and putting at risk people of this country because somebody has an ideological concern about this bill?

Ms. MIKULSKI. First of all, I thank the Senator for bringing Representative CARTER's comments to my attention. I absolutely agree with the Senator's analysis and also with the comments by Representative CARTER. We

should have a sense of urgency in passing the Homeland Security bill. The terrorists and the bad guys—whether they are organized crime trying to get across our borders, whether they are the terrorists watching us—they are saying: Hey, they are so busy fighting each other, they don't have time to think about fighting us. They are watching us and laughing at us because while we squabble and quibble and dribble, they are out there plotting against us.

I say to the ranking member of the subcommittee, I do think there is a sense of urgency.

I also wish to comment on the House. When we were working in the closing hours on the actual money part of the bill, I found remarkable bipartisan consensus. Left to our own analysis about how to be wise stewards of the taxpayer dollars for important security investments, there was wide bipartisan agreement. There may have been a different priority here or there, but by and large we knew exactly which public investments to make. And you know what—we did it within the caps, we did it within the allocation, and we got the job done.

We could do this job this afternoon. I feel a great sense of urgency because while the bad guys are plotting against us, we are busy plotting how we can fight each other.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I certainly agree with the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. I will just point out that in the last 2 days, we have heard from the Conference of Mayors, which has urged us to pass a clean bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security. We have heard from the emergency managers across this country who are concerned about the risks of assistance for disaster relief and for FEMA, and today we got a letter from the National Association of Counties urging the passage of a clean bill to ensure that the safety of our communities can be maintained.

As the Senator said, we should not put these communities at risk, the efforts that are going on across this country to keep the Nation safe, because there are those people who are angry at the President about an Executive action. We can have that debate, but we should have that debate separately. We need to fund the Department of Homeland Security now to ensure that there are no risks to our citizens.

I thank Senator MIKULSKI and the Presiding Officer.

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

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

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke about the importance of voting yes to proceed to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill for 2015, H.R. 240. That motion was unsuccessful. Despite all the voices from the other side of the aisle expressing support for the Department of Homeland Security, they refused to actually proceed to debate the bill.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have expressed concern that the bill is not 100 percent of what they want. In my experience, it is rare for anyone to get 100 percent of what they want when it comes to passing legislation, and that is certainly true when it comes to passing an appropriations bill. I am not talking about a vote on final passage or even a vote on amendments. I am talking about a vote to proceed to the debate on this bill. In addition to having the opportunity to offer amendments, an important part of the debate on a bill is the ability of any Senator to raise a budget point of order.

My counterpart, the distinguished ranking member of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee, has pointed out that there are budget points of order against the bill. But the point I would make is that in order for her to raise the budget point of order, you have to actually proceed to the bill.

I am certainly willing to acknowledge her budget points of order, which she brought up on the floor yesterday, but the point I am making is we have to proceed to the bill in order to debate those budget points of order and, in fact, vote on them.

The minority refuses to move to the bill because they object to the amendments added by the House of Representatives. The House went through its process, and now it is time for the Senate to go through its process. That is how the system works. That is regular order.

Last week, after the consideration of many amendments, we passed the Keystone XL Pipeline bill with a bipartisan vote of 62 Senators. There were rollcall votes on 41 amendments.

Since I introduced the Keystone bill, I would have thought it would have been great if we could have just passed it with an up-or-down vote, but that is not how the Senate is designed to legislate. Instead, we vote to proceed to a bill so we can debate it, offer amendments, and work to develop consensus.

I am aware that it has been a long time since we had regular order in the Senate. We are not used to bringing a bill to the floor and debating amendments. But instead of embracing regular order, something we were denied in the previous Congress, we can't even proceed to debate and offer amendments on this bill—an important bill that we need to take up and address.

The contents of H.R. 240 represent the bipartisan prerogatives and priorities of Congress. Again, the House went through its process. What we are

asking for now is for the Senate to do the same—to go through the process, go to the bill, and do the work we were sent here to do.

I discussed the merits of the bill at length earlier, but I will go through some of the highlights again just to remind my colleagues what is in the bill and why we are here. This bill will support the economic prosperity, public safety, and security of the American people.

This bill provides \$39.67 billion in net discretionary appropriations, plus \$6.4 billion in disaster funding. That includes \$10.7 billion for Customs and Border Protection, CBP, and that is an increase of \$119 million over fiscal year 2014. It supports record levels of personnel, tactical infrastructure technology, and air and marine assets.

The bill provides \$5.96 billion for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE. It maintains a record 34,000 adult detention beds and 3,828 family detention beds.

The bill provides strong support for the Secret Service, an organization that requires congressional oversight, given some of the recent incidents, and is \$81 million above fiscal year 2014 funding.

The bill provides the funding necessary to construct the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, NBAF, in Manhattan, KS.

It provides more than \$10 billion for the Coast Guard, including the 8th National Security Cutter, and takes a serious step to address the near-term, heavy-ice breaker needs with \$8 million for preserving the ship *Polar Ice*.

The bill supports our cyber security efforts, both protecting government operations and working with the private sector to share threat information and protective measures.

Since homeland security is a national effort, the bill provides continued funding for grant programs to State and local firefighters, emergency managers, and law enforcement.

The bill also provides for research and development, TSA's aviation security screening operations, the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and E-Verify, which supports businesses across the United States in hiring legal workers.

Finally, the bill provides a requested \$7 billion for the Disaster Relief Fund to assist with recovery costs for communities when they are hit by natural disasters.

What the bill does not fund is the President's Executive actions. The House bill includes several amendments that are targeted at reversing the President's actions and articulating priorities for immigration enforcement. If that is concerning to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, then allow us to proceed to the bill so we can debate these important issues.

We have returned to regular order in this Chamber, and with that comes the responsibility to debate, offer amendments, and vote on legislation. That is

what we are asking to do, and that is what we are calling on our colleagues to do. That is what the American people want us to do. That is what we are here to do.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of proceeding to H.R. 240 so we can do our work.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, will my colleague from North Dakota, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security, yield for a question?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I will.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I appreciate the work my colleague has done on this funding bill, and I think we certainly agree on the funding that is in the bill. That is not what the debate we are having is about.

I ask the Senator from North Dakota if he has heard the comments of Chairman JOHN CARTER of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security, a Republican from Texas, who said: "Ultimately, there may be a clean bill."

If the House is acknowledging that ultimately we may have a clean bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security, doesn't it make sense that we would move forward to get this funding done, and we would make sure there is certainty to address the risks facing this country?

We can debate immigration. I don't think there is anybody on the Democratic side who doesn't want to have an immigration debate. We are happy to have it. But we should have that as a separate debate. As the Republican majority knows, they control the debate in the Senate. So they can decide to bring up an immigration bill as soon as we pass funding for the Department of Homeland Security. So I hope, as the House suggests, ultimately there is going to be a clean bill and that we would pass it as soon as possible to provide certainty and then move on to debate the other issues facing this country.

I ask my colleague from North Dakota if he has spoken to the chairman of the House Appropriations Homeland Security Subcommittee, and does he share his view that ultimately there may be a clean bill?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to respond to the question of my counterpart on the Subcommittee on Homeland Security in the Senate, and I want to begin by acknowledging and stating again that I enjoy working with her. We have worked together on other committees and other issues, and I think there will be other issues we will work on together.

I am pleased to have this discussion with her because this is exactly the kind of debate we are asking for. We are asking to proceed to this bill so we can debate and, in fact, offer amendments. So what we are saying is—whether it is our colleagues on the House side or whether it is Members of the Senate—let's follow regular order,

have the discussion, have the debate, offer amendments, and see where we end up.

Now, I believe the President's actions exceeded his authority in regard to his Executive order regarding immigration. Let's have that debate. Let's go to the bill so we can actually do the work we were sent here to do, where we discuss, debate, and offer amendments. If my esteemed colleague feels there is an amendment she should offer that would change this bill to bring it in line with the opinions of House Members or other Members of the Senate, then she will have the opportunity to do that, as will her colleagues, as will we. That is the point.

So the answer to the question is: We don't know where we end up if we don't get started. So let's get started. That is what we are saying. Please join with us. Just as in our committee, we will have many committee meetings where we will debate issues and where we will take amendments from our fellow Senators who are on that committee. But we can't do that if we don't bring the bill to the committee and get started. That is what we are asking to do on the Senate floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I point out to my colleague that Senator MIKULSKI and I have introduced a clean bill that addresses funding for the Department of Homeland Security.

The fact is we find ourselves in this situation on the appropriations bill because of the riders that were attached by the House of Representatives. Those riders defund immigration directives that were issued by the President last year.

Yesterday, the senior Senator from Texas suggested that Senate Democrats don't want to debate immigration. In fact, we are happy to debate immigration. In fact, this body, in 2013, passed a comprehensive immigration reform bill with a very strong bipartisan vote.

The debate we are having today is about whether we are going to fund the Department of Homeland Security. The bill that is before us raises concerns about what is in the original clean bill that funds the Department of Homeland Security.

As the Senator from North Dakota and I were just discussing, Senate Republicans control the Senate. If they want to vote on immigration measures, they can bring a bill that would do that to the floor by the end of this week because they control what we consider in the Senate. But the issue that is before us today is whether we are going to fund the Department of Homeland Security. This is an issue that is critical because right now our Nation faces serious national security and terrorism threats.

This bill is not about the President's Executive action; it is about whether we are going to fund the Department of

Homeland Security. Since we have heard from so many of our Republican colleagues that they want to discuss immigration and border security, I spent some time yesterday speaking about all of the important investments that a clean, full-year funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security would make in our border security. If we don't pass a clean funding bill, we will fail to make significant upgrades to technology on the border. We will fail to fund expanded enforcement activities for immigration officers. If we are serious about border security, we should support a clean full-year bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 more minutes.

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

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I thank the Chair.

I also think it is instructive at this time to note for the RECORD that included in the Executive actions that Republicans are trying to defund are provisions that increase border security, prioritize enforcement resources, and ensure accountability in our immigration system. The House bill that is before us today defunds—takes away the money—for the new policy of prioritizing criminals and national security threats for removal from the United States. So one of the orders that have been issued by DHS that Republicans want to defund directs law enforcement officers to place top priority on removing national security threats, convicted felons, gang members, and illegal entrants apprehended at the border.

The House bill also defunds increased and strategic border security.

Another one of the memos issued by DHS is on the Southern Border and Approaches Campaign, which establishes three joint task forces to reduce the terrorism risks to the Nation, combat transnational criminal organizations, and prevent the illegal flow of people and goods along our border. So that is another part of this legislation our colleagues want to defund.

It doesn't make sense, if we are concerned about border security, that we would want to pass a bill that includes measures to defund these efforts.

I understand my time has expired. I certainly hope everybody understands what the bill before us, which includes those five House riders, would actually do.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to respond to some of the points made by the Senator from New Hampshire. She indicated defunding provisions, but understand that this relates to Executive action undertaken by the President. The very same prioritization in terms of enforcement is funded in the underlying bill

for enforcement of immigration law. Those prioritizations are there.

The other point I wish to make is that the Senator speaks about funding the Department of Homeland Security and their desire to fund the Department of Homeland Security. That is exactly what this bill does. This bill fully funds the Department of Homeland Security. There really is consensus between the House and the Senate that it does it very well. That is what this bill does. It funds the Department of Homeland Security.

So they are saying they want to fund the Department of Homeland Security. That is what this bill does, and that is why we have to proceed to it in order to accomplish full-year funding for DHS.

The third point I will make briefly is that the Senator referred to a bill that she is sponsoring with the Senator from Maryland to fund DHS—to fund the Department of Homeland Security—and she wants to proceed to that bill. Well, the way to do that is to vote with us to get on the bill before us—H.R. 240—and then they can offer that as an amendment, and we will debate it and we will have the vote.

So if the Senator from New Hampshire wishes to have the opportunity to debate her legislation and vote on her legislation, then let's vote to invoke cloture on this motion to proceed, let's proceed to the bill, and we will allow our colleagues to offer amendments which we can debate and vote on. We are offering the other side the opportunity to do exactly what they have asked to do.

Most importantly, again, I wish to go back to the point I just made. This bill fully funds the Department of Homeland Security for the full year, and we are being blocked from going to the bill, debating the bill, allowing amendments on the bill, and getting to the final product for the American people, while working with the House. Remember, we have to produce a product that passes the House, too, to fund the Department of Homeland Security for this country.

With that, I yield the floor.
THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 240.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 240.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:
 CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 240, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Richard Burr, Jerry Moran, John Thune, Johnny Isakson, Marco Rubio, Roy Blunt, Pat Roberts, Deb Fischer, John Boozman, David Vitter, Tim Scott, Roger F. Wicker, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Rand Paul.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 240, an act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close, upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 52 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Ayotte	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Graham	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Capito	Hatch	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Peters
Blumenthal	Heller	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 47.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The Senator from Indiana.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with

Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Indiana.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I wish to make some remarks about the President's budget, which was presented to us on Monday of this week as his annual proposal to Congress.

Given our country's enormous fiscal challenges and the results of the 2014 midterm election, I think there was hope among many of us that the release of this budget would be an opportunity for the President to work with us.

There was a lot of talk about working with Congress, working together. The message from the November 2014 election was that the American people want Congress to get some things done. And by the way, what about the continuing deficit? Are we going to get back to this draconian knife held over our throats, where the budget continues to put us in a position where debt and deficit continue to be the plague which is going to have enormous, negative consequences on the future of this country?

Given these enormous challenges, there was really hope the President with his last 2 years, would see as part of his legacy an opportunity to work together to put us on a sound fiscal path. But much like the coach of the Seahawks on the 1-yard line, the President chose to make the wrong call.

In this case, in my opinion—and I think the opinion of many—the right call would have been a plan that actually puts us on a path for a balanced budget, addresses a skyrocketing mandatory spending burden and reforms our outdated Tax Code. These are, hopefully, ideas that both Republicans and Democrats could agree on. They would be in our national interest to move forward on. The time is now—with a Democratic President and a Republican Congress—to work together to achieve what Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill agreed to and what Bill Clinton and Newt Gingrich agreed to on welfare reform and on a number of other major initiatives that had been undertaken in Congress with support from both parties. They could be addressed.

But instead of pursuing a path of consensus on these issues, the President comes forward with \$2.1 trillion in additional tax increases over the next 10 years. Is there any end to the obsession the President has for raising taxes on the American people?

All the debate at the end of the last cycle—the previous cycle before the last cycle—was over the fiscal cliff. Let's raise taxes on the richest people in America and the high earners, and that will address the problem of taxes. But we never could get to the spending issue.

So if you like government to just keep increasing: Send your tax dollars