

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

to Washington, and we will spend it. That seems to be what the President had to say. Rather than looking at the dire consequences of not addressing these long-term problems, the President proposes to spend nearly \$4 trillion in fiscal year 2016, a 7-percent increase from fiscal year 2015 and about \$1 trillion more than what was spent in 2008. The President wants to eliminate the very budget caps that his administration proposed and he signed into law in 2011.

Well, it may be one thing to adjust those budget caps, particularly as it impacts our national defense and national security, but if that was done in conjunction with a larger proposal to address this out-of-control mandatory spending, wasteful spending, and unnecessary spending that is taking place here in Washington, that would be one thing to consider.

But this simply is just more of the same, going in the same direction, proposing unbalanced budgets each year, and adding more and more to our deficit and to our debt.

The President likes to talk about his veto pen and, with the release of this budget, we can only conclude that pen only contains red ink. The President has taken a pass on the golden opportunity to move forward and work together. Instead, his budget takes us in the same direction we have been going in the past 6 years without any proposal to address it in any kind of serious way. I think it is imperative that we do that.

Just last week, the Congressional Budget Office released its latest economic report and the findings were, once again, very sobering. This non-partisan report warned that under current law our "large and growing federal debt would have serious negative consequences, including increasing federal spending for interest payments; restraining economic growth in the long term; giving policymakers less flexibility to respond to unexpected challenges; and eventually heightening the risk of a fiscal crisis."

The CBO projects that the gross Federal debt is expected to raise another \$10 trillion over the next decade. The report also says that we will spend down almost \$800 billion of the Social Security Trust Fund over the next 10 years.

Ten years from now, it is projected that spending on mandatory programs and interest on the debt will consume almost 94 percent of all Federal revenues, leaving far fewer funds for other important national priorities, such as strengthening our infrastructure, national defense, medical research, education, and any number of issues that could be dealt with on a national basis that would affect the future of this country. But it will not be able to be done because we have not taken these steps. Time is running out to make the tough fiscal choices now so future generations will not be saddled with an even higher burden of debt.

I regret the President has yet to come forward with the serious intent of working with us to deal with one of our country's most challenging and most pressing problems with creative solutions. We will only be able to accomplish the results we need if we work together, as the President has said. But it takes his engagement if we are going to succeed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. First, Mr. President, I commend my good friend, the Senator from Indiana, for his good work on laying out, with the Senator from Oregon, one approach on reforming the Tax Code and his willingness to look at this issue of our national debt.

Let me echo, at \$18 trillion—he cited some statistics—interest rates go up 1 percent. That is more than \$120 billion a year off the top. That is more than we spend each year on the issues I am going to speak to—the Department of Homeland Security.

The only issue I would raise with my friend is that we do need that grand bargain. But no one who has looked at this problem hasn't said: You are not going to solve it without revenues being part of the mix. You have to do entitlement reform. But even with the so-called revenues from the fiscal cliff, let me just point out that we brought the country to the brink of unforeseen financial areas.

To raise \$600 billion, well, in the past few years we have had unprecedented one-time revenues from the Federal Reserve north of \$400 billion, \$200 billion-plus that CBO counts as revenue from paybacks of Fannie and Freddie. We do not have the revenue streams. If we can get back to revenue streams from the late 1990s, revenue as a percent of our GDP, when the economy was booming and jobs were being created and there was bipartisan collaboration, I think that, combined with entitlement reform—to make sure Social Security and Medicare are truly sustainable for the next 50 years—there is a path there and I thank the Senator for his work.

Mr. COATS. If I could ask the Senator from Virginia to yield for a response without yielding the floor, and I will yield right back to him.

I wish to say that the perception of the public is that this is a partisan issue. It is not. The Democratic Senator from Virginia has taken a lead in this effort and committed an extraordinary amount of effort—only to come up short.

I have been privileged to work with him and a number of Members from the other side of the aisle together with Republicans, and we see the need to work together on this. We have lacked one thing. We have lacked support from the executive branch. Until we have that, I don't believe we will be able to take serious steps forward in addressing this problem.

But that is not something that can be defined as one party versus another.

Most of us on both sides of this aisle have recognized the disastrous potential consequences of our not taking action. I appreciate the tremendous work the Senator from Virginia has done in leading this effort, and I know we both regret that we haven't achieved success.

I thank the Senator, and I yield back.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator for his comments. We might agree or disagree on the role the President has played, but that still doesn't beg the fact that we need to continue our efforts in this body and in the body down the hall.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the subject of our debate today is that it is wholly inappropriate that at this moment in time some in Congress are deciding that they are going to hold hostage Homeland Security funding unless they get 100 percent of what they want.

I think immigration reform is a terribly important issue. I was proud to join in one of the broadest, bipartisan votes in the past few years to pass bipartisan immigration reform. I was disappointed when our friends in the House didn't take up that legislation and pass it.

Subsequent to that failure to act on the part of the House, the President has acted—and I believe there are even folks here watching these proceedings now who are beneficiaries of those Executive actions, some of the DREAMers.

Now if this body wants to redebate immigration, that is a fair topic, a fair subject. And I, for one, would welcome that full-throated debate again. But it should not—it should not—be tied to a critical part of national homeland security funding.

The remarkable thing is this is actually an area where both parties came to agreement on the size of the budget and the program prioritization. There was an agreement. But instead, extraneous items were added that now some are saying if we don't get these items we are willing to roll the dice or potentially shut down the most essential parts of our government at a time of enormous international and potentially domestic challenge.

All of us, obviously, can come and speak about the unspeakable tragedies we saw reported coming out of the Middle East. We see as well challenges that ISIL presents potentially—not just in that region but to the homeland and in terms of trying to encourage home-grown terrorists. The notion there would be Members of this body or any body who would say it is okay to cut off funding to DHS at this moment in time is remarkable.

The American people—as someone who just went through a refreshing reminder of what they are looking for through my last election process—do