

than I want it to be, and I am proud of our efforts to bring Members of this body together to see that we have an end product for consideration by our colleagues, and presumably, passage by the U.S. Senate, consideration by the House, and a signature by the President.

We don't legislate often enough, as I said, and the sad thing is that I have said this before to my colleagues: I don't know why anybody would want to be a Member of the U.S. Senate if it wasn't to accomplish results, to work together to get a product that meant something for the benefit of our constituents back home.

That meant something for the brighter and better future for the American people and made our country more safe and secure.

When we don't do our responsibilities, when we are unable to accomplish that goal, we harm not only the institution of the U.S. Senate and its role in our government, but we harm the American people.

In the bill that I am most responsible for in this package of four, the Department of Commerce is what you might expect it to be. It affects our business communities and climate. It affects international trade. It is important for communications and telecommunications and broadband.

There is a broad array of issues and Agencies within the Department of Commerce that we are monitoring. We are making certain they are performing correctly to the best of our ability, and we are determining how much money they need to operate.

The Department of Justice is one that certainly comes home to the American people quickly. It is in many instances about law enforcement. This Department funds, for example, the FBI, the DEA, the ATF, the U.S. Marshals, and they fund many grants to our local sheriff's and police departments—hugely important for the safety and well-being of American citizens.

We have been at this process, and we are making certain that we have done everything we can to make certain that law enforcement are adequately resourced for the protection of the American people and themselves.

Science—that is the third component of the bill I am most familiar with. Science is, among other things, NASA, our exploration of space; the study of STEM education, the opportunity to excite young men and women, boys and girls, across the country who see an astronaut in space and dream the dream of being that person in their future and, in that process, have a love for STEM education, for science, mathematics, engineering, research—something so important to the future of our Nation, something that protects us as an economy and, as importantly, protects us in our national defense.

We also invest in something called NSF, the National Science Foundation—again, where we produce products and research and information that en-

hance the quality of life, the future of our country, and our national security. It is a very, hugely important bill to the U.S. Senate, and more importantly, it is important to us because it is important to America.

So the goal this evening is to see that that bill, Commerce-Justice-Science, and the other two bills are added to the House bill that is before us that funds veterans and military construction.

So to start this process on the appropriations process—and, again, let me thank the majority leader, the Senator from South Dakota; my colleague, the vice chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Washington, Senator MURRAY; and the chairwoman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Maine, who have worked so diligently to get us to the point that we are tonight.

Nothing has been easy, but there have been significant compromises and efforts to work together at a time in which the Senate finds too many reasons to be divided. It is enjoyable to be on a committee in which, even though we have our differences and even though there have been things that have intruded on each of our desires to have something done in the committee—there have been problems that come from the outside that distract us from our ability to work together. This committee said: We acknowledge the distractions, we acknowledge the differences, but we are going to do everything this year to make certain that the appropriations process works.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

So, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 121, H.R. 3944, and the committee-reported substitute amendment be withdrawn; that during the consideration of H.R. 3944, the Collins substitute amendment No. 3038 be considered an Appropriations Committee amendment for purposes of rule XVI, with no other rule XVI points of order waived by this agreement; that H.R. 3944, MILCON, as engrossed by the House of Representatives on June 25, 2025; H.R. 4121, Ag, as reported by the House Appropriations Committee on June 25, 2025; and the bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes, as reported by the House Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies to the House Appropriations Committee on July 15, 2025, serve as the basis for defense of germaneness under rule XVI for any floor amendments and that it be in order for floor amendments to amend the substitute in more than one place; that the following manager's package of amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc to No.

3038; that is, Paul No. 3070, Shaheen-Grassley No. 3042, Smith No. 3025, Hirono No. 3090, Rounds No. 3081, Rounds No. 3082, Budd-Shaheen No. 3072, Hawley No. 3080, Rosen-Cortez Masto No. 2975, Cornyn No. 3073, Hirono No. 3110, Shaheen No. 3041, Klobuchar No. 3121, Crapo-Rosen No. 3163, Blumenthal No. 3000; and that upon adoption of the manager's package, the only amendments in order be the following amendments, if offered, to No. 3038; and that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate vote in relation to the following amendments: Merkley No. 3114, Murphy No. 2972, Van Hollen No. 3115, Kennedy No. 3088, Kennedy No. 3089, Scott No. 3113, Scott No. 3108, Johnson No. 3079, Van Hollen No. 3126; further, that upon disposition of the amendments listed above, the Senate vote on adoption of the substitute amendment No. 3038, as amended, with a 60 affirmative vote threshold required for adoption; the bill, as amended, if amended, be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended, with a 60 vote affirmative threshold required for passage.

Finally, Madam President, notwithstanding passage of H.R. 3944, as amended, if amended, that it be in order to consider an amendment the text of which is identical to S. 2257, Leg Branch appropriations, the Senate vote on adoption of the amendment, and if adopted, H.R. 3944 be further amended, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

Madam President, what all those words mean is that we are taking three appropriations bills, adding them to the underlying House bill that is on the Senate floor for consideration, and that we have outlined what amendments we will adopt by a manager's package and what amendments will be made in order for consideration by the full Senate as to whether or not they should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, reserving the right to object—and I object to the end request, but I want to begin on a point of agreement, which is, other than the final request made by the good Senator from Kansas, I agree with everything he said.

As he said, we have four appropriations bills bundled together here—proposed to be bundled together here: Military Construction and Veterans; Agriculture; Leg Branch; and the Commerce, Justice, Science bill. And I have the privilege of working with Chairman MORAN on what we call the CJS bill, and it makes very important targeted investments in a whole range of areas that he described.

And, of course, one of the areas of jurisdiction of this subcommittee is the Department of Justice and the FBI.

And, in my view, we absolutely have an obligation to make sure we address the needs and the mission of the men and women of the FBI, that we provide the resources to carry out that mission, and that we make sure that they are safe in conducting that mission.

And I am here on the floor objecting to this request today because, just a short time ago, the Trump administration took \$1.4 billion that this Congress had set aside on a bipartisan basis and proposed that, instead of going to a site for a new headquarters that had met the security requirements and that had gone through a competition, the administration proposed to effectively rescind those funds and use them for a different purpose, without presenting a plan as to how their alternative would meet the security requirements for the men and women of the FBI.

I am not going to repeat the whole history over many, many years that this Senate has gone through with respect to ensuring that the men and women of the FBI have a new headquarters that is fit for the purpose and meets the security requirements. I will only point out that the FBI, in making the determination with respect to where they had planned to go before the Trump administration's intervention said this:

Because of the symbolic nature of the client mission and performance of functions critical to the security of the United States, a Facility Security Level 5 designation was selected for this campus.

In all the work that this Senate has done and all the work to date at the FBI, it has been determined that, wherever the FBI makes its new home and new headquarters, it has to meet the level 5 security requirements because of the special mission of those men and women and because, I think, all of us want to make sure that they are protected in the greatest degree that we can make sure their security is protected.

So in the Appropriations Committee, I worked on an amendment that would have said that the FBI has to move its new headquarters to the place that had already won the competition, that had already been selected, and one of the reasons is the level 5 security requirement.

I am not asking that in the amendment that I proposed for the floor today. I asked for something very straightforward. I proposed an amendment that simply says that wherever the FBI chooses to make its new headquarters, it has to meet the level 5 security requirements that it, itself, has laid out as necessary to defend the safety of the men and women who do that important work.

That is an amendment that we should include in this bill, and that is why I am here right now objecting to the proposal that is being put forward, because while we put an even stronger version of that amendment at one point in our bill in the Appropriations

Committee, that action was then reversed. And so now I am proposing that we just put the other alternative forward.

And, again, based on the consistent position taken by the FBI, taken by Members of the Senate, that level 5 security requirement is important, and wherever they go, they should be able to do a study. They should be able to conduct a study before they move people into a new headquarters, before they put people at risk, to show that that new place—wherever it may be—is fit for purpose and meets those security requirements.

That is a simple request that I would have thought all of us could stand behind: making sure that the new headquarters of the men and women of the FBI meets the security requirements that we and they have set out.

And so that is why I reserve the right to object, and I will now ask the Senator to modify his request so that my amendment No. 3126 be included in the list of amendments in the managers' package to be adopted en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Kansas modify his request?

Mr. MORAN. Reserving the right to object, Madam President, let me explain what the Senator from Maryland is asking to be done, and I explained earlier that there is a set of amendments that is in this unanimous consent request that are put into a managers' package where they have been agreed by both the Republican and Democrat leaders of the Senate. In other words, there has been agreement that these amendments are satisfactory and will be adopted upon the adoption of that amendment.

The Senator from Maryland's amendment that he seeks is not in that list because it is in the other list I described. That list requires a vote of the Senate to determine whether or not that amendment should be adopted, in this case, by 51 votes of the Senate.

So Senator VAN HOLLEN, the Senator from Maryland's request is: Can I move my amendment? Can we modify the unanimous consent request to move my amendment to the place that it is assured of being passed, rather than leave it in the place in which he offers that amendment during the debate of the bills—the underlying bills that we are talking about this evening, in this case, Commerce-Justice-Science—and allow the Members of the U.S. Senate to agree or disagree by approving his amendment with 51 votes or not?

Madam President, the change in procedure is: Do I get my amendment approved by unanimous agreement or do I have to earn the votes of 51 Senators to have my amendment approved?

The reality is, there is not unanimous agreement that the amendment that the Senator from Maryland is speaking about—there is absolutely not unanimous agreement across this Senate floor, perhaps, not even in a partisan way. There may not be agree-

ment from the Democrat Members of the Senate, and there may not be agreement from the Republican Members of the Senate. Therefore, it is impossible for us to agree to allow an amendment that we know has controversy and is not acceptable to 100 Senators to get this special privilege of being adopted so easily.

The underlying unanimous consent request allows for the amendment that the Senator from Maryland is proposing—he has the right to offer the amendment on the floor. That has been agreed to. But that is insufficient for the Senator, and he wants to modify his amendment to be more easily—in fact, automatically accepted.

This issue is, sadly, if the Senator from Maryland ultimately objects to the underlying request, if he is not able to have the consent agreement modified to get the amendment in the position he wants, he then has to decide—if he fails in that regard—he has to decide: Do I want to object to all the bills, all four of them, from being considered? Unfortunately, that includes Commerce-Justice-Science, which I and the Senator from Maryland have worked on together as the chairman of that committee and as the ranking member or vice chair of that committee.

Should he ultimately object to the entire package here because he isn't successful on this request to move his amendment, then all the work that he and I and the members of the subcommittee and the members of the full committee and other Senators and their input have put together, that passed in a bipartisan way out of the committee, that bill will fall by the wayside.

We will then not consider Commerce-Justice-Science tonight, tomorrow, next week, and, in my view, the U.S. Senate will never see the Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill on the Senate floor. And, therefore, our work to fund NASA; to fund the National Science Foundation; to fund our police in our home communities and our sheriffs in our home counties; to support the FBI, DEA, ATF, and the U.S. Marshals; and to support the Department of Commerce in its efforts to grow the country's economy, provide broadband to our constituents at home, rural and urban; and to support the efforts of trying to find trade agreements by this administration and the efforts at USDR to find those satisfactory agreements that grow our Nation's economy—the work that we have gone through to this point becomes irrelevant.

If this was a momentary setback, I would feel less concerned, less emotional, less connected to the desire of having this bill see consideration on the Senate floor in this package. Our appropriations process, which I have bragged about tonight—our appropriations process is fragile. We have been successful because we have each set aside things we find objectionable and

worked for the common good of the committee and the American people. It has been so long since the U.S. Senate has done its work in this arena and too many others.

All of us in this Senate, we have other things we would like to do, but we devote our time and effort to public service, presumably, to the public good of our constituents at home and the well-being of Americans across the country. And whether we do that well or not has a consequence around the globe. The United States of America is a place that needs to demonstrate to others—in our own country but others around the world—that we still have the capabilities of governing.

My view is that I have never served in the U.S. Senate when it was at its best. What I know about the Senate is what I read as a kid. What I know about the Senate as the way it should be is the way I learned about it in history. And I want to work here where we do our jobs. If we fail here, we don't just fail for the moment.

Once again, the appropriations process is set aside. When we return in September, I hope we are able to do more appropriations bills. But I doubt that this is the first one to be considered, and I doubt that the Senator from Maryland's amendment goes away so the problems we have tonight aren't going to disappear. We won't see this, and then we will immediately turn to the consideration of a continuing resolution—a continuing resolution that funds the Federal Government at the same rate, at the same place, the same amount of money as we did last year.

Incidentally—it is not incidental. We had the same problem last year. We didn't get our appropriations bills—not 1 of the 12 appropriations bills were considered on this Senate floor, and we had to do—we did; I shouldn't say we had to do—we did a continuing resolution saying we can't decide this. We can't get our act together well enough as Republicans or Democrats or as whatever—however you want to categorize people—we can't work together well enough to pass 12 appropriations bills on the Senate floor, if we were ever given a chance.

This is an indictment of all of us. And I take it very personally as a member of the Appropriations Committee with responsibilities to do our work. And none of us—to go back to the point I attempted to make earlier and got sidetracked—none of us want to be here if we are not making a difference. We have families, we have homes, places that we love to be. And we devote our time and effort to something that is of worthy cause. But the worthiness of that cause—if it is just to be here because you have your name on a door, you have perhaps an important-sounding title, "Senator," there is no joy. There is no joy for me, and I can't imagine there is joy for others if the answer is: Well, we just can't work together well enough to do what the American people insist on, demand, and certainly deserve.

This place needs to prove its relevance. And, once again, if we see failure tonight, that failure will continue, and we will demonstrate it one more time: Well, they just couldn't do it. They didn't get it done. Well, they passed 3 out of 12 appropriations bills.

And in September, as the government is approaching a shutdown because we haven't funded these 12 bills—we are, once again, on the Senate floor scrambling to figure out how we keep the government open.

What message does that send to our constituents that we can't even figure out how to have a budget or top-line number and appropriate money? Every county commission, every school board, every city council has a budget, and they figure out how to spend money in a year. Why are we less than that? Why is it so difficult for us?

I want to work in a Senate that works together. I don't expect us to agree, but there is common good that can be found in so many instances. And we are so close.

The Senator from Maryland's amendment is about where the FBI headquarters should be located and the process by which that decision should be determined. I appreciate the Senator's interest, but this is not even in the jurisdiction of the subcommittee I chair. This is before us tonight because one of the Senator from Maryland's successors put money into the Commerce-Justice-Science bill for the purposes of building an FBI headquarters, perhaps, in her home State of Maryland. We have dealt with this issue. Let me say it this way. This issue has appeared before us before. The jurisdiction is in a different subcommittee of Appropriations. And the jurisdiction in the administration rests with the General Services Administration, the GSA, not funded by Commerce-Justice-Science or any of the other bills we are considering.

The Senator did offer an amendment in the committee, and it ultimately failed. And one of the things I know about the Senate is it takes a majority, at a minimum, to pass a piece of legislation. And the Senator from Maryland does not have a majority, in my view, who will vote for his amendment.

He can work to make that happen. The Senator from Maryland can lobby and encourage and educate Senators on the Senate floor and in their offices from now until the time that this bill passes. If he objects—if he ultimately objects because he doesn't have a modification to where he fits in the adoption of what we are talking about, then none of the things in the bill become law, and he has lost his opportunity to make the case to 99 of his colleagues about whether he is right or not.

The Senator and I have worked to find a conclusion that would be satisfactory and I have been unable to—we have been unable to. I don't know exactly what my reputation is in this

place, but I do think that people think I work hard and work hard together, and that has been the case in this circumstance. But as I have assured the Senator from Maryland, I know no path forward with his amendment that allows this bill to pass the U.S. Senate.

So when he decides whether or not he is going to object to the underlying question, the question to the Senator from Maryland is, the things that we worked on together, do they matter more than the amendment that you want in such a way that you are unwilling to offer the amendment on the Senate floor and let the Senate work its will?

I think I am about ready to conclude my remarks. But it reminds me that so many times, by our colleagues who are not on the Appropriations Committee, I think we get criticized for being insular. That is not true. We take input from every Senator. Ninety-nine of the Senators in this body provided information to the Appropriations Committee to tell us how to do our work, but there is this sense that we do our own thing.

I have always said the reason we have the Senate is to bring the bills to the floor so everybody—those who are not on the Appropriations Committee—have the chance to have their input. I can't turn what was a majority vote against the Senator from Maryland's amendment into something that a majority of my colleagues would support.

But we are willing—the majority leader has indicated to the Senator from Maryland, he can have a vote to see if he can do it. While I tried and failed to find 51 votes for the Senator's amendment, I am quite certain he is more skilled than I am. I am quite certain that he is passionate enough about this issue. Let him find the folks who would support his amendment, and he can do so. It has been given to him, that opportunity. All he has to do is find 50 Senators to join him to say it. I don't think it is easy, but I think that effort on his part is a better outcome—whatever the outcome of what that amendment is—it is a better outcome than this legislation, Commerce-Justice-Science, the Agriculture Department, the Legislative Branch, and Military and Veterans Affairs. It is more important for us to demonstrate that we actually can legislate and appropriate.

And here we are, starting on our first effort in 2025, and we are already hung up on something that is not really our business.

I started to say earlier that this issue has been around a long time, and it has always been resolved by somebody way above me as a chairman. Sometimes it has gone higher than, certainly, the—I don't mean "certainly." There is not much higher than the chairman and the vice chairman of the committee, but even they have struggled in the past to find a resolution to this issue about where the FBI headquarters should be. It has gone to the other

leaders—the two House leaders and to the Senate leaders—to see if they can find a conclusion.

I can't solve the problem even if I wanted to. I shouldn't say it that way. I can't solve the problem as I want to solve the problem for the Senator from Maryland. Perhaps somebody else can in this process. But don't let it affect the work product that the Senator from Maryland and I and members of the committee and this Senate have worked so hard to find common ground on. We were successful and got complimented for the work we did in accomplishing this goal.

I will not modify my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCORMICK). Objection to the modification is heard.

Is there an objection to the original request?

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

I just want to take a few moments to respond to the Senator from Kansas.

First of all, I do think it is the business of the subcommittee that oversees the Department of Justice and the FBI to ensure that the men and women of the FBI have a headquarters—wherever it is—that meets the security standards that they have set out for themselves for their own protection.

I also agree with the Senator from Kansas in that we should and do work together on a bipartisan basis on the Appropriations Committee and that we should do that as a separate branch of government than the executive branch.

The only reason we are here is that the President of the United States decided to seize funds that had been set aside by this committee on a bipartisan basis and others and use them for another purpose.

This is a moment, actually, where, if the Senate were adhering to its traditions of bipartisanship, it would stand up together against the President of the United States. But that is not what we are witnessing on so many of these appropriations bills.

What happened in this case was the President of the United States interfered with the process. I did offer an amendment in the Senate Appropriations Committee. It was actually adopted on a majority basis. It was an amendment not only to ensure that the FBI would go to a level 5 security facility, but it was an amendment that said it should go to the one that was selected after a long process.

After that was adopted on a bipartisan basis, our Republican colleagues on the committee said that all of the work that we had done on the bill—all of the work the Senator from Kansas is talking about when it comes to the NSF, when it comes to NASA, when it comes to NOAA—that we were not going to let all of that good work go forward if that amendment to ensure the security of the FBI facility at the selected site were attached.

I have never seen anything like it in Congress. Even before I got here, I, too,

was a student of Congress and loved the process. What happened was, after that amendment got on in the Appropriations Committee on a bipartisan basis, our Republican colleagues said: We don't want that so badly that we are now going to undo that entire process.

That is not bipartisanship—and we know why that happened too. It didn't happen because members of the Senate Appropriations Committee—Republicans and Democrats—didn't think that it was the right thing to do to preserve what we had set out before and make sure that the men and women had a level 5 security headquarters. We did it because the President of the United States was going to throw a fit if that provision stayed on. That is why people reversed the position.

So I say to my friend from Kansas: We should do our work on a bipartisan basis, and we shouldn't make our decisions out of fear about what somebody in the White House is going to do, because that—that—distorts the entire process here in the U.S. Senate.

I believe that, if we set this aside for now, we will, I hope, be able to get it back on track in September. I hope we will return to what has been that bipartisan tradition and not allow the executive to come in and undo work that has been done on a bipartisan basis. This is not about picking the location in this amendment. This is simply about making sure that the men and women of the FBI have a building that is secure.

I will just end with this: The last time the Trump administration was in the White House, they also played with this whole issue. They said they wanted to construct a new headquarters on the site of the current FBI building, the Hoover building. Then they submitted to Congress a 25-page prospectus that they said would meet the security requirements of the men and women of the FBI. Guess what. The inspector general of the Department of Justice and the inspector general of GSA said that the work they showed did not meet those security requirements. It did not meet those security requirements.

We should make sure wherever they go—Maryland, Virginia, Washington—that the congressional directive, that FBI directive, for the purposes that I set out at the beginning because of the kind of work the FBI does—we need to honor that. That is what this amendment does. That is what it did when it was first adopted by the Appropriations Committee on a bipartisan basis before everyone ran the other way because they were going to make the White House mad.

So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, it is so disheartening that the Senator from Maryland is not taking to heart the eloquent words of the Senator from Kansas.

Let me make a point very clear.

The Senator from Maryland is not being denied the opportunity to offer an amendment on this issue. Indeed, the unanimous consent request which the Senator from Kansas put forth specifically recognizes, makes room for, allows the Senator from Maryland to offer his amendment. What we cannot do is guarantee that he will be successful in his amendment. That is the way the legislative process works. But he is not, in any way, being denied the opportunity to offer his amendment, to debate his amendment, to make the case for his amendment. Yet he is opposing this unanimous consent agreement. That is so disappointing because I know that the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Maryland have worked together to craft an excellent bill and an important bill.

The Commerce-Justice-Science bill supports programs that enjoy overwhelming bipartisan support and are critically important to communities in every single one of our States, including the State of Maryland. The State of Maryland, for example, has the Goddard Space Flight Center. It is funded functionally at \$200 million above the fiscal year 2025-enacted level.

There are many other provisions in this bill that directly benefit the State of Maryland, represented by the Senator.

There are programs in this bill that need our support. It includes the National Weather Service. It warns Americans of life-threatening weather events. It includes everything from tornadoes in the Midwest; hurricanes in the gulf and on the Atlantic seaboard; ice and snow storms; blizzards in New England and in the Northeast in general; flooding events such as the tragic flooding that we saw in Texas just recently and, just last night, the risk of catastrophic tsunamis in the Pacific. The American people are counting on us to ensure that the Weather Service is able to execute its safety-of-life mission as well as to deliver a reliable forecast each morning.

The legislation funds public safety programs that are so important to our police departments, our sheriffs, law enforcement in general, the FBI.

It funds programs that help combat substance abuse and drug trafficking.

It also supports pro-growth programs that are so strongly supported by so many Members of this Chamber. These include the overwhelmingly popular economic development assistance programs at the EDA; the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program. So many Senators wrote to us about the importance of that program; trade promotion for our smaller businesses provided by the International Trade Administration.

There is a program run by the Commerce Department that is particularly important to my State of Maine and to some 30 other States, and that is the Sea Grant program, which helps our fishing and lobstering industries, our

seafood and fishing processors, and our coastal communities.

It supports American leadership in scientific research. That includes the cutting-edge research supported by the National Science Foundation in critical fields like artificial intelligence and quantum computing. We absolutely cannot cede our dominance in these fields to China. That is why this bill is so important.

I would urge my colleagues to call the presidents and the chancellors of your States' public and private universities and ask them for their thoughts on the value of the National Science Foundation's supported research. I can predict that you will be told just how important it is that we fund the NSF, and that is what we have done in this bill.

Of course, this legislation supports NASA—one of the jewels of the U.S. Government and our country. I know that the funding for NASA is particularly important in States with a major NASA presence, including Maryland—Maryland—as well as Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, California, Ohio, Texas, Virginia, and Louisiana.

A final note on this bill: The allocation for the Senate version of this legislation, the CJS legislation, is \$79.7 billion. This is very close to the amount that the House subcommittee has reported. So this is a bill that we could send to conference with the House and be assured that we could get a product to send to the President's desk to be signed into law to avoid a continuing resolution that just puts these important programs, these vital Agencies, on autopilot. We don't want to do that. We want these important programs, these vital Agencies and Departments, to reflect the deliberation, the debate, and the hearings that we had through the Appropriations Committee.

Let's not miss this opportunity. Let's not kick the ball down the road and hope that somehow it can be worked out.

Again, let me emphasize what I believe to be the absolutely key point here: No one—no one—is denying the Senator from Maryland the opportunity to offer his amendment on the Senate floor.

There are many Members of this body who decided to withhold amendments that they might want in the interest of expediting consideration of this package. But in the case of the Senator from Maryland, we knew that he had this amendment that he cares about, and we have accommodated his ability to offer his amendment as part of the unanimous consent request.

So, therefore, I would implore the Senator from Maryland to withdraw his objection and allow us to proceed with this package of four appropriations bills—bills that came out of committee with overwhelming bipartisan support, bills that were carefully drafted, bills that reflect the input from so many Members of this body, and I

would urge him to let us get on with the business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I want to start by thanking the chair of the Appropriations Committee. And I see the vice chair of the Appropriations Committee is here on the Senate floor, Senator MURRAY. I want to thank them for the work that we did together.

The Senator from Maine described very well the important initiatives and funding that are contained in the Commerce-Justice-Science bill, CJS bill. For all those important purposes, I agree.

I would ask why our Republican colleagues are saying that they won't let this package go through if it includes a provision that requires that wherever the FBI moves its new headquarters, that it meets the security requirements that we have set out for the men and women of the FBI.

I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Maine talks about how I can offer an amendment on the Senate floor. I offered an amendment in committee to, essentially, accomplish this purpose. In fact, it went even further. It not only said you had to meet the level 5 security requirement, but you had to do it by selecting the place that had already been established to meet that purpose.

The amendment passed through the democratic process in the Appropriations Committee. It passed. Apparently, there was such great concern down at the White House—I don't even know who exactly. I have been asking for a long time for a discussion on the merits of this: Who is it that is actually objecting to the provision that requires that the FBI headquarters building, wherever it is, meets level 5 security? Who is objecting to this?

That amendment passed, and then all of a sudden, it was undone. That democratic process was undone by another vote when it became clear that the White House wanted to have a different outcome.

So I just say to my colleagues again: If we are going to be true to article I, if we are going to work together as colleagues to do the work of the Congress, we need to make independent decisions among ourselves and not be so easily turned around by the dictates of the person at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

It is no secret to anybody here that that is what is happening on so many occasions, on so many issues during this appropriations process.

I hope that will change. I hope it will change in the coming weeks and the coming months. I hope the Senate can get back to operating as an independent branch of government, along with the House, because if that doesn't happen, we are going to continue to be able to see the executive branch interfere in the independent decision of Members of this body and reverse decisions that were made in a democratic process.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, it has been a good discussion.

I want to reiterate something that was said by the Senator from Kansas who chairs the relevant subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee, Senator COLLINS, when I say that the Senator from Maryland was offered an amendment to vote here on the floor of the U.S. Senate. That is—that is—the article I branch of the government working.

You had a markup at the committee. The Senator offered his amendment. And, yes, there was a lot of swirl when that amendment was offered. But at the end of the day, the committee voted, and the committee defeated it. That is article I working.

Now the Senator from Maryland wants to see article I work and have Congress be restored to its constitutional responsibility, the power of the purse. The way to do it is to let us get on these bills and debate them and vote on amendments. That is what we are talking about here. That is what we didn't do last year.

He could have had a vote on the floor on the amendment last year, but, oh, that is right, we didn't do an appropriations bill last year. Actually, he is actually trying to restore regular order where people like the Senator from Maryland, who has an important role on the Senate Appropriations Committee, has an opportunity, in front of all U.S. Senators, to get a vote on his amendment. What he is insisting on is a guaranteed result. Well, that doesn't happen here. In the process, he is holding hostage 99 other Senators who want to proceed to this bill—99 other Senators—because many of them have an interest in this legislation. As was pointed out by Senator MORAN, there are lots of things funded, programs that are important to Senators here on both sides of the aisle.

We are trying to do something here this year that wasn't done at all last year. Despite the fact that the Appropriations Committee reported 11 of the 12 bills out of the committee last year, not a single one was brought to the floor for consideration. We are trying to do not one, not two, not three but four appropriations bills with an amendment process that enables Senators from all parts of the country to have an opportunity to shape the bill or, in their view, perhaps improve the bill to their liking. The Senator from Maryland has decided that he is going to stand in the way of that because he can't get a guaranteed result—something that nobody around here is guaranteed.

That is why we have votes. And that is what I would love to get back to, is actually voting, actually putting bills on the floor, having an amendment process, and letting the Senate work its will.

It doesn't look like we will be able to do that, at least not on that bill. The

unfortunate outcome, as has been pointed out multiple times now, is that it probably ends up in some continuing resolution where all the work that was done by the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from Maryland, the Senator from Maine, the Senator from Washington, and others could very well go by the wayside and we end up funding the government at some CR level without all the input that all the members of the committee have had up to this point. I find that really unfortunate, but that is where we are.

Just so everybody understands what happens next, if this consent agreement fails, we will have to strip out the Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill, which carries a lot of things that people have worked for some time on, and then we will see where it goes from there. But I can't predict the fate of that bill from this point forward.

And, at least, what the Senator from Maryland gets, if we get on this package of bills, is a vote on his amendment by the U.S. Senate. He had a vote in committee. We have had process. We have more regular order ahead of us. He is going to hold 99 Senators hostage to try and get a guaranteed result on his amendment. It is not the way this place works.

I hope that we can get back to where it works like it is supposed to—where bills come to the floor, we have an open amendment process, and we don't have individual Senators blocking the opportunity for every other Senator in this country to be heard from.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I will be very brief because we have covered a lot of territory here.

I hope we can get to the place where we make decisions in this Senate, in this Congress, on their own merits, among ourselves, without direct intrusion by the President of the United States.

That, unfortunately, is what we witnessed in the Appropriations Committee process.

We would be in a very different place here on the floor today if we hadn't seen the effort to overturn a decision the committee had made on a majority vote with respect to the security of the men and women of the FBI. It would have been a very different situation.

So, again, let's dedicate ourselves to making sure that as we move forward, we do so as Senators—Republican and Democratic Senators—and not essentially take direction from the President of the United States who is trying very hard to interfere with this process.

I yield the floor.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 186.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Andrew Puzder, of Tennessee, to be Representative of the United States of America to the European Union, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 nomination of Executive Calendar No. 186, Andrew Puzder, of Tennessee, to be Representative of the United States of America to the European Union, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

John Thune, John R. Curtis, Bernie Moreno, Tommy Tuberville, Kevin Cramer, Ron Johnson, Shelley Moore Capito, John Boozman, John Barrasso, Marsha Blackburn, Roger Marshall, Jon A. Husted, Roger F. Wicker, Jim Banks, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Ted Budd, David McCormick.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 100.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Brian Burch, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 nomination of Executive Calendar No. 100, Brian Burch, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

John Thune, Bernie Moreno, Tim Sheehy, David McCormick, Ted Budd, Roger Marshall, Cynthia M. Lummis, James E. Risch, Joni Ernst, Mike Crapo, John R. Curtis, Markwayne Mullin, John Barrasso, Bill Hagerty, Dan Sullivan, Mike Rounds, Kevin Cramer.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 151.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jason Reding Quinones, of Florida, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Florida for the term of four years.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 nomination of Executive Calendar No. 151, Jason Reding Quinones, of Florida, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Florida for the term of four years.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, Markwayne Mullin, Mike Crapo, John Barrasso, John Boozman, Bill Cassidy, Kevin Cramer, Todd Young, David McCormick, Rick Scott of Florida, Mike Rounds, Marsha Blackburn, Shelley Moore Capito, Pete Ricketts, Ashley B. Moody, Roger Marshall.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.