

I am so thankful that it is so far so good, but we must finish the task today. We can do what so many folks failed to do in this legislative body for the last few decades—not a few years but a few decades—which is to pass consequential legislation that makes it easier to become a homeowner for those who are ready for that part of their journey.

I urge this body to vote yes on this bill, and let's create more homeowners at an earlier age. The age of affordability is now, and the solution to affordability is, in fact, us. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this bill, and let's get the ball moving.

VOTE ON H.R. 6644, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired. The clerk will read the bill by title, as amended, for the third time.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 53 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Alsbrooks	Grassley	Murphy
Baldwin	Hagerty	Murray
Banks	Hassan	Ossoff
Barrasso	Hawley	Padilla
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blunt Rochester	Hirono	Ricketts
Booker	Hoeben	Risch
Boozman	Husted	Rosen
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cantwell	Justice	Sanders
Capito	Kaine	Schiff
Cassidy	Kelly	Schmitt
Collins	Kennedy	Schumer
Coons	Kim	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	King	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Sheehy
Cotton	Lankford	Slotkin
Cramer	Luján	Smith
Crapo	Lummis	Sullivan
Curtis	Markey	Thune
Daines	Marshall	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McConnell	Warner
Durbin	McCormick	Warnock
Ernst	Merkley	Warren
Fetterman	Moody	Welch
Fischer	Moran	Whitehouse
Galleo	Moreno	Wicker
Gillibrand	Mullin	Wyden
Graham	Murkowski	

NAYS—10

Budd	Paul	Tuberville
Cruz	Schatz	Young
Johnson	Scott (FL)	
Lee	Tillis	

NOT VOTING—1

Blackburn

The bill (H.R. 6644), as amended, was passed.

(Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina assumed the chair.)

(Mr. HAGERTY assumed the chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina). The Senator from North Carolina.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2026—Motion to Proceed

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to resume the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147.

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

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147, a bill making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

HOUSING FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I want to say congratulations and thank you for your leadership.

We just passed a housing bill with 89 Senators in favor of it. Now, this is a bill about increasing supply, and anybody who wants to try to block this bill is going to have to explain to the American people why they don't want to see us build more housing and have that housing in the hands of homeowners, to make that happen.

I thank the Presiding Officer for all you have done, for your leadership, to get us here.

Our Nation is in a full-blown housing crisis. Across rural communities, small towns, suburban neighborhoods, and major cities, home prices are sky-high, rent is through the roof, and just last year, the median age of a first-time home buyer hit 40 years old.

Housing is the single biggest purchase that most Americans will make in their lifetime, but it is far more than that. Owning a home means building economic security. It is the No. 1 retirement plan for families across the country: You pay off your home and live on your Social Security. It helps people have the financing to start small businesses in their communities, and it is the main asset that families can pass down from one generation to the next. Owning a home affects the jobs you can get, the schools your children can attend, and the kinds of communities you can live in.

But for too long, the Federal Government has been asleep at the switch while the crisis grows. Hundreds of thousands of families are priced out of homes by private equity. Many State and local governments have too many rules holding back housing construction. Young people cannot buy their first homes. Seniors and veterans are being left behind. Home ownership is out of the reach of too many families, especially Black families.

We need to act, and that is why I stand here today in support of the 21st

Century ROAD to Housing Act. This landmark bipartisan bill will help tackle the root cause of this crisis by getting more homes built in every community across this country. It will make sure that families own those homes, not giant corporations looking to jack up the rent and squeeze every nickel of profit they can out of American families.

House Republicans should immediately take up this bill and pass it. If they do not, they will have to explain to families across this country in November why they refuse to lower the cost of housing.

(Ms. LUMMIS assumed the Chair.)

This is the biggest package of bills to make housing affordable in 30 years. This bill has more than 40 provisions, every single one of which is designed to help increase housing supply and bring down housing costs.

Here are just a few of the things this bill will do. It removes regulatory barriers and streamlines environmental reviews to speed up affordable housing development and construction approval processes.

It rewards communities that build more housing, and it prods those that are not building to step up and build more. It strengthens the Community Development Block Grant—CDBG—and HOME Programs to get more affordable housing built and to permanently authorize the CDBG-Disaster Recovery Program to get more money out to disaster-stricken communities faster.

It makes it easier and cheaper to build new manufactured housing by removing the outdated chassis requirements, bringing down the cost of a new unit by up to \$10,000.

It creates an Innovation Fund, one that I have been proposing for years, to reward communities that are successfully building more housing with new funding for community infrastructure or even to build more housing.

It will make long-needed improvements to rural housing programs to preserve affordable housing for 400,000 rural families.

It offers new and streamlined funding opportunities for cities and towns to bolster local infrastructure and to convert abandoned buildings into new housing, for homeowners and landlords to make structural home repairs, and for homebuilders to finance new manufactured and modular housing.

And there is so much more in this bill. This bill supports more housing opportunities for veterans, it takes action to reduce homelessness, and it helps address appraisal bias.

And, finally, this bill takes a good first step to get single-family homes back into the hands of American families, not corporations. An overwhelming majority of Americans, across party lines, want to stop private equity from snapping up single-family homes, and this bill does exactly that. It also makes sure that corporate landlords who don't follow the law pay up, and it invests any money they pay in

finances into the HOME Program to build more housing and to help first-time home buyers with direct assistance for downpayments, closing costs, and interest rate buydowns.

The bill does another thing that is very important. It preserves the power of State and local communities to tackle the problem of corporate landlords making it harder for families to afford rent and to own a home.

The 21st Century ROAD to Housing Act has overwhelming bipartisan support. It includes the vast majority of bipartisan housing provisions that passed the House of Representatives, and the bill has strong support from the White House.

Americans have been clear that they want their leaders to focus on lowering costs. There is no excuse to delay this relief. The American people will be watching.

I want to say thank you to Senator TIM SCOTT for his partnership in this historic bill. His leadership made this bill possible, and I am grateful to work with him on an issue that will matter so much to so many families. I also want to note that every single member of the Banking Committee—Republicans and Democrats—added ideas and specific provisions that made it into this bill. I thank them for their thoughtful and creative contributions and thank them for helping make this a much stronger, better bill.

I also want to offer a very special thank-you to the local and State officials, including the mayors across Massachusetts and all around the country, who helped shape this bill and then who raised their voices to help get it passed. I also want to thank the advocates who have worked tirelessly to push for more and better housing all across America.

So let's get this bill to the House. Let's get it signed into law as quickly as possible. There is no time to spare.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGERTY). The Senator from Maine.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to end the reckless Democratic shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. This shutdown has caused chaos at our airports, delayed assistance to communities hit by disasters, and forced thousands of essential frontline employees at TSA, at the Coast Guard, and at the Cybersecurity Agency to work without any guarantee of when they will be paid.

More than 50,000 TSA agents and officers who help keep us safe are currently working without pay, with many forced to find second or new jobs to make ends meet. Some are so discouraged that they have quit. Over the weekend, we saw security lines at some American airports stretch for more than 3 hours as the result of TSA's staffing shortage.

And what is the Democratic response? According to one Democratic

Senator, they are "very serene with what is going on." How can you be serene when you have increased the danger to the United States of contraband being smuggled into this country or a terrorist attack occurring or illegal substances being smuggled into our airports?

I don't like to be partisan, but the fact is the American people need to know that the Democrats created this chaos when they walked away from the bipartisan, fully negotiated DHS funding bill and then blocked repeated Republican attempts to pass a short-term funding measure to prevent these disruptions that are so harmful both to our country, security, and to the employees while the negotiations continue.

They claim that they need meaningful policy changes to support fully funding the Department, but their approach to resolving this impasse has been characterized by a lack of urgency and a lack of seriousness.

We are nearly a month into the shutdown of this vital Department. And today—today—marks 2 weeks of the Senate Democratic leadership sitting on what is a good-faith offer from the White House to end the shutdown.

Democrats have even rebuffed entreaties from Senate Republican negotiators to meet to bridge the differences between the two sides, to discuss the White House offer, which believe me, answers many of the concerns that have been raised, without endangering our law enforcement officers.

Instead, they have put forward a bill that takes the bipartisan measure that we negotiated in January and completely strips the funding for Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Customs and Border Protection.

Now, while defunding ICE and CBP may resonate well with far-left activists, it is not a serious public policy solution.

I want to take a moment to highlight some of the work that ICE and CBP do, which goes far beyond immigration enforcement and helps to keep our country safe.

More than a quarter of ICE's annual appropriated budget is for Homeland Security Investigations. They are referred to as HSI. Let me explain what HSI is.

This unit is charged with investigating the illegal movement of people, goods, contraband, weapons, and sensitive technology into, out of, and through the United States. HSI's agents are tasked with combating cartels, human smuggling, child exploitation, forced labor, and investigating international financial crimes.

Do we really want to defund those vital investigations? I think not.

CBP, too, does far more than just immigration enforcement. It is responsible for facilitating legal trade and travel throughout the United States. It screens goods for drugs and protects U.S. industry through its efforts to detect illegal imports, duty evasions, and counterfeits.

Its Office of Trade works to ensure that products made with forced labor are not allowed into our country and that businesses are unable to profit from human trafficking.

CBP's Air and Marine Operations patrols our maritime borders. Its agricultural specialists work to prevent the spread of pests and foreign plants being brought into this country.

Last Congress, the Democratic leadership of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee held a hearing—an excellent hearing—entitled "Combatting Transnational Criminal Organizations and Related Trafficking." The witnesses for that hearing were, not surprisingly, representatives of HSI and CBP. These Agencies and their work and the importance of it were highlighted, and I quote the Democratic Appropriations lead who said they are playing "a critical role in interrupting the flow of fentanyl into the United States." That same Democratic Senator said proposed cuts to these accounts would be "catastrophic" to their ability to fight cartels.

Now, the other side of the aisle suggests that we defund those exact same efforts.

We cannot continue this way. Real challenges are worthy of a serious response—a response that does not harm our country.

Today, Republicans are again taking steps to restore funding to the Department of Homeland Security and these critical missions. Shortly, we will have an opportunity to vote on allowing the Senate to debate and amend the Homeland Security appropriations bill.

Once on the bill, I believe that we should consider the White House's good-faith February 26 offer, which the Democrats have yet to respond to, even though it addresses many of the concerns that they have raised and that many of us have raised.

This offer would build on the reforms that were included in the bipartisan funding bill negotiated earlier this year, which included new safeguards to protect the American public and our law enforcement and increased oversight.

For example, our bipartisan bill had \$20 million, which we added, for body-worn cameras. Those cameras help to protect both law enforcement officers and the people with whom they are interacting.

But the White House offer would go considerably further by increasing substantially the funding for the body-worn cameras. I don't know why my Democratic colleagues would not see that as great progress. It goes beyond what we had previously negotiated in a completely bipartisan way.

There are many other critically important, substantive reforms that are included in the White House's offer. But what do we hear from the Democratic leadership? Nothing—nothing in the 2 weeks since the offer was submitted. They won't even sit down and

discuss the offer. I just do not understand it.

The White House's offer represents a good-faith, honest attempt to find reasonable compromises on the differences with our Democratic colleagues. It deserves a good-faith, reasonable, honest response. Instead, silence.

The stakes are far too high.

To my Democratic colleagues, please, stop playing political games when so much is at stake. Work with us to govern. Let's be responsible.

It is time for our Democratic colleagues to get serious.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

TRIBUTE TO CASEY CURTIS

Mrs. MOODY. Mr. President, I am honored to rise on the Senate floor today to recognize one of Florida's best.

Last month, a Martin County man was going about his day when he saw a terrible crash behind him in his rear-view mirror. And what he did next was truly remarkable and heroic.

The car behind him had crashed into a canal and was sinking under water. Casey Curtis, who I am told is watching this, didn't hesitate. He jumped into the water ready to help. And when he got out there, he found three young children stuck in the back, screaming for help from that sinking vehicle, and their mother was unconscious behind the wheel.

Casey acted quickly and helped free the kids. He got them to dry land, and then he turned back and went to the driver. He stayed in the water, holding the unconscious woman's head above the water to keep her from drowning, until the first responders got there.

Because of his courageous efforts, this mother and her three children are still alive. The family is still together because he selflessly acted without hesitation and put others' safety ahead of his own.

I am so proud to honor him today with a "Florida's Finest Award."

This is not somebody who dedicated his professional career in law enforcement. He didn't take an oath. He just decided that day he was going to be someone's guardian, and he chose to do what few others would have chosen to do.

This award honors Floridians and law enforcement officers who demonstrate selfless courage and go above and beyond to save lives.

Casey did not have to do what he did that day, but what he did makes him remarkable, and we are so proud of his efforts.

So thank you, Casey, for stepping in, risking your own safety to save a family. You are truly one of Florida's finest.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in a few moments, my friend and colleague the Senator from Nevada will offer a

unanimous consent request that is very simple. It funds TSA—no conditions; no ifs, ands, or buts.

It just says we are funding TSA. If Republicans want to see our TSA workers get paid, they should not object. It is very simple.

We know we need to straighten this out. Many people have different formulas, but, plain and simple, if you want to fund TSA with no conditions, no preconditions, just yes or no; no ands, ifs, or buts, do not block this resolution.

If Republicans block this resolution, we will know they don't want to fund TSA, because this is the simplest, quickest, easiest way to do it.

Our colleagues on the other side said: Oh, no, we don't want to fund it unless we have a compromise or we have a deal on other parts of ICE and CBP. That is holding the TSA agents and the American people hostage.

We are not holding any hostages. We are just saying: We need to fund TSA. We need to fund it now—no ands, ifs, or buts; no questions asked, no preconditions.

The American people will see. The Rosen proposal is simple. If Republicans block it, they are standing in the way of funding TSA now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I just heard the minority leader come to the floor of the U.S. Senate and say: What the Democrats want to do is peel apart the Department of Homeland Security—a Department that was set up in this Nation after the attacks of 9/11, the attacks that struck the home city of the minority leader, took down the Twin Towers.

This Department of Homeland Security was set up specifically to protect our Nation. Multiple components were put together to protect America, the American people.

And what are the Democrats doing today? They are coming to the floor to peel it apart and say: Oh, no, we are not interested in protecting the border. Oh, no, we are not interested in making sure illegal immigrant criminals are taken out of the country.

No, that is not what they are doing. They are coming and saying: We are going to just take this part or that part.

This is a comprehensive plan for the Department of Homeland Security to protect our Nation. That is what we are seeing here today. That is why they are here.

Our cyber security is under attack, our people are under attack, our Nation is under attack, and we need to defend ourselves. We need a full Department of Homeland Security, not what we are going to see in the next hour, which is "Oh, no, let's fund this little part. No, let's fund this little part. No, let's fund this little part," as they don't want to fund the Department of Homeland Security.

They say: Well, hey, the Department of Homeland Security is here to guard our coast. We have the Coast Guard in there. We have FEMA for emergency management of Federal problems. We have our cyber security—where, today, one-third of those people are working and not getting paid and two-thirds today, right this very moment, are furloughed, and that seems to be fine with the Democrats. They don't seem to care because they are so committed to the illegal immigrants who are criminals and in this country, let in by Joe Biden and them. Over 10 million flooded into the country during the last 4 years. They are so beholden and attached to the far-left component of this Nation that they don't care about everybody else.

We have had terrorist attacks right here in the homeland—two in the last 2 weeks. So we are going to stand here, and we are going to listen to this little unanimous consent agreement and that one at a time when our homeland is under attack.

All warning lights are flashing red, and they want to peel apart piece by piece the Department of Homeland Security—a comprehensive Department of our government to protect the American people—because they want to stand with illegal immigrant criminals.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, as you know, I have only had the honor—I call it an honor honestly—the honor to serve as a U.S. Senator for 14 months.

Every day when I drive down Pennsylvania, make a left on Constitution, and see the sunrise over the Capitol, I genuinely feel the weight of how important this office is.

I actually have incredible admiration not for my forefathers—my forefathers came from South America—but for the forefathers of the people who built this country. Think of the wisdom of what our Founders envisioned. Our Founders created an institution that is genuinely—it gives me chills to think about the genius of what they did. They created a House of Representatives where every 2 years there is an election, and there is a lot of friction that goes on, and a simple majority passes a bill. Yet they wanted the Senate to be more deliberative. They wanted to force us—and the Presiding Officer personally knows how hard it is—they wanted to force us to have strong conversations with the opposing party to get to a resolution. They really did. They didn't want it to just be simple majority rule; they wanted to make it really difficult.

But what I have experienced over the last 14 months, I have to tell you, is decently disappointing, because for me, what I think should unite is, what do the American people really want from us? what is it that they want their leaders to do?

We have now seen it three times in a row this year where my Democrat colleagues have shut the government

down. What does that mean? You hear a lot of speeches. What it means is if you are a government employee, tomorrow is Friday, it is payday, and you are not getting a check.

Imagine what that feels like. The Presiding Officer is a dad. Imagine what that feels like, to have to explain to your kids how you went to work, you did your job, you didn't do anything wrong, and yet you don't have the money you need to pay your basic bills.

Yet we here in the U.S. Senate—our paychecks are uninterrupted. We get paid to do our job—a lot more, magnitude more money than average Americans make. We will leave here today and travel to far-off places, and yet we will walk by TSA agents that aren't getting paid.

We expect Border Patrol to do their job. We expect Customs to do their job. We expect FEMA to do their job. I have a big Coast Guard presence in Ohio. We need them to do their job. Yet none of them are getting paid. They did nothing wrong. There isn't a single employee of the Department of Homeland Security who is affected by this who personally is the reason this Department isn't funded.

So I truly, truly, from the bottom of my heart, ask my Democrat colleagues, with an absolute desire to get a result, let's spend 2 weeks—and we can start today, by the way. There is no reason for us to go home. I am willing to start today, like we start right now, and we sit down together, we look at the appropriations bill for the entire Department of Homeland Security, and in good faith—not with political theater, not to score political points, not to be cool on social media, but actually sit in a room and say: Let's get this entire Department funded. Let's not leave here today and walk by a TSA agent knowing that we are the reason they are not getting paid. That is unacceptable.

Let's sit down together. For 2 weeks, we can do that—14 days. I am willing to stay in Washington, DC, for 14 days and hash out an agreement. We can do it. That is what our voters want. That is why they elected us. They don't want us to be shirts and skins on everything.

So, Mr. President, I ask a very simple—make a very simple motion I think most Americans would appreciate. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to immediate consideration of Calendar No. 156, H.R. 4553. I further ask that the substitute amendment, No. 4353, be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

What that means is that we can fund the employees of the Department of Homeland Security now while we spend 2 weeks working together to get a resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the motion?

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, I understand the political pressures. I really do. We will see that sometimes appealing to a certain voter bloc—maybe it makes us popular. But I want to read you a quote from the deputy Democrat whip—a senior appropriator, by the way—who said:

[We] are very serene with what is going on.

“[We] are very serene with what is going on.” You are serene that today, tonight, a dad, a mom is going to come home and say “Can't do that. Can't pay for your dance recital. Can't pay for your spring break ticket” because they didn't get a paycheck. I want you to explain to a 12-year-old child why they are not getting paid.

They are going to talk about Senate procedure. They are going to talk about the appropriations process. But this is just another effort to distract us from what is going on here.

So, again, I just urge my Democrat colleague to consider, as you think about your own State—by the way, I genuinely believe you deeply care about your State. I hear you talk about it, and it is absolutely sincere. You deeply care about your State. Think about those Border Patrol agents that are welcoming visitors from all over the world to Las Vegas. Think about those ICE agents that are arresting criminal aliens, like the one that was just recently arrested. That was a pretty bad guy.

Imagine those TSA agents, the Coast Guard, FEMA, Cybersecurity—you have a lot of those resources in your State. Can I please ask you for some level of humanity to get this done?

Reconsider your objection, and let's fund the Department of Homeland Security, TSA agents, for 2 weeks. Please. I ask you to do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, you know, I appreciate my colleague, but we have had more than 2 weeks. So where have you been? Where have you been?

This is a nonstarter. Come to the table. Let's give ICE the same training as local law enforcement, as our FBI. We want ICE agents that are transparent, trained, and accountable, not acting above the law.

So now we are almost a month into the Republican shutdown of Homeland Security. The Republicans control the White House, the House, and the Senate. So let's remember how we got here. Donald Trump and Kristi Noem were so, so eager to carry out their cruel mass deportation agenda that they actually cut training for ICE officers from 5 months—imagine this—to 47 days. Why 47 days? Well, you can't even make this up—because it honors Donald Trump, who is the 47th President. So you cut down 5 months to 47

days. What are you thinking about adequate training?

By cutting training and increasing recruitment, Trump and Kristi Noem sent thousands of untrained agents with their guns and their badges into communities all across this country. They added deportation quotas for these officers to meet, and Trump and Kristi Noem pushed these untrained officers to round up as many people as they could wherever they could, and that included legal immigrants and American citizens. That is right.

Instead of deporting illegal, violent criminals—something we do all agree on, by the way—they went after legal permanent residents, visa holders, law-abiding citizens, with devastating consequences when we saw two of our fellow Americans brutally murdered in Minneapolis.

The American people were rightfully horrified and angry, and they demanded accountability, which is exactly what Senate Democrats are pushing for.

We proposed a commonsense, basic idea that ICE officers, well, should just be required to follow the same standards as our local law enforcement—all of my colleagues here—your law enforcement has to follow. That is it. Simple. We want ICE officers to wear body cams, end roving patrols, use judicial warrants, and to respect people's rights. It should be a no-brainer.

Democrats have been ready and willing in good faith to enact these commonsense reforms, fund the Department, and keep our country safe, and, shamefully, our Republican colleagues have refused to pass these reforms. They would rather see the Homeland Security Department shut down than pass commonsense guardrails to hold ICE accountable, rein them in, and as a result, the American people are paying the price. Travelers at our airports, seeing longer lines. TSA officers are being forced to work without pay.

As the Senator from Nevada, you are right—I know just how serious the situation is. My State relies heavily on tourism. More than 50 million visitors travel to Nevada every year to attend conventions, visit our beautiful public lands, enjoy live entertainment, sports, and we support hundreds of thousands of hospitality workers.

Air travel is the gateway to our economy, so when TSA staffing levels drop because officers aren't getting paid, wait times at airport security checkpoints stretch longer and longer. It doesn't just inconvenience travelers; it does undermine security and directly threatens jobs, businesses, and livelihoods across our State.

That is why I rise today with a very simple and practical proposal. If we can't move forward funding the entire Department—sitting down, negotiating in good faith, which you have had plenty of time to do already—we should be at least able to come together to pay the hard-working staff of one of its most essential components: TSA.

Let's not have TSA officers in the middle of this fight. They don't deserve it. We all agree their salaries should be funded, so let's fund it. Let's do it.

Today, I am asking my colleagues to take a simple step. Let's pass my legislation right now and pay the TSA workers so that commercial air travel remains safe and functional and our TSA agents receive the pay they have earned.

I am introducing this bill today with Commerce Committee Ranking Member CANTWELL so we can finally get our airports moving again. If Republicans are going to insist on shutting down the Department of Homeland Security, they should at the very least join us in ensuring that the traveling public does not pay the price.

They even implied in their own tweet that they are for funding TSA, so let's see if that is true, because, you know what, tweets are easy. Tweets are easy. Talk is easy. Will they back up what they say with their votes? We are about to find out.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4073, submitted earlier today, and that would fund the TSA; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I just offered to fund the Department of Homeland Security 5 minutes ago. In fact, I said in good faith that we could sit down, have a conversation, and get this thing done. I just did that. Why are we saying the TSA agents, whom I totally respect? How about the Border Patrol guys and gals? How about Customs? How about CISA? How about FEMA? How about the Coast Guard? Are we saying we are going to penalize all of them? Why would we do that?

Let's fund the whole Department. Let's get this over with. In fact, I would even offer to fund it until Monday. Let's all—every single U.S. Senator—agree to stay here until Monday, until we get this negotiated. In the meantime, we fund the Department, and we retroactively pay every single worker.

If that is not acceptable, I will ask one more, and I will be the first one to offer it: If the answer is that we leave here today without funding the Department of Homeland Security, every single Senator should give their paycheck to a charity of their choice, retroactively from the beginning of the shutdown, until we get this Department funded. We should not get paid while government employees who did nothing are not getting paid.

For that reason, I object to that narrow funding of certain people and not others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, every day the Democrats refuse to fund DHS, they choose politics over the safety and security of our Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada still has the floor. I am sorry.

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, we can fully fund DHS right now—right now—if Washington Republicans will just agree to commonsense reforms for ICE—the same ones that local law enforcement have: Identify yourself. Wear a body camera. It is good for the agent and for the community. Get full training. Respect our Bill of Rights. We want them to be trained, transparent, and accountable like every other law enforcement officer in this country.

I find it extremely disappointing that you haven't come to the table for those commonsense reforms so far. We can let the TSA and other parts of Homeland go and continue to negotiate. Let's remember that the Big Beautiful Bill gave tens of billions of dollars to ICE. They are not running out of money or any pay anytime soon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, every day the Democrats refuse to fund DHS, they choose politics over the safety and security of our Nation. They continue to be the party of open borders and defund the police. To make it worse, they continue to refuse to meet. I am sitting here. It is like I am watching a divorce with two parents fighting over the kids. The Democrats say they want to meet, but they won't meet.

The White House sent them an offer 14 days ago. There has been no response. There has been no official response. There has been no communication back to the White House. I know that the chairperson of DHS Appropriations has reached out multiple times to her counterpart, but they refuse to sit down. It is the same way with the chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee. It is the same thing with our majority whip and our majority leader in that they have reached out through their counterparts and have asked to sit down. So someone is lying here, OK? Somebody is lying. I know that our appropriations folks would sit down this afternoon and work this out. I absolutely believe that they could.

That is why, in a moment, I am going to ask that we fund DHS for 2 weeks. That should be the goal. That should be the objective. I will almost guarantee, if calm minds sit in the same room and go through their asks on ICE, we will figure something out, but there are no negotiations if the other side won't sit down here. That is what America needs to know—that the Democrats have refused to respond to the White House. They have refused to negotiate person to person. So we are happy to have this debate right here and right now.

In a second, I am going to offer a clean 2-week CR to fully fund DHS. I am asking that we fund DHS for 2 weeks so as to protect American lives and then come back and talk, and let's work through our differences.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 156, H.R. 4553. I further ask that the substitute amendment No. 4353 be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. KIM. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, again, we have asked to fund the DHS for 2 weeks. My colleagues have different ideas on what to do here, but I think that we absolutely owe it to our friends and neighbors back home in that our country is less safe today when we don't have DHS funded and that they ought to cooperate to keep us safe.

I am every bit as concerned about sleeper cells waking up today—Iranian sleeper cells waking up today—and carrying out attacks on Americans. I am every bit as concerned about that as I am for the safety of our soldiers' lives.

So I appreciate the objector's concerns here, and I look forward to figuring out a way to get the DHS open.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. KIM. Mr. President, I share these concerns about the safety and security of the American people. I spent my career working in national security and counterterrorism, and these are exactly the reasons we need to make sure that we are taking the steps that we can agree upon.

There is no doubt. As we have had debate after debate this week, we know we are far apart still when it comes to immigration, when it comes to that aspect of the Department of Homeland Security, but what the American people know and what every family has to deal with is that you can also think through what it is that you do agree on and try to move forward with that and try to then further focus in on the issues where there are disagreements. I think that is a very pragmatic idea, a pragmatic approach, that the American people can understand.

So, in just a few moments, I will ask my colleagues to pass commonsense legislation to fund the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, known as CISA. I know maybe the American people are not as familiar with this aspect of the Department of Homeland Security, but I think that they understand that we are in a different moment now than we were just

a couple of weeks ago when these negotiations began. We are now a nation at war. We are a nation at war because of Donald Trump's moving forward without the approval of this body, which the Constitution outlines, in terms of the approval of a declaration of war. So we find ourselves in a time when our servicemembers are in harm's way. Several have already lost their lives. With our diplomatic posts, as a former State Department officer, I am worried about our Embassies.

Then, here at home, there is concern about our own homeland security. When the President was asked about this, should we be concerned about threats to our homeland, he said: "I guess [so]."

That is what he said.

He said: "I guess [so]." He said that people may die; that that is what happens in war.

I am finding that absolutely unacceptable for a Commander in Chief to talk about homeland threats with that level of blasé attitude.

We all know that Iran has the capability of launching cyber security attacks on the United States. We have seen it before, and we had seen this administration, even before this war, take the steps to gut this Agency that is in charge of so much of the critical infrastructure and cyber security protections. They have forced out and reassigned personnel to other missions. They have attempted to slash the budget. The Agency, CISA, has lost one-third of its workforce under this administration and the abysmal leadership of Secretary Noem.

As I said on the floor yesterday, we are at war, and we need to understand that we should take all of the steps available to be able to push forward on the tools that we need. When it comes to immigration, we know that the Republicans pushed forward on the funding for that through the reconciliation bill last year. So let us make sure that the rest of the Department of Homeland Security, including this incredibly important aspect of CISA, is able to step up at this dangerous time.

I hope the Republicans will join us and make good on that obligation today by funding CISA. That is why I am asking my colleagues to pass this bill to fund our cyber security workers and ensure that we have the resources in place to counter these threats. That should be something that, I hope, all of us can agree on. Now is the time to put the politics aside and focus on them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4074, submitted earlier today, and that would fund CISA; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, just 10

minutes ago, we offered to fund CISA and all of DHS. I am not going to leave behind the TSA. I am not going to leave behind the Coast Guard. I am not going to leave behind FEMA. I am not going to leave behind ICE and the Border Patrol.

My colleague mentioned his experience in the State Department, which I have great respect for. He knows that, if one Agency is closed down, it impacts everybody else in the State Department. He also should understand—and I know he does; I know that he understands this—that if you shut down a part of DHS, it impacts everybody else and that there is a domino effect of problems.

There is no one on the Democrat side who could argue that we wouldn't be safer if all of DHS were funded. No one could argue that we wouldn't be much safer as a nation if all of DHS were funded. But, instead, with all due respect, my colleagues across the aisle are turning to politics. They acknowledge the danger that this country is in, but they continue to choose politics over the safety and well-being of our Nation. Carving this up—carving the bill into separate pieces—makes no sense. It is a blatant attempt to distract from the fact that they are putting American lives at risk every single day.

I would ask my colleagues who are pushing this piecemeal approach and who voted against full DHS funding a dozen times—so Democrats have voted against DHS funding at least a dozen times, and they are going to vote against it again several times today. I have got to go back. This is the one place where we probably disagree on the facts. Again, with respect to my colleagues, there is no negotiating happening if you won't sit down with us. There is no negotiating happening if you won't return or at least speak back to the White House and say: This is what we object to. This is what we want.

What do you all want?

I would ask my colleagues across the aisle to commit, as soon as our next vote is over with, to sitting down with our approps team and working this out. But there is no negotiating happening, right, America? There are no negotiations happening. The Democrats will not sit down with us. It is because they like this political argument.

I want to just draw the roadmap here.

Under the previous White House, they let millions of people come across our border, unvetted—violent criminals, known terrorists—and these sleeper cells are now starting to open. Republicans took over. We secured the border. We empowered the Border Patrol, and we empowered ICE. We stopped the flow of illegal aliens and started deporting those criminals. Because of that, America is a safer place today—America is a much safer place today—but now you are trying to unwind everything and defund the police.

This is the theme here. Democrats defund the police. They want open borders. Republicans are the party of law and order. We want secure borders. We want ICE to do their job.

The Democrats are now doing everything in their power to obstruct ICE's efforts to deport those threats. They have shut down funding for the entire Agency—an Agency that also has critical Departments for identifying threats and keeping American lives safe, like cyber security. This Agency is a frontline in cyber defense. Most Americans don't understand what the cyber defense Agency is, but it is a frontline in cyber defense. It protects our grids, our hospitals, water systems, and more from relentless threats—from China, Iran, and criminals. I know my colleague who has worked in the State Department knows that those threats aren't just theoretical.

Every day, we are having thousands of cyber attacks, but the Cybersecurity Agency does not operate in a vacuum. They depend upon the CBP and the TSA and FEMA and the Secret Service and the Coast Guard to function. Funding one Agency while starving the rest is like funding Patrick Mahomes. It is like giving him a lifelong salary—the best deal ever—but not giving him a good offensive tackle. We saw how that worked out in the last Super Bowl. You have to fund the whole Agency. Again, the White House sent an offer 2 weeks ago—crickets from the Democrats.

Why don't you respond to what the White House sent you? Why don't you sit down with our approps team?

With that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. KIM. Mr. President, I will say we are ready to negotiate. We are the ones that want to be at the table here. But look at what has happened since negotiations have begun. Since we started this several weeks ago, we are again now at war. We are at war because the President refused to engage with this body, refused to engage with Congress about that, finding ourselves with these types of threats.

Since negotiations began, we now have a Department of Homeland Security Secretary fired. The Department is in chaos right now. How are we to understand what roles are going to be coming next, what this administration is going to be doing next, when they cannot even get their own Department in order?

So, yes, we are going to continue to push. And as I said, we have still large disagreements. And I am as concerned with what is happening in Iran—I am as concerned about that here because we have about 30 percent of the casualties that we face in Iran, with this attack and war with Iran—we saw that number, about 30 percent of that number in Minnesota. Two American citizens killed in Minnesota, still no formal, independent investigation at the level that is needed. Still no answers.

Still no assurances about what comes next.

So that is why we have got to move forward, fund CISA, fund these other elements of the Department of Homeland Security that can keep our country safe.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I would just ask my colleague to commit for your appropriations people to sit down face-to-face with our appropriations staff and our members this afternoon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 156, H.R. 4553; I ask that the substitute amendment, No. 4353, be considered and agreed to; the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, this is the DHS bill that would fund all the things that are in the DHS bill that the Democrats negotiated until they pulled the rug out from underneath that negotiation to politically grandstand on the Senate floor now for nearly a month.

The truth of the matter is that—I want to make the point for those who care about the way the Senate operates. First of all, we didn't have any appropriations bills the first 2 years. The majority party has now put appropriations bills on. There have been 11 out of 12.

I was told that policy debates are not to enter the discussion on appropriations bills because things like this can happen.

To my Democrat colleagues: If you have a bill that you want to defund ICE with, put it on the floor. I guarantee it will get voted down because it is an extremely unpopular position.

We are not going to let you get to that result by way of holding everyone else hostage.

If you want to support all the Agencies in this negotiated bill, you have a way to do it. But I think we really know what this is about. What this is really about is the Democrats lost an election where the issue of border enforcement and deportations were on the table, front and center in front of the voters, and the voters supported it. Recent polling still shows that.

But to satisfy their radicalized base—which are the same people, these leftist NGOs that conjure and foment discontent, blow whistles, try to create confrontations with ICE agents—won't let them do it, and they are kind of stuck.

So the only thing they have left now is the same playbook they ran a couple of months ago by shutting down the government, but this time they are shutting down DHS.

And to make that clear, Joe Biden and the Democrats let 15 million people in here illegally, tens of thousands of murderers, hundreds of thousands of violent criminals, and now that same party wants to defund the Agency that is charged with deporting these monsters.

So we have a choice. I choose to support law enforcement. I am not going to go along with the idea that we are going to give the Democrats the ability to kneecap ICE so they can get amnesty by lack of enforcement.

And with that, Mr. President, I renew my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, there is not a pending motion on the floor currently?

Mr. SCHMITT. If he has already objected, the objection has been heard.

Mr. MURPHY. Seeking recognition on my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, yesterday and today, Democrats have been on the floor asking for something very simple: Let's open up TSA. Let's open up CISA, which protects this country from cyber attack. Let's open up the Coast Guard. Let's open up FEMA.

Republicans have said "no" repeatedly. Yesterday, we said: Let's open all four Agencies up together. Republicans denied us that motion. Today, we are trying to see if we can open up one at a time.

What Republicans are saying is that: We want to hold TSA, our airports, the protection of our coastline, the defense of this Nation from cyber attacks, and our response to emergencies hostage to their determination to continue to fund a law enforcement operation at ICE that is out of control.

So Republicans are saying: We are going to keep TSA shut. We are going to keep the Coast Guard shut. We are going to keep FEMA shut until you allow the President to continue to terrorize our communities with a lawless, out-of-control ICE.

This isn't just what you see on the news. The scenes out of Minneapolis were horrific, unconscionable, American citizens being gunned down on the streets. One Federal judge found that ICE is in violation of 96 different court orders right now all across the country. Courts have ruled in 4,000 cases that ICE has jailed people illegally.

ICE is behaving in a brazenly lawless and unconstitutional manner, and none of us—Republican or Democrat—should be interested in funding a part of the Federal Government that is operating outside of the bounds of law.

We swore an oath to the Constitution. And so we have a serious discussion that is happening as we speak be-

tween Republicans and Democrats about how we can come together to fund ICE. But while that discussion happens, why are we keeping shut down the Coast Guard, TSA, FEMA? It is not necessary.

If Republicans just stopped coming to the floor to object, we could open up TSA right now. We could get those salaries paid.

I am going to offer a motion to open up funding for the Coast Guard. We could get the people who protect our shorelines paid.

And, yes, this is a mess. This is a mess. I admit it. This is a mess. But we didn't have shutdowns when Democrats were in charge of the Senate.

We are at a logjam because the Republicans refuse to listen to the very reasonable concerns that Democrats and the American people have about the way that ICE is behaving.

And by the way, we aren't representing some fringe political constituency. In the last national poll, 60 percent of Americans said that Congress should not fund ICE until they clean up their act. The vast majority of Americans believe that that Agency is out of control.

But if you went out there and asked those same Americans whether they think that TSA and the Coast Guard and FEMA should be shut down while we resolve those differences, they would say: Hell no. Open up the airports. Protect our shorelines.

So we are going to continue to come to the floor and attempt to convince Republicans to release these hostages.

I know that you are committed to supporting the President's lawlessness. I don't understand why you won't stand up and say it is wrong that there are 96 different court orders that ICE has violated, it is wrong that American citizens are being killed on the streets, that it is wrong that schools are being tear gassed.

But while we are having this difference of opinion on ICE that is sort of hard to understand, don't hold the rest of the Department of Homeland Security hostage to your insistence that the President get to act outside the bounds of law when it comes to the enforcement of our immigration laws.

I am going to offer a motion. And, again, yesterday, we offered a motion to open up all of the rest of the Department of Homeland Security. I am going to offer a more targeted motion.

On the average day, the Coast Guard saves 12 lives, interdicts 1,250 pounds of cocaine, screens 300 vessels. It would be really important to get our Coast Guard opened up.

I know my colleague from Delaware thinks the same thing. Right before I offer the motion, I yield to her for a quick question.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Thank you, Senator MURPHY.

I want to start off as the ranking member on the U.S. Coast Guard Subcommittee, and I stand here today, first of all, to acknowledge your leadership and to acknowledge the fact

that it is surprising, I think, to most Americans that when we can get agreement on 90 percent of something, we don't act on that 90 percent. We have an opportunity right now.

And, again, as ranking member of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, we know that the Coast Guard keeps our Nation safe in times of peace, but also in times of war. Even wars that weren't brought to Congress or that have no strategy or exit strategy, they do their job.

From protecting our ports, to helping our communities with search and rescue operations—the Coast Guard is critical to our Nation's national security and safety. They patrol over 4.5 million square miles of ocean. They protect over 95,000 miles of U.S. coastline. They secure over 26,000 miles of commercial waterways and ensure the safety of over 360 ports, 3,700 marine terminals, and 25,000 miles of navigable channels. The men and women of the Coast Guard of the United States dedicate their lives to protecting the largest system of ports, waterways, and coastal seas in the world.

And right now—right now—over 42,000 Active-Duty servicemembers are uncertain about whether they will receive their next paycheck, and nearly 10,000 civilians who support their critical work are going without pay right now. Their next paychecks should actually be hitting their accounts in a couple of days, which is why what we do here today is so vital.

I had the privilege of visiting the Sector Delaware Bay last summer, and I met the coasties stationed there, and I got to hear firsthand how deeply connected they are to our mission, to our safety, to our economy, and our national security. And it helped clarify how immensely important that we must take care of the coasties at home so that they can serve our country with confidence at sea.

Again, right now, we are neglecting our duty. Politics aside, the Coast Guard has a job to do, and we have an opportunity to do something about it.

Our colleagues asked us for more weeks. We got 2 weeks in the beginning. We are now weeks and weeks and weeks from those 2 weeks.

The best way that we can support our Coast Guard men and women is to pay them. And while we, as Democrats, fight to address a broken Agency that we know of as ICE, we have to recognize and pay our Coast Guard's men and women.

So, Senator MURPHY, do you agree that our colleagues across the aisle should join us in paying our Coast Guard men and women without delay?

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator for the question.

I do.

Especially at a time when the United States is at war, we cannot afford to have our coastlines undefended. The motions that Republicans have been making today have offered to pay the Coast Guard for 2 weeks. That is not good enough.

Right now, this motion that I will make will allow the Coast Guard to be paid for the rest of the year. If the Senator does not object to my motion, then minutes from now, the Coast Guard—the 52,000 people who work for the Coast Guard—will know that we honor their service and that we are going to pay them for the rest of the year, and so here is my motion.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of my bill at the desk that would fund the Coast Guard; that the bill be considered read three times and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I object.

My colleague from Connecticut just talked about this minutes ago. Minutes ago, the very same Senator objected to Coast Guard funding. So here we are again with political gamesmanship and grandstanding for some clip to show that you actually want to fund the Coast Guard. Meanwhile, you just voted against the Coast Guard.

The Democrats do not want to fund the Coast Guard because they are so hell-bent on defunding ICE.

And the term "out of control" was used. Do you know what is out of control? The language being used on this floor to describe Federal law enforcement—Nazis, the Gestapo. This is very dangerous. This is very dangerous.

And I will tell you that I have great appreciation for the men and women who go into very dangerous situations to deport criminals who want to rape and murder our fellow citizens. I appreciate them.

So five reasons why I cannot go along with this scam: Laken Riley, Jocelyn Nungaray, Kayla Hamilton, Dacara Thompson, and Hallie Helgeson—all Americans—all murdered by illegal aliens released by Democrats, instead of being deported.

So what else is out of control other than the Democrats' language? These leftist activist organizations that are creating the chaos in the streets.

There are nine sanctuary jurisdictions in this country that, actually, probably are significant. In those nine sanctuary jurisdictions, there is a 590-percent increase for anti-ICE attacks.

They are creating conditions with the hope that they get some viral moment. This is dangerous. This is out of control.

One more thing that is out of control: sanctuary jurisdictions at large.

And for the friends watching at home, what is a sanctuary jurisdiction that the Democrats are so proud of? They are local jurisdictions that will not tell Federal law enforcement when an illegal alien rapist or murderer is being released from prison.

It happened—by the way, the new Virginia Governor just pledged that she won't do it.

The monster Abdul Jalloh, from Sierra Leone, with 30 priors, who stabbed to death a fellow citizen of ours—she has pledged to not let ICE know when that monster is released from prison.

That is who they are. That is what we are fighting against, and we are not going to allow them to kneecap our Federal law enforcement from getting these monsters out of our country.

They just voted against this. They just voted against the Coast Guard. They just voted against the Secret Service. They just voted against TSA.

They want to undermine law enforcement and give blanket amnesty to 15 million people here illegally. That is the truth.

And with that, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. My friend, you have lost the argument with the public. You just have. The public thinks that ICE is out of control. The public does not want ICE to continue operating in the way that they are operating. They have seen the scenes out of Minneapolis. They are watching what is happening in Vermont today. And they don't agree with you. The majority of Americans, by a large margin, say that what is happening today is out of control.

And, yes, you did offer motions to keep the Coast Guard open for 2 weeks. That doesn't help the peace of mind of the 52,000 people who work for the Coast Guard and wonder whether they are going to have more than one paycheck.

You are objecting to a motion to keep them open for the rest of the year. And so tomorrow, when TSA is still not open and the Coast Guard is still not open, and FEMA is still not operating, there is only one reason.

Today you are offering motions to keep them open for 2 weeks, and you are objecting to motions to keep those Agencies open for the whole year. People are going to see the difference.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. LANKFORD. It feels like "Groundhog Day" here on the Senate floor, trying to bear with all the problems. I wish we could all get in one room and be able to actually talk to each other like human beings and people rather than just rant.

Fourteen days ago—2 weeks—14 days ago, the White House sent over a proposal to my Democratic colleagues and said: We understand there are issues with ICE. We understand there are issues with CBP. So let me make a proposal to you of some options that we can do that we should be able to agree on—14 days ago.

Those options included mandatory body-worn cameras for ICE agents and CBP—mandatory—name tags for every single agent, to be able to have an identifier for every single agent that is

out there; to be able to make sure that selective sensitive sites did not have ICE involvement in those selective sites; deescalation training for all of our Federal officers to be able to know the techniques for how to be able to step down from a violent protester that is screaming in their face and waiving a camera in their face; a full, open investigation of the two shootings that happened in Minneapolis; reducing the footprint of the number of agents in Minnesota; a change in the way that warrants are actually used across the country.

The White House laid all of those things out, 14 days ago, that one of my Democratic colleagues, who is on this floor, said to me was an entirely reasonable offer from the White House—14 days ago. And since that time period, radio silence from my Democratic colleagues. The White House had no response.

TSA agents are not being paid, FEMA agents are not being paid, and Cybersecurity folks are not being paid while we wait for the counteroffer.

What is happening is good politics from my Democrat colleagues. They feel like this is good politics to be able to continue and to be able to press in that some folks on the far, far, far left want to defund ICE and want to show there is a huge fight to be able to take on ICE.

The result of that is 250,000 people—families, individuals—that work with DHS wait for an answer—wait. This has got to get resolved. The politics in this moment have got to stop.

I was here last Thursday saying all of us should stay and stay over the weekend and not leave until this is resolved, and everybody just left.

A quarter million DHS employees are looking at this room right now and saying: Stop bickering about this. Just solve it. Whoever has got the paper, just answer it. Just go back and forth.

Let's figure this out. Let's actually just solve this.

So we have tried multiple times to say: Let's fund it.

The White House has made good-faith offers to say: Here are offers to be able to get some dialogue going if somebody will actually talk back to me.

But while we wait on the politics to cool, in the meantime, I need to offer again what we started with at the very beginning, and that was just this: Can we at least open things up for 2 weeks, like we did at the beginning?

We started this battle weeks and weeks and weeks ago, and we started it with: OK, we agree on all of the other appropriations bills. We don't agree on this one because it has funding for ICE, because it has funding for CBP in it. And so we can't get agreement on that.

Can we at least just keep the status quo and keep debating so that the fight is here in this room, rather than affecting families that literally are trying to get grocery coupons and gift cards from people so they can feed their families. Can we at least, at a minimum,

do 2 weeks, like we did at the start of this? If we can't agree on everything, let's at least keep this open.

Now, this body knows I have been fighting for years to say: We should never have a government shutdown at all.

I literally don't know how many times I have been on this floor talking about this issue, saying government shutdowns should be a thing of the past.

We should be here 24/7 until we solve the problem and hold all those Federal workers harmless.

If we can't get to that, which we have not been able to get an agreement to at least do that, then let's at least have a continuing resolution that pays everyone at DHS for the next 2 weeks while we keep arguing until we can resolve our issue.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 156, H.R. 4553. I further ask that the substitute amendment, No. 4353, be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PADILLA. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. We have been having this debate over a series of motions here over the last hour-plus.

First of all, a status quo position for CBP and ICE is not acceptable. We have seen the violations of people's civil rights across the country for the better part of this last year. Last year alone, it was the deadliest year for detainees in ICE custody. And calendar year to date, we are on track to surpass that by a lot. So, no, the status quo is not acceptable.

For the other Departments and Agencies—TSA, Coast Guard, FEMA, CISA, et cetera—why settle for 2 weeks? We should fund them for the balance of the Federal fiscal year. I think we will have an additional motion to that effect in a minute.

But on the motion currently before us, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, in the few minutes that we have left before the scheduled vote, I do want to make things abundantly clear to the American people who are watching at home. Democrats are here trying to reopen and pay the employees of TSA, members of the Coast Guard, folks who work at the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, and, of course, FEMA. That is right.

Democrats are trying to address the issues of security lines at airports and protect Americans from cyber attacks. We want to pay the brave women and men of the Coast Guard and to help

Americans rebuild after disasters. And Republicans are blocking these efforts one after another.

The question that is holding us all up, folks, is whether or not we, in this process, should hold ICE and CBP accountable with the same basic standards that apply to just about every other law enforcement agency in the country at the State level and at the local level—reforms that my colleague from Oklahoma said were common-sense.

I am glad to hear that from the Republican side of the aisle. So let's incorporate that into Federal statute. But they refuse to do so thus far.

Let's remember, ICE and CBP already have billions and billions of additional dollars from the Republican's so-called Big Beautiful Bill last year. So ICE and CBP are in zero danger of running out of money.

Who is at danger of running out of money? It is TSA. It is the Coast Guard. It is CISA. And it is FEMA. And so that is why Democrats have put these series of motions forward.

Now, in a minute here, my colleague from California Senator SCHIFF will ask for unanimous consent to pass a bill that we introduced together to pay the critical FEMA employees and sustain their essential operations for the rest of the year because we know how natural disasters act. It is not a matter of if; it is a matter of when the next one will strike. And whether it is a hurricane, a tornado, an earthquake, or a flood, we know it is coming. We just don't know where it is coming. And the Federal Government has an obligation to the American people to be ready to act on a moment's notice.

So let's give FEMA the funding they need.

I will defer now to my colleague from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, just over a year ago, Los Angeles County fell victim to the worst natural disaster in my lifetime. The Eaton and Palisade fires were unthinkable tragedies—lives taken; livelihoods incinerated; old photographs, family heirlooms, childhood homes gone forever; the homes of more constituents, friends, staff gone, along with the place where my wife and I got married; whole blocks of neighborhoods razed with indiscriminate and random destruction.

In the year since, alongside Senator PADILLA, I have worked to help the families impacted by these fires in every way I can. I visited recovery efforts in the earliest days of the fires, meeting with survivors and lending a hand where I could to help families grieving what these fires took from them.

My team and I have facilitated Federal, State, and local connections for these communities, trying to ensure they have the resources they need to recover. I have introduced legislation to help families better protect their

homes in the future and to bring down insurance rates.

But so much work remains. It has been more than a year since the fires, and Congress has yet to move forward on much needed Federal disaster aid for L.A. County. We have urged the President to act. We have called on Congress to act—just as we have with fires, hurricanes, and floods of the past in States red and blue—to pass a supplemental that gives us a fighting chance at building stronger than before.

Yet, for the first time, disaster relief is being apportioned not on the basis of need but on the basis of political affiliation, as if these fires discriminate between homes that voted for the President and those that did not. We have called on the President and this Congress to drop discrimination against California or other States based on no more than its political leanings, and we continue that call today.

But the lack of disaster aid for California and other States is not the only place where this Congress is failing to meet the needs of the American people. Right now, the very Federal Agency we call upon to facilitate disaster recovery, FEMA, is shut down. The Agency whose job it is to provide financial assistance to families and aid the recovery process until houses can be rebuilt and families can move back into their homes has no money from Congress to operate. As a result, this critical Agency, already understaffed, has an even more diminished capacity to help do these critical jobs.

This has gone on for weeks and is unacceptable, and that is what we are here today to change. With this legislation, we can reopen FEMA today. We can give paychecks to the people whose job it is to get Los Angeles and communities across the country back on their feet. We can remove unnecessary slowdowns in the approval processes, in recovery applications, because of the lack of staffing. We can put ourselves on a pathway to finally passing a disaster aid package.

Now, this is not the first time we have tried to reopen FEMA. Senate Democrats have tried to call up and pass legislation to open this Agency multiple times in recent weeks, but we have been told no. And why? Because my colleagues across the aisle continue to insist that this Agency and others—like TSA, the Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency, and the Coast Guard—cannot reopen until we pass another multibillion-dollar infusion of resources for ICE and CBP.

Senate Democrats have been clear: not another dime for these immigration enforcement Agencies until we see real reforms, until they take off the masks and put on the body cams, until they are held to the same standard as the neighborhood cop on the beat, until their standard of “no judicial warrant, no problem” is torn out of the training manual. That is not too much to ask.

In the aftermath of Americans watching DHS storming city apart-

ment buildings like they were behind enemy lines or ICE dragging citizens from their homes or CBP gunning down Americans in cold blood in the street, this cannot be too much to ask. We are seeing families torn apart, citizens detained without medical care, fathers and mothers, grandfathers and grandmothers, aunts and uncles, children detained because of the color of their skin or the language they speak or where they work. We have seen DHS spending \$140 million on assault weapons, Glockes, and tasers and countless more on building massive new detention centers.

So we are insisting on reform. We reject the false choice the majority would give us that we cannot reform ICE until we agree to give ICE billions more. These cannot be the only two choices.

Let’s pass this commonsense bill and reopen FEMA today. Let’s get disaster recovery efforts moving forward. We can do both. We can help Californians in need and others across the country.

So, Mr. President, as in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, on behalf of Senator PADILLA and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill at the desk to make continuing appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management pay and operations in the event of a Federal Government shutdown and for other purposes; that the bill be considered read three times and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

MR. LANKFORD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will be brief with some comments on this.

I just wish all that was so that was just stated. The White House presented a set of ideas on paper on reform, put them into legislative text, and handed them to Democrats 2 weeks ago—2 weeks ago—and said: Here are the reforms we would agree with that you have asked for: badges, body-worn cameras, deescalation training, process reforms—all those things they put out there. For 2 weeks, my Democratic colleagues have determined that politics is better than the actual solution, and so they have just said: Let’s do the politics.

The problem with politics on this is that a quarter million DHS employees are not being paid right now, so it doesn’t make good politics for them. They are trying to figure out how to feed their families.

By the way, again, I had a TSA agent from Oklahoma City—who do, by the way, a great job—say to me just last week: I feel like my paycheck is bipolar; I just never know whether it is going to be there or not. That is because my Democratic colleagues have shut down the government just over and over again as their protest against Trump. I get it. They don’t like Presi-

dent Trump. They voiced that. But I don’t know what my FEMA agents that are working on tornado relief in Oklahoma have to do with their frustration with ICE.

So they come to bring a proposal and to say: Well, FEMA has had a bias and President Trump has had a bias against California with FEMA. And I smile honestly and think: You know, last year—or a year and a half ago, I guess, now—President Biden’s FEMA instructed FEMA agents not to go to the houses in disaster areas that had a Trump yard sign in their front yard. So if you want to talk bias of FEMA, the Biden administration FEMA not going to help on disaster relief on houses that had a Trump yard sign—let’s talk bias. So I don’t agree with that at all.

Here is what we need to do: Stop this, sit down like grownups, and actually solve the problem—because this whole issue of “I will fund everything but ICE and CBP” doesn’t really work for the ICE and CBP families. I know you may be mad at them, but, you know what, those secretaries and those assistants and those folks that work in all those offices have lives and families as well.

Can I tell you what CBP does? It is not just border patrol. CBP also is managing what is happening at our ports of entry. Let me be specific on this. There are 9,000 CBP agents that work in California, and 2,000 of those CBP agents are working at the Los Angeles-Long Beach port of entry. They are handling the port stuff coming in and out right now. They are not dealing with border patrol. They are not dealing with ICE. But my Democratic colleagues say “We can’t fund CBP,” including those families that are in California at the Long Beach port. They have nothing to do with all of this. They just want to get a paycheck and to be able to know where they are going.

It has been very, very clear that if we don’t fund ICE and CBP—my Democratic colleagues have been very clear: We are not going to fund them. We see the strategy. The strategy is very clear. Those folks won’t be paid. They will eventually quit. And they will get what they want—no Border Patrol, no ICE—because all the families have quit.

So listen, I object to this, but I encourage this body to actually sit down and look at what the White House presented 2 weeks ago. Make a counterproposal if you disagree. Do something. But let’s get off the dime on this and actually get this resolved for those quarter million families.

I object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Louisiana.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

MR. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147, and let’s start the vote as we were supposed to do at 1:45.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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 Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147, a bill making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Mike Crapo, Marsha Blackburn, Bill Hagerty, Tim Sheehy, Roger F. Wicker, Susan M. Collins, Todd Young, Jim Banks, Bernie Moreno, Jon Husted, Eric Schmitt, John Hoeven, John Barrasso, Pete Ricketts, Roger Marshall, Katie Boyd Britt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 7147, a bill making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 54 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Banks	Fischer	Moody
Barrasso	Graham	Moreno
Boozman	Grassley	Mullin
Britt	Hagerty	Murkowski
Budd	Hawley	Paul
Capito	Hoeven	Ricketts
Cassidy	Husted	Risch
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cornyn	Johnson	Schmitt
Cotton	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lankford	Sheehy
Cruz	Lee	Sullivan
Curtis	Lummis	Tillis
Daines	Marshall	Tuberville
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fetterman	McCormick	Young

NAYS—46

Alsobrooks	Hirono	Sanders
Baldwin	Kaine	Schatz
Bennet	Kelly	Schiff
Blumenthal	Kim	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	King	Slotkin
Booker	Klobuchar	Smith
Cantwell	Lujan	Thune
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Gallago	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	
Hickenlooper	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—3

Blackburn Moran Shaheen

(Mr. DAINES assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 46.

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

The motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 673.

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 Anna St. John, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

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 senior assistant 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. 673, Anna St. John, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

John Thune, Bill Hagerty, Tim Sheehy, Jim Banks, Ted Budd, Katie Boyd Britt, Bernie Moreno, Tommy Tuberville, John R. Curtis, Mike Rounds, Pete Ricketts, John Barrasso, Kevin Cramer, James Lankford, Ted Cruz, Rick Scott of Florida, Mike Crapo.

Mr. THUNE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Vermont.

CUBA

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, last Friday, President Trump was quoted say-

ing that Cuba “is going to fall pretty soon . . . They want to make a deal so badly . . . and we’ll see how that works out.”

I agree that it is absolutely in the best interest of both countries to negotiate an agreement—a “deal” as the President calls them—but it needs to be a deal that puts the national interest of the United States and the national interest of the people of Cuba first.

To do that, we urgently need to do what the Vatican has called for, and that is a “dialogue-based solution to the problems that exist” between our two countries.

It has got to be a solution that stands the test of time, and it should, at a minimum, include the following: One, President Trump can end all restrictions on the right of Americans to freely travel to Cuba. The American and Cuban people should be able to freely interact with one another.

The President should offer maximum support for Cuba’s private sector by allowing direct foreign investment and development financing for Cuba’s struggling, but really essential, small businesses.

The President must remove Cuba from the list of state sponsors of terrorism. That designation has no legal basis. No other country agrees that it applies.

And the President must call on Congress to repeal the failed United States’ embargo of Cuba so that Cuba’s economic reconstruction can begin.

And President Trump should lift his punitive blockade of Cuban oil imports that has contributed to an unprecedented humanitarian crisis on the island.

And what about Cuba’s leaders? Cuba’s leaders should abandon central planning of the economy. It has been a disaster for the Cuban people, as it has been in every other country where it has been tried.

They should take the necessary steps so American companies can compete for contracts to invest in Cuba and help rebuild the country’s dilapidated infrastructure—but not like Cuba before the revolution, when the island was run as a corrupt playground for the rich and famous while average Cubans lived in squalor. Contracts must be transparent, and investors must be accountable.

Cuba’s leaders must release all political dissidents and accept the right of the Cuban people to express themselves freely, without fear of persecution.

And the United States’ and Cuba’s leaders should agree on a mechanism for resolving property claims.

Cuba is a small, bankrupt country. It has neither the capacity nor the intention to threaten the United States. And even before the Trump administration cut off oil from Venezuela and started blocking oil shipments to Cuba from other countries, electricity blackouts were common. And, today, electricity is unavailable—unavailable—for