

grid, and want to lower people's energy costs, support this resolution.

I thank Senators CORTEZ MASTO, WYDEN, and everyone who has shown leadership on this issue, and I want to thank my Democratic colleagues for leading the way.

Last week, Senate Democrats released our newest "Broken Promises" report, exposing how Donald Trump is driving up people's energy bills. Trump made a promise to the American people on the campaign trail: I will cut your energy bill in half. But has he done that? Of course not. Energy prices are up. And they aren't just up; they are rising and at triple the rate of inflation. Some States are seeing double-digit increases over the last year. And now, thanks to Donald Trump's idiotic war with Iran, gas prices are at \$4 a gallon.

We must put a stop to all of this today, and that is what this vote is all about.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE RELATING TO "BEGINNING OF CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS FOR PURPOSES OF THE TERMINATION OF CLEAN ELECTRICITY PRODUCTION CREDITS AND CLEAN ELECTRICITY INVESTMENT CREDITS FOR APPLICABLE WIND AND SOLAR FACILITIES"—Motion to Proceed

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 363, S.J. Res. 107.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 363, S.J. Res. 107, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Internal Revenue Service relating to "Beginning of Construction Requirements for Purposes of the Termination of Clean Electricity Production Credits and Clean Electricity Investment Credits for Applicable Wind and Solar Facilities".

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 70 Leg.]

YEAS—47

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

NAYS—53

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

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO PROCEED TO THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the cloture vote from March 12 on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147.

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

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147.

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

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to 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, Bill Hagerty, Marsha Blackburn, Eric Schmitt, James Lankford, Bernie Moreno, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Steve Daines, Josh Hawley, James C. Justice, Shelley Moore Capito, Kevin Cramer, Ashley Moody, Jim Banks, James E. Risch, Tim Sheehy, Joni Ernst.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a couple of

observations and remarks before this vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, let me just say that this obviously is a vote which we have had multiple times now. It is on the House-passed legislation that would fund the Department of Homeland Security in accordance with the agreement that was reached between Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate, some time ago.

But I would say, to reflect on it, there have been a lot of conversations over the past couple of days with respect to how do we get the Department opened up and funded again, and this vote will reflect the amendment that was proposed by Senator COLLINS and others that would fund all of DHS, except the Office of ERO.

So this is the one office that would be—that the Democrats have indicated, particularly over the weekend, this is what they had desired to see happen, and so this vote will reflect that particular provision that was put forward by Senator COLLINS. It is in response to what Democrats have insisted on and said that they wanted all along, which was to fund everything but the Office of ERO, the Office of Enforcement and Removal Operations at the Department of Homeland Security.

So this vote should reflect that, and I hope Members who are interested in getting all of these Agencies within the Department opened up would cast a "yes" vote when the opportunity comes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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, upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 71.]

YEAS—54

Armstrong	Budd	Cramer
Banks	Capito	Crapo
Barrasso	Cassidy	Cruz
Blackburn	Collins	Curtis
Boozman	Cornyn	Daines
Britt	Cotton	Ernst

Fetterman	Lankford	Risch
Fischer	Lee	Rounds
Graham	Lummis	Schmitt
Grassley	Marshall	Scott (FL)
Hagerty	McConnell	Scott (SC)
Hawley	McCormick	Sheehy
Hoeven	Moody	Sullivan
Husted	Moran	Thune
Hyde-Smith	Moreno	Tillis
Johnson	Murkowski	Tuberville
Justice	Paul	Wicker
Kennedy	Ricketts	Young

NAYS—46

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHMITT). On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 46.

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

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, I want to point out these are just texts that allow us to do certain motions here, and I don't need this for the moment.

I want to speak to you—honestly, speak to my Democrat colleagues—from the heart. We have a situation in America today in which 260,000 families are without a paycheck. This fiscal year, they have been without a paycheck for more than half of this year.

Now, in the private sector you look at it and say: Well, why would you not pay somebody? Typically, it is because they didn't do a good job, they didn't show up for work, they didn't punch in properly—and all of those things are very litigated, by the way, meaning, in a private business, if you don't pay somebody what they are entitled to make, you have something called a wage-and-hour lawsuit against you.

And yet, the third time in 6 months this body—this body—that is charged with a simple job, which is the power of the purse to appropriate money to fund the government, we have failed. And I get the political posturing: That side of the aisle would say it is our fault; this side of the aisle will say it is your fault.

I can tell you who, unequivocally, it is not their fault, and that is the men and women of the Department of Homeland Security who wake up every day and go to work; they do their job.

And by the way—you have been there, Mr. President, in your State of Missouri, St. Louis, you have seen them firsthand. Members of Border Patrol, Customs, immigration enforcement, CISA—you have seen them.

We see their work. What should we, as the body here, tell those families? In

fact, there is an expression that says: Explain it to me like I am a 5-year-old. And there are lots of 5-year-olds affected—grandkids, kids, siblings—that are wondering why they can't go to camp because their mom or dad wasn't able to write a check. I don't know what I would say if I were a dad.

You are a dad. You are a great dad, actually. I have seen you with your daughter. What do you say to her if you didn't have money to pay the bills, but you did everything right?

One thing I think would help bring us to the negotiation table is for us to get together and say: Look—I will use the same expression that I used the other day—let's eat our own dog food. If we are OK and we find it acceptable for 260,000 American families to go without pay, then isn't it reasonable for us to say that this body—and this body alone, the U.S. Senate, who makes four, five times as much as they do—for us to go without pay, that our pay be withheld?

Now, I will be honest. I think our pay should be docked, honestly, because that is what would happen in a private sector. We are not going to do that. I am just saying: Hold our pay.

By the way, this is not a bill that I am proposing; it is not a law; it is just a proclamation that says: Every Senator here, all 100 of us, can go to the clerk's office and say: You know what? We can blame whomever we want to blame, but do you know what? I am going to be in shared pain here. Hold my paycheck until we do our job.

What does doing our job mean?

And I look at the minority whip, I have gotten to know. I didn't know you before I came to DC. I think you are a good man, actually. I have had a chance to interact with you in different ways. I think this is a guy who is a serious guy, and he cares, and I know you deeply care about this immigration issue. I remember you telling the story about how you have your dad—I think it was your dad's—naturalization paper in your office. And that resonated with me because I have my naturalization paper in my office. So I know you care. You are a man of good integrity.

And what I am asking that we do is just be able to look ourselves in the mirror every morning when we comply with Senate rules—put on a jacket, put on a tie—come to work and say: Just hold our checks.

Because you know what we should do? Why don't we just get in a room and hash this out?

The way this negotiation has happened is nothing like I have ever experienced in my life. There is a conversation here, a conversation there, a conversation there, a conversation all over the place from 17 different places. Why don't we just get together and deputize one or two people on your side, deputize one or two people on our side, and let's just get this done? I think all of us—I hope, I hope, I actually hope—that we have the moral character in

our heart to say: It is just wrong not to pay 260,000 people.

And, look, let me just say this. If Renee Good or Alex Pretti were my children, I would be horrified. What happened was a terrible, terrible tragedy that two Americans lost their lives, but it is not the fault of the 260,000 people who are just following orders, the vast majority of the people who weren't even there. There are families that have never even been to Minnesota.

Again, explain it to me like I am a 5-year-old.

You go through Customs. I have been to your airport, by the way, at O'Hare—oh my gosh, that is an airport; that is a big one—and you are a TSA worker there or you are a Customs person there because there is lots of international flights. They go home and say: Dad, did you get your paycheck yet? Deposit is due for Disney World. Been planning this trip my whole life.

No, son. The U.S. Senate hasn't done that yet.

That is not right. It is just not right.

So I will make my first motion, and I don't know how persuasive I am. I am going to guess that I wasn't very persuasive.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 296, S. Res. 526; further, that the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

And what this means is that our checks get held back. We will get the money eventually, like DHS employees do, until we come to a resolution of this national disaster.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving right to object. I say to my colleague from Ohio, I believe you are sincere. I believe you want to find a solution. I share that feeling.

There is a provision in this, which I am not sure that you are aware of. It is very important. It is at the end of the second page, and it says about the effective date of this.

This section shall apply on and after the day after the date of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2026.

I don't want to wait until November, and I think that is an approach which puts that date in play. It really suggests that we are asking even greater sacrifice of the people who are being disadvantaged.

I will just tell you that eight times now we have brought to the floor a provision which would pay TSA, Coast Guard, pay all the divisions of the Department of Homeland Security, except for the ICE and enforcement divisions.

We can agree to that, and I believe the Senator from Oregon Senator MERKLEY is going to offer that.

Mr. MORENO. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. Oh, sure. Go ahead.

Mr. SANDERS. This is totally sincere. I think you are a good man. I really do.

I am probably not supposed to say that.

Mr. DURBIN. You are not supposed to say that.

Mr. MORENO. But I do believe it.

Would you consider modifying the resolution to take that piece out, just to make it clear, the paychecks while we are here, whatever the wording—that you and I sit down and we technically fix that wording so it basically says: During this period of time while DHS is not being funded? Can we just make that amendment and technical fix?

This is not my bill. It is Senator KENNEDY's bill. But would we be willing to do that because I don't want this to fall on a technicality?

Mr. DURBIN. At this point, I am going to object, and we can discuss many of the things which you brought up today. I would just tell you: You will have your chance, within an hour, to vote for JEFF MERKLEY's provision which will pay everybody working for TSA right now. So until you get that chance—and I hope you vote the right way—I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. MORENO. I appreciate the Senator from Illinois and his point of view. I will ask Senator KENNEDY to make those modifications, and we will come back out and fix it, but I appreciate, again, your willingness to engage in this conversation.

So let me offer another proposal, just a little bit different proposal. I think we can all agree that our job is—since we are getting paid, we should do it—is to work hard here and stay through whatever it takes, by the way. I would be willing to stay this weekend. I was here all last weekend. I will stay through Easter. I will stay through Fourth of July, whatever period of time it takes until we release the paychecks of 260,000 Americans.

So what I would like my Democrat colleagues to consider is to fund all of DHS, every single part of it, for 2 weeks—just 2 weeks.

We don't leave for Easter break. We spend every single moment together since we don't have planned meetings Friday, Saturday, Sunday for the next 2 weeks. Maybe we have codels and trips and family vacations, but I have a great and understanding wife. I am sure Democrat colleagues have the same thing, an understanding family—you have to, to do this job. And we stay here until we just get together and say: Hey, look. In a 2-week period of time, we can get there.

And I think there has been some negotiations that said: Hey, maybe we can address this. The White House has come to the table unlike any time I have ever seen. They have offered to codify tactics.

And I know, Mr. President, you personally are concerned about that be-

cause you know a lot about law enforcement. You were the attorney general of your State, and you know that if you put tactics into legislation, there is a lot of unintended consequences. You could have law enforcement breaking the law when, in reality, any of us would say: Oh, actually, they are doing the right thing. There is a judgment call. You can't be that granular. Things have to be reasonable.

So I think we can work out that language; it is just 2 weeks.

But here is what this resolution does, if my Democrat colleagues, all they have to do is stay silent. Think about the power. If my Democrat colleagues do not say a word, I don't know how long the Parliamentarian will wait—maybe 7 seconds. If she hears nothing for 7 seconds, for 7 seconds—think about this, for 7 seconds, silence—260,000 people get to go home tonight and tell their kids, their spouses, their brothers and sisters, their mom or dad: I am getting paid. They are retroactively paying me. They get paid for the next 2 weeks.

Nothing is—the world will still be here in 2 weeks. Politics will still exist in 2 weeks. We can beat the you-know-what out of each other for the next 2 weeks, but we have got 260,000 families that get to go home and just—have you ever been in a situation, Mr. President, where you just (inhale/exhale) and you feel like the world is better again—260,000 people, for 7 seconds or less—maybe, say, 3 seconds—just silence.

I hope that we can get there. And by the way, just to be crystal clear, because what I heard from the minority whip was that my colleague from Oregon was going to offer to fund TSA—this does that. This does that. This will fund every single TSA worker in America. Three seconds of silence gets every TSA worker paid, gets every Coast Guard person paid, gets every CISA person paid, gets every FEMA person paid, gets every Customs person, gets every Border Patrol person paid—3 seconds of silence.

Two weeks. Put the burden on us. You won't take away our paychecks. The Senator didn't agree to that. Will the Senator agree to not object, to just say: Let's pay TSA workers right now?

By the way, I think, if there is a chance that C-SPAN2 is on live at the airports and they saw you, Mr. President, say: Hearing no objection, done, Americans would cheer at airports all over America right now. St. Louis, Portland, Cleveland, Miami, Atlanta, for sure, would cheer. My God, TSA workers are going to get paid. Come back to work. We are so sorry. And we are going to spend 2 weeks—that is it, 2 weeks—not 2 years, not 2 months, 2 weeks—to sit down like grown men and women and do our jobs that pay us \$175,000 a year-plus, plus, plus.

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 at the desk 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 timing will start now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate that my colleague from Ohio has come to the floor and said: Wouldn't it be great if we ensure that a paycheck is written for 2 weeks?

I have a better idea. We have far more than 2 weeks left in this particular year. The funding year ends at the end of September, so we are talking about something closer to 26 weeks. While there might be a cheer for 2 weeks, there would also be a lot of dread, and people across the Nation would be going: So the proposal is to fund for 2 weeks while the majority sends us out for a 2-week break.

Mr. MORENO. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MERKLEY. Not until I finish my remarks, but thank you.

And so there are going to be two proposals by my colleague. And in response to one, I am going to suggest that we free TSA as a hostage.

TSA, right now, we are seeing hundreds of TSA agents quit because they are not being paid. We have seen thousands call in and say: I am not available for work today.

They are probably sick from the stress of not receiving paychecks. We can alleviate that completely for the rest of this entire year—this entire fiscal year—with a proposal I will put forward in a moment.

And then if my colleague has another proposal, well, we will consider that as well, but I will probably put forward a suggestion that we do all 26 weeks for TSA and FEMA and the Coast Guard and Cybersecurity.

See, the debate where pushes come to shove is over ICE and CBP, and it is because of the rules of engagement under which they have acted have been so extraordinarily aggressive, terrorizing our communities.

So the conversation still remains and is underway about ICE and CBP and the reforms.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. MERKLEY. When I am done with my remarks.

And so the key here is: Let's release these hostages because TSA is being held hostage by my colleagues across the aisle, and FEMA workers are being held as hostages—

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, point of order of the Parliamentarian: I would ask my colleague to remember rule XIX, in which you are analogizing me to a hostage taker. I find that offensive. I think that is in violation of rule XIX.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). I will remind everyone that no Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, and so I will just put forward the fact. I am not impugning anyone, just the fact that nine times Members of this body have come to the floor and asked unanimous consent to fund TSA.

And an additional 12 times, Members of this body have come to the floor and asked that we fund all four of those Agencies—the Coast Guard and FEMA and Cybersecurity and TSA. So let's not continue to hold these hostages. And TSA, right now, is the one we are—

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, again—again, Madam President—

Mr. MERKLEY.—completely focused on—

Mr. MORENO.—you have warned the Senator from Oregon. He has repeated the exact same statement. I believe rule XIX does now allow him to continue speaking if he is violating that standard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not find the statement by the Senator to be in the context that you are taking it.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you, Madam President. I will just cut to the chase here. Just as my colleague's heartfelt desire is to get those paychecks written, so I, too, want to see them written. At the moment, we see the TSA agents in high stress. Our airports are causing stress for people all through the Nation, so let's get that piece done right here, right now in this moment.

Therefore, I would ask the Senator to modify your request so the Senate instead proceeds to immediate consideration of Calendar No. 362, S. 4127; that the bill which funds TSA be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, the questions I was hoping the Senator would answer, so they would be more fresh in his mind, were: Is the Senator only suggesting right now, just to be crystal clear—crystal clear—a lot of people's lives are at stake here, by the way.

Let me just clarify that a 2-week continuing resolution would pay people retroactively. See, they are owed almost 40 days of pay. So this would pay them back the money we have taken from them for the last 40 days and give us 2 weeks, not 2 weeks of pay.

I just wanted to make sure he understood because maybe I misspoke. I wanted to make sure the Senator from Oregon didn't misunderstand what I said.

I was suggesting that we fund DHS, which retroactively pays 260,000 people; give us 2 weeks to get a solution; and

never ever do this to a single American family again.

It is a disgrace that we are doing this, and I am not impugning any—I am impugning all of us that we never do this—that we never allow a hard-working American to go without a paycheck because of our politics. I just want to make certain that the Senator understood that.

I also want to make certain that I heard the Senator properly because I don't think his speech matched the resolution.

Is the Senator—so this is a simple yes-or-no question. If the Senator doesn't mind, just give me a yes or no, if he wants to. He doesn't have to. I have the floor. But it is up to the Senator if he wants to answer yes or no, but I am going to frame it as a very simple yes-or-no question.

Is the Senator suggesting that we not also fund FEMA?

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, may I respond to my colleague's questions?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you. To his first question in which he sought to clarify that his proposal is retroactive—

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, I was yielding for a yes-or-no answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may answer.

Mr. MORENO. Is the Senator suggesting that we not also fund the Federal Emergency Management Agency? Is he suggesting that we not do that; yes or no? What is his response?

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, speaking to my colleague through the Chair in the ancient Senate tradition, the answer to that, as I already pointed out, is that I am going to offer two proposals: One, that we fully fund TSA, and we do it not for 2 weeks but we do it for the balance of this year through September 30.

Mr. MORENO. Thank you. The Senator answered my question.

Mr. MERKLEY. And second proposal—

Mr. MORENO. No, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, I have the floor. Thank you for the point of—

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, just because I am answering the question—

Mr. MORENO. Just—I have the floor.

Mr. MERKLEY.—I think I have the floor for a question.

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, would you please instruct the Senator from Oregon who has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. MORENO. Please, let's maintain decorum here. I think the American people deserve public officials, who are receiving paychecks while they are not, to have a semblance of decorum and class with each other. I hope that I have displayed that thus far.

Here is what is being proposed, just to be crystal—crystal—clear because this gets very fuzzy: I have proposed a 2-week continuing resolution that would retroactively pay every DHS employee and give us 2 weeks to negotiate.

And with my colleague from Oregon, whether intentional or not, what he is proposing in this modification request—in this modification request—I don't have a crystal ball or a time machine. I have no idea what you are going to propose later. God knows what that is. I have no idea.

But in this proposal, it is saying only fund the Transportation Safety Agency. I don't understand why we wouldn't take the opportunity.

So I am going to ask my colleague back: Would the Senator consider, in addition to funding TSA permanently for the rest of the fiscal year—I love that, by the way. Let's do that, absolutely. Can I have an amen? But in addition, fund the Federal Emergency Management Agency. It seems like a pretty good Agency to fund. These are the men and women that respond to disasters.

You have been there, Madam President, when they have responded to your disasters in your State of Iowa, right? I mean, you probably know these people are unbelievable. Let's fund them. Let's pay them. By the way, let's pay them and say thank you.

Then we look at Cybersecurity, an Agency called CISA. We love acronyms here. The Cybersecurity Agency. What do they do? They make sure that we don't have threats. We are in a major conflict with Iran; 60, 70 percent of them aren't working. Would the Senator also consider funding that? Seems like a good Agency.

Secret Service. Really important Agency. They keep the President of the United States safe. His threat level right now—if you have been to the White House, Madam President, my God, the threat level against the President of the United States right now is at a peak.

We are about to do FIFA, the soccer championship—although, that is also football, which is what we call it in Colombia, but we call it soccer here. We are going to need Secret Service here.

How about Customs? Should we not fund Customs? What is their job? Their job is to inspect packages coming in from other countries, process visitors to your State and my State. Why don't we fund them?

Let's go through here this chart. The Department of Homeland Security USCIS—ugh, another acronym. What do they do? They take people like me who apply to be a U.S. citizen and process my legal immigration status. I love this Agency. I thank them every day because they do a good job—3,300 people. Can we also agree to fund them?

How about this group, look at the name of this Agency: The biological and nuclear threat prevention Agency.

Can I have an amen to fund that Agency for the rest of the year and never ever, ever gamble with that threat?

Now, let's talk about this Agency here: Homeland—you can't read that, but Homeland Security Investigations special agents. If you think of the enforcement officers as the police officers, these guys are like the detectives. These are the guys that chase down the worst of the worst criminals—the guys that machete people's heads off, child traffickers, transnational gangs. These guys have gone without a paycheck the last 40 days, and they are still at the job chasing the worst of the worst. Would anybody here do that job? Would any of you like to put this little badge on and go chase Pablo Escobar on steroids? Because that is what they are doing.

And then let's look at this Agency down here. We talked about them: Customs and Border Patrol. I don't know. I am sure—my Senate colleague has been here a lot longer than I have, and that is true about most of the people here. I am sure he is familiar with Customs.

You know, I am a simple guy so, you know, those are the blue uniform guys. You come in from traveling and "Can I see your passport? Do you have anything to declare," right? Do we not want them on the job? We don't want Customs on the job?

And then Border Patrol. I don't just think we should pay Border Patrol for the rest of the fiscal year; I think we should give those guys a massive bonus. They have cut border encounters in this country by 98 percent.

So to my colleague, to summarize it all—we can skip a step; we are going to skip a step—would the Senator be willing to modify his proposal to adopt instead Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147, the DHS Collins amendment? It sounds very fancy, doesn't it? It funds all that stuff.

I have listened to speeches for the last 40 days, and my colleagues have come out saying: Fund this Agency; fund this Agency; fund this Agency. I am agreeing with them. I want them to accept yes for an answer. I want them to say: Yes, let's do it; let's fund all of DHS except for the one Agency that is not on there, which is the Enforcement and Removal Operations.

So to my colleague from Oregon who said you want to fund all these things—your words, not mine—for the rest of the fiscal year plus retro pay—would the Senator be willing to change his amendment to my proposal and instead substitute all of this with Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147, the DHS Collins amendment?

The Parliamentarian—is he able to respond to that, or do you need me to read the formal text here?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator modify his request for modification?

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, has my colleague from Ohio objected to funding TSA for the rest of the year?

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, I think I have the floor. English is my second language, so I sometimes speak too fast and maybe don't use the right language. So let me just be crystal clear again.

I am suggesting that we fund TSA for the rest of the fiscal year, retroactively pay every worker, and do that for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, for CISA, do that for Secret Service, do that for Customs, do that for Border Patrol, do that for Homeland Investigations, do it for USCIS—we love these guys—and do it for—definitely love these guys—the biological nuclear threat prevention Agency. That is—to be crystal clear—what I am saying.

So to answer your question: Does that include TSA? Yes, it does include TSA. This would fund TSA for the rest of the fiscal year.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, has my colleague from Ohio objected to—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio renewed his original request. Is there objection to that request?

Mr. MERKLEY. His objection is heard?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request from the Senator from Ohio, which he just renewed?

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I propose we fund TSA for the rest of the year. My colleague, as I understand it, has refused to agree to that; and, therefore, he has essentially objected. But he has asked for a modification.

I am happy to, at this very moment, propose that we go to a request which funds FEMA and the Coast Guard and Cybersecurity and TSA—essentially everything except ICE and CBP—and the other Agencies are fee funded. I am happy to go to that proposal if my colleague is willing to fund FEMA and Coast Guard and Cybersecurity.

But I think he has been well aware that he keeps putting a poison pill in here. He keeps asking for Customs and Border Protection to be funded without modifying how they are behaving across the Nation, and he keeps asking for ICE to be funded without modifying their actions when they are operating like a secret police.

That is why negotiations are underway with the White House—over that issue. So let's stop holding FEMA and Coast Guard and Cybersecurity and TSA hostage. And I am happy to put forward a proposal right now that would fund all four of those Agencies for the balance of this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, there is an old movie line that says: I think we have a failure to communicate. So let me try one last swing here to make sure that I make it crystal clear. By the way, I absolutely mean this sincerely, absolutely, with

total respect. I know that my Senate colleague from Oregon knows that DHS is more than four Agencies. I know he knows that.

So what I just want to clarify is: In this modification to my modification—yes or no—is the Senator from Oregon including USCIS?

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I think my colleague can check and see that that is a fee-funded organization.

Mr. MORENO. So the Senator does not want to fund USCIS?

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I think, if my colleague checks, he will find that USCIS is funded through fees. And let me explain what a fee is. A fee is when—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, he answered my question. I was 5 when I learned what a fee was. So the answer to that question is not including USCIS, which is odd because they do have an appropriations line in the appropriations bill, by the way. So the answer to that question is no. So no.

Here is what is ironic. My colleague from Oregon—you can't make this up—wants to not fund the people who are in charge of defending our borders and deporting criminal aliens but does not want to provide funding for the Agency that brings people here legally. Wow. That is a moment.

Let's go to this next one. Will the Senator from Oregon agree to fund the Homeland Investigations unit? In the Senator's proposal, does it include funding for HSI? Yes or no?

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, my colleague is engaged in a dialogue here that I would be happy to resume at another moment. He has rejected both my proposal to fund TSA—he has rejected my proposal to fund FEMA and Cybersecurity and TSA and the Coast Guard.

At this very moment, there is a ceremony going on to honor our police officers who protected this Capitol on January 6, and that is to honor a plaque that has been posted by the Senate, in a bipartisan way, and agreed to have put up when it was being hidden by the Speaker of the House in some closet.

And so I understand the points my colleague is making. I think the Senator understands the points I am making. I have countered his proposal with a proposal to fund TSA for the balance of the year. I countered his proposal to fund everything but ICE and CBP. And although the Senator has never said the words "I object," I understand he is objecting through his dialogue. If I misunderstand that, please let the Senator say now that he agrees to my proposals and we will be done with this conversation.

But I really think it would be good for both of us, in a bipartisan way, to go down and honor the officers that protected the Capitol.

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, so just to be crystal clear—because, again, this is getting a little deeply

ambiguous—is the Senator from Oregon suggesting that we fund the entirety of the Department of Homeland Security—everything, everything, everything, the entirety of Homeland Security—with the exception of Customs—the people who inspect packages, the people who greet people at Portland International Airport—and Border Patrol and Homeland Investigations and Enforcement and Removal Operations? Is that correct?

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, my understanding is the second proposal funds everything but ICE and CBP is my understanding of the Murray bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio agree to that modification?

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, I would agree to—we are almost there, but this is actually very important. We are making a lot of progress. And I think the plaque will be there for a long, long time.

So here is where we are at, just for a recap. We used to have 10 commandments in my company, and commandment 11 was: Thou shalt recap. So let's just recap where we are.

The Senator from Oregon, on behalf of the Democrat Party, is saying that he is willing to right now fund the entirety of the Department of Homeland Security—everything, every single Agency of the Department of Homeland Security, but—but—but is carving out the Customs and Border Patrol division and the entirety of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, which includes these guys, the guys who chase down bad guys.

So I would ask that the Senator take a look at the Collins amendment, H.R. 7147, Calendar No. 311. Let's include the guys that chase the really bad guys. I will agree to the Senator's proposal if he will include the guys who chase the really bad guys—Homeland Security Investigations—and include the guys who greet people at your airport. What the Senator is suggesting is: Don't pay the guy who screens people who are leaving—you want to pay them—but don't pay the people who are taking care of the people coming back in. This is backwards land. Let's fund everybody at the airport. So why wouldn't we fund Customs? In fact, why wouldn't we fund Customs, the guys in the blue—if you have an issue with Border Patrol, the guys in the green jackets—is that what the Senator is saying? You would agree to fund everybody but Border Patrol and Enforcement and Removal Operations? Because I think we are super close. We can finish this dialogue and bring peace and tranquility to 260,000 families.

Is the Senator willing to do that? Is the Senator willing to modify one little tweak just in between—we are there—saying: Hey, let's include HSI, and let's include the guys patrolling our border; let's include the Customs guys? Or are you saying: No; if we pay people at the airport who receive visi-

tors from foreign countries and the people who guard our border, who are doing an amazing job, and people chasing bad guys—because you won't fund those three things—I am saying: Well, good. We will put Enforcement and Removal Operations on the side. By the way, a \$5 billion haircut to this budget, why don't we just do that?

Will the Senator from Oregon accept that? Let's get this done, make the American people very happy, and have glorious news for a lot of American families that are looking—think of the power the Senator has right now, the power you have right now to feed 254,000 American families by the words that are going to come out of your mouth.

I would ask all of us to have the humility to understand how powerful it is, the Senator's next words, because your next words will provide the paycheck for 254,000 American families. Please. I beg you. Please. Please do the compassionate thing, and then we will work on ERO later.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, is that a question?

Mr. MORENO. Yes.

Mr. MERKLEY. I would be happy to answer the question. Twice when I have answered questions, my colleague has reclaimed the floor in the middle of it. Does he intend to actually let me answer the question this time?

He is not responding—

Mr. MORENO. Of course.

Mr. MERKLEY.—which means he is reserving the right to object when I get part way into the explanation to his question.

But let's be clear. Because of the sequence of events in which I proposed two modifications and he rejected two modifications—he rejected and objected to paying through the end of September the TSA. And then I proposed that we fund everything except for CBP and for ICE because those are the two issues under negotiation with the President, and he has again objected. And he is proposing a 2-week extension and then people don't get paid again.

So we are going to bring this to a close because essentially my colleague has asked me to participate in this debate. And it is very clever, and I have willingly done so; but I would think 26 weeks is a whole lot better than 2 weeks.

And so since my colleague objected to paying TSA, objected to paying everyone in Homeland Security except for ICE and CBP—because that is under negotiation with the House and with the President—I have objected to his 2-week extension.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, let's just spend 60 more seconds here to recap what we have. So my colleague from Oregon representing the Democrats—who has been given a lot of time to kind to figure out how to come here—has said that what the position

of the Democratic Party today is—to day's position—different Saturday, by the way; different Sunday. By the way, different than Monday morning in which the minority leader went on Joe Scarborough and said that it was President Trump who objected to the idea to fund all of DHS except for Enforcement and Removal Operations. And then, of course, I think President Trump was maybe a genius there—because maybe by him saying no on Sunday, it made the Democrats say yes. And then he said yes on Monday evening. Then the Democrats had to go back to no. Kind of crazy.

What we are doing is not going to fund for the rest of the fiscal year people who keep our country safe because they want to defund the people whose job it is to keep our borders secure and to deport people who broke into our country illegally, including murderers, rapists, transnational organizations. They do not want to fund those Agencies. I just want that to settle in here and point out to the Presiding Officer that what I proposed today—and the Presiding Officer voted yes—54 Republicans—sorry—53 Republicans and 1 courageous Democrat—54 voted for that.

All it would take is 6 Democrats, and 254,000 people would get their paychecks. It is a sad day. I will mark the time, 5:45 p.m. It is a sad day for the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

SENATE BILLS

Mr. JUSTICE. Madam President, you know, I have got to say just this: We have Medal of Honor recipients with us right now, and I fast-forwarded because I had this beautiful speech to give and all that stuff, and there have been some things happened that we will get to in just a second.

But if U.S. Army MG Patrick Brady, just please stand up, just one second, sir. If you would, just stand for just a second, sir.

And U.S. Army LTC William Swenson, please stand, if you would.

And U.S. Navy Command Master Chief Britt Kelly Slabinski, if you would please stand.

And U.S. Army SGM Thomas Payne, if you would stand, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the Senator to suspend momentarily.

Mr. JUSTICE. Madam President, if I violated the rule, it is because I am new to the game, and I don't know all the rules. But I want to thank them for their service in every way.

Medal of Honor winners—it is just unfathomable to think that those folks can grab a live handgrenade and try to throw it away from their comrades, to absolutely charge into enemy fire like you can't imagine.

And I think all the time, and I say to myself: You know, if I were in that situation, could I have that courage?