

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 240, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

House Message to accompany H.R. 240, an act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell motion to insist upon the Senate amendment, agree to the request by the House of Representatives for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH TO CONGRESS

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, our strongest and most loyal ally in the Middle East faces a growing existential threat under the specter of a nuclear Iran. I am deeply troubled that our President's solution won't work. Rather than enforcing punitive measures that would stem Iran's nuclear progress, this administration has opted for a policy of conciliation that does nothing to curb this growing threat. All the while, the threat to Israel grows stronger every day.

Now more than ever the Congress and the American people must stand with our Israeli allies to ensure the safety and security not only of our two nations, but the Middle East as a whole. Far from being a political stunt, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's speech to a joint session of Congress provides our Nation with a vital opportunity to demonstrate our unyielding resolve to stand with Israel and oppose Iran's development of nuclear weapons.

To demonstrate our solidarity with Israel, Congress should complement the Prime Minister's address with the threat of sanctions that properly secure both of our countries against the Iranian threat. We must achieve three commonsense objectives:

First, we must prevent Iran from developing or otherwise acquiring nuclear weapons.

Second, we should reaffirm that Iran does not have an inherent right to enrichment and reprocessing capabilities and technologies under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Third, we must seek to reverse the development of Iran's illicit nuclear infrastructure and bring Iran into com-

pliance with all United Nations Security Council resolutions.

President Obama has failed to realize that Iran poses a serious threat to the West, and our response to that threat must be equally serious. Prime Minister Netanyahu understands the precariousness of the current situation, and he is doing his best to help us here in the United States understand. As the Prime Minister stated: "I am going to the United States not because I seek a confrontation with the president, but because I must fulfill my obligation to speak up on a matter that affects the very survival of my country."

The Prime Minister has good reason to be concerned. According to the Heritage Foundation, since the Obama administration began to relax sanctions after an interim agreement was implemented, the Iranian economy grew by an estimated 4.6 percent in the first quarter of Iran's calendar year—the first time it has grown after shrinking for the last 2 years under sanctions.

As we lose leverage by relaxing sanctions, we must not forget the most likely reason Iran agreed to negotiations in the first place was economic restrictions. When the Iranian President Hassan Rouhani is reported to have said after the announcement of the Joint Plan of Action that "the centrifuges are spinning and will never stop," should we curtail our efforts in the one area that appears to give Iran pause?

Times such as these require strength of purpose, which is why we should clearly lay out a series of sanctions that will be imposed on Iran if negotiations fail. We should provide for short but reasonable periods of time for Congress, and, therefore, the American people, to consider if the Obama administration has succeeded in accomplishing the three objectives necessary to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

Tomorrow, the Congress will hear from Prime Minister Netanyahu. In his message, I believe, he will tell us how we together can confront the growing Iranian threat. This is the time to rally as one Nation with one of our strongest allies to ensure a safe and secure world.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

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

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, tomorrow we will gather in the House Chamber to listen to an address from Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. I welcome Prime Minister Netanyahu to Capitol Hill and eagerly await his speech. It is expected that he will paint a very vivid and very real picture of the danger a nuclear Iran

poses not just to Israel but to the international community as a whole. This threat seems of little concern to the administration—so little, in fact, that the President almost immediately dismissed the idea of meeting with Prime Minister Netanyahu while he is in Washington. This is disappointing, to say the least.

Instead of taking the opportunity to join with us to reaffirm our support for the State of Israel, the administration has chosen to send the wrong message to our strongest ally in the region. Unfortunately, this has become a pattern. While the administration's official policy has been supportive of Israel, actions speak louder than words, and regrettably this administration's actions are often too quiet. This has not always been the case. During his first term, President Obama fought Palestinian efforts to delegitimize Israel at the U.N. He made clear that such tactics were counterproductive to the peace process and that the Palestinians would put their relationship with us in jeopardy if they sought action against Israel at the International Criminal Court.

Many Israelis are rightfully concerned that we will not have their backs when the Palestinian Authority becomes a full member of the International Criminal Court and follows through on this threat. I raised this issue with Secretary Kerry during an Appropriations Committee hearing last week, reminding him that the law explicitly prohibits funding for the Palestinian Authority if they initiate or actively support an International Criminal Court investigation into alleged Israeli war crimes. The Secretary said that the Palestinian Authority's actions amounted to a "terrible exercise in judgment" but stopped short of saying they have violated the law in a way that triggers the cutoff of aid.

Three-quarters of this body—Republicans and Democrats alike—don't see it that way. We sent the Israeli people a strong bipartisan message of support when we called on Secretary Kerry to suspend economic aid while the State Department reviews the Palestinian Authority's actions. According to Secretary Kerry's response at the hearing, the State Department will wait to see what the Palestinians do after the first of April before making a decision on economic aid. By then it might be too late.

This is exactly why the people of Israel are uneasy with the ongoing nuclear negotiations. The same administration that once spoke out forcefully against these types of tactics now plays a game of wait-and-see with the Palestinians, somehow expecting them to be an honest partner this time around.

Israel's lack of confidence in the administration's support is certainly understandable. Let's not forget that this same administration employs high-level officials who publicly disrespect our ally, including at least one willing

to use derogatory language to call Prime Minister Netanyahu names during a media interview. Every time that happens, the administration carries on as though these breaches of diplomatic protocol are irrelevant to the U.S.-Israeli relations. The administration sees these actions as having no bearing on the deteriorating state of relations between the two heads of state. Yet, if Prime Minister Netanyahu dares to speak up, the administration labels Israel a problem child—case in point: the President's National Security Adviser calling this upcoming address from Prime Minister Netanyahu “destructive of the fabric of the relationship.” Accepting an invitation from the Speaker of the House to address Congress on the severity of the nuclear threat posed by the regime in Tehran is only destructive for U.S.-Israeli relations in the President's eyes because he wants to keep Congress in the dark about the ongoing negotiations. This administration seems intent on doing just that.

Not content with the message the Prime Minister is likely to deliver, the administration has moved from actively trying to subvert his address to Congress. According to the Associated Press, the Obama administration is actively considering ways to undermine the Prime Minister's visit. Why is that? Could it be that the Prime Minister sees the flaws of any agreement the Paris talks will yield, and does the administration want to keep this from Congress?

As the talks extend on and Tehran engages in more delay tactics, it is apparent that the Obama administration is pursuing a weaker deal with Iran that will allow the country to continue its illicit nuclear program. This agreement has become a must-win for President Obama, so he is willing to concede key requirements that Congress and members of his administration have previously outlined in order to get the Iranians to sign on the dotted line. Any agreement will be a victory in the Obama administration's eyes.

Our longstanding policy that the Iranian regime must abandon its nuclear ambitions is itself being abandoned. As former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger noted in his recent testimony to the Armed Services Committee, the Paris talks have long moved from eliminating Iran's ability to enrich uranium to limiting and monitoring a smaller program that would be unable to produce the material for a warhead in less than a year's time. This is a far cry from the starting point Secretary Kerry once argued when he said: “No deal is better than a bad deal” with Iran. Now we seem to be moving the goalposts from the dismantling of Iran's nuclear program to containing it. That is not what the President told us these talks were going to accomplish. That is not what six U.N. resolutions intended to prevent. That is certainly not something this Congress should allow to happen without our say.

Nothing short of full elimination of Iran's nuclear program could honestly be considered a victory. If these talks fail to produce an agreement that requires that of Iran, Congress must have the authority to reject it.

With that, I yield the floor.

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

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, in an hour and a half the Senate will vote on the House request to go to conference on the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. This push by House Republicans to go to conference is the very definition of an exercise in futility. I have been very clear for days now that we will not go to conference. The majority knows that, and the Speaker of the House knows that. Senate Democrats will not support going to conference because it would be totally counterproductive.

House Republicans have no intention of using that conference to craft legislation that will pass both Houses of Congress, and in so doing they would make sure we had a shutdown of Homeland Security, and that would be very bad for the country.

House Republicans want to take a bill that they negotiated, a bill that was written by House and Senate Republicans and Democrats last December—it was a bipartisan, bicameral bill, and now they want to take that bill and turn it into something that cannot pass. That won't happen. We will not be a party to yet another charade by House Republicans because that would inevitably shut down Homeland Security and put our Nation at risk—and that is an understatement.

The Senate should reaffirm our bipartisan vote last Friday for a clean bill to prevent a shutdown. We had 68 votes. We can do it again, and we should do it again. That vote will happen at 5:30 p.m. this afternoon.

I yield the floor.

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

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to insist upon the Senate amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees with respect to H.R. 240, an act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, John Barrasso, Bob Corker, Susan M. Collins, Michael B. Enzi, John Hoeven, John McCain, Lamar Alexander, Lindsey Graham, Shelley Moore Capito, Deb Fischer, Thad Cochran, Orrin G. Hatch, Joni Ernst, John Boozman.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH TO CONGRESS

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, during the 2012 Presidential campaign, President Obama made a claim. His claim was: “I have Israel's back.” This week President Obama and his administration are turning their back on Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu, and they are doing it right here during the Prime Minister's visit to Washington.

While he won't have a meeting in the White House, he will have a very supportive audience right here on Capitol Hill. The Prime Minister will receive a warm welcome from Members of Congress who are concerned about Israel's security and the value of this very important relationship.

In his speech to Congress tomorrow, the Prime Minister is going to address the ongoing negotiations with Iran over illicit nuclear programs. If President Obama's past negotiations with our adversaries are any guide, Israel is right to be apprehensive. The Obama administration started negotiating with Iran more than five years ago. A series of increasingly tough sanctions have damaged the Iranian economy and have finally convinced them to discuss their nuclear program seriously. In 2013 the President announced his 6-month interim agreement. The United States would suspend enforcement of some of the sanctions that had brought Iran to the table. In exchange the Iranians would freeze and reverse specific elements of their nuclear program. This was supposed to provide time for a final agreement to be negotiated within a year. That 6-month interim agreement has now extended to 17 months.

President Obama mishandled these negotiations from the very beginning

by conceding Iran's right to enrich uranium. In my opinion the President is compounding the problem as he chases the comprehensive agreement maybe to justify his Nobel Peace Prize. Information has leaked out occasionally about the negotiations. Each time there seems to be another point on which the United States has given in to the Iranian position. Iran has gotten about \$10 billion in much needed hard currency since signing the interim agreement. It has gotten additional income from the suspension of other sanctions. We have no way to stop Iran from using this money to support terrorists around the world or to prop up Bashar al-Assad in Syria.

What I heard, along with a number of Senators who went to Saudi Arabia a little over a month ago to meet with some of the Free Syrian Army, is that the freedom fighters from Syria who had come down to Saudi Arabia to meet with us said that this is exactly what Iran is doing with some of the money gained from the relief of sanctions. They are using it to prop up al-Assad and also to fund Hezbollah and Hamas.

The Obama administration has said its goal is to keep Iran 1 year away from being able to construct a nuclear weapon. That is the same level the administration said Iran was at in 2013 when sanctions were still fully in force. Apparently, the Obama administration is aiming for a final deal that suspends sanctions on Iran and does not constrain its nuclear program any more than it was before the interim agreement.

Let me be clear. If the Obama administration allows Iran to continue with its illicit nuclear program, the global community will be less safe, less stable, and less secure. Any treaty that we sign with Iran must be accountable, enforceable, and verifiable. So far, it doesn't appear to me that the Obama administration is negotiating a deal that would meet that standard.

The administration has also undermined Israeli security in other areas as well, specifically, when it comes to Middle East peace negotiations with the Palestinians. U.S. law prohibits sending any money to international organizations that admit the Palestinians as a state. The idea was to support the peace talks by letting the two sides work out their differences without others putting their thumb on the scale. So it was a problem when the Palestinians sought and received recognition as a full member state in the United Nations group UNESCO. This happened in 2012. That is the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. The Palestinians triggered that law, and that stopped U.S. money from going to UNESCO. In every budget request since, President Obama has tried to restore the money in spite of the law. This would excuse the Palestinians and the United Nations from the consequences of their actions. It sends a signal that the United States does not, in fact, have Israel's back.

Vice President BIDEN said: "Don't tell me what you value. Show me your budget, and I'll tell you what you value."

By that standard, it is obvious that President Obama does not value supporting Israel in the international peace negotiations. National Security Advisor Susan Rice said just last week that Prime Minister Netanyahu's visit is too partisan and "destructive of the fabric of the relationship" Israel has with the United States.

Members of Congress disagree. We welcome the Prime Minister. We are eager to show our support, and Republicans will continue to push for additional sanctions to keep the pressure on Iran. We intend to do all that we can to ensure that the vital alliance between the United States and Israel remains strong.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time under the quorum calls this afternoon be equally divided.

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

Mr. BARRASSO. I yield the floor and 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. COATS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Madam President, last week I came to the floor to launch what I have called Waste of the Week. I will put my prop up here. Waste of the Week is designed to provide awareness in simple ways to our colleagues here, how we can look at government spending that doesn't stack up in terms of something that is needed. Perhaps it was needed at one particular time, or perhaps it is something the taxpayers shouldn't be paying for in the first place.

I would like to raise awareness, and I am going to do that each week. This is my second week. This evening I wish to present the second Waste of the Week. Last week we talked about the \$6 billion that could be saved if we simply fixed a program that was duplicating checks to taxpayers who only qualified for payments from one of those programs, not both. If you are disabled and can't work, you can qualify for Social Security disability. Alternatively, you can qualify for unemployment insurance if you can work, but you are not able to find a job. You can qualify for unemployment insurance, but you can't get both. You either can work, or you can't work. Here are two Federal programs that shockingly cost the taxpayers \$6 billion.

This is the second week of Waste of the Week, and I would like to talk about duplication in government. While it is a little harder to put a spe-

cific fiscal number on the savings, clearly we can save the taxpayer money and start this process. We can do this even in small ways to reduce our debt and deficit and not load all this debt on our children and grandchildren. We have tried the big stuff for years, and I was directly engaged as much as I possibly could be the last 4 years, all to be rejected by the President. Let's at least look at the smaller stuff and do something to get started with this process of getting us back on track to fiscal health.

What we have found is there are 52 separate programs that provide workplace training, financial instructions, and preparation for people so they can find a job—52 separate programs. You have to ask yourself, how in the world did we ever get to 52? I think some stems from good intentions. They'll say let's get a training program put together through some agency in the government that can better prepare people for employment and job opportunities.

The Small Business Administration puts one together, and the Department of Agriculture says we ought to have a training program, the Department of Commerce says we should have a training program, and then a Member of Congress says, you know, that is a good idea, I would like to propose that, too.

Over the years we have come up to 52 programs that provide workforce training. Obviously, this is ripe for reform and there should be consolidation for the benefit of the taxpayer.

I was pleasantly surprised to learn the President's 2016 budget incorporates a measure that doesn't deal with all 52, but it starts with 6 major programs and recommends consolidation. I am not often standing here on the Senate floor commending the President for taking a positive step in dealing with our debt and deficit. He refused to do that on any kind of major basis in the last 4 years. But here is his 2016 budget, we can start with six programs to consolidate that—programs that primarily do business and trade—affect business and trade agencies as well as other related programs.

I am quoting from the budget, "integrating the Government's core trade and competitiveness functions into one new Department." Well, surprise of surprises, I am here promoting something the President has put in his budget.

Let me specifically state what these consolidations would affect. It includes the Department of Commerce's core business and trade functions. It includes Small Business Administration programs, the Office of U.S. Trade Representative, the Export-Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and the U.S. Trade and Development Agency. Each of these six, as outlined by the President's budget, can be consolidated into one program.

What does that save? It means saving on all the rent or the purchase or the cost of the property for the government to house six different programs

with six different administrators, six different sets of employees and bureaucrats and personnel, computers, phone costs—on and on it goes. They continue to metastasize and grow.

Now let's put a price on this so I can add this to my thermometer here. We're in the process of trying to save the taxpayer \$100 billion and last week we came up with \$5.7 billion of savings. This week it is much smaller at \$200 million, though it is not chump change. It is \$200 million estimated savings by consolidating these 6 programs. Around here that is deemed a small number. To the people I represent in Indiana, that is a lot of money. We say, well, the government is spending that? No, the government is spending taxpayer money to provide duplication of programs. We think it will ultimately save a lot more as we go forward and define additional consolidations down the line.

We are going to put a little more red on the chart to represent savings. This thermometer will keep rising and rising as I come down here and present the Waste of the Week. Mr. President, \$200 million in savings can be achieved simply by consolidating programs that are duplicating each other in terms of what they are providing.

We can't solve all of our country's debt and deficit problems overnight, but we can take needed steps to identify those that the government's own accounting agencies—independent of Republicans and Democrats—have identified as wasteful money. Let's get this money back to the taxpayer. Let's eliminate this money to reduce our debt so our children and grandchildren don't have to pony up more and let's end up with a much more efficient and effective Federal Government.

With that, I finish this week's Waste of the Week and look forward to being here next week for another iteration.

I yield back my time, if there is any left.

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

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

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, this weekend the United States will mark the 50th anniversary of the march from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama. Those of us who are not old enough to remember 50 years ago have read the history. Those of us who were old enough at that time saw what happened at that historic march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge five decades ago. Scores of courageous Americans refused to be

silent about the need for equal protection under the law. This was a case where their blood, sweat, and tears helped move our Nation toward a more perfect union. One of those who actually shed blood—in fact, nearly died on that march for freedom and equality—is one of my closest friends in Congress, Congressman JOHN LEWIS of Georgia.

Last Thursday I was so proud when Congressman LEWIS came to the Senate Judiciary Committee room to see a vote on the historic nomination of Loretta Lynch to serve as our next Attorney General. He said he was compelled to come because this was no ordinary markup and this is no ordinary confirmation. When the Senate finally confirms her, Loretta Lynch will be the first African-American woman to serve our country as Attorney General.

She is extraordinarily qualified for the job. The letters and testimony I have received from law enforcement and both Republican and Democratic prosecutors attesting to how good she is, are amazing. I urge the Senate to consider her nomination immediately and confirm her this week. She has waited much longer than any modern nominee ever has for this position.

But as I urge her confirmation, I cannot help but reflect on the fact that Ms. Lynch's confirmation will be another step toward realizing Dr. Martin Luther King's dream that people in our country would be judged by the content of their character. Loretta Lynch's life epitomizes that dream.

She was born in Greensboro and was raised in Durham, NC. She is the daughter of a fourth-generation Baptist preacher and a school librarian. I have met Reverend Lynch. He is an amazing and inspiring man. Her parents instilled in her the American values of fairness and equality, even when those around them were not living up to those values. Ms. Lynch has spoken about riding on her father's shoulders as a child to their church, where students organized peaceful protests against racial segregation. The freedom songs and the church music that went hand-in-hand with those protests undoubtedly made up the soundtrack of her childhood. The Judiciary Committee was honored to have her father, Reverend Lorenzo Lynch, with us not only at both days of her historic hearing in January but also with us last Thursday as the Committee considered his daughter's nomination.

Throughout Loretta Lynch's life, those who encountered her intelligence and tenacity have not always been prepared to accept her and her impressive accomplishments. But each time they didn't accept it, the content of her character has shone through and led her to even greater heights.

In elementary school, administrators did not believe that Loretta Lynch could score as high as she did on a standardized test. They demanded that she retake the test. She did, and she scored even higher the second time. In

high school she rose to the very top of her class, which would have made her the first African-American valedictorian. School administrators, however, decided that even though she had earned the title, it would somehow be too controversial. So, they decided she must share the honor with two other students, one of whom was white, even though she was the one who scored the highest. This didn't hold her back. She kept going forward. She went on to graduate with honors from Harvard College and then earned her law degree from Harvard Law School.

This has been the story of Loretta Lynch's life. While some are not ready to embrace her distinction, she just marches forward with grace to prove that she is even stronger and more qualified than her detractors can imagine. Even though she was required to be better than those who were holding her back, she didn't let that stop her. She just kept going forward. She has dedicated the majority of her remarkable career to public service and we are fortunate as a nation that she wants to continue to serve.

The President of the United States announced that Loretta Lynch would be nominated to be our Nation's chief law enforcement official on November 8th.

Right after this announcement, Senate Republicans made clear that despite the urgent challenges facing this country, they would object to even begin consideration of her nomination during the lame duck period. So Loretta Lynch's historic nomination waited. As she prepared for her confirmation hearing, she stayed focused on her current position and continued to lead a dedicated team of prosecutors to bring terrorists and serious criminals to justice in New York.

Ms. Lynch was finally called before the Judiciary Committee at the end of January. She had more poise and credibility than any nominee I have seen in my four decades in the Senate. Any reasonable observer of her hearing, which lasted almost 8 hours, would conclude that she was beyond impressive and that she possesses the leadership, intellect, and wisdom needed to help keep our country safe. After the hearings, Republicans submitted an unprecedented number of written questions to Ms. Lynch, even though every member had been allowed ample time to ask live questions at her hearing. Even members who had already publicly declared that they opposed her confirmation continued to submit scores of questions.

But now, 114 days have passed since Ms. Lynch was nominated. She has been made to wait longer than any one of the previous five Attorneys General—five Attorneys General in both Democratic and Republican administrations. And for what reason? So that those who have already said they oppose the nomination can try to score additional political points? When Ms. Lynch is told she must continue to

wait longer than any of the modern Attorneys General, that she must wait for her confirmation vote, I am reminded that those dedicated to the fight for civil rights have long heard their detractors tell them: Just be patient. We can't give you your rights yet. Just be patient. Just wait your turn.

Well, come on. No Member of this body—of either party—would ever stand for anyone saying: Notwithstanding your qualifications, wait your turn.

Ms. Lynch grew up hearing her family's stories about the Jim Crow South. She knows the meaning of injustice. She would never compare the partisan political games being played with her nomination to the epic struggles her family faced.

But as we in this Chamber reflect this week to honor those Americans who marched in Selma and the role our Department of Justice played in the civil rights movement, it should not be too much to ask just how much longer Loretta Lynch has to wait. How much longer does this woman have to wait before she can become the next U.S. Attorney General? In these perilous times, our Nation deserves to have its chief law enforcement officer considered without further delay.

At the Judiciary Committee's markup last week, Senator DURBIN spoke passionately about the "solemn, important, and historic moment" before us in considering Ms. Lynch's nomination. His comments were moving, and they appealed to our responsibility as Senators to uphold the Constitution and provide advice and consent on the President's nominees. We can do so this week by confirming Loretta Lynch.

We have played politics with too many things already in the young days of this 114th Congress. From the spending bill the House Republicans refused to take up to fund the Department of Homeland Security, to the nomination of this highly qualified woman to serve as the Nation's chief law enforcement officer, we can no longer put national security at risk just for the sake of a few talking points or a second or two on a television program.

So I call on my friend, the majority leader, to simply set a date for her confirmation. Do not leave the American people wondering if this extremely qualified woman will get a timely vote. Treat her like every previous Attorney General nominee. The Nation faces too many challenges to play politics with this important nomination.

Too long some in this body have told her: You have to wait. You have to wait your turn. You have to wait.

No, she has proven her qualifications. She shouldn't have to wait any more than those who went before her. Set an up-or-down vote. Let's confirm her nomination.

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.

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

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

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, here we are again where we were last Monday with about 5 days left before funding runs out for the Department of Homeland Security. So if it feels like "Groundhog Day," it is because it is "Groundhog Day," and we just can't keep playing those kinds of games with this agency's funding.

Those who are blocking action on the funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security have a clear choice: Are they going to prioritize politics or are they going to prioritize national security?

Last Friday the Senate passed a bill with 68 bipartisan votes—a bill that fully funds the Department of Homeland Security without any controversial riders attached to the bill. I am ever hopeful that the House will follow our lead and immediately take up that clean Senate bill. We cannot, we should not replay the chaos we saw last week. The brinkmanship really needs to end. It is time for Congress to pass the Department of Homeland Security funding bill.

Whether it is threats to the Mall of America in Minnesota, plots foiled by DHS and the FBI in New York City, attacks on our cyber networks, or threats at our Nation's borders, we live during a time when the safety and security of this country are at risk. We cannot play politics with the agency that is tasked with keeping us safe, and we shouldn't play politics with the funding that supports our first responders—the very people who are there anytime something happens in our States and our local communities. What must our enemies think when they see Congress fighting over whether to keep the Department of Homeland Security open?

Last week DHS Secretary Jeh Johnson wrote a letter to the congressional leadership, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter from Secretary Johnson.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELAND SECURITY,

Washington, DC, February 26, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, MINORITY LEADER REID, AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: Thank you for your leadership and efforts to pass a clean, full-year appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security. As you know, our funding expires tomorrow at midnight. I

write to explain to Members of Congress the real and substantial consequences of a failure to pass a full-year appropriations bill by that deadline.

As an initial matter, it must be noted that a potential shutdown of the Department comes at a particularly challenging time for homeland security. It is stunning that we must even contemplate a shutdown of the Department in the current global context. The global terrorist threat has become more decentralized and complex. Terrorist organizations are now openly calling for attacks on Western targets. Yesterday's arrests in New York City highlight the threat of independent actors in the homeland who support overseas terrorist organizations and radical ideology. We are working hard to stay one step ahead of potential threats to aviation security. Last year at this time, the spike in migrant children began to appear at our border; we are deployed to prevent this situation from recurring, and to address it aggressively if it does. The Nation is in the midst of a very cold, harsh winter, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency is working with states impacted by record snowfalls.

Here are just some of the consequences for homeland security if the Department's funding lapses and we shut down:

First, about 170,000 employees will be required to work, but will not get paid for that work during the period of a shutdown. This includes our Coast Guard, Border Patrol agents, Secret Service agents, Transportation Security Administration officers, and others on the front lines of our homeland security. These working men and women depend on biweekly paychecks to make ends meet for themselves and their families. For them, personally, work without pay is disruptive and demoralizing. Even worse for our people are the public statements by some that make light of a shutdown, which disregards DHS employees' personal sacrifices and dedication to our Nation's security.

Second, approximately 30,000 men and women of the Department must be furloughed and sent home without pay. Our financial management, human resources, procurement and contracting, and information technology teams—the institutional backbone of the Department—will be reduced by 90 percent, from over 2,000 to just 208 people. My own immediate headquarters staff will be cut by about 87 percent. Our Science and Technology team, which is intensely focused on developing non-metallic explosive detection capabilities as well as other technologies to counter threats to aviation, will be cut 94 percent, from 448 to 26 people. Our Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, which is our Nation's primary research and development lead for development of advanced nuclear detection technologies and technical forensic capabilities, will also be cut 94 percent, from 121 to just 7 people.

Third, contracting services across the Department, including those for critical mission support activities, will be disrupted and/or interrupted altogether. Depending upon the length of a shutdown, contract awards and major acquisitions could be impacted. In the event of a shutdown, negotiations to construct the United States Coast Guard's 8th National Security Cutter will be delayed, potentially leading to an increase in costs.

Fourth, our \$2.5 billion-a-year grant-making to state, local, tribal, and territorial governments, to assist them in preventing, responding to or recovering from terrorist attacks, major disasters and other emergencies, remains at a standstill (it has already stopped because the Department is currently funded by a Continuing Resolution). Of particular note, the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Emergency Management Performance Grants, which

contribute 50 percent of the salaries of state and local emergency management personnel, cannot be funded.

Fifth, public assistance disaster recovery payments to communities affected by previous disasters will grind to a halt. Though these payments are funded with prior-year money, the Federal Emergency Management Agency's staff that processes them must be furloughed.

Sixth, depending upon the length of a shutdown, DHS will no longer be able to support state and local authorities with planning, safety, and security resources for special security events such as the Boston and Chicago Marathons.

Seventh, depending upon the length of a shutdown, work to complete construction of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility in Kansas, which will replace the aging 1950s-era Plum Island facility in New York, could be disrupted.

Eighth, new hires across the Department must be halted, disrupting critical missions to secure the border, protect millions of daily airline passengers, strengthen security at the White House, and deploy new ICE investigators. Routine attrition hiring would cease across the Department, seriously undermining our homeland security frontline staffing needs. Our plans to increase CBP staffing at our ports of entry by 2,000 officers, and to maintain the Transportation Security Administration's workforce of airport screeners and air marshals will be undermined. Our plans to hire additional Secret Service uniformed officers and special agents will also be disrupted.

Ninth, without funding, all training at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers will cease. Up to 2,000 local, state, and federal law enforcement trainees from across the country will be sent home.

Finally, as I have noted many times, mere extension of a continuing resolution has many of the same negative impacts. A short-term continuing resolution exacerbates the uncertainty for my workforce and puts us back in the same position, on the brink of a shutdown just days from now.

I urge Congress, as soon as possible, to pass a clean, full-year Fiscal Year 2015 appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

The American people are counting on us.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
Secretary.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, the following is a quote from the letter the Secretary wrote:

It is stunning that we must even contemplate a shutdown of the Department in the current global context. The global terrorist threat has become more decentralized and complex. Terrorist organizations are now openly calling for attacks on western targets.

The Secretary also noted how taxing the current funding crisis has been on the agency and the employees who put their lives on the line every day to protect the Nation. He said the following in his letter:

These working men and women depend on biweekly paychecks to make ends meet for themselves and their families. For them, personally, work without pay is disruptive and demoralizing.

I can't imagine anyone here thinks people should be expected to go to work—many of them putting their lives on the line—without getting paid. Last week DHS officials had to prepare shutdown plans. They had to give em-

ployees notice that they might be furloughed or they might not get paid.

At a time when resources should be spent protecting the Nation, spending them dealing with a possible shutdown just doesn't make sense. None of us would run our households that way. The private sector doesn't run business that way. We shouldn't run government that way. Instead of focusing on critical missions such as securing the border, counterterrorism efforts, and maritime security, DHS officials have been consumed with the threat of a shutdown of their agency. That is not the way we should be doing business. It is making our Nation less safe.

It is time for the House to end this brinkmanship. It is time for the House to vote on the bipartisan bill the Senate passed last week. We came together in the Senate under the leadership of Senator MCCONNELL and Senator REID, and I applaud their working together across party lines to pass a bill that funds DHS for the rest of the year. That is what the American people expect of us. They expect us to work together to address the challenges facing this country. They want us to get things done, not to play politics and certainly not to jeopardize our country's safety and security.

I hope that the House will follow the Senate's lead, that they will pass a bipartisan bill to keep the Department of Homeland Security on the job for the remainder of this year.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, this afternoon we will vote on whether to go to conference on H.R. 240. For Senators who want to return to regular order, this is their chance. Regular order is the opportunity to offer, to have debate on, and to vote on amendments.

We have already established on earlier legislation that the majority party is willing to return to regular order and to offer an open amendment process. So part of establishing that regular order process is, as I say, the opportunity to offer amendments, to have a debate, and to vote. It is that process which should and has historically produced the best legislation not only here in the Senate but in the House—in this Congress—on behalf of the American people.

Another part of regular order, though, is conference committees. When the House passes a bill and the Senate passes a bill and there are differences in the bill, how do we resolve the differences in the bill? We go to a conference committee. So that is what is before us right now. This vote is simply to send H.R. 240 to a conference committee so the House and the Senate can work on the legislation.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle filibustered H.R. 240. Only when amendments were limited to one amendment did they allow us to proceed to the bill. That is unfortunate,

but clearly it was done to protect the President's Executive order on immigration.

The irony is that the President's overreach should not be a partisan issue. Our forefathers created a system of checks and balances in our Constitution to protect the rights of our citizens. The legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches all have a role to play in this system of checks and balances. When one branch exceeds its authority, the others have an obligation to check that overreach, an obligation to protect the rights of our citizens.

That is exactly what has happened in this situation. The President's Executive order on immigration exceeds his authority as the leader of the executive branch. Now a Federal district court in Texas has issued an injunction to stay the President's action, and that stay is in place while the lawsuit against the President's action which has been filed by 26 States is adjudicated. That is our role too. Just like the States stepping up when the President has overreached his authority, just like the Federal court stepping up when the President has exceeded his authority, that is our role too—to protect the legislative power, which is solely the power of the legislative branch, solely the power of Congress.

So I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to send H.R. 240 to conference to see if we can find common ground. That is, after all, regular order for the Congress.

I again remind our colleagues that this bill provides full funding for the Department of Homeland Security. Let me once again summarize some of that funding. The bill provides \$10.7 billion for Customs and Border Protection, CBP, including record levels of personnel, tactical infrastructure, and technology in air and maritime assets. It provides \$5.96 billion for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, and maintains a record 34,000 adult detention beds and 3,828 family detention beds. The bill strongly supports the vital missions of the Secret Service and provides for cyber security efforts. It provides more than \$10 billion for the Coast Guard for its many missions, including search and rescue. Since homeland security is a national effort, the bill continues critical funding for grant programs to State and local firefighters, emergency managers, and law enforcement. The bill also provides for research and development, TSA's aviation security screening operations, the Federal law enforcement training centers, and E-Verify, which supports businesses across the United States in hiring legal workers.

But in addition to that funding, we also need to check the Executive action of the President on immigration. That is what our system of checks and balances under our Constitution is all about. That is the opportunity we have—to send this bill to conference with the House to find a solution. Let's

do that. Let's find a solution. Let's return to regular order in the Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I encourage the Senate to vote to send the Homeland Security appropriations bill to conference with the House. That should be the order of business. We have been wrangling over this bill for 3 months now. The legislative maneuvering has crowded out all of the real issues before the Senate on this legislation.

We should have debated and voted on the President's actions, the Executive orders which provoked this entire situation. On multiple occasions Members on the other side of the aisle have voted unanimously to avoid having that debate. First, four times they voted over the course of 3 weeks to refuse to even consider House-passed funding bill legislation. Their bill was passed by the other body in plenty of time to avoid the shutdown that currently consumes the Senate.

This won't be the last time during this Congress that the House and Senate disagree on an appropriations bill, but it should not be the last time the legislative branch disagrees with the executive branch and vice versa. Soon we will begin consideration of the fiscal year 2016 appropriations bills. Each of these bills will prompt differences, but we should have opportunities for robust debates on these differences. That is all I am suggesting. We can proceed to conference with the House in a timely manner on the bills. Doing so will help provide opportunities for orderly and direct resolution of differences as reported by the various committees. We have done too little of that in recent years, and it has been detrimental to the legislative process.

I urge the Senate to support the motion to accept the request for a conference committee on the Homeland Security appropriations bill.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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 insist upon the Senate amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees with respect to H.R. 240, an act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, John Barrasso, Bob Corker, Susan M. Collins, Michael B. Enzi, John Hoeven, John McCain, Lamar Alexander, Lindsey Graham, Shelley Moore Capito, Deb Fischer, Thad Cochran, Orrin G. Hatch, Joni Ernst, John Boozman.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to insist upon the Senate amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees with respect to H.R. 240, an act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 64 Leg.]

YEAS—47

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

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Boxer
Bennet	Booker	Cantwell

Cardin	King	Sanders
Carper	Klobuchar	Schatz
Casey	Leahy	Schumer
Coons	Manchin	Shaheen
Donnelly	Markey	Stabenow
Durbin	Menendez	Tester
Feinstein	Merkley	Udall
Franken	Mikulski	Warner
Gillibrand	Murphy	Warren
Heinrich	Murray	Whitehouse
Heitkamp	Peters	Wyden
Hirono	Reed	
Kaine	Reid	

NOT VOTING—10

Blunt	McCaskill	Vitter
Brown	Nelson	Wicker
Gardner	Paul	
Kirk	Shelby	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays are 43.

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

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the bill is not amendable in the Senate and we cannot take further action. Therefore, I move to table the House message, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) would have voted "nay" and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) would have voted "nay."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 65 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Alexander	Collins	Heller
Ayotte	Corker	Hirono
Baldwin	Cornyn	Johnson
Bennet	Donnelly	Kaine
Blumenthal	Durbin	King
Booker	Feinstein	Klobuchar
Boxer	Flake	Leahy
Cantwell	Franken	Manchin
Capito	Gillibrand	Markey
Cardin	Graham	McCain
Carper	Hatch	McConnell
Casey	Heinrich	Menendez
Cochran	Heitkamp	Merkley

Mikulski	Rounds	Udall
Murkowski	Sanders	Warner
Murphy	Schatz	Warren
Murray	Schumer	Whitehouse
Peters	Shaheen	Wyden
Reed	Stabenow	
Reid	Tester	

MORNING BUSINESS

RECOGNIZING GALE WILLIAM FRASER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 27 years Gale Fraser has devoted to the Clark County Regional Flood Control District and his work as general manager and chief engineer for the past 22 years.

Southern Nevada is known for its dry heat and arid environment, but our rare and intense thunderstorms can create dangerous flash floods. These flash floods can cause millions of dollars in property damage and take lives in a matter of seconds. The demand to address this issue grew as the Las Vegas Valley experienced unprecedented development and population growth for more than three decades. The latest statistics show that more than 2 million people currently live in Clark County, and at one point in the 1990s, more than 5,000 people were relocating to the area every month of the year.

In an effort to address the risks associated with flood waters and accommodate the demands of a growing population, the Nevada Legislature authorized the creation of a flood control district in Clark County in 1985. The Army Corps of Engineers completed a feasibility report in 1992 on the flood control improvements necessary for the Las Vegas Wash and Tributaries, otherwise known as the Tropicana and Flamingo Washes. This massive project included debris basins, detention basins, miles of primary channels, and a network of lateral collector channels. Few could have shouldered such a daunting project, but Gale rose to the challenge.

The support and expertise that Gale Fraser and the regional flood control district brought to the Tropicana and Flamingo Washes projects was critical to it being authorized by Congress in the Water Resources Development Act of 1992. The first Federal appropriations to initiate the construction of the project became available through the Energy and Water Resources Development appropriations bill in October 1993. These important steps and strong partnerships contributed to the completion of the Project Cooperation Agreement, which was fully executed in February 1995.

The Clark County Regional Flood Control District and the Clark County Public Works Department were the local sponsors of the Tropicana and Flamingo Washes. Gale, as the head of the Regional Flood Control District, was instrumental in shepherding this project through the process, which has brought safety, security, and peace of mind to the residents of the Las Vegas Valley. Gale's impressive leadership has persisted. He further developed plans to improve Clark County's water infrastructure to manage destructive flood waters. To date, under Gale's leadership, 90 detention basins and ap-

proximately 590 miles of channels and underground storm drains have been constructed in Clark County.

On behalf of a grateful community, I thank Mr. Fraser for his years of dedicated service to Clark County and his work to ensure responsible flood management and public safety in southern Nevada.

Gale has also been an active member of the National Association of Flood and Stormwater Management Agencies and served as the president of the organization from August 2008 to August 2010. This organization includes many flood control districts and public works agencies across the country that are charged with working with Federal partners, such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to help develop and implement public policies regarding storm water quality and flood plain management.

Although Mr. Fraser will be missed, his legacy will continue to benefit Nevadans and our visitors for generations to come. I congratulate Gale Fraser on his retirement and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS BROOKS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week marked the end of Francis Brooks' tenure as the sergeant-at-arms of the Vermont State House. The position of sergeant-at-arms is one of great importance, playing a pivotal role in maintaining the order and decorum that Vermonters have come to expect of their State government. It is a job that demands a comprehensive understanding of the people who conduct the important work within the building, and the building itself.

Francis Brooks has served the people of the city of Montpelier in a number of roles. He taught chemistry and physics at Montpelier High School for 32 years; he was a State legislator for 25 years; and he has volunteered with the Montpelier Fire Department for 40 years. This level of dedication alone is worthy of appreciation and respect, but Francis's service did not stop there. For the last 7 years, Francis has served his State as sergeant-at-arms.

I have fond memories of the Vermont State House. My parents owned the Leahy Press, located just across the street, and now home to the Vermont Arts Council. From our early years and onward, my brother and sister and I were always encouraged by our parents to pay attention to what happened within those walls and to respect the building for what it represented. As a young boy I rode my bicycle through the halls of the capitol in Montpelier, sometimes wandering into the private office of the Governor, where he sat from behind his desk peering down at me. Francis upheld what I treasure most about our State's capitol—an open and welcoming building for all Vermonters. He has not only overseen

NAYS—31

Barrasso	Fischer	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Rubio
Burr	Hoeben	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Moran	Tillis
Daines	Perdue	Toomey
Enzi	Portman	
Ernst	Risch	

NOT VOTING—11

Blunt	Kirk	Shelby
Brown	McCaskill	Vitter
Coons	Nelson	Wicker
Gardner	Paul	

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CORNYN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE APPROVAL ACT—VETO

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the veto message on S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to the consideration of the President's veto message on S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message to accompany S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

(The text of the President's veto message is printed on page S1073 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 24, 2015.)

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk on the veto message.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the veto message on S. 1, an act to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Mitch McConnell, Susan M. Collins, Shelley Moore Capito, John Cornyn, David Vitter, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, Daniel Coats, Mike Rounds, Dean Heller, David Perdue, Bob Corker, Mike Lee, James Lankford, Jeff Sessions, Lamar Alexander, Johnny Isakson.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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