

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

### CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 696, Markwayne Mullin, of Oklahoma, to be Secretary of Homeland Security.

John Thune, Roger Marshall, John Barrasso, Pete Ricketts, Bernie Moreno, John Cornyn, Lindsey Graham, Jim Banks, Marsha Blackburn, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, Bill Hagerty, Rick Scott of Florida, Shelley Moore Capito, Jon A. Husted, Joni Ernst, James Lankford, Ted Budd, Katie Boyd Britt.

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 nomination of MARKWAYNE MULLIN, of Oklahoma, to be Secretary of Homeland Security, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 62 Leg.]

#### YEAS—54

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

#### NAYS—37

Alsobrooks	Blunt	Rochester	Gillibrand
Baldwin	Cantwell	Hassan	Hassan
Bennet	Cortez Masto	Hickenlooper	Hickenlooper
Blumenthal	Duckworth	Hirono	Hirono

Kim	Padilla	Van Hollen
King	Reed	Warner
Klobuchar	Rosen	Warnock
Lujan	Sanders	Warren
Markey	Schatz	Welch
Merkley	Schiff	Whitehouse
Murphy	Schumer	Wyden
Murray	Slotkin	
Ossoff	Smith	

#### NOT VOTING—9

Booker	Gallego	Paul
Coons	Kaine	Peters
Durbin	Kelly	Shaheen

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 37. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of MARKWAYNE MULLIN, of Oklahoma, to be Secretary of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 526

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have a resolution that I have talked about before. I want to emphasize that it is not a bill.

Could I ask for order in the Chamber? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Order in the Chamber.

Mr. KENNEDY. I want to emphasize that it is a resolution; it is not a bill. I also want to emphasize, at the outset, that it only applies to the Senate. It only applies to the U.S. Senate.

And here is what my resolution would do: It would change Senate rules to provide that, when we are in a shutdown, Senators cannot be paid, cannot receive their salaries. Their checks would be—think of it this way—locked in a vault. And once the shutdown is over, the Senators could pick them up.

Now, I think everybody in the Congress knows what I am about to say. It is maybe a bit cynical, but it is true. If I were King for a day—I am not, and I don't aspire to be—and I wanted to avoid shutdowns, I would do two things. I would provide that Members of Congress can't be paid during a shutdown, and I would provide that Members of Congress can't leave Washington, DC, during a shutdown.

Now, I can't pass the second part of that, so I am going to try to pass the first part of that.

This resolution—again, it is not a bill—is about shared sacrifice. And I am not doing it to punish anybody. I am not doing it to try to embarrass anybody. I recognize that there are varying degrees of wealth among U.S. Senators and their ability to go without a paycheck.

I know and like every Member of this body, and every Member of this body who has a substantial amount of wealth has achieved that wealth through their own hard work, and

most, if not all, of them started with nothing. And do you know what I say? God bless them. More power to them. That is America.

So I want to put that up front because I am sure some are going to point out that some of our Members are wealthier than others, and it is true. I mean, not to single anybody out, but I have seen Senator RICK SCOTT's house. It is bigger than a Costco, OK? More power to him. He earned that. I have seen Senator MARK WARNER's house. It is bigger than a Target. More power to him. He earned that money. He started from nothing. So did Rick.

But this bill isn't about that. It is about shared sacrifice and sending a message. We have about a squillion employees at the Department of Homeland Security that aren't being paid, and there is no prospect of them being paid.

Before I yield to my colleague Senator MORENO, I want to point this out. I said it yesterday, but I am going to say it again. The party line among us is that we are "that close" to reaching a deal to get government back open, to which I respond respectfully: Dream weaver. OK? I don't believe it. I hope I am wrong.

I know Mr. Homan is now involved. He is good, but he can't work miracles. I do not believe, because of the faction of my Democratic friends' party that is in control, that my Democratic colleagues can vote for anything—anything—that could be interpreted as helping ICE. I just think that is political and policy reality. This is America; they are entitled to their opinion.

What I think we should do, as I said yesterday—and Senator CRUZ has talked about this eloquently. I want to give him full credit. The Democrats have offered to open every part of DHS except ICE. I would gratefully accept their offer. Let's get them open immediately, and then the very next day, we should start a budget resolution. Through reconciliation, we should pass a budget for the rest of ICE—the rest of DHS that is not open.

Now, I would welcome my Democratic friends' involvement with that, but I know they can't vote for it. But we could do this through reconciliation, as we passed the One Big Beautiful Bill. We have two more shots under the rules of reconciliation. It would easily be sustained in a Byrd bath. It would not take 60 votes; it would take 50 votes plus the Vice President. That is how we passed the One Big Beautiful Bill.

So before I call on Mr. MORENO and return to the subject, I really think we ought to surprise ourselves and do something intelligent if we really want to get this government back open. We could have it open within a week. The Democrats, I think, will find that acceptable, and I believe Republicans will find that acceptable if we would just do it.

I would like to yield a few minutes to my good friend Senator MORENO about my resolution.

Mr. MORENO. My colleague will yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY. Of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. To all the Senators here, I ask you to think about a couple concepts that come from the private sector.

Mr. KENNEDY. Sure.

Mr. MORENO. I remember the 2008 financial crisis as follows: It was a situation where any day, you would think, we are going to face total and complete bankruptcy.

I had mortgaged everything I owned in my life. I had maxed out my credit cards. I took out loans so big, I couldn't even do the math in my head. I would wake up at 2 o'clock in the morning wondering how I was going to make payroll.

My wife would say: Are you OK?

I would say: Oh, yeah, yeah. No, I am fine.

I think, Mr. President, you have been there.

I had to ask my team to make a lot of sacrifices. We had to cut pay. We had to make a lot of adjustments because it was a matter of life or death. Either the business was going to survive or we were going to collectively perish into the great abyss of bankruptcy.

There is a concept that is important in creating a culture that says that as a leader, you must be willing to live in the shared experience of your team.

Now, I will contradict a little bit of what you said. Each of us in this Chamber makes \$175,000 a year. That is not what the average American makes. That is dramatically more than the average American makes, and it is certainly a lot more than what the average TSA worker makes or the average FEMA worker who has to go out and help in places all over the country.

I saw the very sad storms that Hawaii is seeing, and I hope we get help to those people. But it is not going to be me that goes there; it is going to be the hard-working men and women of FEMA that go there, and they make a fraction of what we do.

I can't imagine having a job in which, for the third time in 6 months, you have to explain to your wife or husband or kids: Hey, I didn't get a paycheck today.

The kids look at you and say: Well, what did you do? What did you do to not get a paycheck? Were you insubordinate? Did you not show up for work? Did you yell at your boss?

Nope. I did everything right—other than work for the Department of Homeland Security.

Why would you stay in that job?

I think that is the thing we don't understand, is that people have breaking points where they just say: I am just not going to work here anymore.

This particular Agency, more than anything else, has a very simple char-

ter: Protect us from dangers from abroad. These are the people that chase transnational criminals. I don't think any of us in this Chamber would be willing to go do that. It is tough work, brutal work. They put their lives at risk.

Not only do I think we should give them their paychecks, I think we should say: Thank you. Thank you for being willing to do this job.

I will end with this to my colleagues: We have to eat our own dog food. If we don't eat our own dog food, we will get disconnected permanently from the people we serve.

If we are willing to accept a paycheck that is three, four times what the average American makes and we deposit that every month and we say: Well, look, I have to pay the bills—I don't care how wealthy you are, if somebody is a multimillionaire or not a multimillionaire, 175 grand a year is a lot of money, certainly enough to pay the bills. Just ask the people who make three times less than that—they figure out how to make the bills.

This isn't about giving up the paycheck or giving up money—which, by the way, I think we should. I don't think we should get paid retroactively. I think we should just say: Look, you didn't do your fundamental duty, which is to fund the government, and if you have a policy dispute, then do the hard work. Go into the rooms and make the calls and go out there and persuade your colleagues. In the meantime, don't punish the workers. Don't punish the workers.

I grew up coming to America in the seventies and eighties. I looked at Democrats like Tip O'Neill and J.F.K. These were Democrats who said: Above all else, we are the party of the working men and women of this country. We are for the people who built this country. The very wealthy—they are just fine. They are just fine. But we focus on the working men and women of this country.

What drove me to run for office—not what I expected ever to do in my life, believe me. I never did. But I do consider it a great honor. Every day, including today—a beautiful, sunny day—I see the Capitol, and I think, my God, what would my mom and dad think if they were alive, that their youngest son gets to work in the U.S. Capitol?

It is crazy. Do you know what my mom would say? Only in America. Only in America.

But there are 260,000 families that aren't feeling the love right now. The least we could do today is say: We join you in that shared sacrifice. We join you so that we can understand what it is like to have to leave here and say "Hey, yeah, not good. We are not going to get a paycheck because we didn't do our job."

If we don't do that, what do you think the message is? You are much more elegant than I am. I think the accent does you 80 percent of the bidding

there. But what do you think that says?

Here is my question: What does a signal of saying "No, no, no, no. We insist on getting paid three times what the average American makes. We are not willing to sacrifice anything because maybe we are special"—is that the message that is sent?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Here, Mr. President and my good friend Senator MORENO, is the message that we send if we do not pass this resolution: If it weren't for double standards, we wouldn't have any standards at all. If it weren't for double standards, we wouldn't have any standards at all.

Now, the American people see what is going on. As I have said before, not every American reads Aristotle every day. They are too busy earning a living. They are too busy getting up, going to work, obeying the law, trying to do the right thing by their kids.

As usual, Senator MORENO makes very salient points. He is aware, as am I, that once again, this is a resolution that just affects the Senate. It doesn't affect the House.

Senator MORENO is well aware, as am I and every Member of this body, that this is a bipartisan resolution. To change the Senate rules, I had to go through the Rules Committee. My resolution—our resolution passed the Rules Committee unanimously. Every single Republican and every single Democrat voted for this resolution.

What I hear Senator MORENO saying in a very eloquent way: Yes, there are varying degrees of wealth in this Chamber, but we all make 170 grand a year, and that is a fortune for most Americans.

I am not saying that Senators don't earn that. This bill is not meant to punish anybody. I know some Senators who work so hard that that 170 grand a year is probably equivalent to about \$11 an hour. I mean, they are working all the time. This isn't about that.

This is about shared values. This is about sending a message to our colleagues at TSA and elsewhere in DHS that we understand, that we are trying to get government back open. But in the meantime we are going to try in our small way to share your experience.

So I would ask my colleagues, please—I don't like to talk too much about doing the right thing because I think everybody in this body wants to do the right thing. We just disagree sometimes over what the right thing is. But honestly, I don't see how any one of my colleagues can disagree with either the spirit or the letter of this resolution.

So, Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 296, S. Res. 526, which Senator MORENO and I have just talked

about; further, that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). Is there objection?

Mr. SCHATZ. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with respect, I want to give my colleague Senator SCHATZ more time. He objected and left the Chamber. Is he coming back?

Mr. MORENO. Will my colleague yield for a quick question?

Mr. KENNEDY. Just one second. Is he ill? What should I do, Mr. President? Should I give him more time?

Mr. BARRASSO. Point of order, Mr. President. Is it appropriate for someone not to be recognized, to just say "I object" and run out? The Senator had not been recognized. The Senator had the floor, the Senator from Louisiana, who had made a proposal, and then I heard some noise in the background, and that was it. I never heard a Senator be recognized, so it sounds to me that no one has been recognized to object.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, can we get a ruling? I don't want to be unfair to anybody. My Democratic colleagues, I told them that—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection was raised, and an objection was heard.

Mr. KENNEDY. So should we give Senator SCHATZ more time to come back? Should we give him more time to come back and explain?

I see the Parliamentarian giving some guidance.

Tony, trust me; I know what I am doing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot answer that.

Mr. KENNEDY. May I inquire why not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot opine on why a Senator is in the Chamber or not in the Chamber.

Mr. KENNEDY. Can you opine on why my colleague objected and then immediately left and whether he is coming back?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not an appropriate parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, my parliamentary inquiry is a bit different than that. I never heard a Senator recognized from the Chair by the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate—the Senator from Louisiana had the floor. The Presiding Officer said, "Is there objection?" at which time, routinely, someone seeks recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection was raised, and the objection was heard. The Senator does not need the floor to object.

Mr. KENNEDY. So I just want to be sure, Mr. President. I am not trying to put you on the spot, but I see our Parliamentarian is here, and they can give you able advice. Does that mean I can

object to anything, at any time, without being recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. I don't even have to get the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A Senator does not need the floor to object to a—

Mr. KENNEDY. So I can walk in, in the middle of a debate, without the floor, right back here, in front of God and country, and say "I object," and it shuts things down? I don't understand that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is a unanimous consent request pending, any Senator in the Chamber can object, including the Chair.

Mr. KENNEDY. Without having the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. And, again, with respect, Mr. President, is your ruling that Senator SCHATZ, who is my friend; I talked to him before I was coming down—that he did not have the floor but he can still object?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection was raised, and the objection was heard.

Mr. KENNEDY. But did he have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection was properly lodged. The objection was heard.

Mr. KENNEDY. Not to put too fine a point on it, but did he have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator did not need the floor to raise an objection, and the objection was heard and sustained.

Mr. KENNEDY. Senator MORENO, did you want to say something?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, I just wanted to clarify where we are right now because I think it was—we maybe rushed through it.

My question to my colleague from Louisiana is: This doesn't remove money from Senators; this just holds the money until the government reopens, much like the employees at DHS, where their paycheck is being held but, once we do our job—because they are doing their job—once we do our job, everybody would then get paid, correct? There is no loss of money.

And so that seems to me—would the Senator agree that that is like a bare minimum standard because any of us can go to the clerk of the Senate and say: Hey, hold my check until this government opens. What the Senator's resolution is saying is that all of us should do that, correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I think the Senator is right. You started out your comments by saying: Where are we? I think we are on Pluto.

I mean, I do not understand how the Chair has ruled that the Senator didn't have recognition but he could still object, and I don't understand how that is possible. I just don't understand how

that is possible. In fact, our whole rule about the majority leader having control of the floor, whoever the majority leader is, is centered around the proposition that, at any time, the majority leader can assert his right—it is a custom, not a law—can assert his right to control this floor and that shuts down my recognition. But he has to get recognition.

He just can't come in here and say: Stop talking; I am the majority leader. And I don't understand how a Senator can object—I don't understand how a Senator can do anything in this body without achieving recognition. That is like—that is—I am no expert on the Senate rules like the President is and the Parliamentarian is, but you don't have to be an astrophysicist to understand that is one of our bedrock rules.

Mr. MORENO. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, Senator.

Mr. MORENO. I would ask my colleague if he would consider resubmitting your question again as a motion to reconsider.

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, I will do that, but I don't want to be unfair to my Democratic colleagues. I don't believe in surprising people. Senator SCHATZ told me—we had a conversation last night—he said he was going to object. I respect that. And if he has left the building, I don't want to go behind his back.

So I don't want to do that unless you can communicate with him. Is he still here? Mr. President, do we know if Senator SCHATZ is still here? Because I would like to urge reconsideration, but I don't want to blindside him.

Who should I ask that to? Tuck? Tuck says: Don't bring me into this. Gary? I mean, I would like to urge a reconsideration, but I am not going to do it and blindside BRIAN.

Can I bring it back later? Could I get a ruling on that? Could I ask that we contact Senator SCHATZ and tell him I am thinking about reconsidering but I don't want to blindside him, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not an appropriate parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KENNEDY. What if I made a motion? Could I move that we contact Senator SCHATZ and tell him I would like to move to reconsider but I don't want to blindside him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no such motion.

Mr. KENNEDY. I just made it up. You are telling me I can't do that under the rules? Why not? I don't get it. I mean, I could move to reconsider and blindside him, but I don't want to do that. So why can't I move to reconsider subject to us waiting for BRIAN to get back so he has a full opportunity to be heard? Can I do that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRASSO). There is no such motion.

Mr. KENNEDY. Sure, there is. I just made it. Are you saying that the motion is out of order? Look, this is a serious matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would take unanimous consent.

Mr. KENNEDY. This is a serious matter. Now, we have established that this resolution doesn't affect the House. It just says to the Senators: While we are in a shutdown, no Senator is going to be paid. You don't lose your money. You pick it up after it is over, after the shutdown is lifted.

We have established the fact that this went through the Rules Committee unanimously. Did I mention it went through unanimously, that every single Democrat and every single Republican said: Yes, KENNEDY; let's do this.

We have established that even though there are varying degrees of wealth among Members of the Senate—and I say that is great—every single Senator makes at least \$170,000 here. They are not going to lose a penny—not one single, solitary penny. Once the shutdown is over, they get their money. We have established that. We have established that there are 260,000—not 2,600, not 26,000—260,000 of our colleagues working in the department of health and hospitals that are not being paid.

And a lot of these people do not have immense wealth, but they are not being paid because of our conduct. And I think we have established that this is a chance to show, in a little bitty way—a minor way, a baby step—that we are going to share their sacrifice.

And there has been an objection. I heard that ruling from the Chair. But for the life of me, I don't know how you can object without seeking recognition, without having recognition. I have never heard that one, OK. We are getting into the foothills of la-la land here as far as I am concerned.

Now, I just made a motion. I want to bring this bill to be reconsidered. And all I am asking—I don't want to blindside my friend Senator SCHATZ. I don't play that way. I want to give him full opportunity. All I am asking is that somebody call Senator SCHATZ and let him know that I am going to move to reconsider and I don't want to do it behind his back. That is all I am asking. So I make that motion. Is there an objection?

Ms. BALDWIN. I object.

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, there you go. My good friend—the Senator didn't have—she didn't have recognition either. How is that possible?

All right. I am coming back, Mr. President. And I am coming back and I am coming back and I am coming back. Did I mention I will be back? And if a Member of this body disagrees with what I am doing, then, by God, they ought to come down here and stand up in front of the U.S. Senate and stand up in front of the American people and stand up in front of God and stand up in front of country and stand up in front of all these people—these good people that aren't being paid—and say: Here is why.

Maybe we need to change the Senate rules, Mr. President. I appreciate your patience.

And I would like to ask, Mr. President—this probably is an improper motion, too—I have got to delve a little bit more on this improper motion stuff.

I want to see the rule that says I can't do what I just tried to do, and I want to see it bigger than Dallas. I don't want to see that it is implied or is a penumbra, and I want to see the rule that says somebody can come into this body without recognition and be heard because I don't believe it, and anybody that believes that—no disrespect—shouldn't be driving.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, just a parliamentary inquiry. Again, this is just somebody who has not been here a long time. I just want a clarification—a parliamentary inquiry: In order to speak before the U.S. Senate, my understanding is that the Senator has to yield the floor or complete his speech. Another Senator, if ordered to speak, has to seek recognition from the Chair in order to speak; is that correct or not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To gain recognition to the floor or hold the floor, that Senator needs to be recognized by the Chair in his or her own right. The Senator who has the floor does not lose the floor when he or she asks unanimous consent.

Any Senator in the Chair, including any Senator in the Chamber, including the Senator in the Chair, can object despite the fact they don't have control of the floor and that the Senator speaking at the podium who has been recognized continues to control the floor.

Mr. MORENO. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to have the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a motion to suspend the quorum call. Is there objection?

Ms. BALDWIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Utah.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, moments ago, as we convened and before we cast votes getting ready to move forward with the confirmation of our friend and colleague the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma to serve as the next Secretary of the Department of

Homeland Security—it is important to reflect on the importance of this position and on the importance of the Department that he has been asked by the President of the United States to lead.

This is a Department that, 25 years ago, didn't exist. It was created, of course, in the aftermath of the horrific attacks on the United States homeland on September 11, 2001. It includes within it, among many other pieces, the apparatus that is used to control, as the name of the Department implies, the homeland of the United States; our ability to protect and defend our border, including our ability to protect and defend the border at the border and all the way through the interior of the United States, through the enforcement of our immigration laws.

This, of course, is one of the most fundamental and distinctively Federal powers granted to the U.S. Government by the Constitution. It is uniquely Federal not only in that it is given to the U.S. Government by the Constitution but that it has to be Federal. It would be impossible to do this without it being a Federal power because no one State could be charged with border enforcement.

If you had only the border States doing it, it would be unfair to the border States, and the border States would have to make policy surrounding immigration, border access, and so forth. And that would impact the other States as well. That is why the Founding Fathers were wise to put all of this in the U.S. Government.

So it bears mentioning here that the Department that our friend and colleague the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma has been asked to lead, the Department of Homeland Security, is a pretty important one to have funded.

It is indeed regrettable, to put it extremely mildly, that that Department has now been shut down for well over a month. And this doesn't occur in a vacuum. This occurs just a few months after that Department was shut down for a very lengthy period of time, starting in the fall, starting in October.

This isn't fair to the brave men and women who place, in many instances, their own lives, their own comfort, their own safety on the line, day after day after day, to defend the U.S. homeland, to defend our border, to enforce our immigration laws, and to perform so many other tasks that are essential to the security of the American people.

And so when we evaluate that shutdown and its impact, we have to think about some of the other things that it also affects, including, of course, but not limited to, TSA; including FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Authority; including the Coast Guard; and including USCSIS, CISA, and the entities within the Department of Homeland Security that operate the SAVE database.

The SAVE database is this entity that is already set up, and it is related