

and in the 2 years or so it might take to get that case to the Supreme Court, other individuals impacted by the rule or regulation are trying to comply with it, only to find out later, as the Court ruled a handful of times during the recent years of this Presidency that, no, the President doesn't have the authority to do that.

They said: No, you don't have the authority to appoint people to the National Labor Relations Board when the Senate is in session just because you have decided somehow the Senate is not in session. You don't get to decide whether the Senate is in session, Mr. President, if they have met all the requirements to be in session. You particularly don't get to decide whether the Senate is in session if that same session of the Senate approves some things that you thought needed to be done and that was good enough for you.

Then they said: Mr. President, by the way, when you appoint these people illegally, whatever rules and regulations they put forward aren't legal either.

So the couple of years of businesses trying to comply with the National Labor Relations Act rules and regulations, all of that is to the wayside. Those rules are all gone, but that doesn't restore the time, effort, money, and needless compliance that happens when the President exceeds his authority or when the President's agencies, such as the Environmental Protection Agency, decide they could do something they would like to do without ever arguing before the Congress that we would like the authority to do this.

So passing the ENFORCE the Law Act would be a way to seek an earlier or quicker remedy. It does appear to me that the Federal judges are likely to decide pretty quickly—Federal judges, the court of appeals level and then the circuit level—that, no, Mr. President; you have gone beyond where you were in fact. You were right the first 22 times, not the November 2014 time that you decided if you don't like the law, you don't have to enforce the law.

I think we should move forward with that ability that the Congress currently doesn't have, but also I think we should continue to express our desire for this process to work the way it is supposed to work.

The House of Representatives, which is supposed to initiate spending bills, has done that. It is the job of the Senate to debate those spending bills. It is the job of Senators to offer amendments if they don't like them, and so far our friends on the other side have insisted they don't want to do that part of this job. Maybe we all should understand why they don't want to defend what the President has done because of all the times he said he couldn't do it.

#### RECESS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess until 2 p.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:51 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOEVEN).

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to commend both of our leaders, Leader MCCONNELL and Leader REID, for coming to the floor and agreeing to a path forward to fully fund Homeland Security, and I want to speak for a moment about how critical this is and how really—if we cannot get the House of Representatives to agree, if they are not willing to move forward and support this path—we have actually not one shutdown but the possibility of two different kinds of shutdowns that will happen within 3 days.

I am talking about the fact there are 3 days left before the funding for the Department of Homeland Security expires—on February 27, at the end of the day on Friday. We are in a situation where those who protect us from terror threats all around us will be in a situation where they either aren't at work or are working without pay. We will be working with pay but they won't be working with pay, which of course is an outrageous situation for us to put them in.

Every week we know there is a new terrorist threat. That is literally true now, and it is shocking, as we turn on the television and we read the papers and listen to the radio. The most recent threat we know is from al-Shabaab, a Somali terrorist group with ties to Al Qaeda. A video appeared this last week where we know they called for an attack at the Mall of America near Minneapolis, as well as at other shopping centers in the United States and Canada and Great Britain.

We also know that an attack on that mall would endanger as many as 100,000 people—men, women, and children. That is how many people come to that mall, that big mall, every single day. Al-Shabaab terrorists have attacked a mall before so we know this is not an idle threat. In 2013, they attacked the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, where 63 innocent people were killed.

On February 14, a shooter at a synagogue in Copenhagen killed three people. In late January, an American was 1 of 10 people killed in a terrorist attack in Libya. Earlier in January, in Paris, an attack by a terrorist claimed 16 lives. I could go on and on. In October alone, gunmen attacked the Canadian Parliament in Ottawa, killing a Canadian soldier.

Michigan has the busiest northern border crossing in the country between Detroit and Windsor. Every day over \$1 billion in goods and people are crossing that border—every single day. We actually have three crossings—two of the

busiest in the country—and we count on border and Customs security. We count on our Homeland Security people to be on the job doing their job every single day.

We also count on the people at the airports—all of us. Most of us are on planes one or two times a week. We all understand the critical importance of the airport. And for those of us who are surrounded by water, the Coast Guard is absolutely critical.

I could go on and on with all of the ways in which the men and women of Homeland Security, border security, Customs, the Coast Guard, as well as police and firefighters, our first responders, are keeping us safe every single day.

If the House does not agree to what we are doing here, in 3 days we will see the Department of Homeland Security shut down—an entire infrastructure put together after 9/11, which we all worked together on in a bipartisan way because we saw and we felt what had happened in terms of the threats to our country and the loss of lives.

It is critical this not be just a game. This can't be just a trick, where we are somehow voting straight up on Homeland Security funding without other riders on immigration or other things where there are differences with the President. If it is straight-up funding, then we vote, and then it goes to the House and it gets completely changed again, that is not going to work. We are going to stand with the men and women who stand with us, put their lives on the line, and work hard every single day to keep us safe. It is critical the House decide to join us if in fact the Senate acts today to fully fund Homeland Security, which I hope we will.

There is another thing I am deeply concerned about, and that is the fact we have heard a lot of people talk about we will just do a continuing resolution from last year. That is effectively a shutdown of the first responders, because when we look at the list—immigration, Customs enforcement, detention, antitrafficking, smuggling—of those things that are funded under a continuing resolution, which is a fancy word for last year's funding, those things don't continue.

The new grants that keep firefighters in Michigan and across the country going—in Detroit alone we have 150 firefighters—were supposed to start in October. Because we haven't fully funded Homeland Security, they have been waiting. We have people who will be laid off—police officers, firefighters in Michigan and across the country under a CR—under a continuing resolution. It is effectively a first responders shutdown.

So that is the second shutdown I am concerned about. We could see Customs and Border Protection unable to award new contracts for new video surveillance. How many times do we talk about the need to protect the borders? But if we don't fully fund Homeland