

properly compensated for their creative works but broadcasters aren't penalized such that they have got to shut down news departments or lay off employees in order to meet those demands. We have got to make sure that we have got licensing and the Communications Act reformed.

Our Communications Act is very old. We have got to take a look at it and bring it into the 21st century. But we have got to be careful that we don't cripple our local broadcasters, many of whom live in the communities and are valuable parts of the community and are basically, in some cases, the heartbeat of the community.

I do want to reiterate that I think we are at a time where we really can see a resurgence in local broadcasting, local content, the return of more full service. It is not just wall-to-wall hits on the radio now.

In order to garner a market competing with XM, our local folks have to be out in the community. They have to be out with live remotes. They have got to be at community events. They have got to be bringing local news and local content and stuff that is relevant to people's lives. They have done it for decades, and it is really great to see that resurgence and to be a part of it. It is a great time for broadcasters in America right now.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman from Texas would yield, you raised an important point that I hadn't thought about that is sort of natural and obvious, and that is, if you are going to be a good local broadcaster, obviously you have to be a good local citizen.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Absolutely. You have got to be out at the events. You have got to say "yes" to the folks that come in and say: Could you give us a public service announcement for our cancer walk? Could you give us a public service announcement for our whatever event?

The community bulletin boards that you used to hear on the radio all the time are coming back, and that is something XM or satellite providers just can't do.

□ 1745

Sure, they are getting the technology to localize some of the ads by downloading them into your devices. But it is not like the local broadcaster who is a part of the community.

Mr. CRAMER. You raise very important points.

Again, I appreciate the reminder that, while we are, today, educating, informing, and celebrating local broadcasting, it is at risk; that we can take our eye off the ball, that we can assume or presume some things and wake up one day and find out that when that accident happens on the railroad tracks or the storm is coming that suddenly there is nobody there to tell us about it.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. You need somebody that has a local news presence. You don't need somebody that has to

bring a satellite truck in from a few hundred miles away and can't get there immediately. Sure, The Weather Channel will send Jim Cantore down. I think they want to kill him because they send him to all the dangerous locations. But he doesn't know the community like the local weathercaster.

We have got Dale Nelson in Corpus Christi. He has been doing the weather on our NBC affiliate. We jokingly call him "Dead Wrong Dale." What other profession can you be in besides being a TV meteorologist and get it wrong half the time and still keep a job? But Dale knows the community, and he gets it right a whole lot more than he gets it wrong. We just like to rib him. But he knows the places that are going to flood. He knows the areas in the neighborhoods that are most susceptible to damage. Those out-of-town reporters don't.

The members of the media in local broadcasting are citizens of the community, and what they do improves the lives of everybody in the community. They know the people. They shop at the grocery store with the folks. Their children are in school in the community. They know what is going on, and they can reflect what is going on and can react to what is going on in the community and really be a valuable asset for good.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, you are a very articulate spokesman and advocate on behalf of local broadcasting, and I appreciate your taking the time and your expertise. By the way, you did pose it in the form of a question. I suppose some people can look at Congress and say: There is a group that can be wrong more than half the time and keep their jobs too. But at any rate, I have noticed that if you stay in good contact through your broadcast community with your constituents that helps as well.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I appreciate your yielding the time and organizing this wonderful Special Order.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, it is very important because as I said, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning, over 600 broadcasters are in town today calling on the Members of Congress, calling on us, reminding us of the important role that they play in public safety, in public information, in public service, in many ways, in many ways, not just in delivering the news, weather, and sports and being active in our communities and elevating those important causes that make for a quality community, contributing their talent, contributing their, of course, their broadcast spectrum, which is really the people's. I think that is really an important point that we sometimes forget—that there is a reason that broadcasters have this legal obligation to public service because the people own the airwaves, and we rent them, if you will.

It is important that broadcasters and Congress stay in close touch because, as the gentleman from Texas pointed out, this is a fragile relationship, and

we can sometimes take them for granted while presuming that there will always be other ways to communicate when we know, in fact, that when the lights go out, when the electricity goes off, when a storm hits, whatever the case may be, as long as you have a car radio and a good battery, or you have a battery-operated radio and the broadcasters are on the air, you can always get that information from your local, reliable, familiar, friendly broadcasters.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time and I appreciate my colleagues from both sides of the aisle from across our country who have taken the time today to help inform, educate, and celebrate the American broadcaster.

#### THE FUTURE FORUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, tonight is the inaugural Special Order hour of the Future Forum. Today young people across America are asking themselves how they are going to afford their education. And if they are even lucky enough to get an education, how they are going to be able to afford to pay off that education, how they are going to find a well-paying job that can help them pay off that education, buy their first home, start a family, and send their own kids to school. That is the issue that the Future Forum is going to address. We are going to address this issue, the American Dream of homeownership, and something very important to millennials, diversity and equality.

Millennials make up about 75 million people of the American population. It is the most diverse generation in America's history. We believe in the Future Forum that we are uniquely suited for this because we are a part of the future too, and it is time that the party of the future starts talking to the future. We will be taking time on the House floor and at events around the country to meet with and listen to younger Americans about how we in government can better ensure that younger Americans have the opportunities that will allow them not only to dream but to achieve. This is a two-way conversation. We will use technology and a collaborative approach in our communications and in our outreach.

Our policy priorities are very simple: college access and affordability, job security and entrepreneurship, and equality and diversity. Many of the members of the Future Forum were called to public service because of what happened on September 11. A recent Center for American Progress survey found that the defining issue for millennials is September 11.

As I stand in this well, we are just 3 days from the Department of Homeland Security being shut down. I have invited members of the Future Forum to share their own personal story about how they were called to service and what homeland security means to them and their constituents.

I would first like to invite down a freshman Member. I yield time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the previous speaker for exercising tremendous leadership in helping to forge this, the Future Forum. I am proud to join him in being a founding member of this important caucus, one that I hope will go out and touch the lives of many young people throughout the country.

In having a conversation with the previous speaker about what brought him to public service and what brought me to public service, I was relaying my personal story, and that happened to involve September 11. I was not one of the heroes by any means, just one of the ordinary Americans working in the private sector straight out of college, attempting to pay off a ton of student loans, and right here in the Washington, D.C., area, just a couple miles from the Pentagon, that bright blue-skied beautiful morning when the world suddenly changed.

Mark Twain had said a long time ago that America's two best friends in the world are Miss Atlantic and Mr. Pacific. September 11, 2001, proved that that was no longer the case, that we were not a separate fortress unto ourselves and completely removed from the problems around the world. That was, as the previous speaker mentioned, such an important event in my life and in the lives of so many people in their thirties and younger.

As a member of this September 11 generation, I decided right then that I would devote my life to public service. The very next year, actually, on September 11, 2002, I began my graduate program in public policy and embarked on a path that about 14 years later has led here to serving in the Halls of the House of Representatives, attempting to make a difference, solve problems, and do so on a bipartisan basis.

I know there are many people on the other side of the aisle, good Republicans, who feel the same way I do; that we can have our legitimate debates, that we can have our debates on public policy, but that when it comes, of all things, to the security of the American people, we need to put the nonsense aside and actually focus on protecting our people.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we had come down here and planned to speak about the Future Forum, I had expected that my speech would be about the student loan debt crisis, something that is deeply affecting our generation, a generation that is more indebted than any other in our Nation's history. But, in-

stead, we are here to talk about the fact we are just 3 days away from seeing the Department of Homeland Security completely shut down, seeing the furloughing of 35,000 employees of the Department of Homeland Security.

On the very same day that information was released, three American citizens attempted to join ISIS, which should be called Daesh, the so-called Islamic State, who truly are evil and would do whatever they could to harm any one of the 310 million of us living in this country.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, you talk about your call to service and after September 11, and you think back to that day, and I don't know if you remember, but I remember Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, standing on the stairs of the Capitol, on the steps of the Capitol and singing "God Bless America" and "America the Beautiful." It was such a moment of collaboration. Every day since that day, up until now, homeland security and our Nation's security has always been about collaboration and bipartisanship. I just wonder, to hear that the Department of Homeland Security could be shutting down, hearkening back to what you thought about collaboration back then, does that gel, is that the collaboration that you had in mind and you always thought of around our Nation's security?

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman asks a great question. Actually it is the exact opposite of the sort of spirit that was invoked on September 11. I remember seeing the pictures of—I believe it was a spontaneous gathering of both Democratic and Republican Members serving in Congress at that time who came together on the Capitol steps to sing "God Bless America."

I think it is a sad commentary that just a decade and a half later that we are here at an incredibly dangerous time, mind you, in some ways actually more dangerous than the days immediately following September 11, and instead of talking about how we can come together in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion, pass this what should be noncontroversial bill to fund our Department of Homeland Security, the fact that we are right here caught up in a partisan fight over this is deeply disappointing and does not at all jibe with the spirit of September 11, and I think the spirit of a generation that was called to serve in the wake of those events.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU), someone who has served our country not just in California's Legislature and not just in the Congress but also in our armed services, and is currently serving in the Air Force Reserves.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, let me start off by saying elections have consequences. I respect

the American voter. I respect what the voters in our Nation did last November when they gave Republicans control of the United States Senate and control of the U.S. House of Representatives. My sincere plea and request to my Republican colleagues across the aisle who control Congress is: Please do not shut down the Department of Homeland Security.

The Republican leader in the U.S. Senate is now poised to delink the issue of funding for security for our homeland from immigration reform. I hope my colleagues across the aisle will do the same. That is because immigration reform has very little to nothing to do with protecting our homeland. I would love to have a debate on immigration reform. I think we need to do that. I would love to vote for bills on immigration reform. But they are not linked to funding for Homeland Security.

Let me just give you an example. Let's talk about DREAMers who came as children to our Nation and who can serve in the United States military. I served in Active Duty in the Air Force, and I am still in the Reserves. So DREAMers can serve in the U.S. military. To say that we are going to deport them because they are a homeland security risk and we are not going to fund Homeland Security because of that is ridiculous. There is no reason to link those two issues. If you don't like DREAMers, if you want to deport DREAMers, fine. Let's have a debate on that. But they are not a homeland security risk. To link these two issues doesn't make any sense. The Republican leader in the United States Senate has figured that out. I hope that this House does it as well.

There are some grave consequences to this. In my State of California alone, nearly 27,000 employees of Homeland Security will either be furloughed or will get no pay and cannot come to work.

□ 1800

These folks are folks that protect our homeland. It is unacceptable that this is going to happen.

The other way Homeland Security works is they provide grants to local first responders across the Nation to law enforcement, to firefighters. On Friday, if Homeland Security shuts down, those grants stop, and these local responders stop.

This is a very real issue, and we, in Congress, our first priority is to protect the American public. Shutting down Homeland Security will be the exact opposite of that. I really hope that the Republicans who control both Houses do not shut down Homeland Security.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I also wonder, Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from California thinks, as somebody who is serving in the Reserves right now and serving shoulder to shoulder with some young DREAMers, what would it do to the morale of

the ranks if DREAMers who are putting themselves on the front lines, willing to go serve the country they call their own, the United States, in battle, if the House GOP had their way and those DREAMers were removed and deported from our country?

What would that do to the morale of our troops?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. That is a great question. Let me just explain a little bit what are some of the professions that the DREAMers do in the military.

Because of their language skills, the U.S. military needs some of these language skills, so that the U.S. military knows what these terrorists are doing in other parts of the world.

To have the language skills that DREAMers possess, that is one reason that we have them serve in the U.S. military. They have a direct effect on trying to prevent terrorist attacks into our homeland. To say that “we are not going to fund Homeland Security because we want to deport you” is ridiculous.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

There are a few categories that the DREAMers are able to serve in the military. You mention their language talent.

As somebody who, himself, is in the military, don't you think we are missing out on a lot of potential among kids that have already gone through the DACA program, but we are still not admitting as regular enlistees or no less given the chance to become officers?

I know a kid in my district, his whole life, he wanted to be in the military. He didn't even find out that he wasn't American until he was 15. He went through DACA, he did everything right, and they are still not letting him join the military.

What kind of talent are we missing out on by not letting these DACA kids enlist in the regular manner?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. That is a fantastic question. Having now been in the military for 19 years, it is very clear that their main criteria for military service is: Can you complete the mission?

How good you are at completing the mission has nothing to do with whether or not you have a piece of paper that says if you are documented or not. The U.S. military is losing out on a significant amount of talent, people who otherwise would do great things for our military to protect our homeland and so on.

Again, it makes very little to no sense to link these two issues, which really shouldn't be linked; really, that is what this is all about. Let's just have separate debates on both issues. The U.S. Senate is about to do that.

I hope the House can do that as well.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite to join our conversation another fresh-

man Member from Massachusetts, somebody who has also served our country very honorably in the Marines, SETH MOULTON.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SWALWELL.

I think our Republican colleagues have a point, which is that we need to have a debate about immigration. This is an issue facing our country, it is a serious issue, and in many respects, it has reached crisis proportions. We need to talk about it, we need to have that debate, but it cannot be at the expense of our Nation's security.

I just returned from a weeklong trip to the Middle East—to Iraq, to Afghanistan, to the UAE, to Kuwait, and to Jordan—to try to understand the situation on the ground and especially the threat that ISIL or Daesh poses to the United States of America.

I can tell you that that threat is serious and severe. There are those who think that this will just be a Middle Eastern problem, that it won't ever come to infect our homeland. I don't share that view. I think it is a serious threat. ISIL has brutally killed Americans abroad and made clear their intentions to kill Americans here at home.

That is the kind of protection from threats like that that the Department of Homeland Security provides. We cannot put our Nation's security at risk for a debate that is critical, that needs to happen, but that is separate from keeping Americans safe.

Our most sacred responsibility as Members of Congress is to protect our homeland. Right now, the partisan brinksmanship around funding the Department of Homeland Security is putting that safety at risk.

I served my country for four tours in Iraq. I was proud to serve, I was proud to go every time, but I don't want to see Americans have to keep going back to that part of the world because we can't provide for our security here at home.

We have a lot of work to do in this Congress, and a lot of it requires bipartisan cooperation. Immigration is one of those issues. It is an issue that we need to debate on the floor of the House.

We need to take up the Senate bill for comprehensive immigration reform, debate its merits, and decide whether it does enough to ensure the safety of our borders and the future of those who aspire to be Americans, but none of that should happen at the expense of our Nation's security.

The crisis that we are facing today is the result of partisan politics that places the safety and the lives of the American people at risk.

Last week I returned from a trip to the Middle East, and I learned that the threat of a terrorist attack on the United States is real. Terrorist organizations including ISIL pose a serious national security threat and have made clear their intentions to commit acts of terrorism both abroad and here at home.

Our number one responsibility as members of Congress is to prevent that from happening and keep Americans safe.

Holding hostage the funding for the Department of Homeland Security over the President's executive action on immigration is a disservice to the men and women who put their lives on the line everyday both at home and abroad to protect us all.

There is no doubt that Congress needs to address immigration reform. It is an issue that is deserving of a debate and I look forward to participating in that discussion with both Democrats and Republicans. However, attaching immigration policy to this appropriations legislation is simply irresponsible and hijacks the intellectual debate that should take place on this floor.

If you disagree with the President's actions, then let's have that debate.

However, with such threats to the security of the American people, now is not the time to play political games with an agency that is charged with protecting the homeland from acts of terrorism.

If Congress fails to fund the Department of Homeland Security, agencies and grant programs critical to the safety of Americans will no longer be able to carry out the responsibilities that they were created to uphold, including the TSA, U.S. Customs and Border Protection and the United States Coast Guard. 85% of all enlisted Coast Guard personnel do not live on base—they cannot afford to miss a rent or mortgage payment on their homes. Many Americans don't realize this, but not only are Coast Guardsmen important to the safety of fishermen in my home state of Massachusetts and to all coastal states, but they are also deployed globally alongside our military in support of critical national security missions.

When I was in Iraq, I needed to focus on the mission. For Coast Guard personnel performing high-risk drug cartel interdictions or patrolling the Persian Gulf, we needed their 100% focus on the mission at hand. So last summer when an Iranian boat aimed a 50 caliber machine gun at American Coast Guardsmen deployed in international waters in the Persian Gulf, those are the American men and women in harm's way who would still be required to put their lives on the line despite not receiving a paycheck so that their families at home can put food on the table and pay rent.

In my home state of Massachusetts, we recently experienced a series of historic snow storms that resulted in record-breaking snow accumulation and caused millions of dollars in damages to homes, business and roadways. Without the support of funding from FEMA, Massachusetts will have to bear the brunt of the clean-up and repair costs in spite of the likelihood that Massachusetts will be eligible for federal disaster aid relief.

Further, failure to pass an appropriations bill for DHS would furlough or deny payment to the 4,735 law enforcement officials, disaster response officials and many other homeland security personnel in Massachusetts.

Republicans know that the right thing to do is to fund the department. This is why, earlier today, the Senate passed a clean bill to fund the department.

This is not a partisan issue. This is an American issue. I implore the Republicans to have the debate on immigration, and have it soon. Talk about our differences there, but let's not put our citizens, our country, and our allies at risk by holding funding for the Department of Homeland Security hostage.

I'd like to thank my friend from California again for the opportunity to speak this evening.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Actually, I have a question for the gentleman from Massachusetts. I know you are active on social media, I follow you, and I see you are very in touch with your constituents, particularly those on social media.

I am wondering: What are you hearing from young people about the House GOP's inability to fund the Department of Homeland Security? What do young people think about the inability to separate an important immigration issue, as you talked about, and something so critical and as important as homeland security?

Mr. MOULTON. What I hear from young people is they want the Congress to get things done for the American people. Our job is to come here and debate the important issues of the day, but, ultimately, it is to get things accomplished, it is to pass bills, it is to make laws, it is to fund important institutions of our government.

What people say is they want us to get it done. They want us to have that debate on immigration reform, they want us to do that, too, but they need funding for the Department of Homeland Security.

My generation has grown up under the threat that we came to face on September 11. Many of my friends were in New York on that perilous day and watched the planes crash into the World Trade Center towers. It is a remarkable testament to the success of the Department of Homeland Security that, over the past decade, we have not had another attack. It is a remarkable achievement. We should not put that achievement at risk.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I invite to join the conversation a leader in our party, someone who serves on the House Rules Committee and also the House Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for getting this time for this important message and to just talk with people. That is really what this body, at its very best, does: we talk amongst ourselves, we solve problems.

What you are hearing about today, namely, that we are 3 days away from shutting down our own national security, is an example of this body not solving a problem—in fact, causing a problem.

You think: Who is causing this? Why is our security going to shut down in 3 days? Who is doing this? Who is shutting down the Department of Homeland Security?

The sad answer is that we are doing it to ourselves. There is no reason for this manufactured crisis.

I want to share my story from 9/11. 9/11 is something that, in our generation, we all remember where we were. It is

like the Kennedy assassination to our grandparents' generation or like the Moon landing. Everybody knows exactly where they were and what they were doing when we heard about the Twin Towers.

I was at a conference near Washington, D.C., here. Like anybody who was near one of the sites, it was scary because we didn't know what was going on. The rumor was: all planes are flying into buildings, we are under attack.

They thought there were bombs at one point. It was a madhouse to try to escape the area and get out of the city. We drove all the way back to Colorado, and I never got to see what was happening to the towers in realtime or the immediate aftermath because, for the next 25 hours, I was just listening to it on the radio in the car, and my friend and I took turns driving.

That was a unique moment when people came together. It didn't matter if you were Democrat or Republican. Our petty differences melted by the wayside as we came together around a national response.

In many ways, it is sad to see our Nation go back to those same kind of partisan divisions which, unfortunately, reduce our national security. When we are talking about the Department of Homeland Security—which I would point out was set up after 9/11. That was set up to ensure that something like 9/11 doesn't happen again.

It coordinated agencies in a new way that didn't occur before, encouraged intelligence sharing among the agencies about domestic threats, and now, a lot of that work is just 3 days away from being defunded over a totally different issue, one that we are happy to talk about, by the way.

I mean, we talk about DREAMers and what a pathway to citizenship could look like and immigration reform and what the President can do and can't do, and those are all important discussions, and there are many diverse opinions in this body about them.

I would hope nobody with any opinion, no matter how extreme, would hold our national security hostage over this. I am reminded of what one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said, disappointed in his own party over this particular strategy.

He said: "Unfortunately, we have taken a hostage that we don't want to shoot." I think that is very much the case. Yes, they are taking our own security of our Nation and the Department of Homeland Security hostage. Do they actually want to shoot that hostage?

Our friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they are not bad people. They believe in protecting our country. I hope they don't go through with it, but they have gotten themselves into this predicament over rhetoric that threatens to jeopardize our national security.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I would ask my colleague, knowing that,

as we speak—and the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed this out, Mr. BOYLE—three Americans are in custody right now because of their intent and the steps they took to want to join ISIL. As we speak, our enemies are plotting against us.

Although my colleagues across the aisle, the House Republican leadership, wish to shut down the Department of Homeland Security, our enemies do not intend on shutting down their efforts to attack America.

What do you think, knowing that Colorado is home to a large airport, Denver International Airport, what is going to happen to the TSA officers who are charged with detecting these hidden bombs that al Qaeda has put out there that they would like to put on our airliners, detecting people who are trying to come back to the United States after fighting alongside with ISIL, what is this going to mean in places like Denver and across Colorado?

Mr. POLIS. We had a young lady from our district—you mentioned people—we had a young lady from our district, 19, from Lafayette, Colorado, who tried to get over to Turkey and then to Syria to join ISIS.

Fortunately, for her parents, for her family, frankly, for her own life, thanks to the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security, it was interdicted. Her travel plans were detected, and she was detained at the airport and not allowed to join ISIS.

Thank goodness we had the Department of Homeland Security connecting those difficult-to-connect dots. I don't even know how they did it to this day because, obviously, people go to Turkey on tourism all the time, but they used several points of information to figure out that this young lady was trying to join ISIS, and, thankfully, they were able to return her to her family.

That is the kind of thing that, unfortunately, happens every day across our country. If in 3 days this Congress doesn't take action, we are tying our own hands behind our back in our fight against terrorism, which makes absolutely no sense.

Look, you and I, Mr. SWALWELL, I am sure, were equally passionate about our views on immigration. We would love to see DACA expanded, and I would love to see a pathway to citizenship, but it would never cross my mind, no matter how I want to see those things, that I would shut down the security of the country just to get it.

I think most Americans don't think that way. I mean, here we are as some of the young Members, I think that perhaps some colleagues on the other side are acting even younger, like preschoolers and kindergartners here, where they either get all the toys or they are not letting anybody else play with them.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. We haven't named that generation yet.

Mr. POLIS. We haven't named them yet.

That is the approach here. If they don't get their exact way, well, fine, we are not going to keep the Nation safe. I mean, that just doesn't make sense in any deliberative body, like we all grew up thinking that Congress was the lofty deliberative body.

That just doesn't make sense, that kind of reasoning.

□ 1815

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. POLIS.

Mr. SWALWELL, I would just take issue. My wife, as you may know, is a kindergarten teacher and is teaching that generation, and I think she would take issue with you comparing Members of Congress to the kids she teaches. I think she would say the kids she teaches are much better behaved than many of us here in Congress.

But, you know, I do want to just circle back to a point that Mr. POLIS made, Mr. SWALWELL made, a number of the speakers here tonight have made. This is a false choice. We can have the necessary debate on immigration and immigration reform. There has been a great American tradition going back to the very beginning of, on the one hand, praising the immigrants of yesteryear while simultaneously expressing concern about the immigrants of the present day. That was the case in the 1840s and in the 1880s and in the 1920s, and so it is today.

That debate will always be a part of who we are as a nation of immigrants and as a nation of laws. I think that debate needs to happen, and we need to have that here on the floor of the House, the same way they did in the Senate where they passed the bill with 70 votes on a bipartisan basis.

So let's get to that debate. Let's not allow this sideshow over holding up a Homeland Security bill that I think all of us agree here, all 435 of us agree that we need. These are real, dangerous threats we face, people who actually thought that al Qaeda was not extreme enough so they wanted to go, instead, join an even more murderous, more barbaric group. As the sign that Mr. SWALWELL had up was showing, our enemies are certainly not shutting down their efforts, nor should we.

I do want to ask Mr. SWALWELL a question—and I think this is important whether you are near the Denver Airport or the Philadelphia Airport or the bay area—and that is: What message do you think it sends to ordinary citizens who are looking to their Congress to just get things done and protect them, the people who aren't necessarily strongly ideological one way or the other, who just want to believe that their government can work, what kind of message do you think we are sending to them this week with this sort of behavior?

Mr. SWALWELL of California. It is a message of dysfunction.

And I know Mr. POLIS, just like Mr. MOULTON, is also very much in touch with the doers and DREAMers who are

defining the innovation economy, whether it is in the bay area or Colorado or Philadelphia or Boston and Cambridge. These folks, they see the shortest distance between two points as a straight line. They don't see it as a partisan line. They are problem solving by nature, and they can't understand why politics would get in the way of something so simple as funding the Department of Homeland Security.

My own personal September 11 story, as Mr. POLIS was saying, is: I was headed to Capitol Hill that morning. I was an intern for Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher. I remember the gray suit that I was wearing was the one I wore every day at that time as I was wracking up my own student debt. As I got to the Capitol, I was turned around because the building had been evacuated. What I do remember, though, in addition to the color of the suit I wore and the phone call that I got from the staff assistant telling me to go home, I remember those Members of Congress singing "God Bless America."

I remember in the weeks and the months and the years afterwards the bipartisan 9/11 Commission Report. I remember the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, and I felt so honored when I was elected to come to Congress to be asked to serve on the Committee on Homeland Security. I felt so honored in my second term to be asked to serve on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

I cannot believe that just 14 years later, after all this bipartisanship and collaboration, while every other issue around us seems to be mired in gridlock, we have always agreed that we fund the Department of Homeland Security that was created out of September 11. Today, to think that we are so close to shutting down that Department, it really does defy the collaboration that came out of September 11.

I would ask my colleague from Colorado, who is in the Future Forum, but he is one of the more senior Members of Congress in the Future Forum—I think he is now serving his fourth term—what do you think about the collaboration that we have seen around Homeland Security up until now?

Mr. POLIS. As I like to remind my friend from California, there is not really a strict age limit, per se, of the Future Forum, but I am very proud to still be under the 40 number, at least for another half year.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. We are all in our thirties here.

Mr. POLIS. Good. We are all still in our thirties.

But look, I think that what is happening is that when people of all ages, but particularly young people look at Congress and they look at this kind of thing with, "Well, you, yourselves, are shutting down security?" when they look at that, when they look at when the whole government shut down, again, do we remember why? Not really. I don't remember why the Republicans shut down government. There

wasn't really a reason. They gave up, and they reopened it. It didn't make sense. When people see that, they lose faith in this institution; they lose faith in democracy; they lose faith in themselves. We can't allow that to happen.

The only way for this body to change, for the quality of government to change, is for people to be invested in that change, to have that same sense of solidarity that came after 9/11, not just around disasters, but every day; when it is election day, to make sure to vote; when it is time to write and call your Congressperson, if you have a Congressperson who thinks it is okay to shut down the Department of Homeland Security, call that Congressperson, show up at their town hall meeting. Guess what. It is not okay to play games with our national security.

As my colleague from Pennsylvania pointed out, many kindergartners are more mature than somebody who either wants to have it their way or not at all and to send all the toys home. That is really what we face here in this scenario. I think we have really hit upon one of the reasons that people of all ages, but particularly younger people, are losing faith not just in this institution, but as a part of the democracy it represents and how it really is our role to try and reinfuse that hope in not just, again, the competency of this institution, but the institution of representative government and the vision that our Founding Fathers put in place through the Constitution.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Thank you, Mr. POLIS.

Something we haven't really talked too much about yet, and we have alluded to the fact that we are charging these transportation safety officers with detecting these hidden bombs that al Qaeda is determined to put on our airplanes, we are charging the Border Patrol agents to protect our border and make sure that is secure, but if this shutdown happens, they still have to do that job. The threats continue to elevate and escalate, but those employees will not get paid.

I wonder what my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. MOULTON, someone who flies home, logs a lot of miles going back and forth between Washington and his district, flying into Logan, you look those transportation safety officers in the eye every week when you are coming to Washington and getting off the plane in Boston, what is the morale going to be among our TSA workforce, among our Border Patrol workforce if they still have to do the job as the threats escalate but we are not going to pay them?

Mr. MOULTON. Thank you, Mr. SWALWELL.

There is no question that their morale and their mission effectiveness will be hurt. In fact, it will hurt my own morale because I am very proud to serve in the United States Congress, but I am not going to be proud to walk through that security gate and have to

look them in the eye when they recognize that I am partly responsible, as a Member of this body, for not giving them the basic pay that they need for their families.

You know, another element of the Department of Homeland Security is the U.S. Coast Guard, and many of us know that the U.S. Coast Guard protects our shores. I represent the fishing community of Gloucester north of Boston, and Gloucester has gone through some hard times and has often had to rely on the Coast Guard to save its fishermen in the worst storms. Those Coast Guardsmen not only protect fishermen in Gloucester. They also work with our military and Department of Defense overseas. There are Coast Guardsmen and -women stationed in the Middle East today.

Can you imagine having to do such a difficult mission, to be in the Persian Gulf defending American ships against the threat of an Iranian attack and yet not knowing whether your rent will be paid back at home? That is an unacceptable risk for us to take, and it is an unacceptable burden for us to ask them to bear. You are absolutely right, sir, this is going to severely impact their morale. When morale is impacted, it hurts their ability to do this incredibly important job.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. While the workers are going to still have to do the job and not get paid, much of the Department will shut down, and an important part that will shut down will be Department of Homeland Security grants.

I have had the opportunity in just the last few weeks to go and visit about a half dozen firehouses. I call them firehouse chats. I just pop in and meet with the brave men and women who are serving as firefighters in our community. If this shutdown happens, for example, we will see all of the assistance to firefighters' grants stopped. So the men and women who are responding to car accidents, building fires, God forbid, if a terrorist attack occurred, the people who are going to run into the burning buildings, who rely upon these grants to hire firefighters, to give them the equipment they need, that is all going to be stopped.

So I am wondering if you have heard in your district or if you have talked to your law enforcement and public safety officials about the grants they depend upon and what it would mean if that funding just went cold.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. It would be, in a word, devastating.

I am proud of the fact that a part of the district I represent is the city of Philadelphia, Philadelphia Fire Department, one of the largest and oldest in our Nation, also a number of volunteer fire departments in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. There are so many of them around the country. To put them in this position is just deeply unfair.

I am also thinking, as I am looking to my friend to the right, fellow freshman, Mr. MOULTON, he happens to be from Massachusetts. They right now are devastated with mountains of snow that fortunately most of us in the rest of the country, while we have had snow, not nearly the way they have had it in New England. It is important to note that a number of those who work in FEMA are the officials who receive those grant applications, those emergency applications that so many in Massachusetts and Vermont and other parts of New England and other parts of the country are applying for right now because they have been so overstretched, given this incredible winter that we have had and record breaking in terms of snow. So they can keep on doing the applications and applying for assistance. The only problem is, come Saturday, we shut down the Department of Homeland Security, there will be no one on the other end to receive them.

I want to make one final point, and I think that this really strikes at the heart of why we are here and why the Future Forum was created.

This is my first year in the House. I might end up serving one term, might end up serving 10, who knows? For anyone who serves here, they all talk about the fact that it goes by extremely quickly. We, right now, are Members of a body with an approval rating of approximately 9 percent. I don't want to dedicate my life to public service in an area that is so poorly regarded by the American people. That is not something I want to do. I don't think that is something that other Members on the other side want to do.

It is important to our American democracy that whatever your ideology may be, whatever political positions you may have, we have to show the American people that their institutions of government can work. The American people, the overwhelming majority of Democrats and Republicans, have lost confidence in us, in all of us. I don't think this kind of a political fight, frankly, benefits either side. I think it is only a race to who loses less. We can end this now. Let's do the responsible thing, the mature thing, the right thing. Fund Homeland Security, and then get on to the important debates that we must be having.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. That is right, Mr. BOYLE. Mr. MOULTON talked about this. We are taking an issue—immigration—that there are two sharply different sides on in this House, and that is fine. That debate needs to happen. Most people on our side, almost everyone on our side wants a pathway to citizenship. But that debate must happen.

Because of that debate, what we are seeing is the one issue that we have always agreed on since the Department of Homeland Security was created is now as divisive as the immigration issue, meaning that the Republicans would like to politicize an issue that

has always had bipartisan support and make that just as divisive as they have made the immigration issue. I think that is, frankly, unfortunate.

Mr. MOULTON, I would invite you to close here on just your overall perspective on why we should or should not tie immigration to Department of Homeland Security funding.

Mr. MOULTON. Thank you, Mr. SWALWELL.

You are absolutely right, because immigration is a debate that we need to have. It is a national security debate in and of itself. We cannot hold the Department of Homeland Security hostage to that debate. It needs to occur. We ought to have that debate. We ought to have it here on the floor of the House. But our most sacred responsibility and the present threat here is to make sure that our people are safe.

□ 1830

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my friend and colleague, Mr. BOYLE, for bringing up the issue of FEMA grants. We have been faced with unprecedented snowfall in Massachusetts, and it has put our first responders to the test. They are providing for the security of the people of Massachusetts right now, and we are all banding together to make sure that we get the FEMA grants that we need and deserve. In fact, it is a great example of a crisis that is bringing Republicans and Democrats together. The Democratic delegation of Massachusetts is working hand in hand with our Republican Governor to make sure that we get these applications in so that we can get this funding that we desperately need. Yet that is all going to grind to a halt if the Department of Homeland Security is not funded.

Right here, today, we can see the effects that failing to fund the Department, shutting it down, will have. Even worse would be if we had to see the effects of another attack on our homeland. Having been to the Middle East in the past week, having seen the unprecedented challenges that our first responders face at home, we cannot afford to put our Nation's security at risk. All of the young people out there—those who are our age in the Future Forum—want a government that works. They want a government they can believe in, and they want a government that will make them safe.

Let's pass a clean funding bill. Let's fund the Department of Homeland Security. And let's show the American people that our Congress can do its job.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I thank my colleagues from California, Colorado, and from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying, as Mr. MOULTON alluded to, our principal responsibility can be found in, literally, the first sentence of the Constitution, which is: We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union . . . to provide for



the common defense of the United States.

There is no agency that has a harder job or a job that is more important in protecting our homeland than the Department of Homeland Security. We should be here today, on our first evening of the Future Forum, talking about the rising amount of student debt that millennials carry. We should be here today talking about how hard it is to get a job if you are a young person and if you have just finished college. We should be here today talking about how hard it is to buy a home if you are carrying all of this student debt. We should be talking about the need for diversity and about having a pathway to citizenship for immigration.

Instead, bizarrely, we are here talking about the real possibility that the Department of Homeland Security, created out of a bipartisan coalition in the early 2000s, could shut down and leave us more vulnerable.

I hope that our better angels will guide us. I hope that the spirit that those House Members had when they stood on the steps of the Capitol after September 11 prevails, that we work more collaboratively, and that we remember, at the end of the day, we are charged with protecting the people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S CONSTITUTIONAL OVERREACH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House this evening, and I appreciate the opportunity to continue the conversation that was started by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle tonight.

Listen, there is a future in this body that, hopefully, is going to look a lot different than what it has looked like in past decades. I would fully concur that government should work and that we should keep the government open, but we must also defend the Constitution, and that is the paradox that we are faced with this week. I rise with some frustration from my side of the aisle and from what I have seen from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in recent days.

I have seen speeches upon speeches upon speeches about a partial shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. I have seen big signs in the well of this House, scaring the American people about a potential partial

shutdown. I have seen press conferences across the country, including in my hometown of the Tampa Bay area, scaring the American people about something that has not yet happened. Recognize that all of these speeches, all of these signs are coming not from members of our community, not from the people who elected us; these speeches, these signs—the “sky is falling” mentality—are coming from our elected leaders, from Members of this body.

Why does that matter? Why do I rise tonight to continue the conversation started by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle?

It is this: all we are hearing are speeches, and all we are seeing are signs. We are not hearing solutions.

To this entire body—to both sides of the aisle—our constitutional authority was infringed upon when the President signed his executive order. That is not a partisan issue. We have a responsibility to confront that constitutional overreach. Yes, one mechanism we used to do that was the power of the purse. That is a fundamental power of this body, the power of the purse, and it was appropriate that we responded to the President's unconstitutional overreach by exercising our constitutional privilege, that of the appropriations process.

Here is what I would point out to the American people tonight about the speeches that they hear from my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Recognize something very important: what is being presented in the midst of this debate over the constitutional overreach of the President is merely an “all or nothing” approach. It is either we pass a clean bill—and as the leader on the other side said, he will deliver 188 votes if we pass a clean bill—or it is nothing. Friends, colleagues, that is not legislating. That is using the bully pulpit. That is politics. That is not legislating.

So what I would ask tonight is: Where are the solutions? Where is the conviction on the other side of the aisle? Where are the efforts to pass a bill that accommodates all Members of this body, Members on the other side, and, yes, something the President can sign?

You see, I am actually a Member of Congress who thinks that the first priority of this body is to fund the government and to fund the Department of Homeland Security. I am looking to work with colleagues on the other side of the aisle to say: How do we do that? We have a responsibility to do that.

I have three Coast Guard installations in my district. They are men and women—it is absolutely true what is talked about—who will have to go to work on Saturday morning with only the promise to be paid later. That is wrong. That is a failure of this Congress if we let that happen.

We do have until Friday evening to solve this, and I believe we will, but I am asking, actually, for accommoda-

tion and cooperation from the other side of the aisle. What will it take? What will it take?

Think about this: Rather than putting signs on the floor, rather than condemning our side of the aisle for trying to respond to the constitutional overreach of the President, what if we talk about provisions that will actually build consensus and get a majority of this body, regardless of Republican, Democrat, Independent—whoever you are—to fund the Department of Homeland Security and to also respond to the constitutional overreach of the President? I think we can get there.

Do you know what I have never heard from the other side of the aisle? I have never heard: What if we remove the funding prohibition in the original House bill that prohibited the implementation, the further exercise, of DACA? They criticized it. If we remove it, does that get us the votes to pass a bill?

I understand there is disagreement over the President's executive order from last September. I think it was wrong. Members on the other side don't. A Federal judge has said it is unconstitutional. The President of the United States said over 20 times he didn't have the authority to do it. Yet he did it. What if we allowed 6 months to let the courts work their will? It is perfectly reasonable.

If you are a Member of this Congress who stood up on opening day and took the oath to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States, to defend and protect the obligation of your office, why don't we agree upon a 6-month delay in the implementation of the President's executive order, an executive order a Federal judge has already put a hold on? Does that get us there? Does that get us the votes necessary?

What my colleagues on the other side of the aisle tonight said is absolutely true: Congress should work, Congress should govern. The American people should expect that of all of us.

It doesn't matter our partisan affiliations, but it does matter whether or not we truly exercise the convictions about which we pontificate on the floor here tonight. It is not about signs. It is not about the bully pulpit. It is not about press conferences.

Any Member who stands up here tonight, Republican or Democrat, and says that we will be worse off as a nation on Friday night if we have not funded the Department of Homeland Security is absolutely right. We must fund the government. But where is the effort on the other side of the aisle to actually reach a compromise? It is not there.

I promise you that I have watched my colleagues from the time I got here this week—every speech. The leader on the other side of the aisle made an impassioned speech about the importance of funding Homeland Security, and he is right.