

the Republican leader says, that there is only one bill that will become law, that is not so. His bill will not pass the Senate and will not pass the House. It is not the only way for us to make a law.

After the first vote fails, Republicans will have a chance to vote with us to reopen their government. The second vote determines whether you want to reopen the government or not. The second vote determines whether you are willing to reopen the government without taking hostages, without hurting 800,000 workers, and without hurting America but open the government with no conditions. We can send that bill to the President's desk. It has already passed the House.

The President may choose to veto it, just as we may choose to override that veto. My dear friend from Louisiana missed that point. If we act with 67 votes, even if the President doesn't like it, it can pass.

We all know it was the President who threw us into this turmoil when he changed his mind and opposed a bill to reopen the government without conditions—just like the one we offered in December and the House wouldn't go forward with, even though the Senate voted for it unanimously.

Our bill should not be controversial. Our amendment is nearly the same bill Republicans all voted for a month ago. It shows that the one cause of this shutdown is the one person who bragged he wanted it—President Donald Trump.

Last month, the Senate unanimously passed the short-term bill to keep the government open. It was Leader McConnell's idea. Everyone thought the President would support it, but President Trump buckled to the most extreme voices in his party and reversed his position at the eleventh hour. That is how the government shutdown began, sadly and unfortunately. Since then, we tried to negotiate with the administration to no avail. When the President's deputies made offers, the President almost immediately retracted them. The President even rejected an idea by Senator GRAHAM, one of his staunchest allies in the Senate, to reopen government temporarily while we debate border security.

Now the President is back with a "straw man" proposal, as the Senator from Oklahoma called it, that makes the same demand he has been making all along: \$5.7 billion taxpayer dollars for a border wall he promised Mexico would pay for, and it adds a new radical change to our asylum laws. What the President calls concessions to Democrats are the protections for DACA and TPS recipients that the President himself rescinded and have been subsequently protected by the court.

Calling this a reasonable compromise is laughable. It is a starkly partisan proposal that perfectly encapsulates the President's hostage-taking of the

American government. This is what the President could be saying in this bill: Give me everything I want in exchange for reopening the government. A vote for the President's plan is very simply an endorsement of government by extortion. Enough is enough.

I know that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree with me. They understand that holding our government workers hostage for a policy goal is no way to govern. I know they feel that way. I urge them to vote yes on the second vote.

Supporting our amendment doesn't mean you don't support stronger border security. To the contrary, it starts funding that effort once again. Voting for this amendment means you agree with the vast majority of the American people that the government should open without precondition. Voting for this amendment means you recognize that holding millions of Americans hostage is not a way to run our government. Voting for this amendment means that you believe members of the Coast Guard, the TSA, the DHS, and the FBI should be paid for their work protecting our country. Voting for this amendment means you support our air traffic controllers, food inspectors, and the men and women who work at our national parks. And yes, voting for this amendment means that you support border security. It means you support a way out of this shutdown where we can sit down and rationally hash out our differences. If we can't do that, if we can't agree today that the way to solve disagreements over policy is through debate and consideration in Congress where it belongs, then we are staring down a very long and very dark tunnel.

Our system of government was designed to allow space for disagreements, even vociferous ones, but when one side—in this case, the President—uses the basic functioning of our government as leverage to extract policy concessions, our entire system of government breaks down. It is a recipe for gridlock, dysfunction, and paralysis, not only now but on into the future.

I believe there are men and women of good faith on both sides of the aisle who want to see this senselessness come to an end today. Let the Senate come together now. Let the Senate rise to the occasion as it has done so often in the past. Vote yes on the second amendment. Open the people's government.

I yield the floor.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant bill 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 Senate amendment No. 5 to H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Josh Hawley, John Thune, Shelley Moore Capito, Johnny Isakson, Mike Crapo, Richard Burr, James Lankford, Tom Cotton, Roy Blunt, David Perdue, Mike Rounds, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn, Rob Portman, Steve Daines, John Kennedy.

AMENDMENT NO. 5

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 amendment No. 5, offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] to H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) would have voted "yea".

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 9 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Roberts
Blunt	Grassley	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hooven	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cramer	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	McSally	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Harris	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Sanders
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Jones	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kaine	Sinema
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Lee	Udall
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Cotton	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—3

Paul	Risch	Rosen
------	-------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 47.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 6 to H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Chuck Schumer, Patrick Leahy, Ben Cardin, Tim Kaine, Brian Schatz, Chris Van Hollen, Chris Coons, Sheldon Whitehouse, Kirsten Gillibrand, Jeanne Shaheen, Gary Peters, Bob Casey, Jr., Tom Udall, Angus King, Debbie Stabenow, Maria Cantwell, Martin Heinrich.

AMENDMENT NO. 6

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 amendment No. 6, offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] to H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) would have voted "nay".

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 10 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Harris	Reed
Baldwin	Hassan	Romney
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Isakson	Schumer
Brown	Jones	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kaine	Sinema
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Udall
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Gardner	Murray	
Gillibrand	Peters	

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Blunt	Braun
Blackburn	Boozman	Capito

Cassidy	Hoeben	Rounds
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cotton	Inhofe	Sasse
Cramer	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Crapo	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Lankford	Shelby
Daines	Lee	Sullivan
Enzi	McConnell	Thune
Ernst	McSally	Tillis
Fischer	Moran	Toomey
Graham	Perdue	Wicker
Grassley	Portman	Young
Hawley	Roberts	

NOT VOTING—4

Burr	Risch
Paul	Rosen

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 44.

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

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON, be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object because we had floor time immediately after my friend from Texas, could you give us an idea of how much time you will be using on the floor before we have the time—we were supposed to come immediately after you. That is my reason for raising that issue.

Mr. CORNYN. I promise my friend from Maryland that I will be less than an hour. I am kidding. I am kidding. I will try to wrap it up in 10 or 15 minutes, max.

Mr. CARDIN. There are about 15 Senators who are waiting for the time. We were originally supposed to start at 3:30. Now we are starting later. I know Senators are going to be inconvenienced. Some have commitments.

I will remove my objection. I really want it understood that we thought we would be starting our time before that.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, responding to our friend from Maryland, I understand the situation. We will try to figure out how to accommodate all Senators so that they get a chance to speak.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, since the shutdown began, we have heard voices on both sides of the aisle, mine included, calling for a bipartisan solution to fund the government and end this stalemate. With Speaker PELOSI and Minority Leader SCHUMER refusing to come to the negotiating table, they made finding common ground much harder than it needs to be.

This weekend, President Trump made a serious proposal that would deliver on priorities that are important to both parties—Republicans and Democrats—in bringing this partial government shutdown to an end.

The bill we voted on today contains key provisions to border security and to make improvements to our immigration system as a whole. As we have

heard from the Border Patrol experts time and again, we need sensible solutions, which, along the border, consist of three components: its physical barriers in some locations, its technology in others, and personnel in others—or some combination of those three.

President Trump himself has said he understands there doesn't need to be a wall from sea to shining sea, and he has acknowledged the role of technology and personnel and border security. We need to prevent the illegal movement of goods and people without inhibiting legitimate trade and travel.

I wish to show colleagues one example of a physical barrier in Texas that was voted on in a bond election in Hidalgo County, TX. These are folks who live on the border. They voted to pay for this levee wall. The reason? Because they knew the levee system had to be improved in order to get insurance companies to write insurance so that they could build and develop the property in Hidalgo County, TX.

They also talked to the Border Patrol about what the Border Patrol needed to control the movement of illegal immigration across the border, and they came up with a win-win proposition—a levee wall, which is appropriate at this particular location. This was voted on as a bond election by the voters in Hidalgo County, TX, and did not involve spending any Federal money.

My simple point is, there are solutions that can be worked out if we consult the experts—the Border Patrol—to find out what exactly they need for border security that will meet with public approval along the border and represent a win-win.

Recently, when the President was in McAllen, TX, Senator CRUZ—my colleague from Texas—and I had a meeting with mayors and county judges after the President's entourage left to come back to Washington, DC. I remember specifically my friend, Judge Eddie Trevino, the county judge of Cameron County, TX—that is where Brownsville, TX, is—who said: If it is the Border Patrol and Customs and Border Protection telling us what we need in order to secure the border, we are all in. But if it is people in Washington, DC, making political judgments, politicians trying to micromanage how the border can be secured, we remain deeply skeptical.

I think those wise words ought to guide us in our discussions going forward. Not only did the legislation that embodied the President's proposal invest in critical components along the border, it included more than \$1 billion for improvements and personnel at our ports of entry.

If you talk to anybody who knows anything about the movement of illegal drugs—heroin, methamphetamine, fentanyl—across the border, most of it comes through the port of entry, embedded in trucks and trailers and personal vehicles. We need more technology in order to scan those vehicles

in secondary review. In order to detect them, deter them, interdict them, we need the personnel to be able to do that without impeding legitimate trade and travel.

These are priorities I have long advocated for, based on feedback from the experts—the law enforcement officers, community leaders, and folks who live and work along the Texas-Mexico border every day.

As we all know, the challenges that exist within our immigration system don't end at our borders. With a court backlog of roughly 800,000 cases deep, nearly 1 million people living in the United States with temporary legal status, and the loopholes that make enforcing some of our immigration laws nearly impossible, there is much more that needs to be done. That is why this legislation includes provisions to build the foundation of real immigration reform—something heralded by both parties.

This bill generously granted provisional status to current DACA and temporary protected status recipients, who live each day not knowing if or when they would be forced to leave the United States. It does not offer a path to citizenship or a long-term solution. I wish we could do that, but we don't have a long-term solution. It does provide stability for 3 years while Congress works on a legislative fix.

This is far from a solution to the pervasive problems in our immigration system, but it is a start. A journey of 1,000 miles begins with a single step. This represents a first step. Most importantly, though, this legislation funds the Departments and Agencies that have been shuttered since December 22. This shutdown may have begun as a battle for border security, but it affects men and women in all 50 States whose jobs have nothing to do with border security at all, people at the Department of Agriculture, the Justice Department, the Interior Department, Housing and Urban Development, Treasury, the National Space and Aeronautics Agency, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Peace Corps. All of the people working for each of these government Agencies are working without pay or have been furloughed. Not only is the partial shutdown impacting the critical work being done by these Departments and Agencies, it is harming the dedicated men and women who work at them, those tasked with executing and enforcing laws written by this very body.

Since this shutdown began 34 days ago, nearly 800,000 Federal workers have lost the security of knowing when their next paycheck will come. Tomorrow is the second paycheck they will miss, meaning they have now gone more than a month without income.

Yesterday, when I was in Austin and then in Dallas, I was told that people who routinely volunteer their time at the food banks in those locations now find themselves going to the food

banks and seeking food so they can feed their families because they are missing a government paycheck and can't provide for them without the generosity of those food banks.

I also went to events in Austin and Dallas and met with U.S. attorneys in both locations to talk about our efforts to counter human trafficking and child exploitation. What I learned is that the frontline prosecutors who prosecute these kinds of cases aren't being paid, but maybe more troublesome is the fact that neither are the FBI agents who conduct the investigations or the administrative personnel who support the U.S. attorneys offices. So this is harming our ability to investigate and prosecute human trafficking and child exploitation cases too. People are being forced to work without pay, and it is harming not only them but also the victims of these horrific crimes.

More than 110,000 of these unpaid Federal workers earn less than \$50,000 a year, and they rely on their paycheck to make ends meet. They are not millionaires. While we did pass legislation to guarantee that these public servants will eventually get their pay, that does nothing to help them in the interim.

Federal workers are being forced to make decisions that no family should have to consider. For a single mom who is a Federal correctional officer in Arizona, that means turning off her heat, never letting the temperature get higher than 60 or 65 degrees in order to cut costs. For a mom in Wisconsin who works at the Department of the Interior, that means rationing her insulin because she can't afford the \$300 copay.

This shutdown is deeply impacting thousands of Federal workers and their families all across the country, including Texas. One Texan who works at the Internal Revenue Service says he has been sleeping in so he only has to worry about eating two meals a day, not three. One woman whose husband is in the Coast Guard drove from Galveston to Ellington Field in Houston—about 40 miles each way—to pick up free diapers for their kids.

On a recent trip home, I heard specific examples of the impact this shutdown has had on the Department of Justice, which I mentioned just a moment ago, and the heartbreaking challenges they are facing every day. These dedicated men and women have chosen their careers in public service. They want to go to work. They want to be able to pay their bills. It is time for us to do our job so they can do theirs with the dignity and the pay they earn.

I want to remind all our colleagues that our constituents did not send us to Washington so we could simply vote no on a less than perfect piece of legislation. If that were the case, we would never get anything done here. We were elected to work with our colleagues to create legislation so we can get to yes, to build consensus, and to solve problems, not to score political points.

Are there certain pieces of legislation that I don't agree with? Of

course—parts of this legislation we just voted on. But it does fund priorities critical to our southern border and to the people of Texas. Right now, this is the only bill I have seen that includes priorities of both parties and that carries the President's support.

I voted for this legislation to support the men and women who have been treated as collateral damage throughout this unnecessary government shutdown, those who are forced to apply for food stamps or unemployment who would rather be working, who can't pay their medical bills or for childcare, who not only want this shutdown to end but need for this shutdown to end.

We aren't here to hold show votes on legislation the President won't sign. Just ask the elementary school civics students, and they can tell you that is not how a bill becomes a law.

This was a serious offer by the President to end this shutdown and build the trust and good will necessary to have real reform, and I am disappointed that our colleagues voted against this bill. That was a vote not on the merits of the President's proposal; that was a vote to get on the bill so it could be amended. In other words, our colleagues who voted against the bill aren't even interested in having a conversation about how we solve this problem and how we find our way out of this boxed canyon. Unfortunately, there are those who, for political reasons, continue to lack any interest in negotiating a compromise bill that could earn bipartisan support.

We solve difficult problems every day in the U.S. Congress on a bipartisan basis—every single day—but somehow we have decided we can't solve this problem. And I fear that is not because of the difficulty of the problem presented; it is because of the politics that have paralyzed us and made it impossible for us to bridge our differences.

I thank the President for this comprehensive offer and the majority leader for bringing it to the floor so we could vote on it. I would urge all of our colleagues, now that we have had these two failed votes—we know we are right where we started when we got here today—to work together to try to bridge our differences, to build consensus, and end this shutdown.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is the minority leader on the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not see him.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 1

Mr. JOHNSON. Yesterday, Chaplain Black opened the Senate by quoting the Gospel according to Luke. He said: "Those who work deserve their pay." I could not agree more.

First of all, I want to thank the finest among us—the members of the Coast Guard, TSA, Customs and Border Protection, ICE, all the men and women whom, because of Federal law, we require to work who are caught up

in the shutdown politics, which I don't agree with, and they are not getting paid. It is a basic principle that we should pay these individuals.

Earlier today, my colleague, the Senator from Alaska, with other Republican colleagues, came to the floor asking a simple question—proposing a bill to pay the men and women of the Coast Guard, and for some reason, the minority leader and Democrats objected to this very fair proposal.

Today, I come to the floor to offer an amendment to the bill I introduced 10 days ago. It has been talked about in the press. We have 24 Republican cosponsors of the Shutdown Fairness Act, which does a pretty simple thing: It simply pays those individuals who are doing the work trying to keep this Nation safe.

Mr. President, I see the minority leader here.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 6, H.J. Res. 1. I ask unanimous consent that the Johnson amendment at the desk be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object, I heard my good friend from Wisconsin say, give him one good reason to object to the Coast Guard. No, there is not one; there are 760,000, if that is the right number—the number of non-Coast Guard workers who are not getting paid.

Similarly here, it will be easy for any Member to get up and pick and choose and say: Pay these. Pay those. Don't pay these. Don't pay those.

Our position on this side is simple: They should not be held hostage. They should not say: We are not going to pay you unless we get our way on the wall—which is exactly what President Trump is doing and exactly what my colleagues, with some exceptions, have decided to do on that side of the aisle, including my good friend from Wisconsin. That is not fair. Everyone deserves to be paid. These are all hard-working people. They have done nothing wrong. They all get up on Monday morning, even if they have a fever or something, to go to work because they believe in what they are doing. They are government workers. To pick and choose some and not others is the wrong way to go and would lead to a cacophony. Every one of us could get up and say: Maybe we should, say, just pay the workers in Brooklyn, NY. It doesn't make any sense at all.

So I would modify my friend's request and expand it to all of our Federal workers, which is only fair.

Reserving the right to object, would the Senator modify his request to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 28, which has been re-

ceived from the House, making further additional continuing appropriations through February 28; that the joint resolution be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate?

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I do object because we basically just voted on that in the Senate, and it was voted down. The President would not sign that. That would not become law. And the minority leader is holding 400-some thousand individuals who are actually working who should get paid—he is the one holding them hostage.

I would yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SCHUMER. I object to that. I am in the middle of an objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection to the modification is heard.

Mr. SCHUMER. Leader MCCONNELL has requested I go to his office. I think that is more important than some of these activities. I am going to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader does not have the floor.

Does the Democratic leader object to the original request?

Mr. SCHUMER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I would like to turn it over to the Senator from Tennessee for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Could the Presiding Officer let me know when 60 seconds is up so the Senator from Alaska can have 60 seconds? And then we can go on with the colloquy people have been waiting for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, this is what we just heard. The Senator from Wisconsin asked unanimous consent that the Senate approve pay for 400,000 workers who are being forced to work without pay. No Republican objects to the Senator from Wisconsin's idea, but the Democratic leader does. That means the Democratic leader is saying to 53,000 TSA employees who make about \$40,000 a year that he objects on behalf of the Democratic side to paying them while they are forced to work. He is saying to 54,000 Customs and Border Protection agents that he objects to paying them while they are forced to work.

Senator JOHNSON says that on the Republican side, we want to pay 42,000 Coast Guard employees who are forced to work and aren't getting paid. The Democratic leader says he objects to that and to 14,000 air traffic control-

lers, 16,000 Bureau of Prisons corrections officers, and 35,000 IRS employees. They are being forced to work. The Republicans are saying pay them; the Democratic leader objects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I had previously noted on the floor the group of Senators who want to join together to send a clear message that we are committed to working together to end this shutdown and responsibly deal with border security in a truly bipartisan manner. This is a group of an equal number of Democrats and Republicans. Senator MURKOWSKI is leading this on the Republican side of the floor today.

I ask unanimous consent that for the next hour, the two of us control 30 minutes of time; that I control 30 minutes and Senator MURKOWSKI will control the other 30 minutes of time.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, during this floor time, I think you are going to see clear messages coming from Democratic Senators and Republican Senators that this shutdown needs to end, that we need to pass a short-term, 3-week clean CR so we can have time to consider the President's request and work together on a bipartisan border security package.

I want my colleagues to know we have been meeting regularly in an effort to try to see where we can find common ground. We feel pretty confident that we can find common ground if we can get government open and get to work in a responsible manner to deal with border security in the best interest of the people of this Nation.

Mr. President, I will first yield to my friend from Virginia, Senator WARNER, then I will yield time and give up the floor to Senator MURKOWSKI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I appreciate my friend, the Senator from Maryland, yielding time. I appreciate the fact that this may be the first time, at least in the last few weeks, where a group of Senators from both sides of the aisle are actually coming together to find agreement—not to score “gotcha” points but to find agreement. I promised the Senator I would be very brief.

It is clear this government shutdown needs to come to an end. My hope would be that as we move toward that conclusion, we will also look at the issues revolving around, particularly, low-paid Federal contractors who will get no relief when the government reopens. I also hope we can work together.

I have legislation called the Stop STUPIDITY Act. It is a good name. It may need further amendments that would try to prohibit future shutdowns being used by either party on a going-forward basis.

What I think we need to do, and I think other colleagues will acknowledge this, is let's take a 3-week, short-

term CR. Let's consider the President's proposal. Let me be clear. The President is watching. This Senator will commit to good-faith negotiations. This Senator will commit to supporting increased border security beyond what we just voted on in the so-called Democratic proposal. I hope the President will take that kind of commitment for increased border security as a good-faith effort and will be responsive so we can get this government reopened on a short-term basis and that the kind of horror stories we all can recount about our workers, contractors, and oftentimes private businesses that surround those Federal installations—that will see no relief—can actually get their operations back open.

I thank my friend, the Senator from Maryland, for granting me this time. I thank the Senator from Alaska for leadership on her time. Let's see if this eight can go forth and multiply so, before this weekend is over, we can get our workforce back to work doing the people's business.

I yield back to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleagues being down here again on a bipartisan basis to talk about where we are at this moment.

We just had two messaging votes. Both of those votes failed. I voted for both of them because my message was I want to get this government open. I want to do it quickly and with the sense of urgency that responds to the men and women who have been so significantly impacted by this partial government shutdown for the past 34 days. I also want to be fair to the President's priorities that he has articulated in the proposal that he has provided to us as recently as Saturday. I think we can do this together.

My message to folks back home—my message to people is don't give up hope because now is the time that we all must come together to address these issues, but you can't do it when the government is shut down.

I have indicated I am supportive of a measure the Senator from Maryland, Mr. CARDIN, has introduced that will allow for a short-term CR, 3 weeks, allow us then to go through—whether it is the appropriations process, the Judiciary Committee process—but allow us to have this debate on these important priorities; allow us to do the business of the Senate, to do the business of legislating, but let's also allow the business of the government to proceed by opening up the government right now.

We will have an opportunity to go back and forth amongst colleagues. I will remind folks, we have very limited periods of time.

I am going to yield to my colleagues on the other side. It is so important that we are coming together now to offer some glimmer of hope.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I couldn't agree more with my friend from Alaska and the way she worded it. We are going to work together to open the government as quickly as possible.

I yield to my friend from Delaware, Senator COONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank my colleagues from Alaska, Maryland, and other States for their willingness to spend so much time talking, listening, and trying, together, to craft a path forward.

The role the Senate has historically played in our constitutional order is one where we are the body that others look to when there is either an inflexibility or an unreliability in negotiating a path forward. We have lots of folks across this country suffering from this government shutdown. It is having an impact that all of us could detail.

I have to ask, what is it going to take for us to reopen this government? Is it going to take a breakdown in food security or airline security? Is it going to take an increase in crime or terrorism, an accident, or thousands more Americans struggling to feed their families, losing housing or electricity? I will not go on with the list. We all know the human cost of this shutdown.

I am here to join my friends, my colleagues from both parties, in saying that we are intent on making a good-faith effort to reopen the government for 3 weeks, to promptly support good-faith negotiations, to address the President's priorities, to discuss what effective, modern investment in border security and changes in immigration policy would look like, and then reach a resolution in 3 weeks or less. We have to be able to do this. We have to show our country and the world that democracy can work.

I am optimistic that with the passion and the commitment I have heard from my bipartisan colleagues who stand on the floor with me tonight, that it is possible to get this done and that whatever gets taken up and considered in regular order by this body could then be passed by the House and signed into law by the President.

Let us take a first bold step together today and sign on to an amendment that my colleague from Maryland has, committing us to a clean, 3-week continuing resolution, reopening the government, and promptly negotiating in good faith to increase investment in border security.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I would ask that the Senator from Maine be recognized at this time.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this shutdown, the longest in our history, must come to an end. It has already caused far too much harm for 800,000 dedicated Federal employees and their families who are struggling to pay bills without paychecks and are on the

verge of missing yet another paycheck. It has hurt the American people who need to interact with Federal Agencies, including seniors, low-income families, people with disabilities who worry about their housing assistance. It is damaging our economy, causing a drop in consumer confidence and consumer spending.

Ironically, shutdowns always end up costing the government more money than if we had operated as we should.

I see a glimmer of hope here. We at least have had two votes today on two different plans. Like the Senator from Alaska and others, I supported both plans because my priority is to reopen government, but where I am really optimistic is the fact that 16 Senators are on the floor, equally divided between the two parties, and willing to compromise. Compromise is not a dirty word. It is not a sign of weakness. It is a sign of strength.

Let us compromise to reopen government, address border security, and get on with the business of this country.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. At this time, I yield to my colleague from Arizona, Senator SINEMA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleagues from Maryland and Alaska for bringing us together today but also for the work our group has been putting in for the last several weeks to find a solution to end this harmful and hurtful shutdown.

The voters of Arizona want a government that is lean, that allows them to pursue their individual interests, and that, above all, does not detract from their everyday life.

Unfortunately, when the Federal Government is shut down, as it is today, it detracts and takes away from the quality of life for folks in Arizona.

Recently, the President asked the Congress to consider appropriations for border security. I stand in support of working together across the aisle with my colleagues in the Senate to answer that request. Arizona needs enhanced funding for border security, and I feel confident that if given 3 weeks, the Republicans and Democrats together in this body could find a reasonable compromise that both continues to keep our government operating in a lean and efficient way, while also providing for efficient and effective border security.

In Arizona, we bear the brunt of a government that has failed its duty to secure our border and protect our communities; in Arizona, we bear the brunt of our country's failure to solve the immigration crisis we live in today; in Arizona, we have been waiting for over three decades for the Congress to solve this problem so that we in Arizona can live our lives free from unnecessary government interference and with the full freedom our country has promised us.

I believe that if we work together over the next 3 weeks, we can find a compromise, we can find a solution to this challenge, and we can work with our colleagues in the House and send a piece of legislation to the President that will meet the security needs of our country and ensure that we keep government operating efficiently and effectively for the people of my State and for this country. I look forward to working over the next several weeks to solve this challenge.

I request of the President, allow us those 3 weeks to find this bipartisan solution together.

I yield back.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I ask that the Senator from South Carolina be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I just got off the phone with the President. I told him we were talking about a 3-week CR. All of us believe that if we had 3 weeks with the government open and all the discord coming from a shutdown, that we could find a way forward to produce a bill that he would sign that would be good for everybody in the country, but we need that opportunity.

He gave me some indications of things he would want for a 3-week CR that would be a good-faith downpayment on moving forward that I thought were imminently reasonable. Rather than me telling you about what he said, I think Senator SCHUMER and Senator MCCONNELL will be talking about this.

The 3-week CR concept is a good idea, and what the President wants to add to it made sense to me, and it gets us back in the ball game. Here is what is going to happen. The TPS language that was sent over by the President is a move forward but unacceptable to my Democratic colleagues. It needs to be like what TIM KAINE did. The DACA provision sent over by the President is moving forward, but it needs to be what Senator DURBIN did because they are both, I think, reasonable proposals that the President should be able to accept.

To my Democratic friends, money for a barrier is required to get this deal done. It will not be a concrete wall, and the money will be a program to a DHS plan that all of you know about and have been briefed on and should approve.

You are not giving President Trump a bunch of money to do anything he wants to do. He has to spend it on a plan that the professionals have come up with. If you want \$800 million for refugee assistance, you will get it. We all need more judges, and 250 more Border Patrol agents on the border would be good for us all.

I want to let the public know I have never been more optimistic than I am now if we can find a way to open up the government for 3 weeks. If we fail, everybody can say we did our best. This is one last chance to get this right. I

am just hoping and praying that what the President is asking for, in addition to Senator CARDIN's 3-week CR, he will entertain. Let's get to work. If we can get in a room, we will fix this, and it won't take 3 weeks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I am now pleased to yield to my colleague from Maryland, Senator VAN HOLLEN, who has been a real partner during his stay here in the Senate. We have traveled the State of Maryland together, and we know firsthand the hardships of this shutdown. We have seen the faces, and we have seen the consequences.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and partner from Maryland for all of his work in ending the shutdown.

I thank him, as well as our friend from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, for bringing us together in a bipartisan way to find a solution to end this shutdown as soon as possible. That is why I support the bipartisan amendment that will be filed this afternoon to open the government for 3 weeks.

I should stress that this is not my preferred solution. I would like to take up the bill that is at the desk that would open eight of the nine Federal Departments right away and give us time to deal with the Department of Homeland Security. Yet the proposal before us is our best option at this point in time for resolving this shutdown.

What will 3 weeks accomplish? It is a fair question.

First of all, it will allow Federal Government employees—all of them—to get back to work for the American people and help resume vital services.

No. 2, it will make sure that all of them get paid—those who are working without pay and those who have been locked out. That is important because all of us know that tomorrow marks the second full pay period of when they will get big fat zeros on their paychecks even as their bills keep coming through the door.

It will do something else that is very important. It will give the Senate and the House a little breathing room to work together on a bipartisan basis to address a number of priorities—priorities to make sure we provide adequate border security, which can include additional resources. We can spend some time addressing immigration issues, including those that were just mentioned by the Senator from South Carolina.

I believe this time and space is absolutely needed to allow us to work together in a bipartisan way. While 3 weeks may not sound like a lot of time, in part, it will help focus our attention on getting the job done, and we will all be held accountable in the House, in the Senate, and in the White House for getting our work done in that period.

I thank our colleagues for showing this good faith in trying to find a solu-

tion to doing it. Take 3 weeks. Open the government. Let's have those very important discussions. Let's do it in a sober and serious way. If we do so, I am confident that we can find a permanent result that will help us get out of this crisis.

I thank the Senator.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, all Democrats and Republicans, pay close attention.

I have been here for 20 years, and I have seen a lot of shutdowns—about five of them. I want to talk about what they have produced.

The first one with Bill Clinton produced Monica Lewinsky. That is how they got into all the trouble—because she was an intern at the White House. Idle hands are never good.

For us, Newt Gingrich lost his job in the same shutdown. He lost his job because he lost six votes in the House and couldn't get reelected as Speaker. I had to replace him. I am kind of glad that happened, but it is still not a good reason to have a shutdown.

A few years later, great Senators—John McCain being one of them and Ted Kennedy being another—worked their fingers to the bone and came up with a great immigration bill that I was a part of in my first term in the Senate. We got castigated and ruined because, all of a sudden, “amnesty” became a four-letter word, and political consultants found it to be kind of an easy way to run against people in the party.

For 15 years, we have been beating each other over something that ought to be easy to do, which is to change for the better. A lot of people think Congress's job is for us to come to Washington and change things for the better. When it comes to immigration, all we ever change is the subject. We never end the debate, and we never pass a result. Oftentimes, we call each other names for the wrong reason.

I am here for one reason—to thank my colleagues who are on the floor. To all of the others who are ready to do some business, I am ready to do some business. It is time we put the workers in our government back to work. It is time we did what we promised the people in the United States of America we would do. And it is time we went to work because when everybody is out of work, it is our fault. They are the people who carry the mail, who empty the garbage, who cook in the cafeteria, who clean up the parks, and they do everything without complaining whatsoever. They are out there—many of them—not even being paid right now while we are sitting here, debating a subject that we can't reach a solution on—period.

We need to take our armor off, leave our weapons at the door, walk in the room, and shake hands.

We need to grab BEN CARDIN's hand and say: BEN, thank you for making an effort as a Democrat.

LISA, thank you, as a Republican, for supporting it.

Let's sit down, and let's pass a bill we can all agree on that gets Americans back to work and restores the spirit of Ellis Island and the pride of the United States of America.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I have joined Senator ISAKSON on many bills since I have been in the Senate, and I look forward to working with him to find the solution with regard to border security issues. I thank him for his comments.

I yield to my colleague from Maine, Senator KING, who has been so instrumental in trying to come up with concrete ways to end this shutdown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it strikes me that there are really two problems before us—one we can resolve this evening or tomorrow morning or in the next 24 hours, and that is the shutdown. At least we could resolve it for a limited period of time and then start talking about the second problem, which is border security.

I think one of the unfortunate realities of what has happened in the last month is the assumption on the part of some that there was no good faith on border security and no interest in dealing with border security from this side of the aisle. That is a misunderstanding. I voted in 2013 for the largest border security provision that I think has ever come before the U.S. Senate. So did virtually every Member of this caucus and a third or more of the other caucus. Two-thirds of the Senate voted for that bill with a very important border security provision.

I want to be very clear. I am very supportive of border security and of increasing border security. There also may be cases in which there may be parts of the border at which some kind of barrier makes sense and is cost-effective; whereas, there are other areas of the border at which it doesn't make sense. What I am interested in is a thorough discussion with the experts about what the most cost-effective way is to protect our citizens and secure the border. I believe this proposal today gives us the breathing space to have that discussion.

I remind my colleagues that this administration submitted a border security proposal to the Congress last February with its budget of \$1.6 billion. Lo and behold, it was approved by the Appropriations Committee and by this body. That is an indication to me that there is good faith.

I think the important thing to communicate now is to not complicate this with conditions. Let's take the awful hammer away—and I don't have to reiterate all that has been said today

about the devastating effect of this shutdown on people in all of our States and on people who are working for no pay, which is fundamentally wrong—and then spend the next 3 weeks finding a solution, which I believe we can do. I have had enough discussions with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I think there is a solution to be had that will satisfy the President, the two bodies of Congress, and, most importantly, the American people in terms of the protection we can provide.

I am happy to join my colleague today in supporting this message and, importantly, to join my colleagues across the aisle. Give us breathing space. Take the problem of the shutdown down away. Then we can have a discussion and a debate and find a solution through a process, which is the way it ought to be, not with a shutdown hanging over everyone. That is not the way we should be governing.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on finding a creative, cost-effective, and safe solution to this issue of border security to protect this country.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, how much time remains on the Republican side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republicans have 21 minutes remaining.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Alaska for her leadership today; my colleague from Maine, who just spoke; my colleague from Maryland; and all of my colleagues on the floor.

By the way, there are several Republicans who came up to me over the last hour and asked: May I speak in this colloquy? We didn't have time for all of them, but that is a good sign. It shows that there are a lot of Members—16 here on the floor and many others—who believe it is time for us to figure this out.

No one likes a government shutdown. I have put out a bill five times now to the Congress to end government shutdowns. By the way, it is getting a few more cosponsors now, and it should because this situation doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense for the families who are affected, including those who are going to work without pay and are living paycheck to paycheck. This is true hardship. It doesn't make sense for the taxpayers, who never end up winning in these government shutdowns but whom we end up paying after the fact—often, for government services that were never provided—because that is how shutdowns work. Finally, it is bad for the economy. If we go another few weeks, there will be one point off our GDP, which will be a huge deal for wages and jobs and economic growth. So let's get this thing behind us.

There is a serious issue here, which is, How do we secure the border? Our

southern border is a mess. I call it a "crisis" while others call it something else, but we have to address this. The President is right about that.

I am hopeful today, and I am hopeful for three reasons.

One is that we just went through a process whereby there was failure on both sides. As was expected, we had two proposals out there, but nobody expected they would pass. It was an opportunity, I guess, for voices to be heard, but no one expected them to pass. After this, the pieces are starting to be put back together by this group and others.

I just listened to my colleagues on the other side. I listened to what Senator KING said. They want border security. They want to enhance what is going on at the border now. Senator KING just talked about the need for more barriers. I mean, look, if you are serious about this, you have to acknowledge that twice as many people crossed in the last 2 months, which we have records for, than a year ago. There has been about a 50-percent increase in families crossing and about a 25-percent increase in kids crossing. There has been a 3,000-percent increase in the last 5 years in people coming forward and claiming asylum. This is a problem we have to address.

There is a huge problem with regard to drugs. I come from Ohio, where we are getting hit hard by the heroin and crystal meth that are coming across the border from Mexico. We are not stopping it—we are stopping very little of it—which is why Democrats and Republicans alike have said there should be more screening at our ports of entry. I agree.

So I appreciate what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said. I will let them speak for themselves in our going forward, but they want border security too. I am encouraged by the fact that they were talking about it today in terms of coming up with a solution here to enhance security.

Secondly, I like the fact that the President put out a proposal. I think he should have put out a proposal that was a compromise, and he did. He said: OK, we are not just going to have more border security; we are going to deal with about a million people who are in temporary protected status who have come from these 10 countries. We don't want to send them back because there is a war or there is strife or there is a natural disaster. There are about 400,000 people.

We are also going to take care of the people who have come here as children, through no fault of their own, who now find themselves in this uncertain status. These are the so-called DACA recipients. I think it is time for Congress to act on this.

Again, the President put forward a plan that said: OK, you guys help me on border security. I am also going to deal with these other issues that many Democrats have talked about for years.

That makes me hopeful in that finally we are talking about these issues.

I agree with what LINDSEY GRAHAM said in that we can do more on these two and that we can do more on some issues that the Democrats care about. I believe the administration is willing to do that, but, gosh, at least we are finally talking.

Finally, I am encouraged by the fact that we are not that far apart. Let me be specific. I think the administration and the Democrats have mischaracterized the President's plan as it relates to barriers on the southern border. It may surprise you to learn that in the President's proposal he has just given us, it is not 2,000 miles of the border. He is talking about his interest in 234 more miles. There will be no wall in the sense of a cement wall, a concrete wall. He has said there will be fences; there will be vehicle barriers, low barriers; and there will be pedestrian wire fences. Yet it won't be done by what the White House says is the right thing to do; it will be done by experts. The experts are in the "Border Security Improvement Plan" that we embraced in this Congress in the last appropriations bill for fiscal year 2018—that we are working on now, which is what the CR is—and in the new one that was passed last summer. We said this plan is the right plan because it says what kinds of barriers are going to be where.

People ask, how did the President come up with \$5.7 billion? Do you know how he came up with it? It was from wanting to fund the top 10 priorities of the "Border Security Improvement Plan" that was put out by the experts. That is what that is. We can disagree on whether that is too much money, too little money, or whatever, but it is only 234 miles out of 2,000 miles. Almost all of it is in Texas, in places where there are no fencing, as opposed to California or Arizona, where there is a lot of fencing, or even New Mexico. We can say: Well, maybe that is too much. Maybe we will go a little more slowly. But this is a plan about which we had all—Republicans and Democrats—with a huge vote out of the Appropriations Committee, said: This is a plan that we ought to follow.

I don't think we are that far apart. Frankly, I think both sides need to start characterizing the plan accurately and stop talking past each other. I think if we do that, with reasonable numbers on both sides of the aisle here, we can do something that makes sense, yes, to help secure our southern border, which everybody wants to do, and to do it in a smart way and not waste money.

Walls are not the only answer. Fences are not the only answer. You have to have more sensors and more cameras. You have to have more immigration judges, which Democrats want and so does the President in his proposal. You have to have more screening for these drugs coming in. You have to help in terms of the human trafficking. These are things that both parties want to do.

So I am optimistic, although frustrated—really frustrated—by this shutdown, but I am more optimistic today because I hear on the other side of the aisle a willingness to come forward. I sense with the new proposal that there is a willingness to reach out, and, folks, it is time.

Let's stop this shutdown. Shutdowns are stupid. Let's protect that southern border, and let's move forward on other priorities we have in this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the words from Senator PORTMAN. The two of us have been working together since we were in the House of Representatives, and we are proud that we have a record of concrete accomplishments, working together across party lines. Sometimes we had to take on the leadership of both of our parties, but we got things done. So I am encouraged by his comments, and I really do believe we can work together to resolve this issue.

With that, I would like to yield to my colleague from West Virginia, Senator MANCHIN, who has been a real leader on the practical impact that this shutdown has. The story about what is happening in the prisons located in West Virginia I think really frighten all of us.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator CARDIN, Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator COLLINS, and all of my colleagues here.

This is a good step. We are all here for the first time after 30 days. But guess what. You have been back home talking to the people who are hurting. They have no idea why we are doing what we are doing, allowing them to be harmed the way they are.

I voted for both proposals today. I will vote for whatever it takes to get us back in the room to make something happen—to open up the government.

I understand that the CR works this way. If we have a CR, then, proportionately, there is going to be 3 weeks of money still being used for DHS and for border security. I understand that is how it works. It is based on \$1.3 billion of last year's approps. A CR continues the spending from last year. So there will be money there to continue on in good faith.

I don't think any of us would want to come back 3 weeks from now and say: It is your fault for shutting it down.

No, it is the President's fault.

No, it is our fault.

No one wants to go through that. I don't know why the 3 weeks is unreasonable for anybody if it is presented properly to the President that you are going to have continuation of money, proportionately, for the 3 weeks that we are going to be in that CR.

The thing that I can't understand is that I am hearing that the President wants \$5.7 billion. Senator PORTMAN just told us where that came from—from the people who are experts and

should know, the Customs and Border Patrol people. I am understanding also—and I heard this morning—that some of the leadership from the Democrats on the House side are saying that they would consider \$5.7 billion for anything but a wall. That means they know we need border security, but they have a different idea of how to secure the border.

Well, guess what. If you want to spend \$5.7 billion for border security and the President wants to spend \$5.7 billion for border security, then, surely, we can sit down in that 3-week period and, talking to the professionals, figure out what needs to be done and where our greatest risks are. How do we stop the opioids and all of the drugs that are coming in? It has ravaged my State. It is horrible what my State is going through.

On top of that, I have about 12,000 people who are working for the Federal Government. I have never seen more people impacted. All they are saying is this: You people really don't care because none of you are hurting. You talk a good game. You throw a lot of words back and forth, but no one is hurting. We are the ones who are hurting.

Then, I have essentials working in prisons. Basically, most of our prisons are in very rural areas. The average drive time to our prison is 1 hour. The prison I am talking about is Hazelton. It is a 1-hour drive time. People are making decisions. They are not not going to work because they are upset and mad. They know their responsibility, but here is the other responsibility: They have to make a decision because they have no cash. They say: Of what little bit of money I have in resources, do I put gas in the tank or do I put food on the table for the kids? It is one of the two because we don't know how long this is going to take. Now we are trying to decide whether we are basically going to carpool or take what public transportation we can get.

Guess what. Public transportation is starting to shut down too. The buses are starting to shut down. It is the way they can get to work in masses.

Colleagues, let me tell you that I have been in public service, like all of you, and I think we are all in it for the right reason. We wanted to truly serve the public, but we are not serving the public. We are all guilty, every one of us. I don't care how you vote on bills. I don't care what we talk about. We are all getting painted with the same brush right now. No one is going to escape this. It is absolutely horrific what is being done.

I have always said this: Government should be your partner and your ally, not your adversary. Right now, the government is the enemy of the people who basically are providing the services that people depend on and who are protecting us. This is why this has to stop.

I am saying to the President: Mr. President, please, give us the 3 weeks.

We understand we need border security.

Basically, our colleagues on the other side understand there should be compassion. When you have a child who was brought here at 2 days old, 2 weeks old, or 2 months and now is an adult and has no idea how they got here but they would like to enjoy the fruits and be able to give something back to this country, there ought to be a pathway forward. These are the things that we all seem to agree on at certain times.

Along with many of the Senators who were here in 2013, I voted for one of the biggest packages we have ever had—\$44 billion in security; basically, border security—and not one person could get a pathway to citizenship or become a citizen of this great country if they were not here for the right reason. They might have gotten here the wrong way, but they came for the right reason. Should they not have an opportunity? They could not become a citizen after 10 or 13 years until we secured the border. That is what this was all about.

Now we are fighting over whatever. I don't know. I can't even explain it when I go back home. So I tell them: Listen, I am for border security. I will vote for border security. I will vote compassionately to try to help people to find a pathway to be an American citizen also, especially children.

The other thing is that I think we can find a pathway forward if the President will give us the 3 weeks. I guarantee you that I don't think any of us will vote for another shutdown or let this happen.

We can't let this go another day longer. We cannot leave here until we fix this. The people back home say: I will tell you the only way you are going to fix it is when you are hurting as bad as I am hurting. Why don't you all stop your pay? Why are you still getting a paycheck? Oh, yes, you fixed that because that is a constitutional amendment. You are taken care of, and it is out of your hands. You can't deny your pay. It is going to come.

They say: I will tell you that this will never happen again if, basically, the day that the shutdown begins, for every Congressperson—every Senator and every Representative, all 535—and the President and everybody who works in that White House over there who is making policy—the pay stops. I guarantee you one thing: You will work around the clock. You will work around the clock to prevent another shutdown.

I cannot disagree with them. So I am saying: I am all in. I am all in. I will do whatever it takes. I will stay here 24/7. I will do whatever it takes to bring people back together, but, most importantly, to get people back to work. We can do that and still have border security and have some compassion for the people who are hurting the most.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, that is exactly why we are here—to get this government open, to get people paid, and to get people back to work.

Let me turn to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, If I were sitting at home or in the Gallery right now, I would be incredibly frustrated. I am frustrated, but if I were home, I would be particularly frustrated. Why?

Think about what we have agreed upon in this colloquy from both the Democratic and Republican side of the aisle. We agree that border security is important. We agree that it is one of the primary functions of the Federal Government. We agree that there needs to be more money, and although in legislation we have not agreed, we certainly have statements from Democrats and, of course, as well as Republicans, that barriers are also important.

COLLIN PETERSON, a Democrat on the House side, put it well. On January 22, 2019, he said:

Give Trump the money. I'd give him the whole thing . . . and put strings on it so you make sure he puts the wall where it needs to be. Why are we fighting over this? We're going to build that wall anyway, at some time.

My Democratic Senate colleagues have said something along the same line, maybe not as point-blank but they certainly have said it. We agree there. We agree that the American worker who continues to show up but is not getting paid needs to get paid.

As for those TSA agents and those air traffic controllers whom we use as we go back and forth to our districts, God bless them. More than 51,000 TSA agents are working without pay. There are 10,000 air traffic controller support staff who remain furloughed.

By the way, I and others have introduced legislation to pay those while they are working. I think it is something we, the Senate, should take up. We need a solution that fulfills our national security responsibilities, ends the shutdown, and so that these workers can get paid.

I say it is time to move forward, negotiate, and come to the table, but you may ask: If Democratic and Republican Senators all agree to this, then, why is it not happening?

In fairness to President Trump, whose rhetoric sometimes inflames and sometimes pushes off and, as my colleague from Ohio said, who sometimes describes things in a way that misrepresents his actual intent, it is not a wall from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean. It is a wall in certain places that are high flow with pedestrian traffic. But, nonetheless, clearly, we have come to a point where a personality conflict between the President and the Speaker has put them at loggerheads and, apparently, they are unable to negotiate.

It is clear from our colloquy that Senators on both sides of the aisle would like to come to a solution that secures the southern border, opens the government, and pays the workers.

In fairness to the President, he has put forward an opening offer. He has said he wants that money for the barrier, but he has put other issues on the table that are near and dear to Democrats' hearts that, hopefully, would open the way to a compromise.

The way I can imagine it would work is that the Speaker would put forward a counterproposal. I think that is where we need to be, to rise above any personal dislike or any entrenched positions that people have come to but, rather, to come to a point where we recognize that the American people are better served if the folks serving them are getting paid, that it is important to secure our southern border, and that some sort of barrier will be part of that, as Members of both parties have agreed to.

So it is time to move forward. It is time to negotiate. It is time for the two principals to come to some sort of compromise. Clearly, we in the Senate are willing to move forward.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to yield to my colleague from New Hampshire, Ms. HASSAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues here in saying how disappointed I was that today's vote to reopen the government immediately while we keep negotiating to address border security was defeated, but I am encouraged by the bipartisan group on the Senate floor with me this afternoon to send one clear message: Let's pass a clean, 3-week continuing resolution to reopen the government immediately, and each of us is committed to work to pass a strong, bipartisan border security bill during that 3-week period.

Like many of my colleagues, I have gone down to the border. I have talked to our frontline personnel on the border. There is a lot of common ground about what we need to strengthen our border security. I join my colleagues here and thank Senators CARDIN and MURKOWSKI for organizing us in saying that we can get to a solution on border security, but we need to open the government right away.

There is no reason to keep the government closed while negotiations on strengthening border security continue. In fact, there is concern that negotiations forced by shutdowns set a dangerous precedent.

So I strongly urge my colleagues from both parties to support this bipartisan approach. I also thank Senators GRAHAM and CARDIN for their leadership in this effort, and I am committed to working with them and the rest of this bipartisan group to find a way forward.

Every day that this senseless shutdown continues, it is hurting people in New Hampshire and across the country. We have all been sharing stories. We have heard these stories. We have talked to the hard-working men and women who serve the people of this country and who are doing their work without pay or who are furloughed and who really don't know how they are going to make their next mortgage payment and their next utility payment or put food on the table and get their medication—all of the things they need a good day's wages to do. So we need to end this now.

I join with my colleagues in being here this afternoon to simply say that we need to open the government and that I am committed, as all of us are, to negotiate in good faith going forward to find a solution on border security.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I turn to my colleague from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. I thank Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator CARDIN for their leadership today in organizing this floor colloquy, and I thank the Presiding Officer.

I want to join my colleagues in expressing how urgent it is that we not only secure our borders but that we open our government. We really do have to come together. We have two sides of the aisle here, our Democrat and Republican friends. Certainly we can come to a solution. We have to figure out a path forward, folks, and I am glad we are here to do that.

We have a duty to provide for our Nation's security, and it is also our job to fund the government. We just voted on a sensible and smart proposal offered by the President that every Democrat and Republican should have supported, but, unfortunately, it was rejected today.

Back home, hard-working Iowans and, of course, Americans all across the country are tired of government shutdowns, and they are disappointed in the dysfunction of Washington, DC. The impacts of this government shutdown are tangible for families. They feel it. People are hurting all across this Nation.

Most families don't have a rainy day fund. Money lasts only so long when you have zero income. Prolonged periods without a paycheck are unsustainable.

I have a friend who works for Federal law enforcement. Fortunately, he is up in seniority, but he told me the other day: JONI, our young Federal workers—they just can't make ends meet.

Children don't stop growing; people don't stop getting sick; and the obligations of caring for families don't stop just because we have. Washington has stopped working, folks. We have to get it together.

I have heard from businesses on the brink of collapse. I have heard from

first-time home buyers who are trapped in limbo right now, and there are serious consequences that I have heard about from our farmers who work every day with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the USDA. Our food banks, churches, and other charities, which spend their time and resources helping families and communities through these tough times, helping furloughed workers and those who are in need, are running out of resources. They are running out of time. It can last only so long.

We need our DOJ working to stop crime and violence. We need our vital government Agencies back up and running. We can do that. I support a stronger border, and I support the President's sensible proposal, which does include a barrier, manpower, ports of entry, technology, and infrastructure. I think it is necessary that these investments be part of an overall deal. Our lack of border security has resulted in a humanitarian crisis at the border. We have tens of thousands of illegal and inadmissible immigrants on our southern border every month.

I agree with President Trump and many of my colleagues that securing our southern border is a must-do to discourage illegal immigration, curb human trafficking, stop drugs, stop gun trafficking, in addition to stopping the ability of gangs and terrorists to exploit the holes in our system.

The American people expect us to do better. We have an opportunity to step up and do the right thing, and that is to find a solution. We have to do it by working together.

I again thank all of my colleagues for coming together today on the floor. Senator CARDIN, Senator MURKOWSKI, thank you for organizing the effort. Hopefully, we will come to a solution.

Folks, the Nation is watching us. We can do better.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Senator from Iowa.

I have a question for the Presiding Officer in terms of how much time remains on the Republican side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Perfect. We are down to the remaining two speakers, 3 minutes each. I ask that Senator GARDNER be recognized at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska for this opportunity to come to the floor to talk about what this Chamber needs to do, along with the House and the President, to get this government reopened and to fund border security, something that all Americans agree on—that we can walk and chew gum at the same time; that we can multitask; that we can find a way to fund priority spending on the border; and that we can find a way to fund 800,000 government employees, including 53,000 Federal employees in my home State of Colorado.

In 2014, I was elected to the Senate. In November of 2014, we were dealing with a question of whether the government would shut down. In fact, the first issue we were asked in the new Congress as we headed back into session was this: Would there be a looming shutdown over immigration? That was not in 2018 or 2019. That was actually in 2014. Here is what I said then:

There's no time, place, or purpose of a government shutdown or default. That's simply ridiculous and something that a mature governing body doesn't even contemplate. We ought to make it very clear that that's simply not acceptable.

I said that in 2014; I echoed it in December 2018; and I stand on the floor today sharing the same belief, sentiment, and value.

We need border security in this country. We need to have barriers and structures on the border where it makes sense, as the President has said. He has made a reasonable request to put in place border security.

We also have a responsibility to the people of this country to govern responsibly. That means not jeopardizing our economy, not jeopardizing the firefighters in Colorado who can't go to training right now because the government is shut down.

My home State lost hundreds of homes last year due to wildfires. Think about the catastrophes in California and across the West last year. Firefighters from around the country were called to do heroic things and save entire towns, yet those training services, classes, and tools they need for a fire season that could start at any time are being denied—training and classes that they need to save their own lives, to save other lives, and to protect our land.

We have farmers who are trying to get production loans right now. They can't get their production loans through certain offices because of the shutdown. Farming is not good right now, and prices are so low right now that people are struggling. I talked to a farmer in Colorado yesterday. He doesn't know what the bank is going to say to him on Friday, tomorrow, when he goes in, and he can't get ahold of anybody at the USDA because of the shutdown.

We need border security. That is why I voted for both measures today—the \$5.7 billion for border security and the continuing resolution proposal that contains the President's 2018 border security proposal. Both measures included border security.

We can do this. It is not that difficult. It shouldn't be a challenge to govern responsibly. Shutdowns aren't the solution. Walking and chewing gum at the same time shouldn't be so difficult, and I hope this Chamber will come to its senses, along with our House colleagues and the White House, to move forward.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I now ask that the Senator from Arizona be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska for organizing this—both sides of the aisle—so we can begin to have our voices heard for those we represent here on the Senate floor.

I came yesterday from Yuma, AZ, and the day before I was in Nogales, AZ. I visited Nogales's port of entry and the CBP officers coming to work every single day now without pay. On Monday, they processed 2,000 trucks through the port of entry there. That cross-border commerce is so important for an economy like Arizona's and for jobs.

They also seized 18 kilograms of methamphetamine, heroin, and fentanyl, which are contributing to the opioid crisis and the drug crisis in our country.

Morale is still pretty good because they still know how important it is for them to be there on the watch and do their job. However, it is unacceptable that they are being asked to come to work and not being paid. As was said by other colleagues, some of the lower level officers—the younger individuals early on the job—have no reserves. I talked to several of them. They are very concerned about what is going to happen when they miss a second paycheck here in the next day.

When I went to Yuma and talked to the Border Patrol, it was the same thing. They need to be on the job. They want to be on the job. They know how important it is for our country and for border security.

I visited the place where, just last week, 376 people were able to tunnel under where we have a barrier they can't see through. They weren't able to see it until they had actually breached it, and they caught a couple of MS-13 gang members yesterday.

Again, they are asking: Please, let's secure our border. Let's provide the resources for the agents and for the officers and for what they need to do every single day, and let's open up the government.

We can do these things. This is why America is so frustrated with Washington, DC, and why many of us ran to come here in the first place: What is the matter with you guys? Just get it together; get something through the House and the Senate that can be signed by the President to open up the government and secure our border.

Let's roll up our sleeves, let's stay here all night around the clock, and let's get this mission done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, over the last hour, many of our colleagues have come to the floor—Democrats and Republicans—with different views about how we should deal with border security issues and how we should deal with the problems at hand but with a common willingness and commitment to reach a bipartisan agreement.

In order for that to be accomplished, we need time. Therefore, we are filing this afternoon a bipartisan amendment to the underlying bill that would provide 3 weeks for a continuing resolution for government to be opened so that we can work together to deal with the border security issues.

I agree with Senator KING in his optimism that we will be able to reach an agreement. It is interesting that Senator KING is an Independent. This should not be a partisan problem on border security. We should be able to resolve the issues.

I thank Senator MURKOWSKI for her help in organizing this event. We tried to work in a truly bipartisan manner in order to give optimism, and I think, rightfully so, that we can solve this issue if we have the time to do it.

I urge all of our colleagues to join us in this effort. Let's open government, let's have 3 weeks, and let's all be committed to deal with border security in the manner in which this institution in the past has been able to deal with tough issues.

I again thank my colleague from Alaska, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Maryland and all Senators—on the Republican side and the Democratic side—who came to the floor after these two votes to express this air of optimism that we can figure this out.

One of the things I have heard very clearly from both sides is enough already—enough already. That is what the American people are saying about this shutdown: Enough already—figure it out.

Well, we got the message. We know what the mission is, and I think what you have seen expressed here on the floor is the good will and the good faith that will be extended in these hours and days going forward, knowing that there is an urgency to get the government open and to address the legitimate priorities that the President has outlined.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RUSSIAN HYBRID WARFARE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I rise to continue my series of speeches on Russian hybrid warfare.

I have done a series of speeches on the Russian hybrid warfare threat. It poses a great challenge to our national security. Russian hybrid warfare occurs below the level of direct military conflict, yet it is no less a threat to the national security and integrity of our democracy and society.

One tactic that Russia deploys as part of their hybrid warfare arsenal, and the one I would like to focus on today, is information warfare.

Russian information warfare includes the deployment of false or misleading narratives against the targeted civilian population or government, often through deceptive means, in order to intensify social tensions, undermine trust in government institutions, and sow fear and confusion, which advances their strategic objectives.

The Defense Intelligence Agency highlights in their Russia military power report in 2017: "The weaponization of information is a key aspect of Russia's strategy . . . Moscow views information and psychological warfare as a measure to neutralize adversary actions in peace and to prevent escalation to crisis or war."

Russia developed its playbook over time, enhancing both the technical and psychological aspects of these information operations in capability, sophistication, and boldness. Lessons learned from previous information warfare campaigns culminated in the attacks the Kremlin unleashed against the United States during the 2016 Presidential election.

The 2016 information warfare campaign, according to our intelligence community, "demonstrated a significant escalation in directness, level of activity, and scope of effort compared to previous operations."

Let's be clear. Russian interference in the 2016 election was an attack on the Nation. It was just not a type of attack that has been commonly recognized as warfare. As former Director of National Intelligence Jim Clapper stated recently, "[I]t's hard to convey to people how massive an assault this was."

While Russian hybrid attacks were detected by our intelligence community and our National Security Agencies in a runup to the 2016 election, the seriousness of the threat was not absorbed across the government, including Congress. There are a variety of reasons for this, including political paralysis and a collective unwillingness to believe that these attacks could compromise our political and social institutions.

Two years on, we still have only scratched the surface in our understanding of about the nature of Russian information warfare attacks. Gaps in our knowledge include the extent to which these attacks have been perpetrated at Putin's direction, by Russian military intelligence units, known as the GRU, and through Kremlin-linked troll organizations. Yet we have no time to waste. Information warfare attacks continue against us, our allies, and our partners to this day, and they continue to pose a threat to our national security.

Former CIA Acting Director and Deputy Director Mike Morell characterized the attacks of the Russians against our elections as "the political equivalent of 9-11."

In the aftermath of the tragic September 11 attacks of 2001, we established a nonpartisan commission to understand what happened and why. One of the 9/11 Commission's conclusions was that the U.S. Government showed a failure of imagination by not anticipating and preventing the 2001 attacks by the terrorists.

We have had no similar wholesale reckoning in the aftermath of the attacks from 2016. Some elements of our government and society have taken steps to focus attention on this pressing problem. However, these efforts have not been sufficiently comprehensive, and the nature of the threats has not been fully communicated to the American public.

As senior vice president for the Center of European Analysis, Edward Lucas assessed in a recent New York Times documentary on Russian disinformation, we "are still playing catch up from a long way behind. We are looking in the rear view mirror, getting less bad at working out what Russia just did to us. We are still not looking through the windshield to find out what's happening now and what's going to be happening next."

We must recover from our collective failure of imagination. We must rethink and refocus our strategy for countering these threats and implement necessary institutional policy and societal changes to support that strategy. Importantly, we must develop a playbook of our own to fight back.

While the West has been slow to recognize the extent of the threat, these types of attacks are not new. Historically, informational warfare has long been a part of the Soviet and Russian arsenal.

As security scholar Keir Giles noted in "The Handbook of Russian Information Warfare," "For all their innovative use of social media and the internet, current Russian methods have deep roots in long-standing Soviet practice."

During Soviet times, information warfare tactics were part of a broader collection of operations that were referred to as active measures.

The State Department described active measures in a 1981 report as including "control of the press in foreign countries; outright and partial forgery of documents; use of rumors, insinuation, altered facts and lies; use of international and local front organizations; clandestine operation of radio stations; and exploitation of a nation's academic, political, and media figures as collaborators to influence policies of the nation."

Active measures were run by the KGB, which at its height employed approximately 15,000 officers devoted to these tactics. The same State Department report described the strategic rationale for such operations, stating: "Moscow seeks to disrupt relations between states, discredit opponents of the USSR, and undermine foreign leaders, institutions and values."

The tactics of contemporary Russian information warfare mirrors Soviet-era active measures but have gained vastly greater potency in the digital age.

The irony is, these are the tactics the Soviets employed, but they have been supercharged because in a digital age, you can reach more people, you can be more effective. Under Putin, Russia has institutionalized informational warfare with a 21st century twist that capitalizes on the interconnectedness of our global society in the speed and reach of today's informational age through cyber space.

This has important advantages for Moscow. For example, the Soviet-era KGB agents worked for years to get an information warfare campaign to "go viral" and be picked up in multiple news outlets. Today, GRU- and Kremlin-linked troll organizations spread propaganda and disinformation campaigns across social media platforms with ease—virtually instantaneously.

These information warfare operations are not simply opportunistic meddling by Russia. Russia's purpose is to further its strategic interests. Putin seeks to advance several strategic objectives, including preserving his grip on power and enhancing his ability to operate unconstrained domestically or in Russia's perceived sphere of influence near and abroad.

Putin further seeks for Russia to be seen as an equal to the United States on the world stage and regain the great power status it lost at the end of the Cold War. Putin knows that for now, Russia cannot effectively compete with the United States in conventionally military ways and win. Instead, Putin seeks to use tools from his hybrid warfare arsenal, including information warfare to divide the United States from our allies and partners in the West and weaken our institutions and open society from within. By weakening our democracy, Putin can make Russia look more powerful in comparison.

It is not surprising that Putin, who spent most of his Soviet career in the KGB and its successor, the FSB, has deployed these techniques during his rule. Putin mourned the downfall of the Soviet Union, lamenting in 2005 that the breakup of the Soviet Union was, in his words, "the greatest geopolitical tragedy of the 20th century."

When he assumed power, Putin revitalized a number of methods of hybrid warfare from the Soviet system, including information warfare. Over time, Putin came to see Russia's nearly continuous campaign of information confrontation with the West as both a justified and defensive response to perceived U.S.-led international activism, regardless of our intentions. Keir Giles confirms this idea, assessing that Russia interpreted the color revolutions in former Soviet states and the Arab Spring as resulting from information operations by the United States and the West. Those operations were seen as posing a serious and growing threat to Putin's rule.

The Kremlin's development of its information warfare capabilities reflects those perceptions and Putin's concern with preservation of his regime. Putin moved from earlier ad hoc information warfare campaigns, such as the operations against Estonia in 2007 and in Georgia in 2008, to the systematic application of these tools.

Most experts point to the Russian's public reaction to Putin's return to the Presidency for a third term in 2012 as the turning point that led to development of Russian information warfare as we experience it today.

It began with the announcement in September 2011 that Putin—then acting as Prime Minister—and Medvedev—then serving as President—would switch roles. This revelation, coupled with the rigged parliamentary elections in late 2011, created an unexpected backlash from the Russian people. Massive demonstrations ensued, with thousands of people taking to the streets. To Putin, the grievances of the protests appeared personal as they chanted "Putin is a thief" and "Russia without Putin."

The year of 2011 is particularly relevant for revolutions and the overthrow of dictatorships. The year 2011 gave rise to the Arab Spring, in which dissidents relied heavily on Facebook and Twitter—American inventions—to organize their protests and cast-off authoritarian governance in places across the Middle East. Again, Putin conceived U.S. actions in places such as Egypt and Libya as proof that the United States actively cultivated regime change. Protests in Russia began to resemble the protests of the Arab Spring, including the similar use of Facebook and Twitter. Putin viewed these activities as a threat to his hold on power.

Around that time, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton raised concerns about the Kremlin's electoral conduct. She urged that the "Russian people, like people everywhere, deserve the right to have their voices heard and their votes counted." In response, Putin accused the United States of interfering in the Russian elections and blamed Secretary Clinton for the massive protests taking place in Russia, alleging that Secretary Clinton gave the, in his words, "signal to some actors in our country to rise up." He further bemoaned what he called "foreign money" being used to influence Russian politics and warned: "We need to safeguard ourselves from this influence in our internal affairs."

After his inauguration for a third term, Putin promoted a close ally and tasked him with getting control over the Russian's people use of the internet. Putin and his cronies also put political pressure on the creators of prominent websites. Those who were not willing to cooperate, such as the owner of the Russian version of Facebook, were pushed out so that the chosen oligarchs could become majority shareholders and then begin to control content.

About the same time, the Russian Parliament passed legislation helping the Kremlin monitor and criminalize unfavorable cyber activities. In concert with the new online restrictions, the Kremlin began paying bloggers to slip in pro-Russian material amongst other benign posts, which was the beginning of government-directed troll operations.

In late 2013, a leading Russian newspaper reported that the tools put in place to co-opt new forms of media were “recognized as so effective that [the Kremlin] insiders send these weapons outside—to the Americans and European audiences.” This may mark the beginning of Putin’s move to institutionalize a more sustained and permanent state of information confrontation with the West.

Russia also used these external operations to further develop its toolkit for information warfare. Central to these efforts included what many experts agreed was the development of a hybrid warfare doctrine, as articulated by the chief of the general staff of a Russian Armed Forces general, Valery Gerasimov, in 2013.

Gerasimov argued that asymmetric approaches to dealing with conflict, including the use of “political, economic informational, humanitarian, and other nonmilitary measures,” have grown and in many instances have “exceeded the power of force and weapons in their effectiveness.” He further discussed how hybrid warfare tactics, including what he termed “informational actions,” can nullify the enemy’s advantage and reduce its fighting potential. One of his conclusions was “that it is necessary to perfect activities in the information space,” including the defense of our own objectives.

About the same time, in August 2013, RT, which is a Russian television station, reported on Russian plans to create a new branch of the military that would “include monitoring and processing external information as well as fighting cyber threats.”

In the article, Putin acknowledged that information attacks are already being applied to solve problems of a military and political nature and that their striking force may be higher than those of conventional weapons.

Based on RT’s reporting and observations of the GRU’s activities, it is clear that Russia has created “information warfare troops” with no parallel in the United States. These GRU units combine the arts of technical cyber operations with psychological manipulation. Malcolm Nance, a former U.S. naval intelligence officer, characterized the GRU as “the armed forces of Russia and the intelligence apparatus that does reconnaissance, surveillance, and . . . strategic cyber operations.”

Russian security services expert Mark Galeotti explained:

[H]istorically, the GRU has been Russia’s main agency for operating in uncontrolled spaces, which mean civil wars and the like. In some ways, the internet is today’s uncontrolled space.

In hindsight, we can trace Russia’s development and conduct of its information warfare campaign against perceived foreign threats from its neighbors and the West. These campaigns generally progressed along three major lines of effort, all of which benefited from advances in technology from the Soviet days.

First, the campaigns involved overt propaganda and disinformation, much of it carried out on Russian state-owned media, such as RT and Sputnik.

The second line of effort involved covert cyber attacks, including hacking and weaponizing stolen information.

The third line of effort in the Russian information campaigns involved weaponizing the internet, particularly social media networks, to amplify messages to a vastly greater audience and promote themes that advanced Russia’s strategic interests.

While Russia’s technical and psychological capabilities grew over time, the outlines of the Russian information warfare playbook were evident during Russia’s invasion of Ukraine in 2014 and during the United Kingdom’s Brexit debate the following year, but we largely did not understand the extent of these operations and the threat to our national security and that of our allies and partners. Our collective failure to understand the pattern of Russian information warfare emboldened Putin. The Kremlin’s tactics and techniques were further refined and deployed in the Russian information campaign against the U.S. Presidential election in 2016.

Starting in 2014 and 2015, Putin turned his information arsenal first on the near abroad, deploying information warfare operations against Ukraine during the conflict over Crimea and eastern Ukraine. Russia used Ukraine as a testing laboratory for experimenting with new tactics of information warfare through cyber space and social media.

The impetus for Russian intervention in the Ukraine arose in response to domestic unrest which caused the Russian-backed Ukrainian President to flee the country. Events tipped off when Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich signaled he was no longer willing to continue efforts to integrate Ukraine with the West, which had broad public support. Instead, he accepted a Kremlin offer of a \$15 billion bailout for Ukraine and a deal on gas imports.

Protests broke out, which grew into what was known as the Maidan revolution. The numbers and strength of the protests alarmed the Kremlin. Putin wanted to ensure Ukraine stayed in Russia’s sphere of influence. He deployed hybrid warfare, including a full-scale information warfare campaign, to force the Ukrainian people back in line. The goal of the information warfare campaign was to convince the people of Ukraine that they were in imminent danger from fascists and Nazis

who were taking over the country and committing atrocities on their fellow citizens.

The Kremlin deployed all three lines of effort that I laid out for their information warfare campaign against Ukraine—a barrage of overt propaganda and disinformation; cyber attacks, including weaponizing stolen information; and the manipulation of the internet and social media platforms. These efforts sowed fear and magnified mistrust toward the Ukrainian Government, which the Kremlin was able to exploit for the seizure of Crimea and to achieve other Russian strategic interests.

The Russian campaign deployed a significant volume of propaganda and disinformation against Ukraine to magnify a climate of fear and distrust amongst the Ukrainian people. Examples include photos doctored to look like scenes of carnage from Ukraine, fake stories of dead children caught in the crossfire, supposed attacks on Jewish Ukrainians who were forced to flee the country, and, allegedly, a 3-year-old who was crucified by Ukrainian soldiers. The messages also portrayed the Russians as the Ukrainian people’s saviors and that Russia had to intervene to help restore order.

The second line of effort—covert military operations in cyber space—was also deployed as a Russian campaign against Ukraine. At the time, attacks against Ukraine were described as coming from CyberBerkut, which the U.K. Government’s National Cyber Security Centre has recently announced “is almost certainly” the same branch of the GRU that infiltrated the Democratic National Committee. The GRU forces responsible for these “hack-and-weaponize” information operations were later named by their unit numbers in Special Counsel Mueller’s July 2018 indictment and have been given many names, including CyberBerkut, Fancy Bear, and Advanced Persistent Threat (APT) 28.

In the spring of 2014, as Ukraine held its Presidential election, CyberBerkut penetrated Ukraine’s Central Election Commission, directly altering the nationwide Presidential vote tallies in favor of Russia’s preferred candidate. The Ukrainian officials caught the change before the results were announced, although it was broadcast on Russian news that the Russian-backed candidate had won, sowing doubt on the validity of the election and magnifying distrust in the Ukrainian Government.

Seeing as how they couldn’t change voting tallies and fully get away with it, Russia’s tactics evolved to try to change people’s minds about whom to vote for or make the public so distrustful of the system that they wouldn’t vote at all. These same units began to steal private information through cyber intrusions on Ukrainian Government and political officials and weaponize it by posting it on the internet. As the Defense Intelligence Agency noted in the “Russia Military

Power” report from 2017, the intent of publicizing the stolen information was “to demoralize, embarrass and create distrust of elected officials.”

A third line of effort by the Russian campaign focused on leveraging cyber space to reinforce and amplify their messaging, which was carried out by the GRU and Kremlin-linked troll organizations. While these efforts were often unsophisticated, this may have been the first time that organizations embarked on wide-scale social media campaigns to amplify information warfare beyond Russia’s borders.

The Washington Post reported, based on internal Russian military documents, that the GRU fabricated numerous accounts on social media after Ukrainian President Yanukovich fled in 2014. These accounts on Facebook and the Russian version of Facebook, known as VK, posed as ordinary Ukrainians who were against the Kiev protests. They preyed on people’s emotions, magnifying fear and distrust.

One example of a message posted by the GRU from a fraudulent social media account was “brigades of Westerners are now on their way to rob and kill us. . . . Morals have been replaced by thirst for blood and hatred toward anything Russian.” The same GRU unit was also responsible for the creation of the fictitious persona “Ivan Galitsin,” who placed pro-Kremlin comments on English language websites.

The intercepted Russian military documents also detailed how the GRU created four fraudulent groups on Facebook and its Russian equivalent to support its campaign in Crimea and used paid Facebook ads to increase traffic to their fraudulent sites.

Subsequent reporting by the Washington Post uncovered the specific GRU unit—54777. The GRU unit responsible for this operation bragged to their superiors that these 4 groups alone received at least 200,000 views.

All of these tactics would appear in later information warfare campaigns.

This information warfare campaign against Ukraine also appears to be one of the first uses of a complementary social media effort—deploying Kremlin-linked trolls—against the population of a foreign country to enhance and amplify the GRU operation.

A close Putin crony, Yevgeny Prigozhin, founded and funded the operation—known as the Internet Research Agency and its related companies—to amplify the Kremlin’s messages across social media platforms. According to a Russian press report in 2014, during the Ukraine operations, the Internet Research Agency was employing about 250 people to engage in online discussions “with a goal to undermine the authority of Ukrainian politicians and post hate speech and fake stories, thus shifting attention from the real events.” Copying the model that the Kremlin developed to manipulate its own citizens, these fake Ukrainian personas would pretend to

be regular, local Ukrainian people and slip in politically charged messages.

BuzzFeed detailed one such campaign entitled “Polite People” which “promoted the invasion of Crimea with pictures of Russian troops posing alongside girls, the elderly, and cats.” The trolls used innocuous pictures to gain a group of followers; then they were easily able to pump out pro-Kremlin messages to readymade audiences.

Although the tactics were relatively simplistic—both for whom they were trying to reach and the technical aspects of their campaign—the Kremlin information warfare campaign appeared largely successful against Ukraine and contributed to the Kremlin’s seizure of Crimea. Indeed, Gen. Philip Breedlove, then head of the U.S. European Command and NATO Supreme Allied Commander Europe, warned at the time that Russia was “waging the most amazing information warfare blitzkrieg in the history of information warfare.”

Even as these information operations overwhelmed Ukraine, the potential threat they posed to Western societies was largely unrecognized, and calls for help in combatting these types of campaigns—including manipulation of social media—went unanswered.

The Washington Post reported last October that high-level Ukrainian officials, including President Poroshenko, personally appealed to Facebook’s Mark Zuckerberg in the spring of 2015. One of his deputies stated that they told Facebook: “I was explicitly saying that there were troll factories, that their posts and reposts promoted posts and news that are fake. . . . Have a look.” Facebook officials failed to take these pleas seriously and in 2015 declined President Poroshenko’s request to open a Facebook office in Kiev to address the problem. In a foreshadowing of events in the United States, Facebook failed to imagine the significant impact these campaigns could have on Ukrainian politics and security. Our government, too, failed to realize the full extent of the threat.

While we have been able to uncover a lot about Russian attacks on Ukraine, we have not been able to piece together the full picture of what Russia perpetrated against the United Kingdom in connection with the spring 2016 referendum on whether the United Kingdom should leave the EU, commonly known as Brexit.

UK members of Parliament and others investigating these attacks have been able to piece together evidence that the Kremlin mounted an information warfare campaign to encourage and amplify anti-EU sentiment in the run up to voting day. However, because these investigations are limited to their committees of jurisdiction and there is no equivalent to the U.S. special counsel’s investigation pulling the disparate pieces of information together, we have yet to understand the full picture of what the Russians perpetrated against the British people.

What we have learned so far indicates that the Kremlin appeared to run a more sophisticated campaign against the British people than the attacks it perpetrated against Ukraine. In this operation, the Kremlin was pushing one side of the argument, as they were in Ukraine, but they showcased increased psychological complexities in their attacks. This campaign focused on targeting segments of the British population that would likely be frightened by threats of increased immigration, particularly from Muslim-majority countries. The Kremlin and Kremlin-linked actors also pushed messages that the EU was corrupt and had little accountability to the people of the United Kingdom, which magnified feelings of mistrust of the EU.

The first line of effort for this Kremlin information warfare campaign and the one that the West was able to track and analyze was propaganda and disinformation. The Kremlin unleashed a slew of overt Russian propaganda in English, advanced on TV and the internet by Kremlin-controlled media outlets. A United Kingdom parliamentary inquiry on disinformation cites 261 articles on RT and Sputnik with a heavy anti-EU bias in the 6 months prior to the referendum. These outlets advanced a steady drumbeat of stories stressing the continued dangers as long as the United Kingdom remained part of the EU’s so-called “open borders.” This included disinformation intended to magnify fear by alleging that British women would be subject to increased attacks from dangerous Muslim immigrants.

It has yet to be determined whether the second line of effort—covert GRU operations in cyber space—was deployed as part of the Russian campaign promoting Brexit. It does not appear that hacking and weaponizing stolen data was deployed in connection with Brexit. However, as detailed in a separate parliamentary inquiry, on the night of the Brexit referendum, there was a suspicious crash of the voter registration website likely attributed to denial-of-service attacks.

The timing of this attack appears consistent with other GRU covert cyber attacks, which aim to take key infrastructure or information offline at crucial times to advance Kremlin objectives. This crude information warfare tactic has been tied to GRU in previous operations, particularly Eastern Europe. Further, the UK Government has been able to tie the GRU to other cyber attacks, including attacks on a United Kingdom television station and the United Kingdom foreign office. If these Russian actors were culpable in this denial-of-service attack, then it would fit with the Russian playbook.

The third line of effort, the use of cyber space to amplify and reinforce messaging, featured prominently in the information warfare campaign relating to Brexit. While we don’t know what role, if any, the GRU played in this line of effort, we have been able to identify

a sustained campaign on social media against the British public by Kremlin and Kremlin-linked actors. These attacks included the use of trolls and automated bots amplifying pro-leave messages ahead of the date of referendum. The New York Times reported that tweets from the Russian accounts “sought to inflame fears about Muslims and immigrants to help drive the vote.” Tweets surged in the last days of the campaign, spiking from about 1,000 tweets a day to 45,000 tweets in the 48 hours prior to the polls closing. In the final days before the referendum, less than 1 percent of Twitter users accounted for one-third of all the conversations surrounding the issue, showing that these actions were artificially boosting the pro-leave messages to increase viewership size.

Joint analysis from Swansea University and the University of California, Berkeley, concluded that the attacks emanated from 150,000 Russian-based accounts and that their tweets were viewed hundreds of millions of times.

It must be noted that Russian amplification efforts in connection with Brexit also received a boost from local surrogates in the UK. One pro-leave local surrogate was Nigel Farage, then-leader of the rightwing populist UKIP Party. Whether unwittingly or not, Farage echoed aspects of Russian propaganda, including lending his voice to stories broadcast on Russian propaganda channel RT. Farage was also often quoted in Russia media articles, including when he warned that British women could be at risk of mass attacks of gangs of migrants due to “big cultural issues” should Britain choose to remain in the EU, again, echoing the message that Russian agents and authorities were promoting.

Here, too, it seems we have just begun to scratch the surface of our understanding about what the Kremlin was doing, including how they had insight into whom to target with their information warfare campaign. Member of Parliament Damian Collins, who is leading an investigation into Russian disinformation connected to Brexit, fears that what we know at this point about the extent of the Russian attack against the British people “may well be just the tip of the iceberg.”

We can’t point with all certitude to whether the Kremlin’s information warfare campaign made a difference in the outcome of the vote. However, we know that those who voted to leave the EU won by a small margin. It was a stunning upset that no one expected, let alone then-Prime Minister Cameron. He cited the outcome as the reason for his resignation.

The Kremlin has also turned these weapons on the United States. The most prominent example was the sustained, multipronged information warfare campaign deployed against the American people, as I stated, during the 2016 Presidential election. While the Kremlin’s information warfare campaign against Ukraine and Brexit

supported and amplified one side of an issue, for this operation Russia showed increased technical and psychological advances by targeting multiple aspects of contentious issues to advance the Kremlin’s objectives. Grievances about race, religion, immigration, social justice, and even U.S. institutions writ large were woven into anti-Clinton, pro-Trump fabric. These efforts were a toxic mix, trying to poison Clinton’s candidacy, promote Trump’s favorability, taint the electoral process, and weaken democratic institutions altogether.

Similar to the information warfare campaign against Brexit, we are still trying to get a full picture of how Russia attacked us during the 2016 election and, particularly, the role that the GRU played. But what is now clear is that the Kremlin’s information warfare campaign regarding the 2016 election was not neutral or even-handed in its messaging on Clinton compared to that of President Trump. As affirmed in the intelligence community’s January 2017 assessment, in their words: “Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. presidential election, the consistent goals of which were to undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process, denigrate Secretary Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency.”

They also assessed, in their words, that “Putin and the Russian Government developed a clear preference” for President Trump. Similarly, Special Counsel Mueller’s February indictment against the Kremlin-linked troll operation found that the Russians “engaged in operations primarily intended to communicate derogatory information about Hillary Clinton, to denigrate other candidates such as TED CRUZ and MARCO RUBIO, and to support BERNIE SANDERS and the candidate Donald Trump.”

The clear anti-Clinton and pro-Trump themes in Russia’s efforts aligned with Russian strategic interests. As mentioned earlier, Putin blamed Hillary Clinton for protests in Russia in December 2011. Weakening Clinton as a candidate would reduce the perceived threat to Putin’s grip on power from a Clinton Presidency. President Trump, on the other hand, offered Russia a freer hand in conducting its affairs.

Similar to Brexit, the Russian information warfare campaign against the American people in 2016 demonstrated a high degree of sophistication in targeting susceptible groups of Americans, potentially including the use of data analytics. We are still learning details of how the Russians were able to build an audience for its information warfare attacks and whether they had any help from any Americans. However, Justice Department indictments, including those from the special counsel, and two reports commissioned by the Senate Intelligence Committee analyzing data provided by social media companies are providing a better

picture of the information warfare campaigns against us.

One of those reports, a joint study by Oxford University and the social media analytics firm Graphika, assessed that the Kremlin-linked troll organization was able to segment users into different groups based on “race, ethnicity, and identity.” Once they categorized people in such a manner, they tailored ads to entice users to engage with their fraudulent accounts and pages. This process engineered messages to manipulate and polarize receptive audiences. The other study commissioned by the Senate Intelligence Committee, a collaboration between the social media research firm New Knowledge, Columbia University, and Canfield Research, confirms this idea, detailing how specific ethnic and Russian groups were targeted. Their analysis concluded that these operations were directed overwhelmingly at African Americans. As the Washington Post technology reporter Craig Timberg explained, social media companies created this technology and, in the process, have “atomized” us into different categories and put us into a “thousand different buckets.” The Russians co-opted this American technology, just as they have exploited other aspects of our open society and democratic system, and weaponized it against us.

Similar to campaigns in the past, this information warfare operation followed the three established lines of effort as detailed in the intelligence community’s January 2017 assessment. The Kremlin’s campaign “followed a longstanding Russian messaging strategy that blends covert intelligence operations—such as cyber activity—with overt efforts by Russian Government agencies, state-funded media, third-party intermediaries and paid social media users or trolls.”

The first line of effort involved overt propaganda and disinformation focusing on a number of themes that advanced Russia’s strategic interest. Having tested their methodology in previous campaigns, including in Ukraine and Brexit, the Russians had an arsenal of tried-and-tested methods of influence they deployed in the U.S. Presidential election to maximize fear and distrust.

Propaganda and disinformation to stoke these negative emotions were pumped out by Kremlin-funded channels RT and Sputnik. They sought to flood an unsuspecting American public with stories portraying Secretary Clinton as untrustworthy and dangerous, thus amplifying negative feelings toward her. Articles painted Clinton as a warmonger who would lead the United States into future conflicts or alleged that she was of ill health and hiding her condition from the public. Additional reports were aimed at bolstering the perceptions that she was not trustworthy and accused her of nefarious dealings detailed in the emails she deleted as a coverup of her so-called “crimes.”

A third group of accounts alleged that Clinton used her high-ranking position as Secretary of State to enrich her family foundation with foreign donations by engaging in quid pro quo schemes. In contrast, Kremlin-funded media pushed positive stories about President Trump, promoting him as a pragmatist who understood that the United States needed to stop interfering in the internal affairs of other countries.

An additional widely used theme, which sought to maximize feelings of distrust and ran through much of what Kremlin media broadcast, revolved around corruption in the United States, American hypocrisy, and that our elections were rigged and fraudulent. Painting the American political system as unfair, biased, and tainted served Putin's strategic interests, allowing the Kremlin to counter pro-democracy forces within Russia by asserting a moral equivalence between a "flawed" American democratic system and his autocratic rule of Russia.

The second line of effort in the Kremlin's information warfare playbook, covert Russian operations in cyber space, repeated tactics used against Ukraine but this time with greater sophistication. In particular, the Kremlin and Kremlin-linked actors engaged in hacking and weaponizing the release of stolen data. From what our intelligence community, the Department of Justice, and FBI have compiled, it appears that the GRU undertook the largest share of this aspect of the information warfare campaign, with complementary efforts undertaken by the FSB. The special counsel's indictment from July 2018 detailed how the GRU "intentionally conspired . . . to gain unauthorized access into the computers of U.S. persons and entities involved in the 2016 election, steal documents from those computers and stage releases of the stolen documents to interfere with the 2016 U.S. presidential election."

As we now know, two of the main targets of this operation were the DNC and Clinton campaign chairman, John Podesta. Press reports indicate that approximately 50,000 emails and documents were stolen.

Once in possession of these stolen documents, the GRU repeated its playbook from the earlier campaigns. It sought to weaponize the hacked information by releasing it in a manner and at key times when it could cause the most damage, while concealing Russia's role in the process. As the Mueller indictment against the GRU describes, "They did so using fictitious online personas, including 'DCLeaks' and 'Guccifer 2.0.'"

The Mueller indictment from last July further detailed the GRU's use of fake persona, Guccifer 2.0, which the GRU falsely claimed was a Romanian hacker. Guccifer 2.0 released stolen documents and was active in promoting so-called "exclusives" of stolen information as a way to launder it to

third parties, including journalists from traditional media outlets.

The GRU's covert efforts also took advantage of a willing amplifier, WikiLeaks. WikiLeaks had an established reputation for spilling State secrets, including those of the U.S. Government and military. WikiLeaks also offered a ready-made audience and had an understanding of how to time releases for political impact. Indeed, according to the Mueller indictment, the GRU, posing as Guccifer 2.0 "discussed the release of the stolen documents and the timing of those releases" with WikiLeaks "to heighten their impact on the 2016 presidential election."

WikiLeaks released the stolen documents during the Democratic National Convention to cause conflict between Clinton and Sanders supporters at a time when many Americans were very likely to be paying attention. WikiLeaks also released documents in the last few weeks of the election, again, when the Nation was very likely to be following campaigns. The first release of stolen emails from the Clinton campaign chairman, John Podesta, coincided with a warning from the Department of Homeland Security and Office of the Director of National Intelligence in October 2016 about Russian attacks against our election. It also occurred on the same day as the release of the Trump "Access Hollywood" tape. These efforts, too, suggest a high level of sophistication that hadn't been seen in earlier Russian influence campaigns.

The third component of the Russian information warfare campaign, message amplification and reinforcement through social media, was deployed in parallel with the other lines of effort to achieve an unprecedented impact. While we don't know the full extent of the GRU's involvement, the Mueller indictment revealed that an entire military intelligence unit—74455—was active in this line of effort. In his July 2018 indictment, the special counsel explained that unit No. 74455 assisted in the promotion of the released stolen material "and the publication of anti-Clinton contact on social media accounts operated by the GRU."

That includes the site DCLeaks, which was, in fact, established by the GRU. It went live in early June 2016, posing as a site run by American hacktivists, promising to "expose the truth" about U.S. politicians. The GRU even created a DCLeaks Facebook page, authored by the fictitious U.S. woman Alice Donovan, which sought to drive traffic to its site. The July indictment further details how the GRU used additional fake accounts posing as Americans named Jason Scott and Richard Gingrey to promote the DCLeaks site. Before it was shut down in March of 2017, the DCLeaks site was viewed over a million times.

The GRU also used social media to magnify fears about Hillary Clinton. The July indictment from the special counsel revealed that the GRU was the

true operator behind the fraudulent Twitter account @BaltimoreIsWhr [Baltimore is War], which encouraged U.S. audiences to "[j]oin our flash mob" opposing Clinton and to share images with the hashtag "Blacks Against Hillary."

In addition to the GRU's weaponizing social media against the United States, there was a complementary effort from the Kremlin-linked troll organization, the Internet Research Agency. By the 2016 U.S. Presidential election, the deployment of the troll organization appeared to be a standard part of the Kremlin's playbook. The October 2018 indictment of the Internet Research Agency's accountant in the Eastern District of Virginia provides additional confirmation of the troll organization's role in the information campaign. The indictment confirms the existence of the Agency's operation known as Project Lakhta—since at least May of 2014—and notes that this project targeted Ukraine, Europe, and the United States with a stated goal in the United States to "spread distrust toward candidates for political office and the political system in general." Social media researchers, including P.W. Singer, have also noted how some of the same trolls were repurposed for different operations. The accounts that pretended to be Ukrainian then posed as British citizens and then as Americans as the focus of attacks shifted over time.

Against the United States, the troll operation capitalized on issues of importance to groups inside American society to magnify fear and distrust in ways that aligned with the Kremlin strategic interest of hurting Clinton and helping President Trump. As the special counsel's February indictment detailed, "These groups and pages, which addressed divisive U.S. political and social issues, falsely claimed to be controlled by U.S. activists when, in fact, they were controlled by [Kremlin-linked trolls]." The indictment further asserted this was the manner in which the troll organization reached "significant numbers of Americans for the purpose of influencing the Presidential election of 2016."

The report prepared for the Senate Intelligence Committee by New Knowledge, Columbia, and Canfield Research that analyzed certain data from social media companies identifies a number of tactics employed by the Internet Research Agency in its assault on the 2016 election. These include building brands across platforms, including Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, and Instagram; deploying or repurposing popular memes to spread propaganda; reinforcing key themes by resharing the same story across multiple accounts; impersonating local media on Twitter and Instagram to win the trust of Americans in their local news; and amplifying conspiratorial narratives among both left- and right-leaning audiences.

As I mentioned, the report found that one of the troll organization's concerted lines of attack was against African Americans. These efforts, however, went beyond just trying to sow discord and reinforce fears about Clinton. Campaigns against African-American groups were pushed across Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, and YouTube with the goal of suppressing voter turnout "through malicious misdirection, candidate support redirection and turnout depression."

Kathleen Hall Jamieson, a scholar who studies political campaigns, examined polling data throughout the campaign and documented similar tactics at disenfranchisement in her recent book, including fake ads that encouraged minority viewers to text or tweet their support for Clinton rather than to vote at the polls or to rally support for other candidates in the race. These efforts may have been particularly effective in peeling off voters who would have been likely to vote for her candidacy. They also may have influenced undecided voters at a key time. Polls in the final month of the campaign showed a marked drop in the number of Americans saying they intended to vote for Secretary Clinton.

The reports prepared for the Senate Intelligence Committee highlighted that Twitter was an important component of the attacks Kremlin-linked troll organizations deployed against the American people. The nearly 4,000 inauthentic Russian Twitter accounts, like their Facebook counterparts, promoted messages related to divisive social issues, such as gun control, race relations, and immigration. The troll organization also deployed bots, or automated accounts, to amplify messages and drive traffic to specific Facebook pages, Kremlin propaganda sites, or other targeted websites. The Kremlin-linked troll operation went into overdrive on election day with strategic messaging that mimicked the spike in activity on Twitter during the Brexit referendum. According to the *Daily Beast*, Kremlin-linked trolls began a "final push" and used "a combination of high-profile accounts with large and influential followings and scores of lurking personas established years earlier with stolen photos and fabricated backgrounds" to send "carefully metered tweets and retweets voicing praise for Trump and contempt for his opponent from the early morning until the last polls closed in the United States."

As the recent studies commissioned by the Senate Intelligence Committee illuminate, the information warfare campaign against the American people was an extensive, widespread, coordinated effort across many social media platforms, both big and small. The increased sophistication of the troll organization's techniques on social media provided a relatively low-cost but highly effective method of influencing the American public. For example, these trolls spent only \$100,000 on 3,000 ads on

Facebook. While this may seem like a small amount compared to the millions of dollars spent on the Presidential campaign, the impact and reach of these Kremlin ads, once amplified through these Russian operations, was extensive.

While Facebook estimates that approximately 126 million Americans saw Kremlin-linked messages, Jonathan Albright, the research director for Columbia University's Tow Center for Digital Journalism, extrapolated that they could have been shared hundreds of millions and, perhaps, many billions of times. Kathleen Hall Jamieson concluded that the widespread reach of the troll organization's disinformation "increases the likelihood" that the Russian activities changed the outcome of the election. A study from the Ohio State University on propaganda and disinformation affirmed Hall Jamieson's assessment and concluded Russian information warfare attacks "most likely did have substantial impact on the voting decisions of a strategically important set of voters—those who voted for Barack Obama in 2012. Indeed, given the very narrow margins of victory by Donald Trump in key battleground states, this impact may have been sufficient to deprive Hillary Clinton of a victory in the Electoral College." That is their conclusion.

As with the Brexit campaign, the Russian information warfare campaign during the 2016 election was aided by others who, either wittingly or unwittingly, helped to advance Russia's strategic objectives. Among these were major American news outlets, which covered much of what was in the WikiLeaks disclosures. They treated it as legitimate news without reminding viewers of how the information was obtained or that it was being pushed by a foreign adversary. Thomas Rid, a professor of security studies at King's College, testified to the Senate Intelligence Committee in March of 2017 that the journalists functioned as "unwitting agents . . . who aggressively covered the political leaks while neglecting or ignoring their provenance" or, as Kathleen Hall Jamieson concludes, the American media "inadvertently helped [the Russians] achieve their goals."

Further, as in the Brexit campaign, a number of local surrogates appeared to echo the Kremlin messages. This included associates of the Trump campaign and even the President himself. He boasted of his love of WikiLeaks at least 124 times in the last month of the election alone and even tweeted a link to access the stolen disclosures from WikiLeaks. According to the *Washington Post*, at least five close Trump associates, albeit perhaps unknowingly, retweeted messages from Kremlin-linked troll accounts, including the account @Ten—GOP, a Russian fake handle that impersonated the Tennessee Republican Party.

The President and his campaign also used talking points that were similar

to Russian propaganda and disinformation, including disparaging Secretary Clinton's health and accusing her repeatedly of being "crooked." The President encouraged Russia, in many respects, to continue these activities. From what we know from the July indictment from the special counsel, the night that Trump called on the Russians to hack her emails, the GRU did, in fact, attack the server that housed Clinton's personal accounts. As journalist and legal analyst Jeffrey Toobin characterized it, "All of these separate [Russian] efforts are completely aligned with Donald Trump's interests, often word for word."

Some have argued that despite this extensive and sophisticated Russian influence campaign, there was no effect on the outcome of the election because no vote tallies were changed. While we may never know definitively what the actual impact of the Kremlin's operation was, it is hard to believe that the Kremlin would mount a sustained, multiyear information warfare campaign against our democratic institutions if it had no reason to expect that it would have an impact. To the contrary, based on its experience in Ukraine, Brexit, and elsewhere, the Kremlin had every reason to believe that it could successfully influence the outcome of the 2016 election with minimal risk of being discovered or suffering retaliation.

As I have laid out, Russia is engaged in a sustained information warfare campaign against the United States, our allies, and partners. This Russian interference can't be dismissed as a one-off operation. As Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein told the Aspen Forum last July, the Russian effort to influence the 2016 Presidential election is "just one tree in a growing forest. Russian intelligence officers did not stumble onto the idea of hacking American computers and posting misleading messages because they had a free afternoon. It is what they do every day." Our intelligence community assessed in January 2017 that the campaign against us represented a "new normal" in Russian influence efforts in which "Moscow will apply lessons learned from its campaign aimed at the U.S. presidential election to future influence efforts in the U.S. and worldwide."

Russian information warfare operations have a real and ongoing impact on our national security. Russia has not paused its information warfare operations since the 2016 election, and, in fact, the level of Russian operations has increased since then. As John Kelly, the founder of Graphika, a social media intelligence firm, who testified to the Senate Intelligence Committee in August and who collaborated on one of the reports for the Senate Intelligence Committee I discussed earlier, stated: "After election day, the Russian government stepped on the gas . . . confirming again that the assault

on our democratic process is much bigger than the attack on a single election." This idea was confirmed by data in both his report and the other report commissioned by the Senate Intelligence Committee on the Kremlin-linked troll organization.

The report done by New Knowledge, Columbia University, and Canfield research noted that the Kremlin-linked troll organization went after those who are investigating Russian information warfare and other malign influence activities in the United States, including attempts to label Russian interference in the election as "nonsense" and casting former FBI Director James Comey and Special Counsel Mueller as corrupt.

We don't have to look too far for other examples of Russia's ongoing campaign against the American people and our allies and partners. Kremlin-linked troll operations flooded Twitter with messages that were intended to sow division and disinformation in the wake of numerous controversies, including the tragic shootings in Las Vegas and Parkland, FL, and during the Kavanaugh confirmation hearings. Last September, we learned from an indictment in the Western District of Pennsylvania that GRU officers, including some agents who were previously indicted by Special Counsel Mueller, attempted information attacks against prominent world organizations, including those who were investigating Russian malign influence activities.

It is now clear that Russian information operations also targeted the 2018 midterm elections. The October indictment from the Eastern District of Virginia details an ongoing and advanced operation to influence the American electorate up through 2018. As the indictment states, this campaign "has a strategic goal, which continues to this day, to sow division and discord in the U.S. political system." The indictment also details how Russian troll operations are using U.S.-based virtual private networks, or VPNs, paid for with Bitcoin through multiple bank accounts, to disguise the origin of Russian messaging on social media.

The sophistication of these operations continues to increase. The Internet Research Agency has a dedicated "search engine optimization" department that is devoted to manipulating social media search algorithms to advance the goals of Russian troll operations. The troll organization spent millions of dollars annually in 2017 and 2018 and is still buying ads on Facebook and Instagram. These operations continue to cover a broad range of divisive issues, and as the indictment details, the organization's employees are instructed on strategies and guidance for targeting particular audiences with carefully tailored messages. Despite efforts by Facebook and Twitter to eliminate inauthentic accounts, there are still thousands of active social media and email accounts

appearing to be U.S. persons when they are, in fact, Kremlin-linked trolls that are acting as part of an information warfare campaign.

Last February, in testimony before the Armed Services Cyber Subcommittee, Russia expert Heather Conley warned that Russian information warfare campaigns in 2018 and 2020 will adapt and "look more American, and [it] will look less Russian." The New Knowledge, Columbia University, and Canfield research study notes that we need to be on the lookout for increasingly sophisticated operations, including "increased human-exploitation tradecraft and narrative laundering."

The technology already exists to create "deepfakes," false videos of real people saying or doing things that are damaging. Advances in artificial intelligence are enabling rapid, automated responses on social media that mimic authentic accounts.

We are still gathering data about information warfare attacks, including the 2018 midterms. Between the indictments I referenced and the additional Kremlin-directed troll operations discovered by Facebook in conjunction with our Intelligence Committee, the FBI, and DHS, we seem to be getting better at responding to the types of attacks perpetrated against United States in 2016, but that is no indicator that we have become better at anticipating future attacks.

The Director of the Department of Homeland Security's Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency warned last November that "the [2018] midterm is . . . just the warm-up or the exhibition game. . . . The big game . . . for the adversaries is probably 2020."

I want to thank my colleague for being generous and patient with my presentation, but I do want to make, I think, an important and concluding point that ties in directly with what is going on right now.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. President, we have been talking about this shutdown. After I described the activities that have transpired over the last 5 to 10 years, we should be aware that they are continuing, and the consequences of this shutdown are more than theoretical.

We are missing some of our most critical tools for countering Russian information warfare for protecting systems that are vital to our democracy. As Andrew Grotto, a former cyber security adviser for Presidents Trump and Obama stated, "Defending Federal networks is already an act of triage . . . furloughs make a hard job even harder."

While I applaud DHS for reorganizing into the new Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, they have since had to furlough 43 percent of their employees. That is over 1,500 workers who right now are unable to continue key missions and protect us from attack.

The FBI is also affected by the shutdown in critical functions related to

countering Russian hybrid and information warfare.

A recent FBI Agent's Association report highlighted how efforts to investigate and prosecute cyber criminals have been impacted. That includes a lack of resources to pay for wiretaps and subpoenas. One anonymous FBI agent quoted in the report remarked: "These delays slow down our work to combat criminal activity on the [internet] and protect the American people."

All the while, Russia continues to attack us with information warfare. They were not closed for business. With this unnecessary government shutdown, we are fighting blindfolded with one hand tied behind our backs.

I am confident in the ability of our government and our society to come together. I am confident that with the American vision and ingenuity, working across the aisle and across the Atlantic, these are challenges that we can meet and conquer, but we must remember that this is not a Democratic or Republican problem.

This is an attack against the Nation by a foreign power. This is a problem of our national security. We have no time to waste. If we are looking for another reason why we should open this government immediately, it is to continue our protection against the attacks by foreign entities.

With that, let me particularly thank the Senator from Florida for his patience and thank the Presiding Officer for his patience as well.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

AMENDMENT NO. 48

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today as a voice for the people of Puerto Rico. I intend to be their voice in the U.S. Senate. They are Americans—as American as the people of Florida whom I was elected to represent. They are our brothers and sisters, and they deserve a voice. Their success is America's success. Their recovery is America's recovery.

In September of 2017, Puerto Rico was hit by a devastating hurricane. Maria's landfall changed the landscape of the island forever. As Governor of Florida, I worked to be there for the people of Puerto Rico. I worked with Congresswoman Jenniffer Gonzalez Colon, Governor Rossello, Lieutenant Governor Luis Rivera Marin, Senate President Thomas Rivera Schatz, and House Speaker Carlos Johnny Mendez to provide whatever support and aid they needed.

Jennifer has been a tireless advocate for Puerto Rico, and she has been fighting so hard for this funding. I am proud to join her in this fight.

In Florida, we created welcome centers at the airports in Orlando and in Miami to support those coming to Florida from the island. We waived housing and education regulations to make sure families coming from Puerto Rico could easily settle in Florida,

whether they planned to stay permanently or just for a short period of time.

I have visited Puerto Rico eight times since the deadly storm and provided Florida State resources to the citizens of Puerto Rico to aid in rebuilding and recovery, but the island still has a long way to go.

The bill I supported today does many good things. It reopens the government after the longest shutdown in U.S. history. It provides significant funding to secure our southern border—funding that is long overdue and that is needed to keep American families safe. It extends protections for children who were brought to this country illegally through no fault of their own, and it extends TPS. While I would prefer a permanent solution for the DACA kids and TPS, this is a positive step. Putting protections for the DACA population into law is also long overdue.

The bill also provides significant disaster funding for the State of Florida following the devastation of Hurricane Michael, which hit Florida's Panhandle just a few months ago. The funding includes resources specifically for Tyndall Air Force Base. I would like to thank Majority Leader MCCONNELL for putting a bill forward to help Florida recover from this horrible hurricane.

On all of these points, I join many of my colleagues in support, but, unfortunately, the Senate version of the government funding bill does not include \$600 million in essential disaster funding for our brothers and sisters in Puerto Rico.

I am offering an amendment today that would add the \$600 million included in the House bill back to the Senate version.

Puerto Rico's recovery continues, and the U.S. Congress must do everything we can to support that, with responsible safeguards against fraud and waste. As long as I am a Member of the U.S. Senate, I will fight to make sure the people of Puerto Rico are represented. I am proud that the first amendment I filed and my first speech on the Senate floor is to fight for Puerto Rico.

To the people of Puerto Rico, know this: I will be your voice in the Senate. I will fight for what is right, and I will never give up.

I will now address the Senate in Spanish. I provided the translation to the Senate for the RECORD.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

The people of Puerto Rico deserve real change. We have to strengthen the economy of the island. As a Senator, I will fight for the families of Puerto Rico and work to ensure that Puerto Rico is treated fairly.

Thank you so much.

Mr. President, the amendment is at the desk.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, it has been 34 days since the President ful-

filled his promise to shut down the government, and the American people are not happy about it.

Poll after poll shows that people are not OK with the way the President of the United States is handling his job, and it is getting worse by the day, because to any reasonable person, this shutdown has been stupid and useless and cruel.

There are so many failures to talk about, but I want to talk about four specific failures that, if it were any other President, if it were any other time in modern history, would bring a President and a Congress to its senses and end the shutdown.

The first failure is this. Federal workers are in food lines. Federal workers are in food lines. People with jobs are now in food lines. Hundreds of thousands of people who work for the government are either furloughed or working without pay, and, tomorrow, these American public servants will miss their second paycheck.

There is a big difference between missing the first paycheck and the second paycheck. Some people can absorb missing the first paycheck, but this second paycheck is going to be really, really challenging for tens of thousands of American public servants because the rent is due, the mortgage is due, the car registration is due, the insurance is due, and the utilities are due at the beginning of the month.

This brings the amount of money that American public servants are owed by their government for work already performed to \$4.7 billion. Remember that about a third of all Federal workers are veterans.

It may be hard for billionaires in the Cabinet to understand, but for the middle class, missing two paychecks in a row is a total disaster.

I have met people working in airport security who can't concentrate. They can't sleep because they can't stop worrying about how they are going to pay their bills. I have met government workers in the midst of applying for food stamps and asking local charities for help. I met a single mom who spent her career working hard to build a life for her family, and she told me that without these paychecks, it is all going backward.

As one Washington Post columnist put it, under the Republican leadership, the United States is starting to look like the failed Soviet system, with middle-class workers literally waiting in bread lines.

I am grateful that for every story I have heard of someone suffering, there is also a story of people stepping up to help. In Hawaii, in particular, local utility companies, financial institutions, and others have decided that they will not penalize Federal workers hurt by the shutdown if they miss a payment. I want to thank our local banks for allowing unpaid Federal workers to make a late payment on their mortgage without a penalty, and I want to thank our credit unions for

extending very cheap credit. I want to thank people who are organizing in local communities, not just in Hawaii but across the country, so that middle-class families can make it through this.

Federal workers want paychecks, not food banks. They want paychecks. They don't want charity. They want to be compensated for the work that they do. They shouldn't rely on pop-up kitchens for furloughed workers or online fundraising campaigns or the kindness of families, friends, and strangers—as great as all of that is. They should just get paid, and that starts with opening the government.

Here is the second failure that should end this shutdown right away, and that is that economic growth is already slowing. This week, a White House adviser said that the Nation's economic growth could be zero if the shutdown goes on. Economists and business leaders were already worried about the potential for a recession, and this shutdown is fanning those unfortunate flames.

Small businesses can't get loans. Companies can't go public. This administration has stopped some of the core functions of our market economy, but there is one thing that will not stop, and that is the corruption in this administration.

If you have money, this administration takes care of you, and if you don't, then they will not. Federal workers have been called back to the office to take care of oil and gas leases—to take care of oil and gas leases—and to help financial institutions. They are working unpaid so that special interests can keep making money.

This is the third failure. While people who are fortunate financially are protected, this shutdown leaves the people most vulnerable to fend for themselves.

Food pantries and health clinics that rely on Federal funds are out of supplies, which means that Americans are going to start to go hungry and without medicine for everything from diabetes to addiction.

Landlords who provide housing for 4 million people—mostly seniors and people with disabilities and kids—will soon stop receiving rent payments. They will have to decide how long they can hold out before being forced to evict these people or lose the properties themselves.

Housing authorities are delaying the release of section 8 vouchers.

Domestic violence shelters that rely on Federal funds are furloughing their own workers and cutting back services that save lives. So men, women, and children who need to get out of a dangerous situation at home have fewer options to get to safety.

That brings me to the fourth failure, which is that public safety is gravely at risk. This is a serious matter. This isn't about whether Donald Trump can save face or whether the Republicans can vanquish the Democrats or NANCY PELOSI makes MITCH MCCONNELL look

bad. It is none of that. Public safety is at risk.

Air traffic controllers and TSA workers are working without pay. They are stressed out, and they are becoming increasingly understaffed and undersupported, and there is no ability to train new employees, and they are sounding the alarm.

This isn't my rhetoric. I want you to listen to what the National Air Traffic Controllers Association said yesterday:

We cannot even calculate the level of risk currently at play, nor predict the point at which the entire system will break. It is unprecedented.

The National Transportation Safety Board is being forced to choose which crashes to investigate and which not to, leaving us with unanswered questions and risking lives in the future. As of this week, the NTSB has been unable to investigate 87 crashes, including some with fatalities.

This is a pattern. It is a pattern of recklessly endangering the safety of Americans. We are just 2 months out from a wildfire that destroyed 18,000 homes and buildings and killed 86 people. Yet the shutdown has stopped us from training firefighters. It has cancelled controlled burns. It has led to dead trees piling up in places that we know pose a fire risk. This is what happens when you shut down the government to try to get your way. You put real people at risk.

The safety of Americans abroad and at home is threatened by this shutdown. The State Department cancelled a border security summit. This fight is supposed to be about border security. Yet we are not paying TSA, we are not paying FBI agents, we are about to close some of our Federal courts, and the State Department itself just cancelled a border security summit. FBI agents are working without pay. Field offices are operating in fiscal uncertainty. That means investigations into street gangs and drug dealers are on hold, training on child abductions and counterterrorism has been cancelled, and communications with sources about gangs, such as MS-13, have stopped. As one agent put it, "Our enemies know they can run freely." Our enemies know they can run freely.

I ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, why would we put public safety at risk? Why can't we reopen the government and negotiate our differences?

The truth is, as it relates to border security—I am in my seventh year in the Senate, and every year, we do a bipartisan bill that includes border security in the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee. We always do this.

By the way, every Republican and every Democrat will quietly say: We are not doing a cement wall from sea to shining sea. That makes no sense, and nobody at the Department of Homeland Security thinks that is a good idea.

So we quietly appropriate money—some for personnel, some for beds,

some for courts so they can adjudicate some of these cases, and some for physical barriers where it is appropriate, to put up a wall where it makes sense. You don't put up a wall where it doesn't make sense. We do this all the time. So the idea that we are going to shut down the government and shut down portions of the Department of Homeland Security itself in order to get to a place where the President of the United States can save face is just absurd.

We have to be the grownups here, and that is going to require some Republicans to craft a border security package with Democrats, as we have over the last 6 or 7 years, and we have to do that after we open the government. The reason that is so essential is that this President—certainly this President especially, but no President, Democratic or Republican, now or 30 years from now, should ever inflict pain on the American people in order to generate leverage in a policy discussion. When somebody does that—and if it is one of my friends in the Senate and they do this 10 years from now, I want them to read this speech back to me. The answer to the offer, which is, "I am going to hurt Americans unless you do X," should be "You get nothing in exchange for not hurting Americans." That is not a cookie for us.

Barack Obama learned that lesson the hard way. Only when he finally said "You guys want to screw with the American economy; you want to mess with the debt ceiling; you get nothing" did they back off, and all that brinksmanship stopped.

Every time we reward hostage taking, we will get more hostage taking. As painful as all of this is, we have to stand firm. We are absolutely willing to negotiate a package related to border security, which will no doubt include some physical barrier, because we do that every year, actually, but I am not doing any of that until the government is opened. That is not just a political position; that is a matter of principle because we can't live like this as a country. We cannot function like this. If we do this, if we cut a deal now and we give \$2 billion for the wall, the debt ceiling is coming up in March or April, and here we go again. The fiscal year expires in September, and here we go again. We will never govern. I know the Presiding Officer was a Governor. That is no way to run a country. Let this be the last shutdown.

I know the two leaders of the Senate are in what appear to be constructive conversations. I know there are plenty of adults who want to get us out of this. For the first time in several weeks, I have actually felt somewhat hopeful about the trajectory. I don't think we are going to fix this in the next hour or so, but at least we are talking, and at least there seems to be a desire to structure an off-ramp. But we have to do one simple thing first: We have to reopen the government. People are about to miss their pay-

checks for the second time tomorrow. It is our obligation to reopen the government.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VENEZUELA

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I wanted to take a moment to address the recent events in the nation of Venezuela, but before I do, I want to take the opportunity to congratulate the Presiding Officer, my colleague from the great State of Florida, who a few moments ago I believe gave his speech on the floor of the Senate—and gave part of it in Spanish, and did it very well—and spoke about the important issue of Puerto Rico. His leadership here on that is going to be critical. It is an issue I know he knows very well from his time as Governor of our State.

I know this is another cause he cares about. He took leadership on it as the Governor of the State of Florida. As recently as 2 nights ago, he was with me and some others, and together we met with the President of the United States to talk about what is happening in Venezuela.

The most important answer we have to have for the American people is, Why should it matter to us? Why should America even be involved in this, beyond expressing an opinion or sending a letter or even a vote on an international organism? Why should America lead, and why should America be so intricately involved in something going on in another country?

That is always a valid question. It is the most important question we have to consistently answer and not take for granted. I think we don't do that enough anymore in American foreign policy. It has allowed some to argue that perhaps the United States gets too engaged around the world.

We are a nation that should always stand for our principles, and we should defend them and stand with those around the world who share the principles of human liberty and dignity and freedom and respect for human rights. When the United States gets deeply involved in something in another country, it must also be in our national interests.

The only reason why being involved in the issues that are going on in Venezuela can be justified to the men and women of this Nation, for whom we work, is to prove to them and argue to them and convince them that what is happening there is not just about Venezuela, but it is in the national interests of the United States.

Before I can do that, I have to lay out the history of what brings us to

this point. I will not go into great detail because the time does not permit it. Venezuela has a Constitution. In fact, it has a Constitution that was put in place during the rule of Hugo Chavez—someone whom I was certainly not a fan of and who was not a fan of the United States.

Under that Constitution, there was a parliamentary body of the National Assembly, and there was a Presidency and a supreme court. What happened a few years ago is that when Chavez died and Nicolas Maduro—the current dictator of the country—took over, he had to stand for election. Before he stood for election, there was an election to the National Assembly. The party that was Hugo Chavez's party and now Maduro's party was trounced. They lost badly. They didn't just lose the National Assembly. They lost Governors' seats across the country.

Maduro realized that his party, and he himself, could not survive in a truly democratic system. What he did is he canceled the National Assembly. First, he started ignoring them. He stopped following their orders. They would pass a bill, and he wouldn't implement it. He would completely ignore it, as if they didn't exist.

Then, he replaced a supreme court with handpicked people who would do what he wanted to do. The equivalent would be if the President of the United States decided that no matter what law we passed, even if we overrode a veto, he just wouldn't implement it and would refuse to do it.

Then, at some point, he actually tried to create an alternative to the National Assembly. He created, out of thin air, this thing called the Constituent Assembly, which is an idea he got from the Cubans and from Communist countries, and gave them extraordinary powers to do all sorts of things.

One of the things that Constituent Assembly did is they created an election late last spring. People would say Maduro stood for election, and he won—theoretically. At least that is their argument. You can have an election and it not be a real election.

For example, every one of the media outlets in the country is controlled by the government. All of them have to run, by law—they are mandated to provide what they call network coverage across the board any time he speaks to the nation.

The opposition party doesn't have that same opportunity. He manipulated vote tallies. They were able to go in and make sure votes were counted in a certain way. They control votes through the food program. Forty-two percent of the people in Venezuela depend on a food program run by the government. To have that food program, you have to have an identification card. When you go vote, that same identification card doesn't just register whether you voted or not, they know whom you voted for. They know whom you voted for.

If you didn't show up to vote and you didn't vote for whom they wanted you to vote, meaning Maduro, you got cut off from your food program. If you had to choose between voting for someone you didn't like or not feeding your family, you were going to vote for someone you did not like.

Despite all that, the turnouts were abysmally low. The images that came out—there were two people in line, in some cases. Sometimes they caught the same five people making the line over and over again. It wasn't a real election.

By the way, he legally disqualified every credible opponent he could have possibly had. Because it was a fake election, the opposition boycotted it. So he didn't even have real opposition.

He won this fake election. Then came January, and he tried to be sworn in. He was, through a ceremony, but it was not legitimate. It would be the same as if the President of the United States announced that he was calling new elections, not in 2020; we are going to have them in April of this year. If he wins, he will get to serve 6 years instead of 4.

Everybody here would say that is not the Constitution. It is not a constitutional election. That is what they did. It is not a reelection. Under the Constitution of Venezuela, because that was not legitimate, you have a vacancy in the Office of the Presidency.

Under the Constitution of Venezuela, similar to ours, when there is a vacancy in the Presidency—and by virtue of that the Vice Presidency because he was elected alongside—the President of the country becomes the equivalent of our Speaker of the House, the same line of succession we have here. He becomes the President of the National Assembly.

The President of the National Assembly assumes that charge as interim President and within 45 days has to call valid constitutional elections. That is what happened yesterday. The valid President of the National Assembly called, assumed the responsibility of interim President, and now within the next 45 days he will have to schedule and call for elections.

The United States responded to that by stating the obvious. This is not constitutional. It is not legitimate. We don't recognize this fake President. We recognize your Constitution and the President whom the Constitution says is in place, this interim President.

This is not a guy who is trying to be President himself for 6 years. This is not a fight between two political parties, not some civil war like we see in other parts of the world between two competing bands. This is basically the person who has been elected, the President of the National Assembly assuming an interim position who is now a caretaker to guide the country back toward a constitutional democracy. The United States recognizes it.

It is stunning to see some of the reporting on this here and around the

world; that he basically proclaimed himself the President. No, he just assumed his constitutional responsibility. The United States did something unusual in recognizing him. No. 1, it is not unusual. It is the Constitution of Venezuela; and No. 2, it was not just the United States.

We were immediately joined by 11 countries in the region. That number is now up to 16 in the Western Hemisphere—Colombia, Chili, Peru, Brazil, Argentina, Honduras, Guatemala—all of them, lined up, and more, and reflected the same position the United States has taken on this issue. So did France. Apparently, so did the United Kingdom today and Albania and Kosovo and a growing number of countries. Even the European Union says Maduro is illegitimate. They have not gone as far as to recognize the interim President as the interim President, but they have said he is illegitimate, and at the National Assembly he is legitimate.

It is not unusual. It happens to be the global norm. Who disagrees with us other than Maduro? Cuba, Turkey, Russia, Iran, Egypt, apparently. What do they have in common? Think about it. These are not democracies. They have their own interests here at heart.

Some might ask: How does this guy hold on to power if he is so terrible? No. 1, he controls access to food. I can tell you, if you control access to food and medicine and you threaten people with hunger, you will have a lot of control. The other thing he has done is, he uses migration as a relief valve. It is a very Cuban regime-type tactic.

It is estimated that over 2.3 million people—basically 1 out of 12 Venezuelans—have left the country since 2015. Think about that. One-twelfth of the population has abandoned the country, leaving behind, in many cases, children on their own, leaving behind catastrophe.

The ability to drive out opponents and people for whom life has become too miserable is a relief valve. The other is just sheer oppression. They put people in jail. They kill people. People die in custody. They shoot them in the streets. That is pretty effective, too, sometimes.

The second thing that keeps them in power is the assistance of the Cuban regime. Every time I mention that, people think: You are just obsessed with Cuba. You are from Miami, Cuban American.

The Cubans, when it comes to intelligence and repression, punch way above their weight. They are experts at repression. That is what they basically assist them with.

Do you know the Cubans basically run the security apparatus of Venezuela? The personal security of Maduro are Cubans, which tells you a lot about how much trust he has in his countrymen. The Cubans provide them with basically all of their intelligence collection and the capacity to collect intelligence. They have trained their National Guard on crowd control.

By the way, none of this is free. These are not free services. This is a country that is poor and low on resources. The Cubans are probably pulling in \$1 billion a year for these services they provide.

The other thing people keep mentioning that keeps him in power is the loyalty of military officers. I know you will see the picture of all these guys in a country, by the way, where people are starving, and every single one of these military guys is overweight. Somehow, in a starving country, these people are gaining weight. They have these fancy uniforms on.

Let me tell you, these folks are not truly loyal to Maduro. I saw that picture today. I can tell you for a fact that more than half of the people in that picture at some point in time have expressed serious doubts about Maduro. They are really limited to what they can do right now. Why? First of all, because all of them—every one of them—is compromised. Their loyalty is not ideological, and it is not personal. It is bought. It is paid for. Every single one of them has access to lucrative corruption opportunities. Some of them have been given the opportunity to raid Venezuela's national oil company. They have made millions—hundreds of millions of dollars—by running that company into the ground. Some of them have been given the distribution of consumer goods—watches and phones and consumer articles. They give them these things and say: You guys go out and sell them in the black market in the street and take your cut.

Others have been allowed to skim off that food program I mentioned that feeds 42 percent of the people. The military officers get first dibs at some percentage of it, and they get to sell food directly for a profit. Some are participating in currency manipulation. It sounds a lot like an organized crime ring, like one of these old-style Mafia families, where one guy ran the loan-sharking racket and the other guy had the gambling and the other guy had the prostitution and the other guy did the bank heists.

That is what this is. These people are loyal because Maduro allows them corruption opportunities. They are also loyal, by the way, because the Cubans are spying on them. The Cuban intelligence agencies quickly pick up on any of these military officers who are being disloyal or expressing doubts, and those guys are arrested.

There has been a massive purge of Venezuelan military officers over the last 2 years. I am talking about dozens of high-ranking military officials, either removed from their positions or arrested and are in jail. It wasn't for corruption, believe me. It was because the Cubans caught them and reported them and were wrapped up. Everybody else was watching that and saying: It ain't going to happen to me.

That is not really loyalty. That is fear. You can see it in their eyes today. By the way, they resent the Cubans,

these military officers. Imagine, for a moment, this is your country, and here comes the smaller country and their guys run everything and tell you what to do and spy on you and pit you against each other. They better be careful about expressing that resentment because the Cubans are listening, and they will report you.

Despite all of this, all is not good in the Venezuela regime. It has gotten harder and harder every day. What has happened with the sanctions that have been imposed on these individuals, they have cut off their ability to steal money and enjoy corruption, and it has cut off the ability to enjoy the money they have stolen. They can't travel. They can't buy certain things. They have to hide their money. Some have had assets seized here and abroad. That has created resentment, and that has created anger within the inner circle. All these people in the inner circle are now upset because they are not making as much money off corruption as they used to make. They start saying to themselves, maybe we have to get rid of Maduro and get a new godfather Mafia head here. Maduro finds out about it, and he eliminates them. So the circle gets smaller, which actually works to his benefit because with shrinking resources, the less mouths you have to feed with corruption, the better.

There is a real good example of it. There is a guy named Diosdado Cabello, who ostensibly is now the president of this fake constituent assembly. He happens to be a drug lord deeply involved in narcotrafficking. I guess that is his part of the corruption deal. That is his take. That is the business line he has been given. But he wants to be President. He wants to be President, not Maduro.

This guy Cabello—when Chavez was removed in a coup that lasted just a couple of days, Cabello was sworn in as President of Venezuela because there was a vacancy, using the exact same provision of the Constitution that they now claim is illegitimate. But here is Cabello, who is a drug dealer, a drug lord, a thug, but he wants to be President. He will never be elected President of Venezuela in a normal election, in a legitimate election, so what is his path to being elected and to becoming President?

First is this constituent assembly he has been put in charge of. This new thing they created outside the Constitution is so powerful that it has the power to remove Maduro today. They could remove Maduro. And this guy hears the whispers. These guys are not blind to what is happening. They can see that the country is in disarray, the economy is collapsing, and there isn't enough money for them to steal anymore, and there are people saying to him: Hey, why don't you move on this guy because this guy is never going to fix this place.

He is thinking about it, and he has thought about it, but he knows the

only way he will ever be President is if he can preserve the outlines of this regime and just get rid of the godfather and declare himself the new godfather, the head of this new criminal syndicate, or he can wait until 2024 and run a rigged election—again, set up under the confines of this regime. Even if he doesn't like Maduro, it is to his benefit that he stay there until he is ready to make his move on him or until 2024, when he can run under this rigged system.

Another thing that is wrong with Venezuela is they are deeply in debt. They have serious problems. These are the things we think about. They owe China about \$18 billion, which they don't have the money to pay. They owe Russia about \$3 or \$4 billion. Do you know how they are paying that right now? They are paying it with oil. They are sending oil to China and to Russia for pennies on the dollar. That is what they are making because they don't have cash, so they are bartering instead, paying the debts off in oil.

I know you have seen the public pronouncements. The Chinese just want to get paid. They are owed \$18 billion, and they want to get paid, and they want to make sure that Maduro or whoever is in power is going to pay them the \$18 billion. But the Russians want to get paid too. Neither one of them believes Maduro is a great leader or is happy with him; they just don't know what is going to come after him. They are afraid that whoever comes after him will state that the debt is not legitimate because it wasn't approved by the National Assembly. So they would rather have this guy in place unless it is going to be someone else just like him. But they are not happy.

The corruption in the national oil company is so horrifying that even the Chinese and Russians don't like it. That is how bad it is. That has to be a pretty high standard. Then there is the mismanagement. They have destroyed this company. Its production has collapsed. It is not run by oil people; it is run by generals who don't know anything about the business. They have run it into the ground, and they missed payments. Remember, they are supposed to be delivering oil for payment. They have missed deliveries to the Chinese and Russians. They are not happy about it, but what are they going to do? At least they are getting paid something.

Russia has another interest, by the way, which leads me now to why we should care about this.

First and foremost, I can make a very compelling argument, I believe, that what is happening in Venezuela is a national interest threat to the United States and even potentially a national security threat.

Let me start with this: Maduro has repeatedly and openly invited the Russians to establish both a naval and an air base in Venezuela. Basically he said: Here is the land. We will build it for you. We want to have your airplanes and naval ships stationed here.

Most of us serving here, with a few exceptions, have never served in Congress when—and many people around do not remember a time—when a foreign military, an adversary, was stationed in our own hemisphere, but that is what Maduro is inviting him to do. Why does Maduro want it? Because he thinks that acts as insurance against ever having an invasion or whatever he thinks is going to happen.

Why does Russia want it? They want it because it is leverage against us. They don't like how close we are to them in Europe with our allies in NATO, so this gives them an opportunity to have the equivalence of it in our own hemisphere.

So if you think Putin having his military stationed here is a good thing, then I suppose what is happening in Venezuela wouldn't bother you. But the enormous majority of Americans don't want Putin's military anywhere in our hemisphere, and that is precisely what will happen if Maduro remains in power. That alone is a national security threat to the United States.

There is more. In their own national territory, the Maduro regime hosts a group called the ELN, which is a terrorist narco organization. In fact, last week the ELN detonated a bomb at the police academy in Colombia and killed 20 people. Do you know where they are headquartered? Inside Venezuelan territory, and it is from there that they plot these attacks.

Do you know what else Venezuela does with the ELN from within Venezuelan territory? They help them ship cocaine to the United States of America.

I can state that both of those matters are national security interests to the United States. The first is that drugs are a threat to this country, and anyone who is helping a drug trafficking organization ship it into our country is a threat to us. So if you don't mind or don't care about cocaine being shipped to the United States in growing quantities, then I guess Maduro and Venezuela is not something that will bother you. But if you do not want to see people around who are helping drug organizations ship cocaine into the United States under the protection of a government, meaning they are giving them controlled airspace, and they are protecting the shipments into the United States and Europe—if that troubles you, then Maduro is a problem.

One of our best partners in fighting drugs in the hemisphere is Colombia, but right now, Colombia is overwhelmed. They don't have enough money to dedicate to the anti-drug cause at a time when cocaine production—the growth of coca and the production of cocaine, I should say—in Colombia is at historic levels 3 years running. Where is that cocaine headed? A lot of it is headed to our streets, and that will be on top of fentanyl, heroin, and all the other problems we have. We

are going to have a cocaine crisis in this country because all that cocaine is headed here.

Colombia is out there trying to fight against it, but their resources are being drained because they have at this moment at least 1 million or 1.2 million Venezuelan migrants who have had to leave Venezuela and are now in their territory. If the United States suddenly absorbed 1 million migrants over a 12- to 18-month period, we would struggle to afford what that would entail. Imagine Colombia, whose economy is a fraction of the size of ours—that means that instead of spending money to fight drug cartels to prevent them from bringing drugs here, they have had to dedicate resources to the humanitarian cost of housing over 1 million people, and growing.

It is not just Colombia that is being compromised. Ecuador has about 170,000 Venezuelan migrants. Peru has about 250,000 Venezuelan migrants. These people are not bad. I am not criticizing the migrants. But these are not big governments. Some of these governments have budgets smaller than most of our States have. They cannot afford this, and it is threatening to collapse their public health system, which means we may not have a humanitarian catastrophe just in Venezuela; we may soon have a growing economic catastrophe in Brazil, Peru, Ecuador, and Colombia—multiple countries in our hemisphere. And geography matters. It would be a terrible thing if it were happening in Africa or halfway around the world, but it would directly impact Americans and our economy and well-being because of how close it is to our country, in multiple ways.

So if you think that having a humanitarian crisis in multiple countries in our hemisphere—including countries aligned with us in the war against drugs—is a problem, then you should care about what is happening in Venezuela.

What is the road forward now? I hope people have been compelled to at least understand that this is about more than just caring about democracy. That is a big part of it. We do care, and we are proud of it. But it is a lot more than just that. This is in the national interest of the United States. We should be proud, not just of the bipartisan support in favor of the interim President and of democracy in Venezuela, we should be proud of the job the National Security Council, the White House, and the State Department have done. Unlike 25 or 30 years ago, this wasn't some unilateral American action where we went in and told everybody what to do; this is international organizations, like the OAS.

Today, the Secretary of State appeared at the OAS personally to argue the American case, and he was joined by 15 other countries that voted on a resolution agreeing with our principles on this and their principles. The leadership of these countries under the aus-

pices of the Lima Group has been extraordinary. The United States is an equal partner to them in this endeavor.

What will probably happen now is that Maduro, instead of being the one who arrests the interim President, will turn it over to the courts to let them decide. Well, he controls the courts. They are all his cronies. They are also corrupt, by the way, sanctioned by the U.S. Government. He could very well move to try to arrest the interim President, Juan Guaido, tomorrow or the next day, although the eyes of the world are upon him, and the consequences for that would be extraordinary and severe.

They are now saying: Let's have negotiations. This is a tactic they have used repeatedly, and they use it because they all know we like negotiations. Everybody—anytime there is an international crisis, why don't we all just sit down and negotiate our way through this? Ideally, that would be the outcome. But he doesn't really want negotiations. He wants a delay tactic. He has done this multiple times. There were negotiations from the Vatican, and they gave up. Then the former Prime Minister of Spain was involved in some of these negotiations. Those were a total catastrophe. He is just doing this to bide time. Now he is talking about Mexico and Uruguay being the host of the negotiations. I wouldn't be surprised if he soon says: Let Russia come in and be the interlocutory. How about that for a national security threat, a national interest threat—having Vladimir Putin brokering political agreements in the Western Hemisphere. Putin would love it. He fancies himself a great global leader. You are going to see him do something like that, all in an effort to bide time. He has no intention of negotiating anything.

It bides him time to do what? It bides him time for his fake constituent assembly to change the Constitution towards one-party rule or even potentially to call on new flash elections at some point for a new national assembly under this fraudulent election system he set up. To many people, he will say: We had an election, and the opposition lost. But it won't be a real election if the people who could win are not allowed to run, are not allowed to advertise, have no access to the media. They control the ballot box, and they extort people with access to food.

At some point, I wouldn't be surprised to see him declare a state of emergency, maybe go out there and trigger some fake incident, a false flag, where agitators go out and commit violence, and he will say: The protesters are out of control; declare a state of emergency. Why would he do that? So he can paralyze the streets. No one can be out there protesting. And if the opposition tries to leave their homes, now they have a pretext to arrest them.

There is really only one way forward, and that is to do everything we can to

strengthen the legitimate interim government, and that began today. The interim President's first request was for humanitarian aid to help bring food, medicine, and medical supplies to the people inside Venezuela.

The Secretary of State of the United States immediately announced that as an initial step, we will provide, immediately, \$20 million. I know they are working on how to deliver that into Venezuela and how they can position that so the Venezuelan people have access to it. This is on top of and apart from the aid we are already providing the migrants in Colombia and other places.

That is a good first step. On day one on the job, the interim President, Juan Guaido, made a request of the international community, and America immediately stepped forward. And I believe very shortly, in a matter of days, there will be significant humanitarian aid—food and medicine—awaiting the people of Venezuela, either within their own territory and distributed through the Red Cross or some other non-governmental organization or just across the border, where they can access it.

We have to continue to make clear to the elites in that country that there is no future for Maduro, that there is no way he can hold on, and that they need to begin thinking about who their loyalties should be to—the Constitution they swore an allegiance to, the people they live among, or some guy whose future is about to come to an end.

I think it is important that the National Guard know that not only should they not repress the people but that they will be held accountable if they do. Ultimately, I believe this deeply. I know the generals and all the guys at the press conference in the fancy uniforms have sworn allegiance—you know how nervous they were—but I can state that the rank-and-file fighters did not. Do you know why? Because the rank-and-file soldier and the mid-level officer in the military don't have corruption deals; they are going just as hungry as everybody else. They have massive rates of desertion, people just abandoning posts.

When you saw the images yesterday of the hundreds of thousands of people in the streets, you know that many of those soldiers have mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, and loved ones, wives, and children in that crowd. Do you know who else knows that? The military brass. I know for a fact that they have significant doubts. In fact, they probably do not even believe that if they ordered the military to act against their own people, the military would, because there is no way these rank-and-file soldiers are going to shoot on their brothers and sisters and mothers and fathers and other loved ones.

So we need to step forward and continue with the humanitarian aid. We need to help use the leadership of the United States to put together reconstruction aid.

We need to help the interim President with whatever he needs to carry out a legitimate free and fair and internationally supervised election, which he should call for in the next 45 days.

This is the path forward. It is in our national interest. It is the right thing to do. It reflects our values, but it also reflects our interests as a nation. That is why this matters. That is why we should care. This is not halfway around the world. This is in our own hemisphere. It is just a few hours' flight away, and it impacts more than just one country. It impacts an entire hemisphere.

I will close with this. There has been a lot of criticism historically over the U.S. role in the Western Hemisphere. During the Cold War, the criticism was that we were supporting rightwing dictators, fighting off communism, but we were involved in some coups, and we had a heavy hand and got in and imposed ourselves. Then we went the total opposite way, and for many years—in fact, up until recently, no one talked about the Western Hemisphere, and to the extent we did, it was about migration and drugs. It was almost, frankly, a complete abandonment of the portfolio.

What you are seeing now is the potential birth of a new Latin America—a new Western Hemisphere, one in which the United States is an important partner but not a unilateral actor. When you see 16 countries in this hemisphere come together in an economic and diplomatic way, from Peru to Chile, Colombia, Argentina, and Brazil, when you see the OAS come alive after years of—frankly, when is the last time any of us here discussed anything of the things happening at the OAS? You start to see the beginning of not just a way to confront the crisis in Venezuela but of a hemispheric partnership whose impetus may have been this crisis but creates a path forward that is in our national interest. Imagine if, in fact, democracies and free people of this region came together not just to tackle dictatorships but to tackle drugs, to tackle the root cause of migration. Imagine a hemispheric 16-, 18-regional-nation response to what is happening in El Salvador and Honduras and Guatemala to cause these people to undertake this dangerous journey with their children, in many cases; imagine if it wasn't just the United States but us working in partnership with all these other countries to tackle these hemispheric challenges. I will tell you, that is in our national interest.

Not only is this an opportunity to do the right thing in Venezuela, it is an opportunity to give a start to a new hemispheric reality, a new Latin American reality that serves the national interest in this country and allows us to live in a hemisphere that is free and prosperous, where people do not have to abandon their homelands, where people can stay in their countries, if they so choose, and raise their families and not have to undertake dangerous

journeys to other countries for fear of their lives.

We have to start somewhere. I can think of no better place to start than on behalf of the people of Venezuela who have suffered terribly for far too long under a dictatorial, corrupt regime that tortured their children and murdered their fathers and mothers and denied a once-prosperous country the future they deserve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor to implore my colleagues and the President to end the shutdown and reopen the Federal Government.

We are now on day 34 of this shutdown, which is well past being the longest in American history. When you think about what our country has been through: the Civil War, World War I, World War II; you think about the protests we had; what we had with the country in the Depression; what we had only a decade ago with the biggest downturn since the Depression—through all of that, even through a few shutdowns, we somehow, in this Chamber and in the House and in the White House, were able to get our act together and were somehow able to keep the government open.

Now is the time to open the government, Mr. President. The 800,000 Federal employees who are not being paid are keenly aware that this is the longest shutdown on record. Another sad milestone is coming if the shutdown continues through tomorrow. These workers will miss yet another paycheck. These are workers, like a Federal prison worker in Rochester, MN, who noted to me that the inmates were getting paid but the prison workers are not. She was so excited to get this job a few months ago. Her child was in daycare. She is a single mom, and now she has to decide between taking some other job and moonlighting. What does she do about the daycare if she takes another job and takes her child out of daycare and stays home with her child, which would make some sense, except she wouldn't have enough money, and then she would lose her spot in the daycare. It is very hard to get daycare in Minnesota.

Instead of working on those kinds of what I would call opportunities, at a time when our economy has been stable after we had gotten out of the downturn, we have been working out of chaos. Instead of helping her to afford childcare and figuring out smart solutions, or doing something about pharmaceutical prices, or doing something about college costs, or training our workers for the jobs of today and tomorrow, or enacting comprehensive immigration reform so our rural areas in my State, where we don't have enough workers on our farms and in our fields and in our factories—we

should be working on those opportunity issues—instead, we are trying to crawl out of chaos.

We need to reopen the government and get these workers back on the jobs providing vital services for the American people. Once it is open, as my colleagues have made clear and as leadership has made clear, we can continue negotiations with the President about border security. I am someone, as is my colleague from Pennsylvania, who voted for a bill that had over \$40 billion in border security that was part of comprehensive immigration reform. We did this, but was it a wall through the entire border? No, it was not. It allowed the experts to decide where there should be technology, where there should be fencing, where there should be barriers, where there should be personnel. That is the way to do this.

There is no reason our Federal workers and the American taxpayers who rely on the vital services provided by the Federal workers should be held hostage while these policy negotiations take place. The pain that this shutdown is causing is real, and it is getting worse.

The administration has implemented many creative measures to try to blunt the public outcry against the shutdown, but these measures are being held together by duct tape. We use duct tape a lot in Minnesota. We try to put things together, but we shouldn't be using duct tape to tape together our entire government.

Our Agencies are running out of money, and many are reaching the breaking point. Earlier today, the five former Secretaries for the Department of Homeland Security, including our first DHS Secretary, Tom Ridge, and John Kelly, President Trump's former Chief of Staff, wrote a letter urging an end to this shutdown and full funding for the Department of Homeland Security. In their letter, the former Secretaries noted that Congress always prioritizes funding of the Defense Department as a matter of national security.

Congress does so because putting national security at risk is an option we simply can't afford. DHS should be no different.

The administration continues to explore ideas like a national emergency declaration to bypass Congress. The irresponsibility of all of this is breathtaking. Yesterday, the presidents of the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, the Air Line Pilots Association, and the Association of Flight Attendants released a terrifying joint statement pointing out the risk the shutdown presents to air travel:

In our risk-averse industry—That is putting it mildly—

we cannot even calculate the level of risk currently at play, nor predict the point where the entire system will break. It is unprecedented.

I have talked to the air traffic controllers in my State. I have talked to the TSA workers who sit there every day and do their job without pay. In

this letter, they go on to state that the "air safety environment . . . is deteriorating by the day."

Reading this statement does not give me confidence, nor does the fact that a full 10 percent of our Transportation Security Administration agents are now missing work because of financial limitations—meaning they can't cover the daycare and transportation expenses required to come to work. Those who can come to work are surely distracted by worries about how they will pay their bills.

As a member of the Senate Commerce Committee, I worked with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle last year to reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration. We were rightly proud of the law, including the third title, simply titled, "Safety," which had 90 individual provisions designed to maximize the safety of air travel for the American people. We required updated safety training procedures for airline professionals, sought to improve safety on our Nation's runways and in rural areas, and updated the laws regarding engine safety. This matters a lot in my State. We are a major hub in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. We are the State that manufactures jets up in Duluth at Cirrus. We are the State that has major Minnesota National Guard facilities that train flight inspectors and aviators and people all over the country. Aviation is incredibly important in my State.

In our bill, we required updated safety training procedures for airline professionals, sought to improve safety in our Nation's runways and rural areas. As the Senator from Pennsylvania and Florida know, rural air service in our States are key, and we updated those laws.

We are hearing the entire system of air travel may break, and for what? What does air travel have to do with border security? The short answer is, air travel has nothing to do with border security, except when we are checking our airports and making sure they are safe when there are border flights. If we are talking about a wall across the southern border, that has nothing to do with our airports in Minnesota and in Pennsylvania and in Florida. I have long favored increasing our border security through smart technology.

As I mentioned, our 2013 immigration bill, which passed this Chamber with a number of Republican votes—many of whom are still here—included money for an additional 40,000 Border Patrol agents. As we know, most drugs come into this country through our ports of entry. If we want to do something about the various problems with the drugs coming into our country, things like heroin from Central America and from Mexico and things like other opioids, then we should be doing something about those ports of entry.

As has been the case all along, there are proposals on the table that will reopen the government and end this

senseless shutdown. The House has now passed legislation that will fund the government under any number of arrangements. It includes bills that fund all remaining government Agencies through the end of the fiscal year—bills that fund individual Departments and Agencies, most having absolutely nothing to do with this debate that is raging in the White House.

The last bill that was passed through February 8, a short-term basis that would have taken us through February 8, would have allowed the President and Congress to negotiate a longer term proposal. That was the bill we passed in the Senate. This last bill was even coupled with additional funding for disaster relief—a priority for both parties that wish to help Americans in States that have suffered through hurricanes and wildfires.

Earlier this afternoon, the Senate voted on the short-term funding proposal. While the proposal did not gain the required 60 votes to gain consideration, I was encouraged by the fact that 5 Republican Senators joined Democrats in voting to consider this bill. This is progress, and we need to build on that momentum by working together to do the right thing for the American people.

On Monday, we celebrated Martin Luther King's life. One of the things Martin Luther King once said was that "the time is always right to do what is right." This is the right time. We can't just keep waiting while government Agencies remain shuttered. There are 6,100 Federal workers in the State of Minnesota who are not receiving their paychecks. Farmers, small business owners, and taxpayers are going without vital services from their government, major portions of which have been closed for 34 days. It is time to reopen the government.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the shutdown, as my colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota, just did. I am grateful for her comments on what is happening to people in Minnesota, the direct adverse impact of this shutdown on their lives. We have all seen it. We have all experienced it.

I will be referring to specific testimony from people who wrote me letters, but let me just highlight one experience I had the other day at a food bank in Central Pennsylvania, just miles from our State capital—a food bank that serves 27 of our 67 counties.

I was talking about how this shutdown could end. The President wanted the shutdown. He got the shutdown, but he could also end it. Prior to the discussion we had, behind us, they had an entire table full of food items that the food bank and others in that region of Pennsylvania were delivering to Federal workers, especially to TSA agents, who cannot afford food because they are working but are not being

paid. It is hard to comprehend that. It is hard to comprehend that so many veterans around the country are, once again, serving their country by serving in the government as they served in combat or in the military; yet they are being left out in the cold, so to speak—sometimes literally—but are, obviously, being left out when they don't have paychecks.

So this is real life. We debate bills and budgets and appropriations here in Washington. We have debates on the floor and debates and discussions in the hallways, but for these folks, this is real life. I will just point to, maybe, five examples in Pennsylvania.

Adams County, which is in the southernmost part of our State, where Gettysburg is—just on the Maryland border—is not a big county by population. Here is what one individual who is married to a Federal worker wrote. I will just quote her in part.

She writes:

We are expecting our first child this summer and, prior to December 22, were excited about the future and potential of 2019. Now we are anxious, sad, and angry, not knowing where the money will come from to buy necessities for this child, let alone medical expenses related to birth and daycare.

She goes on to write later in the letter:

We are now in real and serious danger of losing our home and our vehicles. We will soon have to choose between buying groceries or paying for the electric bill.

She goes on from there. She is one Pennsylvanian in Adams County.

Here is one from Cambria County, which is in the southwestern part of our State.

This individual wrote: "My husband is a Federal employee who has been furloughed."

She goes on to write:

We have a son in elementary school. It is about time for spring sports sign-ups, but we don't know how we are going to pay our bills or buy groceries. It is our son's birthday in less than 2 weeks. We canceled his birthday party to save some money.

That was from Cambria County, PA.

The third one I will highlight is from Delaware County, which is one of the big, suburban Philadelphia counties. It is a big population county.

Here is, in part, what this individual wrote: "My in-laws are selling their home and cannot go to settlement because the FHA will not close a mortgage for the buyer."

That was among several things they wrote in the letter. In the interest of time, I will not read all of it, but we hear these stories all the time of people not being able to complete the work on a mortgage because of the impact on the FHA.

Here is one from Montgomery County, which is also a suburban Philadelphia county.

This individual wrote:

I am a law enforcement park ranger for the National Park Service. . . . I am the sole provider for a family of four, to include two young children. Not knowing when I will get paid again is putting undue stress on the entire family.

That word "stress" keeps coming up either directly in these letters or by implication. Over and over again, we hear of the stress this shutdown is putting on families across America.

The last one I will highlight is from Warren County, which is in the northwestern corner of our State. It is a much smaller population county than were the two suburban Philadelphia counties I just mentioned of Montgomery and Delaware.

Here is what this individual wrote from Warren County:

Both my wife and I are federal employees working for the U.S. Forest Service. We are also both veterans. We will be using our savings to live off of and charging food to our credit cards if we must.

It goes on and on, and I know the Presiding Officer has seen the same thing. We have all seen and heard much about this. There is not enough time tonight to go through every letter.

This is what has to be the priority of all of ours. We have to be responsive to these cries for help, to be responsive to Americans who are just asking us to open the government so they can be paid, so they can make ends meet, so they can pay for groceries, so they can pay their mortgages—or to even have a mortgage in some cases—so they can pay for basic necessities, and so they can sometimes even just pay for birthday parties for their sons. Over and over again, we hear these stories.

As my colleague from Minnesota made reference to, I was encouraged that, today, we had two votes. There was a likely expectation prior to the votes that they wouldn't get enough to pass, but at least we were voting. At least we were voting on one measure that one side favored and were voting on another measure that my side of the aisle favored. I was also encouraged that five Republicans voted for the Democratic proposal, which is very simple—to fund the government, to open the government, and add disaster assistance for emergencies from natural disasters. The lives of people are adversely affected by so many natural disasters, but this is also, of course, an emergency—funding the government so as to make sure that workers have their pay and to make sure people are served by important programs like the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. Of course, we could make a long list of programs that are important to people's lives.

In the case of the so-called SNAP program—what we used to call food stamps—you are talking basically about children, seniors, and people with disabilities. These are most of the people who get benefits from the SNAP program. They are only guaranteed help from that program through February. There is no certainty about March. There is no certainty about April or the forthcoming months. It is just one program that serves millions of Americans that has already been adversely impacted because of the shutdown.

Whether you are talking about a mom or a dad who is a Federal employee or whether you are talking about someone who needs the help of the Federal Government—people who we have said over many generations deserve that help—in either case, it is unacceptable to them, and it should be unacceptable to us to not have the government open. We have lots of time to debate many issues after that, but priority No. 1 has to be to open the government. Then we will have a lot of time for debate on a range of issues.

REMEMBERING HARRIS WOFFORD

Mr. President, I conclude tonight with some brief remarks. We are going to have several occasions to amplify these remarks in the coming days regarding the passing of Senator Harris Wofford, the Senator from Pennsylvania from 1991 to the early days of 1995. I just want to offer some personal remarks. In a short timeframe, it is very difficult to encapsulate the life of any individual, obviously, but in this case, it is impossible in a few short minutes to encapsulate the life, the contributions, and the achievements of Senator Harris Wofford, so I will just highlight a few. If you were to just read his resume, you would think you were reading the life story of the achievements of several people instead of just one.

To give you some highlights, he was an early advocate for civil rights. He was someone who stuck his neck out to march with Dr. King, his good friend, and to advocate on behalf of the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

He then worked for President Kennedy as a special assistant for civil rights and prepared the way for the great breakthroughs of the midsixties, of the civil rights legislation of the sixties. He worked with Sargent Shriver and others in the Kennedy administration in the formation of the Peace Corps, and he served in that capacity overseas.

As I mentioned, he was a good friend of Dr. Martin Luther King's and participated in the Selma to Montgomery civil rights marches in 1965 in support of voting rights for African Americans.

He was the President of two different colleges—one in Pennsylvania, Bryn Mawr, which is a great college. It is one of the best in the country.

I got to know Harris Wofford before he was Senator Wofford. It was when he worked for the new Casey administration, when my father was elected Governor of Pennsylvania in 1986. He put together a cabinet in the early part of 1987, and he appointed Harris as the Secretary of Labor and Industry—one of the big departments in State government.

It was from that position that he was chosen to be a U.S. Senator. It was after the tragic and untimely death of Senator John Heinz, who passed away in April of 1991. Harris was named that next month. He was elected in 1991 to complete that term and then lost his reelection in 1994, but Harris was not done with service.

After serving in the Kennedy administration and in the Senate—after doing such great work on education and civil rights in the interest of justice—he continued his work. He worked very hard to make sure that the Martin Luther King holiday was not just a holiday but a day of service. So he and others came together in the midnineties—after Harris was out of office and after he had left the Senate—to make sure that day would be a day of service. Now, all of these years later—more than 20 years later—hundreds of thousands of people across the country perform acts of service, engage in service, on that day.

We will spend more time highlighting his life here on the Senate floor and in other places around the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and, I am sure, across the country, but let me just conclude with these words: Harris Wofford was a champion for justice. In the Scriptures, they tell us that those who pursue justice should be blessed. Blessed are they who will hunger and thirst for justice for they shall be satisfied.

Harris Wofford was never satisfied when it came to justice. He was always trying to march us forward. He was always urging us to do more in the interest of justice, in the interest of civil rights, and of equal rights. He was a champion for justice. That is probably an understatement. He was also a person of uncommon courage to stand up as he did on civil rights when it was not easy—when, at times, it was literally dangerous.

In addition to his courage, he was a person of integrity and decency. He always wanted to know what others were doing, what other's lives were like, what they hoped for our country. He was always curious about other people's lives and what he could learn from them.

To say that he lived a life of service is, again, an understatement. I don't know of anyone who served in so many different capacities, whether it was in the Army Air Corps in World War II, whether it was in leading the way on civil rights for President Kennedy, or whether it was here in the Senate in his helping to create opportunities for service. He not only lived that life of service, but he challenged all of us. Whether we were public officials or citizens, he challenged us to serve. He lived the words of Dr. King, the words of service. Dr. King said that everyone can be great because everyone can serve. Harris Wofford was great for lots of reasons, but he was also great, of course, because he served.

We will have more opportunities to amplify this small measure of commendation to Harris Wofford, but on a night like tonight, we are thinking of him. We are inspired by him, and we are grateful for his service and for that of his family's.

I had a chance to talk to his son Dan, who has been a friend of mine for a long time, just hours before his father

passed away. I was honored to talk to him in those difficult hours.

Mr. President, in remembering Harris Wofford, as we will do more formally in the next number of days, I want to thank him for his service to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and for his service to America.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO THE SENATE PAGES

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today is the last day for the Senate pages who are here with us today. This is a little known fact—I didn't even realize this until it was presented to me—but the 115th Congress, which we just concluded, had more session days than any Congress since 1951. That goes to tell you that these pages worked incredibly hard, and we are grateful. We hope their experience here was rewarding. They should know that there are several Members here serving on this side who once sat there.

I shouldn't be here by the time the pages get here, I hope, but we look forward to their service to our country in the years to come in whatever they decide to do.

Thank you for all of your work.

We truly appreciate the time they have put in.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that their names be printed in the RECORD.

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

Abby Solomon, Eve Downing, Sophia Valcarce, Ellie Ralph, Luke Baldwin, Benjamin Stimpson, Travis Christoff, Elli Ament, Shira Hamer, Holden Clark, Hardy Williams, Luke Schneider, Alex Little, Luke Lilly, Robert Hess, Nicholas Acevedo Foley, Collin Woldt, Sophia Clinton, Amelia Gorman, Myra Bajwa, Renee Clark, Allison Leibly, George "Win" Courtemanche, Luke Turner, Lucy Besch, Victoria Roberts.

MORNING BUSINESS

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, on January 24, I was not present due to an injury sustained on January 21 and a resulting surgery from which I am still recovering. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on rollcall vote 8, motion for attendance, and rollcall vote 10, Schumer amendment No. 6. I would have voted nay on rollcall vote 9, Shelby amendment No. 5.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO LAINY LEBOW-SACHS

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Lainy LeBow-Sachs, a Baltimore icon whose name has rightly become synonymous with public service and philanthropy. After 23 years at the Kennedy Krieger Institute and 16 years before that as one of then-Governor William Donald Schaefer's key special assistants, Lainy has announced she is retiring. My wife Myrna and I are proud to have Lainy as one of our dearest friends and closest advisers. So today, I would like to pause to reflect on the remarkable legacy she has created.

Lainy was born in Newton, MA, but moved to Baltimore in 1970, where she spotted a flyer for someone who was running to be the city's next mayor. Intrigued and looking for a way to engage in the community, she began volunteering on the campaign. The candidate in question was William Donald Schaefer, who, with Lainy's help and knack for connecting with people, went on to win that election and several others after it until becoming the Governor of Maryland in 1987. Lainy was by his side throughout it all, serving as one of his closest advisers and confidants. She became known around Maryland for her strength of character, work ethic, and uncanny ability to facilitate meaningful connections between State and local officials with shared goals and ideas for making Maryland a better place in which to live and work.

After Governor Schaefer's retirement, Lainy's talents were widely sought-after. She was approached regularly by public officials, businesses, and nonprofits, all of them eager to have one of Maryland's most influential and effective public servants on their team. None of the opportunities resonated, until she was approached by Dr. Gary Goldstein, the president and chief executive officer of the Kennedy Krieger Institute. For those outside of Maryland who may be unfamiliar with Kennedy Krieger, the institute is, as its website states, "an internationally recognized institution dedicated to improving the lives of children and young adults with pediatric developmental disabilities and disorders of the brain, spinal cord and musculoskeletal system, through patient care, special education, research, and professional training."

The chance to work on behalf of children with developmental disabilities, to raise their profile, to put their needs and care in the spotlight and devote her time to something so worthwhile and meaningful, the opportunity called to Lainy. She began directing Kennedy Krieger's external relations, leading the institute's philanthropy, public relations, and government relations efforts into a new and prosperous era. Her penchant for inspiring others to care as deeply as she did, combined