

So on today's anniversary of the Roe v. Wade decision; let's listen to the words of Carl Anderson, leader of the Knights of Columbus, who said:

"What greater legacy can a person have than to save a child's life?"

RECOGNIZING ROGER MOSS

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my good friend, Mr. Roger Moss, who is stepping down as director of the Savannah Children's Choir.

Mr. Moss started the Savannah Children's Choir in 2006, with 30 kids, aiming to transform children into confident leaders through music education. Now, the choir is booming. It mentors hundreds of students, and the choir has gone on to award-winning performances throughout Europe.

The choir has brought children of diverse backgrounds together for a common purpose, winning praise from countless parents, who have seen significant improvements in their children's ambitions, demeanor, creativity, and much more.

I thank Mr. Moss for his important work in the Savannah community. However, I understand his work will continue as he is beginning a new school: the Savannah Exploratory Charter Academy. We are, indeed, very fortunate in Savannah that Roger Moss has adopted us as his home and brought his immense talents with him.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Mr. Moss the best of luck with his new project.

HONORING AL TOWNS

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, 10 years and 17 days ago, I was given the honor of working for the people of Texas 22 in Washington, D.C. They are my bosses. And one of my bosses was born on January 30 of 1918. His name is Al Towns.

Al was alive during World War I. Al fought in World War II. He started as a lowly private. Twenty-two years later, he retired as an O-6, a full bird colonel.

Al then joined NASA and helped us go to the Moon in 1969.

At Al's 101st birthday party next week, I am sure he will share pearls of wisdom, like: "If you want to get something done, give it to a woman. She may step on some toes, but she will get it done." Or, the key to living to 101 years old: "Don't think too far ahead."

Mr. Speaker, Texas 22 says to Al, "Roger that. Wilco. Happy birthday."

And that is just the way it is.

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for National School Choice Week, because I believe that every family should be able to choose a school that is right for their children's needs.

School choice is important because it gives families the autonomy and freedom to do what is in their own children's best interests. It also creates competition and education, through which we can really begin to achieve excellence and innovation.

There is enough evidence to suggest that competition created by more education options increases college readiness and better prepares many students for life after the classroom.

It opens up balanced opportunities for students and their families, whether that is traditional public schools, public charter schools, public magnet schools, private schools, online academies, or other alternatives. That is because what may be right for one family and their children may not be right for their neighbors' kids.

National School Choice Week recognizes the need for families to make that decision for themselves. Your child only goes each step in their education one time. Let's make the most of each year of a child's education opportunity, not subject them to experiments.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HORSFORD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to, once again, ponder the inevitable: that the government of the United States is important in this world; that the strongest country in the entire world ought to have the strongest operating government; that all across this globe people once looked to America as the symbol of leadership, as the symbol of opportunity, as the country where things got done, and a government that functioned, sort of functioned. We have had our ups and downs, but really the United States was always a symbol that other countries would point to and say: Well, there is a democracy. It has its ups and downs, but it has worked. It has been a place where we could look to for leadership.

We are now 32 days into the shutdown of the government of the most important country in the world.

What in the world is our President thinking? What is going on here? How did we come to this situation?

Before we get into all of the harm that is being done by this government shutdown, let's understand how we got here.

Every January, early February, the administration—the President—puts

forward his proposed budget for the coming year. The House and the Senate take that under submission and begin the process of preparing the appropriations and the laws, the changes to enact, or not enact, the proposals that the President has put forth.

□ 1930

In that submission, President Trump proposed \$1.6 billion for border security. The House looked at it, the Senate looked at it, and, ultimately, the Senate passed an appropriation of \$1.6 billion.

Unfortunately, that appropriation was caught up in other debates and other arguments, and the Department of Homeland Security that was supposed to receive the \$1.6 billion, together with the Department of the Interior, the EPA, Department of Transportation, Department of Justice, and several other agencies, was not funded for the whole year but, rather, funded from October 1 until the following Thanksgiving.

Then an additional CR, continuing resolution, was passed until December 11, and that \$1.6 billion was part of that discussion. On December 10, maybe December 11, the Senate unanimously passed another continuing resolution that had \$1.6 billion in it, and that continuing resolution was to go until February 8.

The next morning, when that bill arrived over here in the House of Representatives to be taken up and to pass through to keep the government open until February, in the intervening 13 hours, something happened. The President changed his mind and said, not \$1.6 billion. He demanded \$5 billion. And in a conference at the White House with the leaders, he said: "If we don't get what we want . . . I am proud to shut down the government . . . I will take the mantle. . . ."

So on that morning of the 11th, the House of Representatives amended the bill and said, nope, it is not \$1.6 billion. It is \$5 billion, because that is what the President wanted, and the government shut down.

I thank the President. At the very last moment, he changed the game: not \$1.6 billion, which we were prepared to accept and keep the government open, but \$5 billion, and the government shut.

In the intervening days, as the debate went on, the \$5 billion grew to \$5.7 billion for a border wall.

Now, don't misunderstand. Changes during the course of a year are common, and it is common for the administration to make a change in its budget. That is called a budget change proposal.

It comes to the Congress, the House and the Senate, with all of the reasons—a big stack of paper—all of the reasons why the change should take place: some new; something happened and we have got to deal with it; or, we need more money for this. And a budget change proposal comes to us with all of the justification.

To this day, 32 days into this shutdown, Congress has not received a formal budget change proposal, nor has Congress received any detail about where the \$5.7 billion wall will be built—somewhere on the Mexican-American border. That is 1,900 miles.

Will it be used to repair fences?

Will it be added in some areas?

What are the reasons why it would be added?

None of that has been provided here. So here we are 32 days into it, and the most important government in this world is shut down.

This border wall is supposed to bring security to America. Wow, wait a minute. You are talking about security? You are talking about safety? You are talking about making the lives of America more secure? How do you do that when the government is shut down?

All of the military is working. Thank God that appropriation passed. But the Department of Homeland Security is not, except for those frontline officers who are considered to be essential. All of the backroom operation isn't operating.

The Coast Guard is out there on the water, in the ports, but those men and women are not being paid, 40,000 of them, a few more, not being paid. Many of them cannot pay for gas to get to their jobs.

TSA is operating, but the rest of that backroom operation is not. Transportation is not operating. The parks are closed. The Smithsonian is closed. The kind of safety that the American public depends upon from its government is not operating.

There were headlines a week ago about the President somehow being compromised by Russia. What would be the best that Putin could ever want?

You go to war to take over a government, to shut down a government. You don't have to go to war to shut down the American Government. You go to the President, who gladly says that he is proud to shut down the American Government.

Putin has to be incredibly happy that his nemesis, America, the government is shut down.

I have got a lot to talk about tonight, and joining me are some of my colleagues who will be talking about the effect of the shutdown in their area.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), my colleague and dear friend of many years.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, Congressman GARAMENDI has demonstrated leadership both here in our Nation's capital and when we worked together in Sacramento, and I commend his efforts and thank him for yielding to me.

The government shutdown is simply irresponsible. The American public understands that a Congress debates a budget, the President submits his proposal, and we go through our committee hearing process. We make modifications and changes. You win some

and you lose some. But by October 1, we are supposed to have a budget sent to the President, and he is supposed to sign it into law.

Now, guess what. A budget is among the most important things we do as Members of Congress, and it is the Nation's spending priorities. It is thousands of spending priorities. There are some things we like in the budget, and there are some things that we would change. But our Nation has to have a budget, just like every family has a budget, every business has a budget.

In that family budget or the business budget, there are things you would rather not pay—a house payment, a car payment—but we have obligations and commitments to make and have to be responsible.

This government shutdown, this manufactured crisis orchestrated by the President in which he proudly proclaimed that he would take ownership of it—they can call it the Trump shutdown, as he said so boldly in December—is the Trump shutdown. It is simply irresponsible.

I think the American public, for good reason, regardless of their registration, is frustrated, and I suspect many of them, like myself, are fed up.

I went through the airport security this morning as I did last week, as I did the week before, and I thanked those security officers with TSA for doing their job. They are doing their job. And guess what. They are doing it without pay. That is disgraceful. It is just not what the shining democracy of America is about, leader of the free world.

But it doesn't stop there. There are over 53,000 TSA employees around the country, 54,000 ICE officers, and 42,000 Coast Guard Active-Duty members who are working without pay.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the President, how would it be if he were to suggest to his employees at his hotels and at his golf courses—whom he has to pay every 2 weeks or every month—that he wants them to come to work but he is not going to pay them?

It is immoral, and it is certainly not the American way. We don't expect people to come to work and then not pay them.

This manufactured crisis—and believe me, it is a manufactured crisis—is the real cause for us all to be concerned about national security. I mean, the challenges we have at the border, these Border Patrol agents, these Coast Guard Active-Duty members are protecting our security, and we are saying: Well, but, you know, we don't care if you have a house payment. We don't care if you have a car payment. We don't care if you have other commitments and obligations. We expect you to come to work and to protect our security, and we are not going to do anything to, in fact, take that into account. In a way, that is clearly a dereliction of our duties.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the President that it is a dereliction of his duty, because he has a responsibility,

just as we do, to ensure that our government is fully functioning. We have passed the President's bills and sent them to him which would fully fund and reopen the government.

Last Friday, Congressman Cox and I had an informal workshop at the Subway sandwich store in the building where my office is, where I work on behalf of the people of the San Joaquin Valley. In that 10-story office building are 1,300 IRS employees. That Subway sandwich store has lost over 50 percent of its business in the last month. The two owners, the man and the wife, are being impacted.

The store in the lobby, it has lost 70 percent of its business. And there is another kabob restaurant in which he is helping, sometimes, the employees who are still hanging around there by giving them sandwiches, but this is his business.

So it is not just the direct impact of over 800,000 government employees across this country, people who work for the USDA, the United States Department of Agriculture, who operate the farm service agencies throughout our constituencies.

Our farmers, our ranchers, and our dairymen can't go to those Farm Service Agency offices and apply for loans and other things that are important with regard to this crazy tariff war that is taking place because, guess what. Those offices are closed.

But it is also the ripple effect for businesses that have contracts with the Federal Government, whether it is with the United States Forest Service or whether it is with other departments and agencies. They are not getting paid.

But guess what. They have got employees, and they have got a contract that they signed with the United States Government that says they were going to get paid every month, and they have commitments to their employees.

This is the President's shutdown, and 32 days into it, none of us should be proud of where we are today. Third-world countries are looking at us and wondering: America doesn't do that.

But we are looking like a third-world country. Countries around the world just don't shut down their government.

Let me close on this note. This is a phenomena that has happened, really, in the last 8 years. We had a government shutdown in the mid-1990s by President Clinton and Speaker Gingrich, and that was not a good thing.

Normally, as Congressman GARAMENDI suggested, you have budget requests. You have debate in committees. You pass segments of the budget, and it comes together in an orderly process. Ultimately, both the House and the Senate pass that budget and send it to the President by October 1.

I think there is another principle here that we need to be very clear about to the American public. I don't care which party it is. We should not allow bad behavior to be rewarded in

this sense. If you don't like something in the budget—and there are a lot of things I don't like in the budget—at the end of the day, you have got to have a budget.

□ 1945

What is happening here is that this is a manufactured crisis that the President is using to hold hostage a campaign promise he made 2 years ago to build this wall.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, wasn't Mexico going to pay for the wall?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I believe so.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I say to Congressman GARAMENDI, that is what I heard.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Over and over.

Mr. COSTA. I heard it not once, not twice, but more times than I care to remember. Clearly, Mexico is not going to pay for the wall.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. GARAMENDI and I know that there is bipartisan willingness to improve border security. The gentleman and I know, because we are from California, that the majority of the drug trafficking and the other crimes that are occurring are through what we call ports of legal entry. That sounds like a complicated technical term, but it just means it is an open border crossing between the U.S. and Mexico, and thousands of people cross every day at many of these border crossings. That is where the overwhelming majority of the illegal trafficking is taking place, and along the ocean. And no bill, no bright and shiny 30-foot wall, will make a difference.

El Chapo, whom we are holding now in prison, built tunnels to get out of prison. There are tunnels under existing walls that the President was briefed on when he went down to the border last week.

Mr. Speaker, I don't care how the wall is built, because it is not going to improve border security.

Mind you, we have more than 500 miles of existing barriers and fences at the San Ysidro border, and some of the other portions of the U.S.-Mexican border, where it makes sense. Certainly, I am willing to provide support to improve those existing barriers and to provide the sort of equipment, drones, and other technical devices that are cutting edge, that Border Patrol agents and ICE agents say will improve our border security. That is what we should be doing.

But what we should not be doing is holding America hostage because of a political campaign promise that was made 2 years ago. That is wrong. That is simply wrong.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman GARAMENDI is to be commended for taking a leadership role in this effort. We have to do some things here that change the debate and how we produce a budget so that we don't allow groups of either party—our extreme elements—to decide: Well, gee, I am not going to go through the regular proc-

ess. I will hold this Congress and I will hold the American people hostage.

This is impacting our GDP. If the President doesn't believe us, he should ask his own Council of Economic Advisers, because they came out with a report last week. It is not affecting only our economy, but it, therefore, affects the world's economy. That is why we need to reopen government and have a thoughtful debate on how we can, on a bipartisan basis, improve our border security.

Of the \$1.2 billion we allocated in last year's budget for border security, this administration, I am told, has spent around 10 percent of that \$1.2 billion. Now we were going to give him another \$1.6 billion. Then the President—I know we are getting close to the Super Bowl—to use a football analogy, on December 18, when we thought we had an agreement, he decided to move the goalposts. I can't say it any plainer than that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Congressman GARAMENDI if he can.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, if I might, I say to Mr. COSTA that is exactly what he did. In the negotiations, before inviting the leaders in, agreement had been reached with both Houses. We were going to move forward. The President changed his mind, demanded \$5 billion, and took credit. He said: I will shut the government down, and I will take credit for it.

Indeed, the credit goes to him.

The gentleman said things that are very interesting. The gentleman went back to the Gingrich shutdown. That reminded me, at that time, I was actually at the Department of the Interior. There was nobody in the Department of the Interior except three of us in that entire department who were working.

Then there was the TED CRUZ shutdown, and then there were two other short shutdowns having to do with one or the other of the fiscal cliffs. In every case, our Republican colleagues—Gingrich, TED CRUZ, other leadership, and now the President—have used the American Government as a hostage to get something that they wanted. Senator CRUZ wanted to kill the Affordable Care Act. I don't recall, but I think Gingrich was over some tax issues or some financial issues, fiscal issues. But in every case, they used the government as the hostage.

Now, over in the Senate, Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL is cobbling together a piece of legislation that would affect the rest of Americans.

Let me just show you some things here. He is taking a piece of legislation that we passed last week—it was the supplemental Disaster Relief Act to provide additional money. In this case, this is Paradise, California, where some 18,000 homes were destroyed and 87 people killed. The President was there, together with Governor Brown and our new Governor, Mr. Newsom. It is a supplemental disaster recovery program that we passed last week. It is over in the Senate.

I understand that Senator MCCONNELL is going to take that bill and literally hold not just Paradise, California, but also Puerto Rico.

Does the gentleman remember the hurricane in Puerto Rico?

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I was in Puerto Rico last weekend, and the recovery funding is a serious matter, as it is in Paradise. It is simply wrong. It is wrong and immoral for us to do this.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, he intends to hold Puerto Rico hostage, along with South Carolina; Houston, Texas; and southern California, the Ventura area, all of which have incurred a natural disaster and, in this case, a dam breaking in Puerto Rico.

In the case of Paradise, California—the great fire that occurred there and the wipeout of a community of 30,000 people—it is now being held hostage for the border wall. So not only do we have the U.S. Government hostage—and the American economy with 800,000 employees who are not getting paid—we are now using the supplemental disaster recovery, some \$12 billion that would go to recover these communities that have been wiped out that are now being held hostage.

So the gentleman said earlier that there is something immoral about this, that to use people's lives and their ability to recover, their ability to sustain their family, to get a paycheck, to work for the American Government to keep this economy moving, to be held hostage somehow is terribly, terribly wrong. But that is what the President is doing. And, apparently, that is what Senator MCCONNELL wants to do with this new bill that he intends to introduce that would hold the disaster recovery program hostage for a \$5.7 billion wall somewhere on the border, undefined. Something is terribly, terribly wrong here.

Now, there is an alternative, and I think Mr. COSTA mentioned it. We passed legislation repeatedly beginning on January 3, the first day of the new Congress, and every day thereafter. I think it is about 8 days now that we passed legislation to open the government. That is, the new Democratic majority has done that to open the government. All of those bills are over on the Senate side.

There is a clean bill that is also open for discussion on the Senate side this week. It is the bill that we passed last week. It would fund the government at the appropriations level that the Senate agreed to, \$1.6 billion for border security and all the other programs all worked out in a great compromise. That bill passed the House last week. It is sitting over in the Senate.

There would be one exception to full funding for the remainder of this year—that is until September 30—and that is the Department of Homeland Security, which controls the border. That would be a temporary continuing resolution until February. I think it is the 28th of February.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I think until the end of February, which would

allow us to debate appropriate border security in a committee process in the House and in the Senate, working together with this administration and the President. There would be give and take. There would be compromises. I think we should get back to doing the people's business in an appropriate fashion, without taking hostages, because it is simply wrong. We should not let the American public think that we have lost sight of what the regular order of the United States Congress is to pass appropriations bills and, ultimately, to pass a budget.

That is where this incredibly egregious activity is taking place in recent years. I think we know that, at some point, there will be a series of compromises, and we will reopen government. So why don't we just do it sooner rather than later and end the pain and anguish of hundreds of thousands of people who are protecting our security—they are hardworking men and women of our country—without paychecks?

All the other independent contractors who do business with the government and who have employees or have small businesses, like that Subway sandwich shop in Fresno or the market or the kabob restaurant, let these people do what they do best—work hard and make a living for themselves and their families, and contribute to our economy—because what we are doing right now is wrong.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. COSTA mentioned the Subway sandwich shop. When I was back in my district over the weekend, I was contacted by a small company operating in Davis, California, that has technology that the TSA would employ at the airports to keep us all safer. They will go out of business. They have 13 employees. Their contract is sitting, not finished. They are not getting paid for past work that they have done. They just said: We don't know how we will continue here.

It is a good program. It is necessary for security at the airports. That is just one example.

The gentleman mentioned the farmers. I have farmers in my district with the same problem. I have universities with research contracts that are being held up. All of that is being held up.

The reality is that the most important government of the world is not operating. When they say it is just 25 percent, that is 25 percent of the money. It happens to be 80 to 85 percent of the activities of the government.

Mr. COSTA. And the ripple effect.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And the ripple effect all the way through.

Mr. COSTA. To our national parks.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by underlining one comment that Mr. GARAMENDI made earlier. I know, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman is one of our leaders as it relates to our Nation's security. And I am engaged with a host of other efforts in our Foreign Affairs

Committee and with our European allies. When the gentleman said that no one could be happier about this series of events than the President of Russia, President Putin, let me underline that, because we are doing to ourselves what the Soviet Union and Russia today have never been able to do to us, which is undermine our security, undermine NATO's security, and undermine the security of the free world.

That is how serious this is. This manufactured crisis has now risen to such a level that we are doing to ourselves what our adversaries have never been able to do to us through decades of Republican and Democratic Presidents and Congresses in which, at the water's edge, we all bind together because it is America's security. I don't know how they celebrate in Moscow, but right now, they must be very pleased this evening, with smiles on their faces, as we look at the 32 days of this government shutdown.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so very much for joining us and bringing to our attention the issues in his district, as well as his experience.

The final words that he has said ring in my ears, and I am sure they ring in the ears of people around this world who are looking at the United States and saying: What is going on there? What is this all about?

There is much, much more to say. I will go through a couple things very, very quickly here.

There are 800,000 government employees across the Nation—in California, there are 37,542—who are not being paid but still working. They are furloughed, and they are wondering how they will meet their mortgages and how they will meet their bills.

□ 2000

We also know that this shutdown is approaching the 1-month mark. And very, very soon, if we don't act and we don't get this government back up and working, there are 45,714,688 people in the United States who will lose their SNAP benefits—these are the food stamps—in other words, their ability to have food on their tables—45,714,000 people.

The day of reckoning for these people is coming very soon. The exact day is not exactly known, but it is toward the end of this month or the first weeks of February. So let's keep in mind those 45 million people who depend upon food stamps.

In my own district, just upstream from the district is the Oroville Dam, which came close to collapsing and put at risk nearly 200,000 people downstream from it. Part of the disaster recovery is to shore up the levees downstream from the Oroville Dam, but that is now being used as a hostage by Senator MCCONNELL.

It is unconscionable what is going on here in America, and it is not necessary.

Democrats have always supported border security—always supported bor-

der security—and we have supported walls along the border. In 2006, almost 700 miles of border fencing and walls were built. In California, in the Tijuana-San Diego border area, those walls have been there for nearly 30 years, maybe even longer than that.

The point here is border security is more than a wall, and if the President wants a wall, he needs to tell us where and why.

Why is it more important than upgrading the ports of entry, as Mr. COSTA talked about, where we know 80 to 90 percent of the drugs come through the ports of entry, the legal ports of entry? One out of five cars is checked; four are not.

The containers, the trains, the planes, the ships all coming through legal ports of entry, but we don't have the technology to check all of them, nor do we have the operations to be able to check all of the cars, all of the planes, all of the containers. So the drugs come in—even through the post office.

Wouldn't it be wise that we spend money where 80 to 90 percent of the drugs enter the United States? It is not in a bunch of children carrying backpacks who are bringing drugs into the United States. That is not where the problem is. The problem is at the ports of entry.

Mr. President, you have the authority and you have the budget today, the appropriation today, to fill 3,000 positions that have remained unfilled for more than a year, positions at the ports of entry, U.S. Customs and Border Patrol positions—3,000. Why are they not filled? If there is such an emergency, why are you not out hiring?

You were given \$1.2 billion a year ago to enhance the border security. Less than 20 percent of that money has been spent. Why? Why?

If we have a national emergency, why are you not hiring the necessary people who are authorized? Why have you not spent the money that was appropriated previously?

Why did you shut down the American Government for an ill-defined border wall that seems, in the minds of most of us, to simply be a fulfillment of a campaign pledge? What is that all about?

What is going through your mind that you ignore things that we know create security: better devices to observe what is going on, unmanned aerial vehicles to observe what is happening, sensing devices to know what is in those containers, men and women to conduct the inspections, all of those things? Why are you not doing it? Why?

Why, Mr. President, did you say that, unless you get your way, you are going to shut down the American Government; in your own words, you will take the mantle of the shutdown? In so doing, you created a real serious national security threat. Yes, you did.

You shut down the government, and, in doing so, you have created a real—a real—national security threat.

HONORING HARRIS WOFFORD, JR.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, before I terminate this, I want to change subjects.

A very, very dear friend died, and I want to bring to the attention of the House Harris Wofford.

Harris Llewellyn Wofford, Jr., was born in New York City on April 9, 1926. At the age of 11, he had the opportunity to travel around the world with his grandmother, in 1938. He experienced many defining events during that time, including what was going on in Italy with Benito Mussolini and in Germany with Hitler, the Japanese aggression in Shanghai, and Gandhi's movement in India.

His passion for creating change and fighting for progress began in earnest during those years. As the civil rights movement began, Mr. Wofford quickly became a fervent supporter of Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., whom we remembered yesterday.

He marched alongside Reverend King for civil rights and voting rights in Selma. And during John F. Kennedy's campaign for President, Mr. Wofford played a key role in Kennedy's efforts that freed Reverend King from prison, a move that galvanized the civil rights movement and helped carry President Kennedy to the White House a year later.

Following that election, he served as President Kennedy's special assistant for civil rights and later served as the head of two colleges. And during his time with the Kennedy administration, he helped launch the Peace Corps, which my wife and I joined shortly thereafter; and that inspired Patti and me as we served 2 years in Ethiopia.

In 1991, Mr. Wofford became Pennsylvania's first Democratic Senator in more than 20 years, unseating the former Republican Governor and U.S. Attorney General Dick Thornburgh.

As Senator, he led the effort that established the community service program, AmeriCorps. My wife, Patti, had the opportunity to work with Mr. Wofford as they, together, created the AmeriCorps program in the 1990s.

In 2008, he introduced then-Senator Barack Obama before his defining "A More Perfect Union" speech that is often credited as the origin of Obama's successful campaign for President.

In 1995, Mr. Wofford left the Senate and began serving as the chief executive at AmeriCorps, where my wife was able to work with him.

In a 2005 speech commemorating the work of French philosopher Teilhard de Chardin, Mr. Wofford, in considering the impact of the invention of nuclear weapons during World War II, said this: ". . . the burning question, above all other questions in the political world, is: How do we crack the atom of civic power and start a chain reaction of constructive force to do for peace what man has shown can be done for war? You may say that is the old question that vexed the 20th century in its occasional search for the moral equivalent

of war. For the 21st century, let's accept Teilhard's challenge and set out to discover the moral and political equivalent of fire."

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD all of Mr. Wofford's speech on that day, April 11, 2005.

[From the Woodstock Forum, Apr. 11, 2005]

THE GLOBAL LEGACY OF TEILHARD DE CHARDIN—GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

(By Harris Wofford)

It's a special honor to participate in this 50th Anniversary commemoration of Teilhard's death—but really this is much more a celebration of his birth, his new birth that came to pass after his death when his words began to be published and spring to public life.

I would have been here earlier today listening and learning but for our family's memorial service in Philadelphia this morning for my 96-year-old stepmother, who died this week. Phyllis Taylor Wofford was the first woman Minister of the Riverside Church of New York, ordained at age 50 in 1959, just as Teilhard's books were spreading around the world.

Remembering our many discussions in the 43 years since she married my father and reading her sermons and poems this weekend, I know she was a reader of Teilhard—and I think he would have liked one of her most recurring metaphors that she attributes to her mentor, the great preacher Harry Emerson Fosdick: The Sunset of Spirit that people fear as death. "Sunset," she believed, "is only our limited human way of looking at things. Nothing has happened to the sun."

You can say that about Teilhard. The limited human way of looking at his writings led to perhaps the greatest intellectual mistake made by the Church since Galileo. The earth does move around the sun, and the sunlight of Teilhard is still there for us, even if he did not live to see it shine on the world during his lifetime.

Teilhard would have understood what my mother the Congregational minister meant when she said in her ordination statement that her studies at Union Theological Seminary started "an adventure in faith": "Doors which had been closed opened and beyond them were tremendous vistas." She said that "All the little scattered fragments of existence as I know it were at last caught up and knit together in one comprehensible whole."

In the late 1950's that is what seemed to be happening to me, in a more amateur fashion, as my heart leaped up when I first started to read Teilhard. I was ready for Teilhard—for his vision that knit together in one comprehensible whole, not only a view of the world and human destiny but a view of the ever-expanding universe of universes—the existence we are all trying to comprehend. Before there was anything of Teilhard's to read, I had committed my mind and heart to his proposition: "The Age of Nations is past. The task before us now, if we would not perish, is to build the Earth."

At age 12, in the spring of 1938, while Teilhard was in China or briefly back in France, I was looting Shanghai. Literally looting. Except for the international quarter protected by the French and British forces and the United States Marines, Shanghai had been bombed almost out of existence, and then occupied by the Japanese army. They sold looting permits to tourists and my grandmother and I were driven into the deserted Chinese city to the roofless remains of a teahouse. I went in to find some loot. Other tourists came out with china, silver and works of art. To my grandmother's dismay, I emerged with a 4-foot stuffed os-

trich—which later I tossed overboard when we sailed into Yokohama harbor.

That six-month trip around the world on the eve of World War II is no doubt what led to my later readiness for Teilhard. It sparked a lasting love affair with the world—with the Earth, Teilhard would say—and a deep-seated sense that the world is truly our stage and the frame in which all the burning questions of our time must be seen.

I returned to 7th grade as an ardent interventionist; a presumptuous, know-it-all, politically active boy who wanted America to join the war to stop Hitler and the Japanese militarists from conquering the world.

After Pearl Harbor, before entering the Army Air Corps, I started what grew into the nation-wide Student Federalist organization that became an enthusiastic part of the campaign for a union of democracies to win the war and be a nucleus of a post-war world federation with power to keep the peace.

When the United Nations was established without the power to control the atomic bomb we campaigned to strengthen it and to establish nuclear control backed by a world police force. But by then the Cold War was closing in, and the vision without which we thought people would perish became distant and dim.

Then came Teilhard's books, one by one, re-lighting the vision of world unity in the broader context of the Human Phenomenon—and of a Divine Milieu. To our realistic discouragement from the vicious circle of international power politics, he offered a different possibility: "the passionate concern for our common destiny which draws the thinking part of life ever further onward. The only truly natural and real human unity is the spirit of the Earth." This "sense of the Earth", he prophesied, would become "the irresistible pressure which will come at the right moment to unite humanity in a common passion."

And as a scientist, he spoke to the skeptics: "To the common sense of the 'man in the street' and even to a certain philosophy of the world to which nothing is possible save what has always been, perspectives such as these will seem highly improbable. But to a mind become familiar with the fantastic dimensions of the universe they will, on the contrary, seem quite natural, because they are simply proportionate with the astronomical immensities."

One last personal account of Teilhard's impact. In the presidential campaign of 1960 and for years afterward, I had the privilege of working with Sargent Shriver, the most creative social inventor of the 20th century and a lover of the words of Teilhard. A brother-in-law of President Kennedy, Shriver organized the Peace Corps and later led President Johnson's War on Poverty, along the way launching the domestic Peace Corps, the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), the forerunner of AmeriCorps; the Job Corps; Foster Grandparents, Community Action agencies, and Legal Services for the Poor. On nights when we worked late I often found myself staying in Shriver's suite at the Mayflower Hotel or in some hotel while traveling to other countries. Each night before he turned out the lights he would read in his bed for a while, usually a book of spiritual import. Often it would be Teilhard de Chardin and the next morning he would talk about it on the way to an early mass.

Then in the Presidential campaign of 1972, after George McGovern asked Shriver to become his running mate, I was helping Sarge work on his acceptance address. As we were due to leave and the police motorcade was revving up, he was still unsatisfied with its ending. "I know how to end it," he said. "It's Teilhard de Chardin! I'm going to find the quote on a plaque in a pile upstairs." We

physically tried to stop him but he bounded out and in two minutes, came back with the plaque. He ended the address with these words of Teilhard that brought the delegates to their feet:

"The day will come when, after harnessing the winds, the tides and gravitation, we shall harness for God the energies of Love. And on that day, for the second time in the history of the world, man will have discovered fire."

No one on that day is likely to have forgotten the fire with which Shriver said that word "fire". Teilhard's watchwords became the theme of his Vice Presidential campaign and recurred again when he ran for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1976. And Sargent Shriver practiced what Teilhard preached, as he went on to help his wife Eunice and son Tim spread Special Olympics to the far corners of the world.

Let me note that those and many other words of Teilhard played a significant part in my own little journey from the Anglican Episcopal Church of my father to the wider Catholic Church centered in Rome (as the world well-observed this week of the Pope's funeral)—the church of Teilhard and the Society of Jesus. As an advocate of civil disobedience of the Gandhian and Martin Luther King kind on fundamental matters of conscience I should confess that I find it hard to fathom the faith it took for Teilhard to accept the silencing of his most important thoughts. But we can respect his agonizing decision to choose what he may have viewed as "divine obedience."

What does Teilhard's vision say to politics today—and to the burning questions of our times? To the world-wide poverty, including the poverty of spirit? To the epidemics sweeping Africa and other places that seem to be behind God's back? To the maybe a billion children who are not learning to read and go to sleep hungry at night? To all those suffering violence in the streets or in their homes, from crime or terrorism or war?

Teilhard's vision tells us to do everything in our power to find the ways and means to harness the energies of love in order to end as soon as possible the scandal that such conditions exist anywhere in the world. This requires We the People of this earth to do in the political world what wartime America did with the physical atom; to win the war scientists, backed by all the necessary resources of our society, worked with fierce urgency to produce the quantum leap and chain reaction that put in man's mortal hands the power to end human life on earth.

Therefore, the burning question, above all other questions in the political world, is: How do we crack the atom of civic power and start a chain reaction of constructive force to do for peace what man has shown can be done for war. You may say that is the old question that vexed the 20th century in its occasional search for the moral equivalent of war. For the 21st century, let's accept Teilhard's challenge and set out to discover the moral and political equivalent of fire.

This Woodstock Forum's other question: What is Teilhard's literary legacy? is not a burning one, but it brings to mind Gertrude Stein's explanation for her famous line: "A rose is a rose is a rose." When Gertrude was asked what in the world was the reason for such repetition, she said that for thousands of years poets have been writing about roses, so often and so sentimentally that the rose had lost its redness. Her intent, she said, was to restore redness to the rose.

Teilhard was a far better poet than Gertrude Stein, but as I've been re-reading him after many years, it seems to me that his most repeated metaphor, which he delivered in a hundred different ways, is indeed Fire—the fire that will blaze forth when we do discover how to harness for God and for all

human beings the power of love, and achieve the unity of man that Teilhard foresaw.

The poet in Teilhard, I think, is seeking, in politics as in science, philosophy and religion, to restore to the ancient idea of creative fire the energy, heat and light that our divided world so sorely needs. So we can hope the sparks that Teilhard's words sent out will catch fire in the dry tinder of these times.

"The world is very different now," John Kennedy began in stating the first proposition of his Inaugural Address. "For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life." To follow that proposition where it leads, we can do no better than to lift our sights to the perspective and the passionate concern for our common human destiny that pervades the writings of Teilhard de Chardin. But we let's not leave it to hope, to time, or to Teilhard to discover this fire, "knowing," as Kennedy said in closing his summons to a New Frontier, "that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable sorrow that Patti and I bid farewell to a very dear friend and an incredible leader who spent his life fighting for justice, civil justice, civil rights, and world peace.

Harris Llewellyn Wofford Jr. was born in New York City on April 9, 1926 and grew up in Scarsdale, N.Y. with his 2 younger siblings. Growing up in an upper-middle class family, at age 11 he had the opportunity to travel the world with his grandmother in 1938. During this formative trip, he experienced many of the defining events of that time including Benito Mussolini speaking about the League of Nations, the results of Japanese aggression in Shanghai and the movement of Mohandas Ghandi in India.

His passion for creating change and fighting for progress began in earnest. After his return to the United States, he quickly established the first chapter of the Student Federalists, which would later become a central pillar of what is now Citizens for Global Solutions. After serving in the Army Airforce, he graduated from the University of Chicago in 1948 and married his fellow student Clare Lindgren.

As the civil rights movement began, Mr. Wofford quickly became a fervent supporter of Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. He marched alongside Rev. King for civil and voting rights in Selma and, during John F. Kennedy's campaign for President, Mr. Wofford played a key role in Kennedy's efforts that freed Rev. King from prison—a move that galvanized the civil rights movement and helped to carry President Kennedy to the White House later that year.

Following the election, he served as President Kennedy's special assistant for civil rights and later served as the head of 2 colleges. During his time with the Kennedy administration, he helped to launch the Peace Corp, which helped to inspire me to enter the realm of public service as one of the first Peace Corp officers serving in Ethiopia.

In 1991, Harris became Pennsylvania's first Democratic Senator in more than 20 years, by unseating the former Republican governor and U.S. Attorney General Dick Thornburgh. As Senator he led the effort that established the community service program, AmeriCorp and in 2008 introduce then-Senator Barack Obama before his defining "A More Perfect Union Speech" that is often credited as the origin of Obama's successful campaign for President.

In 1995, he left the Senate and began serving as Chief Executive at AmeriCorp. Harris Wofford, a Democratic Senator from Pennsylvania, a university president and a defining colleague of President John F. Kennedy died yesterday on the Federal Holiday commemorating the work and vision of Martin Luther King, a vision that as a lifelong champion of civil rights he shared. He was 92.

In a 2005 speech commemorating the work of French philosopher Teilhard de Chardin, Mr. Wofford in considering the impact of the invention of nuclear weapons during World War II said this:

". . . the burning question, above all other questions in the political world, is: how do we crack the atom of civic power and start a chain reaction of constructive force to do for peace what man has shown can be done with war. You may say that is the old question that vexed the 20th century in its occasional search for the moral equivalent of war. For the 21st century, let's accept Teilhard's challenge and set out to discover the moral political equivalent of fire."

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to talk about the necessity of reopening our government, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to properly yield and reclaim time in debate.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be here tonight, with so much going on, but it seems, other than some people rushing to judgment to beat up on a smiling high school kid with a sweet disposition, people are still concerned about the border.

In talking to some TSA agents, some Border Patrol, some of those who are not getting checks—we are still getting some calls—I am still hearing from people, personally, saying: Look, it is really hurting not to have gotten a check; and if we don't get a check, our next check here in the next week, it is going to hurt. But we also know how many American people are hurting because of an insecure border.

How many people have to die, how many people have to have their homes broken into, how many people have to be hit by drivers that should not be driving without insurance, without a driver's license, without fully understanding the laws?

It shouldn't have to be said, but because there are so many people who are quite dense in the liberal media, we know that everybody who comes into this country illegally is not out to hurt America. But what they don't understand and what some in this country—thank God, literally, that it is a minority—don't understand is that, if you keep the border as open as it is, then this country will continue to be more and more overwhelmed, and we will