

the common defense of the United States.

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

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

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

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### THE PRESIDENT'S CONSTITUTIONAL OVERREACH

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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