

life and respects mothers and their children, both born and yet to be born.

#### SHUTDOWN HARMS VETERANS

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

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak out against the great harm this shutdown has on our Nation's veterans. I have often said, when politicians talk tough, real people get hurt.

Today, over 150,000 veterans are furloughed or working without pay. In Colorado, over 20,000 veterans who rely on SNAP food assistance are left wondering if they will be able to afford to feed their families.

This is more than just a delayed paycheck. It is about the denial of dignity and respect.

As one furloughed veteran in Colorado told me, when he took off the uniform, he wanted to continue serving our country by working for the government. We owe it to him and all others to honor that service by getting them back to work. There is a sacred promise in America that, if you step up to serve, we will be there for you when you take off the uniform.

After I returned from my third tour of duty, I was grateful that my country was there for me, and today, I stand before you to make sure we are there for them. It is time for the Senate to vote. It is time to reopen the government. And it is time to end this travesty.

#### SHUTDOWN IMPACTS

(Ms. UNDERWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this week, we will vote for the tenth time to end the shutdown. I sincerely hope that this is the last time.

For the people in the 14th Congressional District of Illinois, the effects of this shutdown are real and they are painful.

This weekend, I visited a family shelter for survivors of domestic violence that does incredible work serving my community. This shelter would like to expand to serve more people, but funding uncertainty around reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act makes that impossible for them. Domestic violence survivors are a casualty of this senseless shutdown.

This weekend, I met an entrepreneur who is working to open a pet care company with her husband. He even left his job so they could realize their dream. They are currently waiting on a Small Business Administration loan they need to open their business. It is sitting on a furloughed worker's desk. Entrepreneurs are a casualty of this shutdown.

This week, I met with air traffic controllers in my district, people who keep passengers and freight moving safely

through the skies. They are working 6 days a week and about to miss a second paycheck. They told me they look after their colleagues by asking: How long do you have left?

How long do they have left before they miss a mortgage payment, a healthcare bill, or max out their credit cards?

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the Senate will take up one of these bills and reopen the government.

#### PRESERVE DIGNITY OF OUR CITIZENRY

(Mr. DELGADO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DELGADO. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to lay bare the calamity that is the shutdown. From phones ringing off the hook, to folks I talked to at my townhall meeting on Monday, we have heard from far too many of our fellow citizens struggling because of government inaction.

Take the Coast Guard, who I met with in Saugerties last Friday. They are providing an invaluable service to our community up and down the Hudson River, not only search and rescue, but ice cutting, which is critical to our local economy.

They are out there working in the freezing cold and not being paid. This is the first time in history U.S. Armed Forces servicemembers are not being paid during a lapse in government funding.

I repeat: Because of the shutdown, members of the U.S. military are working without pay.

Government dysfunction of any kind is not good for the well-being of our democratic order. We are now approaching levels of dysfunction that ought not be tolerable for anyone who cares to preserve the dignity of our citizenry. We must open the government now.

#### HONORING LIFE OF DR. RONALD MERTHIE

(Mrs. MURPHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a spiritual leader in my central Florida community, Dr. Ronald Merthie, who recently passed away.

A proud son of Seminole County, Dr. Merthie attended what is now known as Crooms Academy of Information Technology, where he was elected class president. He went to Texas Southern University on an athletic scholarship and, upon graduation, returned home to become an educator.

Dr. Merthie struggled with substance abuse for a period of time, but he found strength through faith, overcoming personal hardship and becoming a pillar of his community.

Dr. Merthie's life was filled with action and achievement. He established

the New Life Word Center Church, offered spiritual guidance on a weekly broadcast, and founded a K-12 school.

It was Dr. King who said, "Life's most persistent and urgent question is, 'What are you doing for others?'" Dr. Merthie devoted his life to serving others, and he will be deeply missed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this exceptional man and offer our condolences to his family and to all of those whose lives he touched.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 648, CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 31, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 61 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 61

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 648) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. Clause 2(e) of rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 31) making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of February 1, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of

any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 4. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of January 30, 2019, relating to a measure making or continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUFFMAN). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), pending which time I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 61, providing for consideration of H.R. 648, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2019, under a closed rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. It also provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 31, which makes further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019 under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Additionally, it extends same-day authority for appropriations measures through January 30 and suspension authority through February 1.

Mr. Speaker, we are on day 33 of the Trump shutdown, the longest government shutdown in American history. Hundreds of thousands of Federal workers will miss a paycheck for the second time since the President plunged us into this mess.

The very people who keep our Nation safe are struggling to put food on the table, people like men and women in the Coast Guard, FBI agents, Border Patrol officers, and TSA agents.

Makeshift food banks are being opened across the country to help these workers and their families get by. Right outside our Nation's Capital, in Northern Virginia, some Federal workers waited more than an hour recently at a local food bank. Demand was so high that a tenth of the food was gone in the first 5 minutes.

Because of the President's shutdown, 15 million households could see a gap in their monthly SNAP benefits that lasts more than 40 days. Four million low-in-

come households could see a gap that lasts more than 50 days.

This program is their lifeline, Mr. Speaker. These families don't have a plan B.

I have given weekly end-hunger-now speeches on this floor since February of 2013, and I have made it clear time and time again that hunger is not only unacceptable in this country, the richest country in the history of the world, but it is a political condition.

We have the resources. We have what it takes. What we need to muster is the political will to do something about it. But here we are, and as I said, it is embarrassing enough that the wealthiest nation on the planet has an ongoing hunger crisis, but I never, ever imagined that a President of the United States would exacerbate it like this.

This is disgusting. This is unacceptable. This is unconscionable.

Let us be clear: It is the President's bruised ego that keeps a quarter of our government closed today.

Now, his latest so-called compromise proposal isn't really a compromise at all. In fact, it brings new meaning to the word "cruel."

□ 1230

Not only does it fail to provide a permanent solution for the Dreamers or TPS recipients, it only covers a fraction of eligible Dreamers, it excludes TPS holders from Asia and Africa, and it rewrites the law for future DACA recipients, TPS holders, and asylum seekers that will make it all but impossible for anyone to qualify.

These are the same old, tired, and extremist ideas the President and his advisers floated last year. They were rejected by both the Republican-controlled House and the Republican-controlled Senate. This is not a compromise. This is called backwards.

Now, if this administration wants to target refugees, people fleeing persecution, people fleeing for their life, if that is what he wants to do, then at least he should have the guts to do it in an open hearing for the world to see.

Now, President Trump is treating this like some reality show. He doesn't want to look bad in the right-wing press despite the fact that Members of both parties are refusing to fund his ineffective wall. If the President really wants to reach a real compromise, then he should log off Twitter and actually sit down with us and be willing to actually negotiate; no more storming out of the Situation Room and no more of his my-way-or-the-highway approach. Work with us for a change.

For whatever reason, Mr. Speaker, he has been unwilling to do that. President Trump may not have the fortitude to get us out of this mess that he created, but this majority does. So instead of following the President who got us into this mess, we have an opportunity to lead. Passing these bipartisan, bicameral bills is what leadership looks like.

Now, many of my Republican friends have asked to consider a plan that

doesn't cede the House's will by considering a Senate bill. Well, today is their day because we are considering a bipartisan, bicameral compromise. This six-bill package is the result of real negotiations between the Appropriations Committees in the House and Senate. It is a true compromise that would reopen the entire government apart from the Department of Homeland Security. In fact, these negotiated bills are exactly what my good friends on the other side of the aisle have been asking us over the past week to take up. Again, this is all last year's work in the last session.

I recognize that we don't have a similar agreement on the Homeland Security measure included here, but this short-term CR will get our TSA agents paid while all other parties get back to the negotiating table.

The minibus includes \$328 million in new dollars for border security that we know will actually work. The funding will increase infrastructure investments at our ports of entry; install new technology that will scan for drugs, weapons, and contraband; put in place technology to detect unauthorized crossings; and fund more immigration judges. This is what smart security looks like in the 21st century, Mr. Speaker, not some medieval wall.

Now, these details have already been agreed to by Democrats and Republicans on both sides of the Capitol. The majority is standing by our word. I urge my Republican friends: Take yes for an answer.

The President may be proud to have shut down this government, but this is nothing to be proud of.

How can anybody be proud that 800,000 Federal workers are about to miss a second paycheck, that our TSA workers are calling in sick so they can work another job that actually helps them pay the bills, or that the economy is losing growth at twice the speed originally estimated?

I could go on and on and on and on, Mr. Speaker, but I know each of us has heard from people in our districts. Our offices are getting these calls every day, in fact, every hour and every minute now. We are all hearing from struggling constituents. Their message is the same: End this shutdown. End this shutdown.

This doesn't seem, unfortunately, to be a priority for President Trump. He is out there tweeting about which player should be in the Baseball Hall of Fame. Give me a break. Maybe he doesn't know what it is like in the real world. After all, the President got his start through what he has called a small loan from his dad that reports now estimate could have totaled more than \$60 million. That is the world he lives in.

But families are struggling and left to wonder how they are going to afford to put food on the table or how they are going to pay for medicine without a paycheck.

Enough of the games. Congress has the power to end this shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote "yes" on this rule and give the underlying legislation the strong veto-proof vote it deserves. Let's finally turn the lights back on. Listen to your constituents, I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle. Listen to what they are saying. Turn the lights back on.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I appreciated the first 60 seconds of his comments where he went through that kind of policy work and that kind of procedural work, the work that we do.

We are on opposite sides of this issue. The Rules Committee is the single most partisan committee on Capitol Hill, and, yet, we always find a way to come together and share the debate to move forward. But after that first 60 seconds of process, we went into 4 minutes of the President and accusations, one after another after another.

Now, I have only been in this institution for five terms, Mr. Speaker, but that is long enough to understand that there is only one way to turn a bill into a law, and that is if Congress proposes it, Congress passes it, and the President signs it. Now, my good friend from Massachusetts knows as well as I do the President has not vetoed one single spending bill that the Congress has sent to him. The government is not shut down because the President is rejecting bills that Congress has passed. The government is shut down because Congress hasn't passed a bill.

Mr. Speaker, if you would just listen to that opening statement, your blood pressure probably gets as high as mine does: failure after failure after failure, disappointment after disappointment after disappointment, embarrassing event after embarrassing event. I will remind my colleagues that we are where we are because we came together and passed more spending bills on time before the end of the fiscal year than any other Congress in 22 years.

Now, we could have gotten them all done. My Democratic friends in the Senate didn't want to move those along. They had perfectly legitimate policy reasons for doing that. I am not going to question their motives; I will question their wisdom.

We have got more done together than we ever have before, and we could build on that, I tell my friend. We could build on that or we could go into our corners, we could put on our jerseys, and we can throw accusations out as fast as we can invent them in our head. That is where we are.

It is the month of January, Mr. Speaker, the very first month of this new Congress. We have new leadership. It has been more than a decade since I have seen a face like yours in the Speaker's chair. We have spent 338 hours in this Chamber—338 hours in

this Chamber—this month working on appropriations bills. Not one has gone to the President's desk for his consideration.

My friend from Massachusetts is right when he talks about pain in American families. My friend from Massachusetts is right when he talks about the expectations folks have of Congress and how we should do better. My friend from Massachusetts is right when he says that this is not what any one of us was sent here to do. We were sent here to solve problems.

I promise you, unless your family is different from mine, Mr. Speaker, unless your relationships are different from mine, I have never solved a problem in my family by telling my loved ones how much it is their fault, how much they need to change, how much they are on the wrong side of an issue and we are not going to do anything until they come around to my way of thinking. It hasn't been a particularly successful method for me.

Now, I look back over these last 33 days. The President sent the Vice President to Capitol Hill. He came with the OMB director, Mick Mulvaney.

He said: I told you what I needed to pass the bill. I told you what I needed and what I thought was important for America and for national security. But I will tell you what; I don't have to have exactly that. I can come off that. I can negotiate down from that. I can move away from that. Let's talk about what the other options may be.

No response.

The President this past weekend: I want to break this impasse; I want to find a way we can move forward; it is not about who wins. We all need to win as Americans. We all want to do better as Americans. I am going to offer to do something that no President has been able to do. I am going to offer to put into statute protection for the young men and women in the DACA program. I am going to offer to put into statute protections for those men and women in temporary protected status that has since expired. I am going to put that into statute for the first time.

As the press release is dated, Mr. Speaker, Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI rejected that offer 7 minutes before it was made.

I am not saying that that is the right answer. I am not saying that that is the best we can do. I am not saying that is where the conversation ends. I am asking my friends: When does the conversation begin?

More than 300 hours we have spent talking amongst ourselves and produced nothing to go to the President's desk. Sadly, I know that this issue has elevated beyond where my friend from Massachusetts, even as chairman of the powerful Rules Committee—and it is the powerful Rules Committee, it can move absolutely any measure through this House, and the Rules Committee has been incredibly successful. The House is moving appropriations bills like nobody's business, Mr. Speaker,

because when you are in the majority you can do that. You can do my way or the highway.

That is the way my friend described President Trump's attitude. I will just remind my friend that is actually what we have today in this bill. My ranking member asked if we could consider some amendments to this bill, and he was told no. My friend didn't say: Let's just come down here and have amendments willy-nilly. We will have a preprinting requirement, we will do what we call a modified open rule, just so some of our new Members can have their voices heard, their constituents' voices heard in some way.

The answer was no; straight party-line vote. All the Democrats said: no, we are not going to allow any other voices to be heard; and all the Republicans said: yes.

I don't fault my friend for that. That is not a personal slight of any kind, Mr. Speaker. The Rules Committee is the Speaker's committee. It does the work of the Speaker. As powerful and talented as my friend from Massachusetts is, it is his job to implement the Speaker's will. Now, to his credit, he has been very bold in terms of trying to open that committee up. He has been very bold in trying to make sure more voices have been heard. But we find ourselves trapped in this appropriations cycle. We haven't actually gotten to where my friend is going to be able to do his very best work. We are still trapped in trying to do the business of last year.

But my friend's pointing out that the President's my way or the highway—which is inaccurate—is not helpful. My pointing out that this bill is Speaker PELOSI's way or the highway may be accurate, but it still isn't helpful. We have got to have a conversation with one another. I can go down the list of the ways that the President has said he is willing to come to the table, but he is sitting at the table alone.

I am a vote counter, Mr. Speaker. I know how to count votes in this Chamber. I have no doubt that the rule that my friend from Massachusetts is proposing is going to pass this floor today. I have no doubt that the underlying appropriations bill is going to pass this floor. This rule includes something called martial law, Mr. Speaker, which means they can bring up anything they want to any time they want to, no preprinting, and no opportunity to review it, none of those activities that we would say bring out the very best in transparency here. If any of those bills come up, they are going to pass.

There is no confusion in this Chamber about who has the votes to win. The confusion in this Chamber is how it is we get from where we are to where our constituents want us to be and doing the same thing over and over and over again isn't going to get it done.

It is my first time carrying a rule in the minority, Mr. Speaker. I knew when I walked down here this morning my job was to lose. I don't mind losing.

But I do mind when the American people lose, and the American people are losing right now. There are no winners right now.

I know the men and women of this Chamber. There are some talented orators here. We can absolutely trade insults and accusations until the sun goes down. But there are some talented policymakers here, too. There are some talented negotiators here, too. As long as the President is sitting at that negotiating table alone, we are not going to get to a solution. But he doesn't have to be there alone. I appreciate his making the invitation, and I hope, as my friend from Massachusetts said, we will learn to take yes for an answer.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just remind my colleague that the bills that we are taking up here today were the result of a robust amendment process and robust debate in the last Congress. This is all last year's work.

I also remind the gentleman he is right about one thing, that we haven't sent the President a bill from both Chambers, but we almost did. If he remembers correctly, in December, when the Republicans controlled the House and the Republicans controlled the Senate and they, obviously, controlled the White House, we actually came together and the Senate passed a bill that would keep the government running and open, unanimously.

I even supported the gentleman's martial law rule to be able to bring up that legislation expeditiously so we could do our work and so that nobody would have to be anxious over the holidays as to whether or not they were going to get paid.

We were about to vote on it, and it was agreed on by Democrats and Republicans. There was no controversy. And then the President turned on rightwing TV or was listening to rightwing radio, and Ann Coulter and some of these other rightwing extremists said: No, you can't do that.

And he changed his mind, and everything came to a standstill. So all this bipartisan work was for naught.

What we are bringing up here today is all the bipartisan work that many of my Republican colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, Democrats and Republicans, worked hard on to come up with a compromise that is good. It is good. Yet my friends say: Well, no. Let's start all over again.

The bottom line is the other side left us with a mess. When they controlled everything, they weren't able to get the job done.

Let me just say, here are some facts:

This is the longest shutdown in history, but it is historic for another reason. This is the first time in history that a Congress has ended in a government shutdown. Never before has a

Congress left it to the next Congress to reopen the government. With all due respect to my friends, that is what my friends left us with.

On top of that, Republicans had control of the White House, the Senate, and the House last year, and they couldn't keep the lights on. Then Republicans went home for Christmas and New Year's and every day in between. I know because I was on the floor multiple times begging to be recognized to offer solutions, and I was denied even the ability to offer a solution.

Since we took charge, we have non-stop offered options. Now some Members want to complain about how we are cleaning up the mess that was left to us.

Imagine this. Imagine if someone dumped a bunch of garbage on your lawn and then started complaining about how you weren't cleaning it up. That is what is happening here.

I would suggest that my friends kind of save their criticisms for a time when we aren't cleaning up after all of them.

I just want to make one other point. The gentleman said that we have martial law, same-day authority in this rule to bring up anything we want. No, that is not the case.

When my friends were in charge, they did. They had martial law to bring up anything they wanted to, and they were trying to bring up a cheese bill, if I remember correctly, instead of a bill to keep the government open in the last days of December.

No. We limit it to appropriations matters, and we want to be able to, if we can come to a deal, if we come to some sort of solution, to be able to bring something up immediately to be able to get everybody the paychecks to which they are entitled.

I know the gentleman was home over the holiday weekend, and I was, too. My constituents asked me the question over and over: I get it that there is a disagreement over the President's border wall, but why do you have to shut the entire government down over that issue? Why can't you just continue in negotiation? Why do you have to deny TSA workers a paycheck? Why is that okay? Why is that acceptable? Why are they pawns in this? Or men and women who serve in our Coast Guard, why is that okay to say: You don't get paid because the President is having a temper tantrum and he is not getting his way? All of a sudden, we have to deny them a paycheck?

People don't understand why my Republican friends think this is acceptable. The gentleman from Georgia knows that the reason why a bill is not on the President's desk is because the Senate majority leader, Mr. MCCONNELL, is basically doing the President's bidding. He said: I am not going to bring anything to the floor that the President doesn't want to sign.

We have another option here, too: We can actually pass bipartisan bills that should win overwhelming support. We should pass them with veto-proof mar-

gins and basically say to the President: We don't believe in government by blackmail. That is not the way we do things around here. That is not the way this government is supposed to work.

We ought to reopen the government, and we ought to engage in serious discussions about how we improve our border security. We have some great ideas on how to do that. We have some ideas that I mentioned in my opening speech on ways we can improve our border security.

We think a border wall is a ridiculous idea. But if you want to talk about a wall, fine, but don't—don't—hold hundreds of thousands of workers hostage.

We have an opportunity now to set these hostages that the President has taken free. Let's do it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I appreciate that admonition from the Chair.

I was looking aggressively at all the words my friend had to say for what that thing was that was going to break this logjam, what that thing was that was going to bring people together, what that olive branch was that he was extending to succeed where others had failed.

I heard that if we only come together and do it his way, that we could all just get along, and I have no doubt that that is true. That is not what a negotiation is. That is not the way this Chamber works.

We have got to send a bill to the President's desk. When the President starts vetoing bills, then start accusing the President of being the grit in the cog in this legislative wheel. We don't have agreement amongst ourselves.

We were up in the Rules Committee last night, Mr. Speaker, and one of my appropriator friends was celebrating the bills that were coming to the floor today and celebrating how pleased she was that so many of the pro-life provisions had been stripped out, celebrating that so many of the dollars that we would be sending overseas would no longer be encumbered by pro-life provisions, that folks would be able to use them in any way that they wanted.

Well, I have no doubt that she was pleased by those things, but we are not all pleased by those things, Mr. Speaker. This doesn't represent the compromise solution that everybody is on board with, as my friend would have you believe.

The financial services language in this bill, that never made it through conference. We couldn't agree, not amongst ourselves in the House and the Senate, not in a bicameral way.

My friend who is the ranking member of the Financial Services and General

Government Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. Speaker, shared last night that there were 20 different pieces of bipartisan legislation that were in the original bill, 6 pieces of bipartisan legislation that had been signed off on by the then-ranking member and, now, chairwoman of the Financial Services Committee that we could have moved forward, that we could have made a difference—again, stripped out for reasons beyond my understanding.

This isn't complicated if folks are sincere about coming together around the table. It is impossible if folks would rather trade insults than solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), a friend who has been dedicated entirely to solutions in his short time in the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, we have three crises in our country right now: We have a humanitarian crisis at the southern border. We could talk about the dynamics of that, but let's be honest about it—we truly do. We need to secure our Nation's borders, and we need to reopen our government and pay our Federal workers, something I have been committed to since I joined Congress.

So far, we have wasted more than 338 hours working on dead-end bills that will not pass the Senate, the President won't sign, because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, or their leadership, won't get in a room and negotiate with the President, with MITCH MCCONNELL, with the majority leader, with the minority leader—all in the same room—and negotiate on the package that the President has put forward.

I spoke on that package last week. I held up this letter, which was a January 6 letter from the President, from the administration, to the chair of the Appropriations Committee and all the members. The other side of the aisle was astonished. They didn't know what this letter was.

That is a little bit demoralizing, if you think about it, why the letter wasn't shared with all Members on the other side of the aisle.

You see, compromise means you don't get 100 percent of what you want, but you move the ball forward. You move the ball down the road, and you keep making progress.

Those same people who are calling it a border wall or a barrier or whatever you want to call it—I do stress to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, call it about anything you want, short of a moat. If you make progress, we move forward.

These same people who are now calling it immoral voted for border security, border barriers, when there was a different President. Now that it has President Trump's name on it, suddenly it has become evil.

Since January 3, President Trump has made two detailed proposals to Congress on how to solve this prob-

lem—it shows that the President is prepared to negotiate on it—a package of things that include border security, technology at the border, strengthening our points of entry, humanitarian aid, additional immigration judges, and, let me stress this, providing assistance for people to apply for asylum from their home countries rather than take that dangerous and treacherous journey to the Mexican border.

Doctors Without Borders says that 31 percent of the women who make that journey are sexually assaulted. The President wants to address that. Neither of those proposals have even gotten a moment of discussion from the other side of the aisle.

Anyone who spent 35 years in business, or even a few years in business, as I have, would know that compromise means you deal with the entirety of the problem. You negotiate the problem, and you get an answer that moves it forward rather than say: Some things are out of bounds; we are not going to talk about that.

The part I like now, lately, is: We will talk about it later; we promise we will.

There is a song about that. It is called, "Tomorrow, Tomorrow."

Sorry. Now is the time to deal with it. Now is the time. And I agree: Having people not paid—my dad was an autoworker. He was laid off multiple times. Missing two paychecks is brutal. There is an answer to that. It is called negotiate.

It is important that Members of the House and Senate and the leadership take seriously the President's proposals, go to a room, close the door, and negotiate rather than say, as has been said by the current Speaker: zero dollars for the wall, maybe a dollar.

I don't care if you call it a wall. I don't care if you call it a steel slat. I don't care if you call it a barrier. But we need security at the southern border. Why is it we can't have that now?

Further, we have to end this and pay our Federal workers. We must end this crisis and pay the workers. There is a route there.

Rather than spend 338 hours on the floor—in this whole posturing, this whole profiling—sit in a room and spend 10 percent of that time, 33 hours, in one room. My guess is you would come to an answer on the problem.

Why are we not doing that? Why are we not doing that? Our Democrats on the other side of the aisle obstruct people being paid.

Last week, we proposed an amendment that would have, in fact, retroactively opened the government to pay Federal employees. Six Democrats joined us in that—only six—and it was defeated.

Again, if you want to pay the employees, pay them; don't use them as hostages, as you have.

A couple summaries I wish to make: First, these are not the same bills that you claim were bipartisan bills that

passed appropriations. As my colleague has noted, significant items have been pulled out of that—life protections. I will go through a list. So they are not the same bills.

Let's be honest on the floor and at least call them what they are. They are Democratic versions of the previous bills that they put through.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Michigan an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. MITCHELL. One of the questions I posed for my colleagues: Why is it okay to begin running reelection campaigns now for an election to go 2 years from now? Why is it okay for the Presidential campaigns to start on the backs of these workers and the southern border?

Someone answer that question for me, because that is what is happening. That is what is happening all over the country. That is what is happening on TV.

□ 1300

This is now the cause for which people are going to run campaigns. And, frankly, as a result, yeah, we have government by blackmail, but the blackmail is going on by the other side of the aisle that insists they will only talk about certain components of this, but not all of it, because they have now decided it is not politically expedient as they are getting ready to run for office—some getting ready, apparently, to run for President—and they want to use this as leverage.

We can solve this problem in 1 day. I encourage my colleagues to do so. Get the Speaker of the House, the minority leader, majority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, and the President in a room, close the door, and don't come out until you have an answer that they all agree to. How hard is it to understand that concept?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say, I think we have agreement here. We all want to open the government. We all want to reopen the government. I think the difference here is that we have no preconditions on reopening the government. My Republican friends do have preconditions, and it is whatever the President decides he wants to tack on at the last minute.

So there is a difference here. We have no preconditions. Open the government up, start paying all of our Federal workers, let's get our country back to normal here in terms of the Federal workforce, but my Republican friends have all these strings that they want to attach to it.

The gentleman from Michigan said, you know, he refers to one of the "gotcha" amendments that the Republicans offered on backpay for Federal workers. I should remind him that we actually passed a law here, S. 24, which created an entitlement to backpay for

Federal workers who aren't getting paid during the shutdown. So we actually dealt with that here. We actually passed a law, and, that, he may not have known that.

I should also say to my Republican friends, understand that the American people are not on your side on this. There is a recent "CBS News" poll—7 in 10 Americans do not think the issue of a border wall is worth a government shutdown—7 in 10.

Now, I know there is this—you know, the President is worried about that 25, 30 percent of his base, but the vast majority of the people in this country aren't with him on this. They are not with you on this by not stepping up and saying we ought to reopen our government.

You want to have a negotiation on border security, we have lots of ideas to enhance border security, and that is based on conversations with people on the border who talk about increased technology, who talk about better infrastructure, who talk about more personnel, you know, more asylum judges. I can go on and on and on. We are all for that. Let's continue that conversation.

But why in the world does this President insist on shutting the government down until he gets his way on this border wall? This is not the way you do a negotiation. And, again, if you want to reopen the government, and we do, we have no conditions. Reopen the government. It is that simple.

And the bills—the gentleman from Michigan talked about bills that the Senate would pass. Some of the bills that we are sending over to the Senate passed unanimously. Boy, I mean, if that is not a signal that they overwhelmingly agree with the substance of these bills, I don't know what is, but they did. They voted unanimously, in some cases, for some of these bills we are sending over here.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from "The Washington Post" titled: "Unacceptable: Coast Guard's top officer criticizes lack of payment in government shutdown."

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 22, 2019]

**'UNACCEPTABLE': COAST GUARD'S TOP OFFICER CRITICIZES LACK OF PAYMENT IN GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN**

(By Dan Lamothe)

The Coast Guard's top admiral said Tuesday that members of the armed forces should not be expected to shoulder the burden of the partial government shutdown, citing the "anxiety and stress" it is causing military families as their pay is withheld.

Adm. Karl Schultz, the Coast Guard commandant, said he is heartened by the outpouring of support Coast Guard personnel have received across the country but expects more.

"Ultimately, I find it unacceptable that Coast Guard men and women have to rely on food pantries and donations to get through day-to-day life as service members," he said, speaking on a video posted to his Twitter account.

The comments marked the admiral's most forceful remarks about the shutdown since it began 32 days ago amid a dispute over Presi-

dent Trump's demands for funding for a southern border wall. While the majority of the U.S. military is part of the Defense Department and has funding, the Department of Homeland Security and its agencies, including the Coast Guard, are affected by the shutdown.

About 41,000 active-duty service members and 2,100 civilians who are considered "essential personnel" are working without a paycheck under the promise they will get back pay when the shutdown is resolved, said Lt. Cmdr. Scott McBride, a service spokesman. That situation grew more urgent Jan. 15, when service members missed a paycheck. An additional 6,000 civilians working for the service are furloughed.

Overall, about 800,000 federal workers are not receiving paychecks amid the shutdown, with nearly half furloughed.

Schultz, appearing alongside the service's top enlisted man, Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard Jason M. Vanderhaden, noted that civilian employees will miss another paycheck Friday and called it a "sobering" situation.

Senior Coast Guard officials and the American public, he said, "stand in awe" of the affected service members' "continued dedication to duty and resilience" and that of their families.

The admiral, in keeping with the military's tradition of not commenting directly on politics, did not blame anyone specific for the shutdown. He and Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen are making their case for the service on Capitol Hill, Schultz said.

The Coast Guard has continued to carry out operations across the globe during the shutdown.

On Sunday, the Coast Guard Cutter Bertholf departed from Alameda, Calif., with about 170 people aboard for a deployment to the Pacific that will last up to six months. The Defense Department will reimburse the service for the deployment, but Coast Guard personnel still will not be paid until the shutdown is resolved.

"The crew, like all other [Coast Guard] members, are affected by the lapse of appropriations, and are not being paid," said Lt. Cmdr. Steve Brickey, a service spokesman. "It is always difficult to deploy for months and leave behind family and loved ones. That stress is of course magnified when you add on the uncertainty of the shutdown."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Admiral Schultz, the Coast Guard's commandant said: "Ultimately, I find it unacceptable that Coast Guard men and women have to rely on food pantries and donations to get through day-to-day life as servicemembers."

In total, 41,000 Active Duty service members and 2,100 civilians are essential personnel and working without pay and have been for 33 days now. An additional 6,000 are furloughed. As of this Friday, these brave men and women will have missed two paychecks. That is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article titled: "America's veterans said to be disproportionately affected by government shutdown."

[From ABC News, Jan. 9, 2019]

**AMERICA'S VETERANS SAID TO BE DISPROPORTIONATELY AFFECTED BY GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN**

(By Elizabeth McLaughlin)

As the partial government shutdown continues for a third week, veterans groups are sounding the alarm because of what they say

is the disproportionate impact on America's veterans and a growing fear that financial uncertainty could lead to self-harm.

An estimated one-third of the federal workforce is made up of veterans, according to the Office of Personnel Management, meaning that more than 250,000 veterans are not currently receiving paychecks.

"This shutdown has consequences that go beyond loss of pay," the Union Veterans Council said in a statement this week. "Financial instability is one of the main cause of suicides among the veterans' community. These hard-working men and women who sacrificed so much for their country should not have their families held hostage by lawmakers that cannot relate to living paycheck to paycheck."

Edward M. Canales is a local union president with the American Federation of Government Employees and a veteran liaison officer who serves as a resource to veterans working in the U.S. Bureau of Prisons west of the Mississippi River.

He told ABC News that he's received numerous calls from veterans who aren't able to support their families during the shutdown and express "no positive outlook on the future."

"If this shutdown does not stop, we are going to have fatalities. We're going to have suicides," he said.

Canales, a U.S. Army veteran himself who deployed to Iraq during Operation Desert Storm, said he is referring calls to the Department of Veterans Affairs hotline out of concern that a veteran will self-harm.

He called the shutdown "shameful," saying its "slapping every veteran in the face who has served their country."

As a special investigative service technician who worked in the federal prison system for 26 years, Canales is currently not receiving his retirement pay.

Toby Hauck, a six-year Air Force veteran, is an air traffic controller in Aurora, Illinois, who has gone without a paycheck since Dec. 31. He told ABC News that his father and grandfather served in the U.S. military and now his son and daughter-in-law are deploying overseas at the end of the month.

Hauck and his wife, a neonatal intensive care unit nurse, will be looking after their two-and-a-half-year-old granddaughter during the ten-month deployment, and the continued lack of pay causes added stress to their already hectic jobs, he said.

"We are hardworking, proud American employees doing a job for the American public that is essential as an air traffic controller," said Hauck, who is also a representative for the National Air Traffic Controllers Association. "It's not acceptable as a veteran, as a federal employee, as an air traffic controller to use my profession and my livelihood as a political football."

"[Veterans] are very proud of our heritage and what we've done for the country. And those of us who continue to serve the federal government as a federal employee continue that pride throughout their careers," he added.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The Union Veterans Council said in a statement this week, "Financial instability is one of the main causes of suicide among the veterans' community. These hardworking men and women who sacrificed so much for their country should not have their families held hostage by lawmakers that cannot relate to living paycheck to paycheck."

According to the Office of Personnel Management, one-third of the Federal workforce is made up of veterans. That means 250,000 veterans are not receiving paychecks right now during this



Trump shutdown. That is an absolute disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, as the Trump shutdown continues, hundreds of Internal Revenue Service employees have received permission to skip work due to financial hardships, and absences are only expected to grow.

I would like to share a story about Marissa Scott, an IRS employee who is gravely affected by this Trump shutdown. Ms. Scott lives outside of Kansas City, Missouri. She drives 98 miles roundtrip to work each day. Right now, she cannot afford to fill her gas tank and has stopped going to work.

She shared that she typically helps 50 people a day with their tax returns and fears that this shutdown may cause delays in tax refunds for months as more employees like her are unable to continue working without a paycheck. These are tax refunds that Americans rely on and are eagerly waiting to be processed.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from "The Washington Post" titled: "Hundreds of IRS employees are skipping work. That could delay tax refunds." It also details Ms. Scott's story.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 22, 2019]

**HUNDREDS OF IRS EMPLOYEES ARE SKIPPING WORK. THAT COULD DELAY TAX REFUNDS**  
(By Danielle Paquette, Lisa Rein, Jeff Stein and Kimberly Kindy)

Hundreds of Internal Revenue Service employees have received permission to skip work during the partial government shutdown due to financial hardship, and union leaders said Tuesday that they expected absences to surge as part of a coordinated protest that could hamper the government's ability to process taxpayer refunds on time.

The Trump administration last week ordered at least 30,000 IRS workers back to their offices, where they have been working to process refunds without pay. It was one of the biggest steps the government has taken to mitigate the shutdown's impact on Americans' lives.

But IRS employees across the country—some in coordinated protest, others out of financial necessity—won't be clocking in, according to Tony Reardon, president of the National Treasury Employees Union, and several local union officials. The work action is widespread and includes employees from a processing center in Ogden, Utah, to the Brookhaven campus on New York's Long Island.

The move is the leading edge of pushback from within the IRS, and it signals the potential for civil servants to take actions that could slow or cripple government functions as the shutdown's political stalemate continues in Washington. U.S. Department of Agriculture meat inspectors have begun to call in sick, Transportation Security Administration sickouts at airports have been rising, and federal law enforcement agencies say the shutdown is increasing stress among agents and affecting investigations.

"They are definitely angry that they're not getting paid, and maybe some of them are angry enough to express their anger this way," said Reardon, whose union represents 150,000 employees at 33 federal agencies and departments. "But these employees live paycheck to paycheck, and they can't scrape up the dollars to get to work or pay for child care."

Not receiving pay for more than a month has taken a toll on employees across the

government, but especially on those who are not in high-salary jobs. The employees summoned back from furlough to process tax refunds are paid between \$25,800 and \$51,000 a year, depending on their seniority. IRS employees will miss a second paycheck Monday if the government does not reopen this week.

"I'm at the point where I cannot afford to go to work," said Marissa Scott, 31, an IRS customer service representative who is out on hardship leave. Scott lives outside Kansas City, Mo., and drives 98 miles round trip to work each day. "I cannot afford to fill my gas tank."

Scott, who has worked at the IRS for four years, says she typically helps as many as 50 people a day with their returns during tax season, including U.S. troops stationed overseas. She said the shutdown could delay refunds for months, and without employees like her on the job, "it's going to be a disaster all around."

Many of the IRS employees who are choosing not to come to work despite getting called back are taking advantage of a provision in the union contract that allows them to miss work if they suffer a "hardship" during a shutdown, according to the labor groups.

That could mean a blown car tire, an empty gas tank or a child-care bill.

"I have fielded no less than 30 to 40 calls, emails or text messages about hardship requests from employees daily since Thursday," said Shannon Ellis, president of the NTEU's Chapter 66 in Kansas City.

In Andover, Mass., more than 100 customer service representatives, electronic filing workers and other IRS employees plan to use the hardship exemption and won't report to work, said Gary Karibian, chapter president of a local union.

"I would say a majority of employees are calling out under hardship," Karibian said. "I'm getting reports whole teams are requesting out. One person told me, 'I'm the only one on my team here.'"

The union lacks an official head count of absent workers—the IRS declined to share data on hardship exemptions—but staffers in Fresno, Calif.; Austin; Andover; Kansas City and Atlanta, among other locations, say they won't be showing up for work, Reardon said.

Duncan Giles, who has worked for 24 years at an IRS call center in Indianapolis, said more workers are requesting hardship leave as they learn it exists.

"The more this goes on and the tougher it is to get to work—they simply cannot afford it," said Giles, president of NTEU Chapter 49, noting that about 30 of the 170 employees who have been called back to work in Indianapolis have requested the exemption. "Every single person wants to be at work. They want to help the American taxpayer. But we have to pay for gas and child care."

The hardship exemption allows IRS employees not to have to use sick days to be absent from work, and managers must approve the exemptions.

Lawmakers also have heard reports of IRS staffers intending to miss work and are planning to ask Treasury, Secretary Steven Mnuchin for details when he testifies on Capitol Hill this Thursday, a House aide said.

The IRS declined to say how many workers are on hardship leave, and spokesman Matt Leas said the IRS is continuing its work to prepare for the beginning of filing season next week.

"We are continuing our recall operations, and we continue to assess the situation at this time," Leas said.

The IRS employees' moves come amid broad uncertainty about the Trump administration's attempts to minimize the impact of the shutdown. On Sunday, the number of

TSA agents who failed to show up for work hit a record 10 percent, resulting in long wait times. Guards at federal prisons also are calling out at high rates, with union officials at 10 prisons contacted by The Washington Post this month saying the number of employees skipping work has doubled.

As a result, officers who report for duty often are working 16-hour shifts, and prison secretaries and janitors are being forced to patrol the halls and yards.

"All I have is pepper spray and a radio to call for help," said 52-year-old Opal Brown, who works as a secretary at Hazelton Federal Correctional Institution in West Virginia.

The FBI Agents Association said in a report Tuesday that the shutdown is hampering the ability of agents to perform their "duties and fund necessary operations and investigations."

USDA meat inspectors also have begun calling in sick—in numbers large enough to trigger an agency crackdown. The inspectors were told Jan. 11 to bring in a doctor's note, even if they were ill for a single day, records show.

Six days later, after protests from union leaders, agency officials reverted to existing policy, which calls for a doctor's note after three days.

Some front-line managers at the IRS have threatened their employees and said they could lose their jobs if they put in for the exemption, but Reardon, the union leader, said most have been instructed by senior management to approve the requests.

IRS employees are some of the most impactful federal workers caught in the middle of the shutdown, as the tax filing season begins and millions of Americans are expected to seek tax refunds in February. Last year, more than \$140 billion in tax refunds was paid out through early March, according to IRS data.

Trump has expressed an interest in making sure that tax refunds are paid out next month, believing that if they are delayed he could face major public backlash. His budget office took the unprecedented step this month of ordering thousands of unpaid IRS workers back to the office, saying that processing refunds was an "essential" government function even if the workers weren't paid.

As much as 75 percent of the roughly 4,000 furloughed IRS employees in Kansas City could qualify for hardship leave, said Christina Bennett, executive vice president of the local National Treasury Employees Union chapter. "Right now, they're being lenient," Bennett said.

Employees who process tax refunds, she said, are among the lowest-paid IRS workers. Some are worried about losing their cars.

Bennett, 63, who has worked nearly four decades at the IRS, most recently as an accountant, said she, too, can no longer afford her commute. She plans to request hardship leave if the government calls her back to work.

"I just don't have it," she said. "I'd have to walk a half-hour to get to a bus stop. And it's so cold. We've got rain, snow, rain, snow."

Sakeya Cooks, 24, another IRS worker who guides taxpayers through the refund process, said she might never report back to work. She already has applied for a new job at a Kansas City bank.

"How am I supposed to live like this?" she said. "I'm worried about losing my apartment."

John Koskinen, a former IRS commissioner, said federal employees are dedicated to the agency's mission but might be reaching their breaking point.

"As you put more and more pressure on the system, you increase the risk of a significant glitch," Koskinen said. "If I were the

administration, I'd be troubled. The pressure is going to mount."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I wasn't kidding when I said I was looking for the olive branch in what my friend had to say. I genuinely believe, if you look me and the gentleman from Massachusetts in a room together for 24, 48, maybe 72 or 96 hours, we could come to a solution and get us out of this box. But it does take sitting down with people that you trust to get a hard negotiation done.

I shared in the Rules Committee the other night, Mr. Speaker, and I will share with you today, the story of one of my constituents. His name is Doug Jenkins, and this is his story:

Jeanette Jenkins, age 76, of Lawrenceville, Georgia, passed away on Saturday, April 28, 2018. Jeanette was a member of Hebron Baptist Church for over 25 years and currently a member of First Baptist Church of Atlanta. Jeanette had a passion for serving in many capacities of the ministry, as a Sunday school teacher and volunteering in various activities. She was an avid reader and enjoyed sewing. She is survived by her loving husband of 57 years, Doug.

Jeanette didn't die of natural causes on April 28, Mr. Speaker. She was just running out to pick up some drugs at the drugstore. Her husband stayed at home. She was leaving the subdivision, waited for the light to turn green, and pulled out, when a van full of gentlemen who should not have been in this country, who were not in this country legally, ran that red light and killed her. She never recovered consciousness; died in the hospital later on that evening.

We can describe the President of the United States and his commitment to border security as a temper tantrum, but it is not true. We can describe the President of the United States and his commitment to border security as some sort of political fixation, but it is not true.

The stories that my friends tell about Federal employees missing paychecks, those are painful, those are hard, and we can do better. But the stories that each and every one of us have about members in our community who have lost loved ones, not for a week, not for 2 weeks, but forever, because we didn't do our job protecting American borders—I want to do better.

I was pleased to see the President talk about agricultural visas and how he wanted to expand those programs. It is important to us in Georgia. I am excited about EB visas, trying to get more investment in this country. We need more. I come from a community of immigrants. America's history is founded in immigration, and our future is founded there, too.

But nobody else could have protected Jeanette Jenkins. Nobody. My local law enforcement can't do it. My gov-

ernor can't do it. That responsibility falls to the national government and the national government alone. The President campaigned on it; the President was elected on it; and we have an opportunity to come together and do it.

I don't want to kick the can down the road for another year. I don't want to kick the can down the road for another decade. I don't want to have another Jenkins family come into my office and say: Rob, where were you? What did you do when you had an opportunity to make a difference?

I regret that we are in the box that we are in. It is a box of our own making. But we can get out of it, and we can make America better as a result of it. It doesn't have to be a lose-lose. It can be a win-win.

Nobody is winning today. Nobody has benefited by the shutdown today. I cannot negotiate by myself. The President cannot negotiate by himself. We need folks to say "yes" to the invitation. Take the gentleman from Michigan's advice: Ask your leadership, as we have asked ours, to lock yourself in that room together and don't come out until you have an answer.

My friend from Massachusetts says he has no preexisting stipulations about what the package has to look like. I hope that is true. It has not been my experience—stripping out all the pro-life provisions, for example. That was something that your conference wanted. Not working on the CFPB provisions that the Financial Services Committee had done, not including those 20 bipartisan bills, there are conditions that folks have, as they should, because they were elected to this House, and they are obligated to serve their constituents.

We can get this done, Mr. Speaker, but I commit to you, we are not going to get it done by pointing the finger of blame at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. We are going to get it done by coming together right here and doing our job, the task the Constitution assigns to us, and, that is, agreeing on a provision amongst ourselves and sending it to the President for him to accept or to reject.

I believe in what we can do together, Mr. Speaker, and I hope my colleagues will again take "yes" to an invitation to the negotiating table as an answer.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say, at the outset here, that if we all agree that the government should be reopened, then what is there to negotiate about? We should just open up the government.

We have no preconditions about opening up the government. We have none. The gentleman from Georgia apparently has a precondition: whatever the President's whim is on a particular day. Yeah, the President did campaign on building a wall, but he didn't get up there and say: We want to build a wall

and you pay for it, American taxpayers. What he campaigned on was saying: I want to build a wall, and Mexico is going to pay for it.

Well, he has had 2 years, and, obviously, he can't get Mexico to pay for it, so he wants to saddle the American taxpayers with that bill.

So, look, the bottom line is, we believe that border security is an important issue, and we, on this side, have been more than willing to invest in border security, and we are going to continue to do that.

As I mentioned before to the gentleman, President Trump's shutdown has put a strain on local and Federal law enforcement, undermining cooperation between them that helps keep our communities safe. While he is having his temper tantrum, you know, our local law enforcement officials are feeling the strain. That is why local law enforcement leaders across the country, including those serving in border States, are calling for an end to the shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter to President Trump and Members of Congress.

[From the Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force, Jan. 22, 2019]

LAW ENFORCEMENT LEADERS CALL FOR AN  
END TO SHUTDOWN

DEAR PRESIDENT TRUMP AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: As law enforcement leaders who support commonsense immigration reforms consistent with public safety, we write to express our deep concern with the partial shutdown of the federal government.

State and local law enforcement work constructively with federal law enforcement to combat drug trafficking, gangs, organized crime, and other threats. In addition, the federal government provides needed training, equipment, and funding to state and local law enforcement agencies—support that is now threatened by the ongoing shutdown. A prolonged shutdown threatens this cooperation and strains local resources. It also negatively impacts our colleagues in federal law enforcement, forcing essential law enforcement personnel to work without pay. These circumstances threaten public safety and cannot continue.

Instead, we call on Congress and the Trump administration to reopen the federal government without delay and work together on bipartisan solutions to improve our immigration system. We believe there is room for compromise.

While there are partisan disagreements over the need for a border wall across our entire southern border, there is widespread agreement over commonsense steps that can improve border security. A bipartisan deal can build on these areas of agreement, improving border security by focusing on ports of entry, strategically deploying and using technology and ensuring that CBP has clear sight lines all along the Rio Grande. With nearly 700 miles of physical barriers already in place along the southern border, these targeted investments in border security can contribute to improving public safety and reassuring the American people that the border is a priority.

Similarly, bipartisan immigration reform will benefit the United States as a whole. We believe that immigrants should feel safe in their communities and comfortable calling upon law enforcement to report crimes, serving as witnesses, and calling for help in



emergencies. By reforming our immigration system to bring undocumented immigrants into the legal immigration system, immigrants are incentivized to become constructive partners with local police in public safety initiatives. Bipartisan immigration reform can provide undocumented immigrants with an opportunity to earn citizenship, requiring them to pay a fine and back taxes and pass a background check, encouraging further civic responsibility. This would improve community policing and safety for everyone.

The current impasse is an opportunity for Congress and the Trump administration to strike a bipartisan agreement to end the shutdown and fix our immigration system. The shutdown prevents state and local law enforcement agencies from having access to needed federal resources, strains federal law enforcement personnel, and undermines cooperation between state, federal, and local law enforcement.

We urge Congress and the Trump administration to break this deadlock and improve public safety by reopening the government without delay and working to reach a bipartisan compromise that includes common-sense border security as part of a comprehensive reform of the immigration system.

Thank you.

Chief Art Acevedo, LEITF Co-Chair, Houston, TX; Chief J. Thomas Manger, LEITF Co-Chair, Montgomery County, MD; Executive Director Dwayne Crawford, National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE); Executive Director Chuck Wexler, Police Executive Research Forum (PERF); Chief Ramon Batista, Mesa, AZ; Chief Roy Bermudez, Nogales, AZ; Sheriff Tony Estrada, Santa Cruz County, AZ; Chief Chris Magnus, Tucson, AZ; Chief Steve Stahl, Maricopa, AZ; Chief Roberto Villaseñor, Retired, Tucson, AZ; Chief David Valentin, Santa Ana, CA; Sheriff Joe DiSalvo, Pitkin County, CO; Chief Dwight Henninger, Vail, CO; Chief Peter Newsham, Washington, DC; Chief Orlando Rolon, Orlando, FL; Sheriff Paul H. Fitzgerald, Story County, IA; Chief Wayne Jerman, Cedar Rapids, IA; Director of Public Safety Mark Prosser, Storm Lake, IA; Chief Mike Tupper, Marshalltown, IA; Sheriff John Idleburg, Lake County, IL.

Chief Michael Diekhoff, Bloomington, IN; Chief Scott Ruszkowski, South Bend, IN; Chief Ron Teachman, Retired, South Bend, IN; Chief James Hawkins, Retired, Garden City, KS; Commissioner William Gross, Boston, MA; Chief Brian Kyes, Chelsea, MA; Sheriff Kevin Joyce, Cumberland County, ME; Sheriff Jerry Clayton, Washtenaw County, MI; Chief Ron Haddad, Dearborn, MI; Chief Todd Axtell, Saint Paul, MN; Sheriff Mike Haley, Retired, Washoe County, NV; Chief Cel Rivera, Lorain, OH; Public Safety Commissioner Steven Pare, Providence, RI; Chief Fred Fletcher, Retired, Chattanooga, TN; Chief Frank Dixon, Denton, TX; Sheriff Ed Gonzalez, Harris County, TX; Chief Andy Harvey, Palestine, TX; Sheriff Sally Hernandez, Travis County, TX; Chief Mike Markle, Corpus Christi, TX; Sheriff Lupe Valdez, Retired, Dallas County, TX.

Chief Mike Brown, Salt Lake City, UT; Chief Chris Burbank, Retired/FBI National Executive Institute Associates President, Salt Lake City, UT; Sheriff Dana Lawhorne, Alexandria, VA; Chief Carmen Best, Seattle, WA; Sheriff Mitzi Johanknecht, King County, WA; Sheriff David J. Mahoney, Dane County, WI.

Mr. McGOVERN. "The New York Times" reported yesterday that the Trump shutdown has also impacted the FBI's efforts to crack down on child trafficking, violent crime, and terrorism, needlessly putting our commu-

nities and constituents at risk. I say to my friends: Look at what you are doing here. Look what is happening. This has to end.

For example, a long-term MS-13 investigation that has resulted in 23 gang indictments has been constrained because of the inability—get this—the inability to pay for interpreters needed to communicate with informants. That is insane, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, I include that article from *The New York Times* in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 22, 2019]

REPORT SAYS SHUTDOWN IS IMPEDING F.B.I.'S LAW ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS

(By Katie Benner)

WASHINGTON.—As the partial government shutdown enters its fifth week, the funding freeze has impeded F.B.I. efforts to crack down on child trafficking, violent crime and terrorism, according to a report issued Tuesday by the group that represents the bureau's 13,000 special agents.

"The resources available to support the work of F.B.I. agents are currently stretched to the breaking point and are dwindling day by day," said Thomas O'Connor, the president of the group, the F.B.I. Agents Association.

The report reflected the scope and seriousness of the shutdown's effects, and came as President Trump and the leaders of the two parties on Capitol Hill maneuvered to find a path out of the impasse. The Senate scheduled procedural votes for Thursday on competing Republican and Democratic proposals, although neither appears likely to win sufficient support to pass.

The Justice Department, which oversees the F.B.I., is one of the government agencies affected by the partial shutdown, along with the State Department, Transportation Department, Agriculture Department, Interior Department and others.

Mr. O'Connor said that national security was directly related to the bureau's financial security. "It is critical to fund the F.B.I. immediately," he said.

Because of the shutdown, the F.B.I. has been unable to issue grand jury subpoenas and indictments in several cases cited in the report.

An agent working on an MS-13 investigation that has gone on for more than three years and resulted in 23 gang indictments for racketeering, murder and money laundering has been hamstrung by his inability to pay for an interpreter who can communicate with his Spanish-speaking informants, the report said.

The bureau has also not been able to pay its informants, an important source of intelligence in terrorism, narcotics, gang, illegal firearm and other national security cases. The F.B.I. could lose those informants.

"It is not a switch that we can turn on and off," the report said.

The 72-page report described how field offices in some cases have run out of basic supplies like tires for vehicles, copy paper and forensic supplies like DNA swab kits, and do not have the funds to buy replacements.

The F.B.I. is not the only part of the Justice Department struggling during the funding lapse. The department has had to ask the federal courts to postpone some major civil litigation, including a lawsuit over the lawfulness of the Affordable Care Act, which the department no longer defends in court.

The federal courts that hear Justice Department cases are also running out of

money. The nation's legal system could soon be hobbled if Congress and the Trump administration cannot come to an agreement to reopen the portions of government that have been closed since last month. The federal courts will run out of money by around Feb. 1, requiring them to cut back to essential services at that point and furlough some workers.

The F.B.I. Agents Association has been warning of the negative effects of the shutdown for nearly two weeks.

On Jan. 10, the association and representatives from all of the F.B.I. field offices signed a petition that said the shutdown could create financial issues for agents that would make it hard for them to pass the routine financial background checks necessary for them to obtain certain security clearances. They also said the pay freeze would make it hard to retain and attract agents.

The latest report from the association, which is based on the accounts of scores of agents, outlines more dire consequences. The group allowed the agents to speak anonymously to protect them from retaliation and other negative repercussions.

Correction: Jan. 22, 2019—An earlier version of this article incorrectly described the F.B.I. Agents Association. It is a professional association, not a union.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, 40 million Americans struggle with hunger and food insecurity, and the Trump shutdown has needlessly made this terrible problem worse. Without funding for USDA in place, access to SNAP benefits for hungry families is threatened. Millions and millions of people will be affected.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a report from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities titled "Many SNAP Households Will Experience Long Gap Between Monthly Benefits Even If Shutdown Ends."

[From the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Jan. 22, 2019]

MANY SNAP HOUSEHOLDS WILL EXPERIENCE LONG GAP BETWEEN MONTHLY BENEFITS EVEN IF SHUTDOWN ENDS

(By Dorothy Rosenbaum)

The Administration and states' efforts to issue February Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, or food stamp) benefits early to avoid deep benefit cuts in that month that might otherwise have occurred as a result of the partial government shutdown have created a new problem: a lengthy delay between February benefits (which most beneficiaries received by January 20) and March benefits.

In turn, this will place additional strain on the emergency food network and other community resources, which already are stretched.

MOST HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING FEBRUARY SNAP BENEFITS IN JANUARY; MARCH SNAP BENEFITS REMAIN UNCERTAIN AND AT RISK

The Department of Agriculture (USDA) announced on January 8 that it would work with states to pay the vast majority of February SNAP benefits early, by January 20, to ensure that SNAP has the funding to stay open through February 2019. Despite the operational challenges of this approach, it appears that every state was able to issue benefits early, and in combination with SNAP's contingency reserve, there will be sufficient federal funding to cover all February SNAP benefits as a result.

These recent actions that USDA and states have taken protect millions of low-income households—including millions of poor children, parents, elderly people, and people with

disabilities—from having their basic food assistance cut back substantially in February. With a continuing shutdown, USDA would have to issue additional guidance to states explaining whether it has other options available to cover all of March benefits, or if not, how deep a benefit cut will be required in March and how states should implement it.

Ending the shutdown, and funding and reopening the Agriculture Department and other parts of the government that now are shuttered, would be the best way to avoid cutting millions of households' SNAP food assistance. For the remainder of this paper, we assume that SNAP will receive funding so that full SNAP benefits can continue in March and subsequent months—an assumption that is far from assured.

#### MANY HOUSEHOLDS WILL HAVE A LONG SNAP BENEFIT GAP EVEN IF THE SHUTDOWN ENDS

Some states may be able to adjust their March issuance schedules to partly address this issue, but if all states paid February SNAP benefits on January 20 and don't make changes to their March issuance schedules, we estimate that about 90 percent of SNAP households that receive ongoing SNAP benefits—about 15 million low-income households—will experience a more than 40-day gap between issuances. Almost 60 percent will experience a gap of more than 45 days, and 25 percent will experience more than a 50-day gap.

States have long had the option to pay SNAP benefits to different SNAP households on different days of the month. Spreading payments across multiple days eases state workloads across the month and helps to ensure that retailers that participate in SNAP do not face a severe increase in demand for food and staffing on the day that SNAP benefits become available. Any given household, however, must receive its SNAP benefits on or about the same day of the month, usually resulting in only 28 to 31 days between SNAP issuance dates. Only seven states issue SNAP to all households in the state on the first day of the month. Most others spread issuance out, often over ten or 20 days, and usually based on households' Social Security or case numbers or the first letter of the head of household's last name.

In fact, SNAP law requires that “no household experience an interval between issuances of more than 40 days. It is not clear whether USDA will waive this requirement in response to the unusual circumstances resulting from the shutdown—as seems likely—or whether the agency will require states to develop an alternative issuance schedule to avoid gaps of longer than 40 days. One possibility would be for states to change March issuance to occur on March 1, and to stagger the adjustment back to households' normal issuance cycle over several months, as needed to stay within the 40-day maximum interval between issuances.

#### HOUSEHOLDS IN ALMOST ALL STATES WILL SEE GAPS LONGER THAN 40 DAYS

The length of the gaps between February and March issuances will vary by state, but the vast majority will be longer than 40 days.

States where all households will have 40 days between SNAP issuances: Seven states, accounting for about 2 percent of SNAP issuances nationally, issue SNAP benefits to all households on the first day of the month. In these states, the gap for ongoing SNAP households that received the early February issuance on January 20 would be exactly 40 days, as households would receive their March benefits on March 1. Those states are: Alaska, Guam, Nevada, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Virgin Islands.

States where households will have 40–49 days between SNAP issuances: Another 21

states issue all (or almost all) of their ongoing SNAP benefits within the first ten days of the month. In these states, SNAP households will experience a 40- to 49-day gap in benefits. Those states are: California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

States where some households will have 50 days or more between SNAP issuances: About half the states have some households that will have more than 50 days between SNAP issuances if the states do not change their issuance schedules. In states that issue some SNAP benefits for ongoing SNAP households after the 10th day of the month, those households will have at least a 50-day gap; households that typically receive their benefits after the 15th day of the month will have a gap of 55 days or more. These households account for much of these states' ongoing SNAP benefits: in 17 states, 50 percent or more of benefits will be issued with at least a 50-day gap.

#### LONG PERIOD BETWEEN SNAP ISSUANCES WILL CAUSE HARDSHIP FOR SOME SNAP HOUSEHOLDS

Assuming SNAP has full funding to continue in March, SNAP households should have available the same total amount of SNAP benefits over the three-month period (January through March) that they otherwise would have. However, the change in the timing of February's issuance and the long interval between January 20 and a March SNAP issuance is likely to cause hardship for some households and, as a result, increase the demands for emergency food assistance and other community services.

It's well documented that SNAP benefits normally run out for most households before the end of the month. Within a week of receiving SNAP, households redeem over half of their SNAP allotments. By the end of the second week, SNAP households have redeemed over three-quarters of their benefits, and by the end of the third week they have redeemed 90 percent.

SNAP benefits are not intended to cover the entire month for most households. The SNAP benefit formula assumes that families will spend 30 percent of their available cash income for food. Many households spend their SNAP benefits quickly because they can only be spent on food. Cash income from other sources is needed to pay for other expenses, such as rent or mortgage, utilities, essential non-food items, clothing, gasoline, and car repairs. As a result, families use their SNAP benefits first to make food purchases, saving cash for other needed expenses.

Moreover, SNAP benefits are low. SNAP is intended to provide additional benefits to meet the cost of the Thrifty Food Plan (TFP), the Agriculture Department's estimate of a bare-bones, nutritionally adequate diet. But substantial research has found that the TFP, which currently provides at most \$1.85 per person per meal for a family of three (the average benefit is about \$1.40 per person per meal), is not sufficient to meet the needs of most low-income households.

Because SNAP benefits often fall short of meeting basic monthly food needs, and because struggling households have to use available cash to meet non-food expenses, families can find themselves at the end of their 30-day SNAP benefit payment cycle without enough food or the resources available to buy more food. Research has found that food spending, food consumption, and diet quality fall and that food insecurity, hospital admissions, and school disciplinary problems rise after households have ex-

hausted their monthly SNAP benefits. SNAP families often have to turn to social networks, food pantries, and others to get through the month.

Given the experience of the strain on low-income households' budgets and community resources under normal SNAP issuance patterns—when the gap between SNAP issuances is no more than 31 days—stretching that gap to 40 to 50 days or longer could create substantial hardship and hunger and sharply increase demand for local emergency food providers and other community social services providers.

Many SNAP households may find ways to weather this disruption. In general, households that participate in SNAP demonstrate a capacity to manage limited budgets. But extending the time between monthly benefit payments for the vast majority of SNAP households will certainly cause difficulty for some substantial number of poor families. Many families may not be able to budget the advance food-assistance benefit over an extended period of time for several reasons, including:

**Lack of information.** USDA, state officials, retailers, and state and local nonprofit groups and charities are working to educate SNAP households about the early issuance of February benefits and the fact that those households will not receive another issuance in February. States are urging households to factor the early payment and the delay until a March payment into their February food budget. But USDA did not require states to send SNAP households individual notices about the change in February benefits. Instead, states are trying to use newspaper stories, posts on their websites, fliers in local welfare offices, and their partners' networks to spread the news about the changes in the timing of SNAP benefit delivery. Many households likely won't understand that the benefits they received around January 20 are an early issuance of their February benefit and that a lengthy gap will ensue before they receive their next benefit insurance.

**Confusion and misinformation.** Reports are emerging that there is considerable confusion about why households are receiving early SNAP benefits for February and what to expect in the future, especially given the uncertainty resulting from the government shutdown. The confusion may result in some SNAP households spending their SNAP benefits relatively quickly, exacerbating their food shortages in the latter part of February and the first part of March.

**Household income fluctuations or unexpected expenses.** Households living with very low incomes experience shocks to their monthly income on a routine basis. Workers can see their hours and pay reduced with little warning. Individuals with monthly income below the poverty line rarely have savings to manage unexpected expenses. If their income drops or expenses spike unexpectedly during this timeframe, perhaps because of a high winter heating bill, households generally will use available cash to manage their non-food needs, leaving less money to buy food at the end of the SNAP payment cycle.

**Differing abilities among SNAP participants.** Even with advance warning and robust information, some SNAP households can struggle to manage a significant shift in their budget, particularly those with cognitive limitations. Managing a major monthly budget shift like this could be difficult for some individuals with mental impairments who do not receive assistance to manage their benefits.

#### CONCLUSION

Even if the government shutdown is resolved quickly, the disruption in the timing

of February SNAP benefits is likely to make it hard for many SNAP households to meet their basic food needs as they wait for their March SNAP benefit payment. Some 30 million people in about 15 million households—the vast majority of SNAP households—will not get their March benefit until at least 40 days after they received their February payment. Of these, 8 million people in more than 4 million households will need to wait more than 50 days. This benefit disruption will likely cause hardship for a substantial number of these households. We expect more households to try to turn to emergency food networks and other social services for help as they seek to stretch their benefits across more days.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The crisis already has started. Access to food for SNAP beneficiaries also is being threatened by the shutdown, as reports indicate that 2,500 retailers around the country are unable to take any form of SNAP EBT payments.

As PBS reported over the weekend, the licenses for these retailers are on hold due to the shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the transcript of the PBS story.

PBS NEWS HOUR: WHY MANY STORES CAN'T ACCEPT FOOD STAMPS DURING THE SHUTDOWN  
(Jan 17, 2019)

While so far there have been no major lapses in benefits for the nearly 39 million people who depend on food stamps amid the partial government shutdown, 2,500 retailers around the country are unable to take any form of SNAP EBT payments.

Judy Woodruff:

With the government shutdown now in its 27th day, many federal programs have been affected, including food stamps.

So far, there is no major lapse in benefits used by nearly 39 million people each month. That's because of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It found a way to pay SNAP benefits, as they are called, earlier than normal.

February benefits, awarded through a debit-style card used at stores, are being paid out this week. Several states, including California and Florida, are warning users to be careful and make sure they manage to make the money last longer.

For 2,500 retailers, the problem is already here. That's because those stores needed to renew a license for the Electronic Benefit Transfer, or EBT debit card program, and they failed to meet a deadline before the shutdown. Those renewals, required every five years, are on hold.

Sarah Jackson is an employee at one store in Northern Arkansas.

Sarah Jackson:

We have been completely unable to take any form of SNAP EBT payments. Grocery stores need a license to process EBT payments, and ours expired and was unable to be renewed on schedule because of the government shutdown.

Because of an argument about a wall, I have to look people in the eyes every day and tell them they can't pay for their food, for their children's food.

Judy Woodruff:

Sarah Jackson in Arkansas.

We reached out to the U.S. Department of Agriculture for a response. A spokesperson wrote back—quote—"Over 99 percent of SNAP retailers are able to accept benefits as usual. There is a small percentage of stores that failed to complete a required reauthorization process that was due on December 21. These stores can take steps to update their status once funding is restored"—end quote.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and on about the impacts here. If we all agree we should end the shutdown, let's just end the shutdown.

Maybe my Republican friends should be calling Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL to say, you know, let's come together and pass a bill to reopen the government without any conditions. That is what the American people overwhelmingly want.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard my friends on the other side of the aisle rushing to congratulate the President for his so-called compromise plan over the weekend. Let me repeat: This is no compromise at all. Just read the fine print.

The Washington Post said simply: "The proposal on the Dreamers was whittled down to the point where it only undoes the disaster Trump himself is orchestrating."

That would be like an arsonist offering you a fire extinguisher to put out the wildfire that they created. That is a compromise? Are you kidding me?

I have an idea. Mr. President, stop causing disasters. Congress should be more than a cleanup crew for your messes and failed policies.

Let me close with this, Mr. Speaker. When I think of the best of the United States, I think of the Statue of Liberty. It wasn't built from within our borders. It was gifted to us by friends from abroad, the French, to represent the freedom that we stand for, to welcome all those immigrants who come to this country, not to transport drugs or crime, as the President portrays, but to live a better life that they can find only here in the United States.

When President Trump thinks of the best of America, he dreams about a concrete wall, something to prevent immigrants from coming here, something that offends our allies, that would make our country, a global leader, turn away from the rest of the world at a time when American leadership is badly needed.

On top of all of that, a wall will not work. It would be ineffective. If we built a 50-foot wall, someone would build a 51-foot ladder.

As I said, it is a medieval idea when we have better solutions here in the 21st century: cameras, sensors, radar, and drones. If anyone doubts that they work, go visit the border, as I have.

Democrats are for border security. The minibus includes \$328 million in new funding to help secure the border. This is what professionals are asking us for. A concrete wall is being discussed as a viable option only at the President's rallies and in the right-wing media.

Here in the real world, hundreds of thousands of people are struggling. They need us to reopen the government today, right now, not years from now, as the President has suggested.

These bipartisan, bicameral bills will get us there. This continuing resolution to fund the Department of Homeland Security will get us there. Let's

end this shutdown and reopen this government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.J. Res. 28;

Adoption of House Resolution 61; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

#### FURTHER ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of January 17, 2019, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 28) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 184, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—229

Adams	Bustos	Connolly
Aguilar	Butterfield	Cooper
Allred	Carbajal	Correa
Axne	Cárdenas	Costa
Barragán	Carson (IN)	Courtney
Bass	Case	Cox (CA)
Beatty	Casten (IL)	Craig
Bera	Castor (FL)	Crist
Beyer	Castro (TX)	Crow
Bishop (GA)	Chu, Judy	Cuellar
Blumenauer	Cicilline	Cummings
Blunt Rochester	Cisneros	Cunningham
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	Davids (KS)
Boyle, Brendan	Clarke (NY)	Davis (CA)
F.	Clay	Davis, Danny K.
Brindisi	Cleaver	Dean
Brown (MD)	Clyburn	DeFazio
Brownley (CA)	Cohen	DeGette