

Steil	Upton	Wenstrup
Steube	Wagner	Westerman
Stewart	Walberg	Williams
Stivers	Walden	Wilson (SC)
Taylor	Walker	Wittman
Thompson (PA)	Walorski	Womack
Thornberry	Waltz	Woodall
Timmons	Watkins	Wright
Tipton	Weber (TX)	Yoho
Turner	Webster (FL)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—21

Abraham	Gibbs	McNerney
Budd	Graves (MO)	Payne
Carter (TX)	Hartzler	Rogers (AL)
Cartwright	Himes	Rooney (FL)
Cicilline	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Doggett	LaHood	Wilson (FL)
Gaetz	Marshall	Young

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1048

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote on the passage of H.J. Res. 31 during the last vote series. I oppose the bill and would have voted “nay.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, 2019, I was unable to be present for the vote on the motion to recommit on H.J. Res. 31, offered by Rep. GRANGER of Texas. Had I been present for roll call No. 50, I would have voted “nay.”

I was also unable to be present for the vote on passage of H.J. Res. 31, offered by Rep. LOWEY of New York. Had I been present for roll call No. 51, I would have voted “aye.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 23, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, I hereby resign effective January 23, 2019 as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

It has been my sincere privilege to serve on the Committee during the 115th Congress. I want to thank you Madame Leader and Chairman Scott for the opportunity to represent my constituents in New York’s 13th Congressional District and my colleagues on

the Committee for their hard work and support.

Sincerely,

ADRIANO ESPAILLAT,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 23, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Thank you for appointing me to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I am writing you to formally ask to resign from the House Committee on Education and Labor during the 116th Congress. I would like to take leave from and reserve my right to return to the House Education and Labor Committee in a future term.

Thank you for your leadership, and I look forward to working together to preserve the health of our democracy and strengthen economic prosperity for hardworking Americans across the country.

Warm regards,

RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHI,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 73

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Moulton, Mr. Jeffries, Mr. Khanna, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Higgins of New York, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Panetta, Mr. Morelle, Mr. Horsford, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Ms. Jackson Lee, Ms. Lee of California, Ms. Jayapal, and Ms. Omar.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR: Mrs. Trahan and Mr. Castro of Texas.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Costa, Mr. Sablan, Mr. Huffman, Mr. Lowenthal, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Cox of California, Mr. Neguse, Mr. Levin of California, Ms. Haaland, Mr. Van Drew, Mr. Cunningham, Ms. Velázquez, Ms. DeGette, Mr. Clay, Mrs. Dingell, Mr. Brown of Maryland, Mr. McEachin, Mr. Soto, Mr. Case, Mr. Horsford, and Mr. San Nicolas.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Cohen (to rank immediately after Mr. Sherman).

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Ms. Finkenauer, Mr. Golden, Mr. Kim, Mr. Crow,

Ms. Davids of Kansas, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Mr. Veasey, Mr. Evans, Mr. Schneider, Mr. Espaillat, Mr. Delgado, and Ms. Houlahan.

Mr. JEFFRIES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 74

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Woodall, Mr. Johnson of Ohio, Mr. Smith of Missouri, Mr. Flores, Mr. Holding, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Norman, Mr. Roy, Mr. Meuser, Mr. Timmons, Mr. Crenshaw, Mr. Kevin Hern of Oklahoma, and Mr. Burchett.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Young, Mr. Gohmert, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Wittman, Mr. McClintock, Mr. Gosar, Mr. Cook, Mr. Westerman, Mr. Graves of Louisiana, Mr. Hice of Georgia, Mrs. Radewagen, Mr. Webster of Florida, Ms. Cheney, Mr. Johnson of Louisiana, Miss González-Colón of Puerto Rico, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Kevin Hern of Oklahoma, and Mr. Fulcher.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mrs. Radewagen, Mr. Kelly of Mississippi, Mr. Balderson, Mr. Kevin Hern of Oklahoma, Mr. Hagedorn, Mr. Stauber, Mr. Burchett, Mr. Spano, and Mr. Joyce of Pennsylvania.

Ms. CHENEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend and the majority leader of the House, for the purpose of inquiring as to the schedule for next week.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour debate. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the

House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspensions will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

Members are advised that additional legislative items are possible, including additional legislation related to fiscal year 2019 appropriations.

I want to make it clear to Members that when we leave today or tomorrow, we will leave with the notice to Members that they are subject to being asked to come back Saturday, Sunday, Monday morning, or any day thereafter, if there is a possibility of opening up the Government of the United States, so that it can serve the American people.

Mr. SCALISE. As we, Mr. Speaker, work to reopen the government and to secure the border, clearly, there has been a divide on the other side. We were trying to get some kind of agreement on how much the majority is willing to work with us on, to put an offer on the table.

If you look, Mr. Speaker, last week on Saturday, the President of the United States addressed the Nation and laid out a new proposal. And, Mr. Speaker, what the President laid out was not only a proposal that reopens the government and secures the border, but also offered the suggestion that DACA could be a part of this negotiation, at least to start working on some kind of solution on DACA.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, we were just talking about the request from the Department of Homeland Security, the \$5.7 billion that was requested by the people who risk their lives to keep our country safe. Their request, Mr. Speaker, was that is how much it was going to cost to secure the border.

So far, we have not seen a single counteroffer from the majority. In fact, when the President spoke to the Nation at 4:07 p.m., before the President even walked to the microphone at 4:07 p.m., at 4 p.m., the Speaker of the House had already put out a statement opposing the plan that hadn't even been presented.

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to ask the majority leader is, if we are trying to get a resolution and if the President continues to try to lay out alternatives, if the President's latest alternative wasn't even offered until 4:07 p.m., why did the Speaker of the House already reject it before it was even presented? Is there an actual desire to work together to solve the problem, or is the answer going to continue to be no alternative, no alternative?

At some point, we have to get an agreement on how to solve this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me make very clear that which ought to be very clear: We believe the President of the United States, with the aiding and abetting of the majority leader of the United States Senate, has taken the Government of the United States hostage, and the President of the United States is asking for ransom, and that ransom is to accept his policy or go home and stay shut down.

I will tell the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that I have been in this body for a long time. I am in my fourth decade. I have never supported shutting down the Government of the United States.

Now, the gentleman may point out that I have voted from time to time against bills that would have opened it up because of things that were in the bills and these bills passed the House of Representatives when you were in charge. They did not pass the Senate, of course.

□ 1100

I believe that shutting down the people's government is an unacceptable—unacceptable—tactic in a democracy when one is discussing differences that need to be resolved. Unacceptable.

Furthermore, as I said on the floor the other day, Mr. Speaker, I can find no free government in the world that shuts itself down, other than the United States of America. Now, we have a relatively unique system of government.

But I will tell my friend that we are for border security. We have supported bills that affected border security. During our tenure, there was more border security fencing, I will tell the gentleman, constructed than when they had been in charge over the last 8 years. Look at the record.

But the issue is, we are not going to negotiate at the point of a gun, which is shutting down the Government of the United States, affecting 800,000 of our employees.

Some of you say: I run a business. I am a businessman.

Well, if you are a car company, or you are a real estate company, or you are a contractor, or whatever you may do, can you tell your employees: I am going to have you work, but by the way, I am not going to pay you.

Mr. Speaker, we want to negotiate. We want to get this resolved, but we are not going to pretend this is business as usual. This is the longest shutdown in history, and the other side has consistently voted against every bill that we have offered to open up government.

Now, the other side offered a bill where they want to pay employees while they don't work. I voted against that. I think the taxpayer deserves to have his employees or her employees working, and, yes, he should pay them and she should pay them for working, not some stopgap measure to pretend that somehow we are lessening the consequences of a shutdown, in light of a consistent, overwhelming vote on the

other side of the aisle to keep government shut down.

I tell my friend, he voted against Boehner, when he was the Speaker of the House, requesting to open up the government. Maybe he believes, Mr. Speaker, that shutting down the government is good policy, good practice, the way to treat your employees. I emphatically reject such a premise.

When the gentleman asked me if will we negotiate, I am pretty proud of my reputation, having negotiated with George H.W. Bush a major piece of legislation that was very controversial, the Americans with Disabilities Act, negotiating in league with ROY BLUNT, one of the gentleman's predecessors on his side of the aisle; and Jay Rockefeller and Senator Kit Bond from Missouri to get FISA, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which was a very controversial issue, resolved, with Democratic and Republican support, and President George W. Bush signed that bill.

So anybody who knows my reputation knows that I am prepared to sit down and come to agreement, because that is what you need to do in a democracy. I won't get everything I want; you won't get everything you want.

But the fact of the matter is, as long as government is shut down, we are not going to have business as usual.

I remind the gentleman that his side was in charge last year and went 11 months and 20 days and didn't bring a Homeland Security bill to the floor of this House—11 months and 20 days. It was in the waning 10 days of the year when his majority brought a bill to the floor that they knew wouldn't pass the Senate.

We have passed Senate bills that would open up the government. We have sent simple CRs with no controversy to them that would have opened up the government. We have sent 10 different bills, 11 different bills. The 12th lost on suspension, because their side voted against it.

So I tell my friend, I am prepared to negotiate. I am prepared to negotiate in good faith. I will tell the gentleman, the Speaker of this House is prepared to do the same, and our Members are prepared to do the same.

There are significant, strong differences. We differ on whether the wall is an effective way to keep the border secure. But we agree on a number of other things.

When the gentleman and I were down at the White House, for instance, the magnetic resonance of trucks and vehicles that are carrying contraband, drugs, guns, and other material that we don't want to come into the United States, we can agree on that. We can agree on much, I think, of border security.

That was a long answer to the gentleman's question, but until we open up government, it is not going to be business as usual, until we open up government and put those 800,000 people back to work. I represent 62,000 of them.

Now, not all of them are laid off, because we funded some portions of government. But a significant number of them are, and they are hurting.

A TSA agent comes in at \$28,000 per year. We make substantially more than that, and they are living paycheck to paycheck. Tomorrow, they are not going to get a paycheck. But they have been told by their government they have to work, and because they are conscientious, patriotic Americans, they are working. But you can't expect them to work much longer. We can't expect people to work when they are not getting paid, when they are not getting respected, when they are not getting treated as we would want to be treated ourselves.

So I say to the gentleman, in answer to his question, we are prepared to discuss and negotiate and compromise, but not in the face of this shutdown.

I would hope that it would end. It is the wrong policy. It is a cruel policy. It is hurting America. It is hurting our economy. It is hurting our reputation around the world. And it is hurting our people who work for us.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman uses terms like "hostages." The gentleman uses terms like "ransom." I was in those meetings in the White House with the gentleman from Maryland and the Speaker of the House. In fact, in our third meeting—by the way, in all three meetings, not one time did the Speaker of the House put any alternative on the table.

President Trump isn't the one who said: I need \$5.7 billion to secure the border.

Our experts, our experts at the Department of Homeland Security, who risk their lives to keep our country safe, said it is going to take \$5.7 billion to secure the border.

We can all talk about border security, Mr. Speaker. At some point, you have to be willing to put the dollars behind the rhetoric. So when the Department, Mr. Speaker, says we need \$5.7 billion, if your side thinks that there is some lesser amount that it is going to take to keep our country safe, then put the amount of money on the table. So far, the only offer that has been put on the table by the Speaker of the House, she said a dollar, and she laughed about it, a dollar. That is the only offer that has been put on the table. It is not a joking matter, by the way. And a dollar is not going to secure America's border. So what amount will the other side agree to?

The President of the United States looked at the Speaker and said: Okay, I will tell you what, we disagree on a lot of this, but I will agree to keep the government open, even with the things I disagree with, for the next 30 days, if, at the end of that 30 days, you are willing to negotiate with me on the wall and the border security.

The Speaker of the House said no. She said no to that offer from the President. She wants to keep everybody hostage. She wants to keep the pay of workers hostage.

In fact, now the Speaker of the House wants to keep the State of the Union hostage. How ludicrous is that? George Washington, in 1790, addressed a joint session of Congress. They were meeting in New York back then. George Washington addressed a joint session of Congress.

This is a constitutional requirement of the President. Historically, for generations now, every single year, for generations—Republican Speaker, Democrat Speaker, Republican President, Democrat President—the Speaker of the House has invited the President to give a State of the Union.

In fact, that agreement and that offer went out on January 3. The Speaker sent a letter to the President, inviting him to come here in this Chamber and address the State of the Union next Tuesday, and the President accepted that offer. And the Speaker of the House this time, for the first time in the history of our country, rescinded the offer, took it back. She doesn't want the people in this country to hear what the President has to say about the security of this country.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of the House doesn't want the country to hear the President's message, but do you know what? The people of this country want to hear the President's message and deserve that opportunity. So who is holding whom hostage?

Look at some of the votes. We had a vote today on the House floor to pay everybody, to pay everybody who has worked or who has been furloughed. Those people who are securing our border today without pay, they ought to get paid. We had a vote on the House floor, and we almost got there: 200–214. Mr. Speaker, every Republican voted yes; 13 Democrats voted yes. Last week, only six Democrats voted yes.

The good news is, Mr. Speaker, a growing number of Democrats are recognizing they have to be willing to work to solve this problem and pay people who have worked. So we have had those votes on the House floor.

The gentleman talks about opening government. The gentleman talks about bills they have brought to the House floor that we voted against. The gentleman talks about the Senate bills that were passed. At the beginning, the first week of this new majority, when they brought a bill to the floor to fund what was so-called, or presented as, the Senate bills, some of those bills had passed the Senate, Mr. Speaker, but not all of them. In fact, one of those bills would not have passed the Senate because it would have allowed taxpayer funding to go to foreign government entities that provide abortion.

So let's get this right, Mr. Speaker, and let the RECORD reflect that the other side was willing to bring a bill to the floor a few weeks ago that allows taxpayer money to go to fund abortion in foreign countries, but they wouldn't put a dime of money in that bill to secure America's border. There was not a dime of money from the President's re-

quest to secure America's border, but taxpayer money went to fund abortions in foreign countries. That was in that bill.

Sure, I voted no on that, because those are not the values of this country. Let's be serious about this.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to talk about what it will take to resolve it, I think the gentleman from Maryland and I could come to an agreement. So far, for whatever reason, the Speaker has been unwilling to put a counteroffer on the table.

When you have a negotiation, when two sides are apart—frankly, I don't know why we are apart on this. It is not the President's number. The \$5.7 billion request is from the people who are risking their lives to keep our country safe. If they say that is what they need, we ought to take them at their word.

And if we disagree with them, if we disagree, Mr. Speaker, then at least show what their offer is, what their amount of money is, and put that on the table and back it up with something.

If they say the wall is the issue, maybe it is personal, maybe it is because President Trump wanted it. Back in 2006, CHUCK SCHUMER voted for the Secure Fence Act, which would have authorized \$50-plus billion to build fencing, which, in essence, is a lot of what the Department is asking for today. If he was authorizing \$50 billion—by the way, they didn't put any money behind it.

Again, it is always good to give the Fourth of July speech and say you are for something. Unless you are willing to put the money behind it, you are not there.

So he said \$50 billion was okay for fencing, but, today, he is not willing to put a dollar behind, in essence, fencing, or whatever you want to call it.

The President said he is willing to negotiate and let you ban a cement wall. The President said he is willing to do that. Right now, the experts are saying steel slats are the best approach.

The majority leader himself, just a few days ago, said, "Physical barriers are part of the solution." I think we are making headway. The majority leader agrees that physical barriers are part of the solution, maybe because the Speaker is saying that walls are immoral. In some strange way, people who build a house, you could build the strongest door in the world—and I agree, the gentleman from Maryland and I agree on enhancing port security, and the points of entry.

We have points of entry all around our country. If you want to come here and seek asylum, if you want to come here and just be a part of the American Dream, like more than a million people a year who we let in, we have that. And we need to bulk that up. There is a lot more we can do with technology there.

But you don't put a door in your house and then leave the windows

open. Who would do that? Who would call that security of your house?

What the President is saying is, we have more than 500 miles of area in our country that is not secure. So you have a big door, and we are going to strengthen the door. But if you are going to leave 500 miles wide open, you are going to wonder why people are coming in illegally.

If we are for border security, it is going to take something to actually back that up. I would ask the gentleman: What amount is the majority willing to put on the table for real border security, which includes a physical barrier? And I quote the gentleman again: “Physical barriers are part of the solution.”

□ 1115

And I agree with the gentleman from Maryland on that. But I guess maybe the question I have is: The experts have told us it is going to cost \$5.7 billion to build that physical barrier. How much of that \$5.7 billion is the gentleman willing to support?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

The gentleman, of course, just voted against funding the Department of Homeland Security, as did his colleagues.

The gentleman proudly said that all of his colleagues—and not all of his colleagues voted against it—but he voted against opening up the Department of Homeland Security. He voted against paying the personnel in Department of Homeland Security. Yet, he cites them as experts who have given us advice, and why don’t we follow that advice.

But, Mr. Speaker, the minority party doesn’t have enough respect for them to open up the government, open up the Department of Homeland Security, pay the people who are protecting our border, pay the people who are processing paperwork for those border security guards, pay the people who are answering the phones, pay the people whom we ask to protect our borders, and then laments that somehow we are not coming up with a number.

Open up this government, Mr. Speaker.

And, yes, I used the word, “hostage”; and, yes, I used the word, “ransom.” And, yes, I believe there are two people, and a lot of complicit people, with this government being shut down and with the pain and suffering that we are imposing on our employees. Anybody who thinks Democrats are responsible for that doesn’t know what is happening.

I am very concerned about the President being able to communicate with the American people. The historic, greatest tweeter of all time. You can’t get away from hearing what the President has to say, every morning, every afternoon, and every evening. He has plenty of time.

And, by the way, the President said: Yes, I am not going to give the State of

the Union until the government is open. He just said that, just a few hours ago.

Open up this government.

And for anybody who watches the votes on this floor, watched that we voted unanimously to open up DHS; we voted unanimously to open up the other departments of government; we voted unanimously to make sure that the people are being served by their government agencies.

And, Mr. Speaker, again, I understand Mr. SCALISE and I have a difference. When the Speaker of the House John Boehner brought a bill to the floor when the government was shut down to open it up, Mr. SCALISE voted “no”; and the other person who voted “no” is Mr. Mulvaney, who is now the chief of staff.

I get that. They think shutting down the government is not a bad option to try to force the other side to agree with them or to pay their ransom.

Yes, I use those words. And, actually, if either one of us adopts that as an acceptable alternative in the negotiation process, this country is in real trouble—real trouble.

And so we ought to open up the government, and then, yes, we can sit down, and, yes, we will resolve this.

But my friend’s great angst—he did not mention why it took them 11-2/3 months while they were in charge last year. They didn’t offer a bill until they were about to walk out the door and be the minority. Mr. Speaker, 11 months and 20 days, no Homeland Security bill was brought to this floor. I don’t know why. My supposition is they didn’t have the votes, but I wasn’t counting on their side.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to probably 37 or 38 States of the Union. Never was the government shut down. This shutdown is not only of historic length, it is of historic irresponsibility and historic danger to our country, to our people, to our national security, and to our economy.

Let’s vote to open up this government, and then let’s resolve the differences that we have in the way democracies resolve differences: by discussion, by debate, and by votes.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let’s reflect on why we are here.

We are here because the President said we have a difference of agreement on parts of government. We negotiated over the course of months to fund 75 percent of our government.

The good news, Mr. Speaker, is that the vast majority of our government has been funded, including our troops. Our military are being paid. We were able to come to an agreement there.

The bad news is, Mr. Speaker, we were not able to come to an agreement over the remaining 25 percent. And people around the country, I am sure, wonder: Why can’t they work it out?

And I think, Mr. Speaker, you just saw a display of why this can’t be worked out. Because, Mr. Speaker, the

President of the United States got a request from his Homeland Security officials, people who risk their lives to keep our country safe. They said, Mr. Speaker: It is going to take \$5.7 billion to give us the tools we need to secure our border.

And I asked the gentleman just a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, once again, how much are you willing to support if you won’t support the \$5.7 billion? The entire time, not once did the gentleman from Maryland give a number—not once.

If the gentleman would give a number, I would yield, but there are a lot of other things that he said that need to be corrected that I want to also address.

Is the gentleman willing to give a number over \$1, which is the Speaker’s number? \$5.7 billion, \$1. Is he willing to give some number more than \$1 that would secure the border?

Mr. Speaker, I yield if the gentleman would give that answer.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, these CRs carry forward the spending in 2018. The CRs the gentleman voted against. They have \$1.6 billion in them. He voted “no.”

And would the gentleman tell me why he didn’t bring a bill to the floor for 11 months and 20 days that would have done what he says is such important work to be done? Can he tell me why he waited 11 months and 20 days to bring a bill to the floor?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to tell the gentleman.

I think the gentleman knows, one of the dilemmas we have been facing with negotiations is that the Senate has a 60-vote requirement. The Senate had that 60-vote requirement back when you all were in the majority last time. When we were in the majority, they had that 60-vote requirement as well.

When we were negotiating all of those bills, all the bills that fund our government, we were able to get an agreement on 75 percent of government funding. We had that negotiation with the Senate. We can’t just negotiate with ourselves.

As you see, you can pass bills in the House and they go nowhere in the Senate. We brought a bill in December—and, by the way, the gentleman from Maryland said we didn’t have the votes, that is why we didn’t do it. The Speaker of the House went into the Oval Office and told the President: Your side can’t deliver the votes for the \$5.7 billion. She said that.

Well, guess what, Mr. Speaker. We did deliver the votes for the \$5.7 billion, and we were able to do that all along, but the Senate wasn’t there. And why wasn’t the Senate there? The Senate Republicans were willing to support that, but Senate Democrats weren’t. It is the same dilemma we are in today. The Senate Democrats and House Democrats have refused to negotiate with the President.

I think the gentleman from Maryland knows the legislative process. He has

been here enough to know you can't just pass a bill out of the House, and you can't just pass a bill out of the Senate. You have to reconcile the two bills. And even then, you need a bill that the President will sign.

So the legislative process has to play out. It played out for 75 percent of the government, and it is funded. We never got that agreement on the remaining amounts.

We proved to the Speaker and to the President we could deliver the votes to pass the bill to fund the \$5.7 billion. The problem has been that this majority, the Democratic majority in the House and the Democratic minority in the Senate have refused to negotiate. They have refused to put a dollar amount.

If the gentleman is willing to start at \$1.3 billion—by the way, that \$1.3 billion had strings attached, important strings that limited our ability to actually secure the border. In those strings, Mr. Speaker, they actually told the President where he can and can't build wall.

So our security experts are saying, for example, we need to build wall around the Rio Grande. That is where a lot of people are bringing drugs and human trafficking across our country. And yet law says you can't build it there. How ridiculous is that?

So, in our legislation that we passed, we removed that limitation. Why should we be micromanaging the experts who risk their lives and telling them they can't do the things it takes to support the border? That was in our bill.

Current law also prohibits what kind of security, what kind of physical barriers—to use the gentleman's term—can or can't be used. And so our experts say there are some physical barriers that don't work.

Why would you want to spend \$1.3 billion of taxpayer money to build things that won't actually work when you can spend the money to build things that actually do work? And again, these aren't the President's designs. These are the experts who risk their lives, who said: This is what we need.

So, yes, Mr. Speaker, we weren't able to get an agreement with the Senate over that 25 percent. We proved we could put the votes together in the House to do it. The Senate couldn't pass the bill. So, ultimately, there was nothing that got to the President's desk on those remaining items, so the President convened us.

The President got all the principals together, Mr. Speaker, and in three different meetings in the White House, not one time—not one time—was a single dollar amount put on the table by the Democrats in the room—not once. So then you can look at other votes, you can look at other plans.

So the President said: Well, if the Speaker of the House won't negotiate, maybe I will bring in other Democrats.

And, by the way, it is a growing list of Democrats who are starting to say we need to address this problem.

I will read from the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, Mr. COLLIN PETERSON, Democrat from Minnesota: "Give Trump the money. . . . I'd give him the whole thing . . . and put strings on it so you make sure he puts the wall where it needs to be. Why are we fighting over this? We're going to build that wall anyway, at some time."

Representative ADAM SMITH, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee: "The wall is not in itself a bad idea, it's just—it's been done."

Representative CHERI BUSTOS from Illinois: "If we have a partial wall, if we have fencing, if we have technology used to keep our borders safe, all of that is fine"

So we see a growing list of rank-and-file Democrats, and even committee chairmen, who are saying let's just do this, and yet the Speaker refuses to do it.

So the President invited some members of the Democratic majority in the House to the White House. The first meeting, Mr. Speaker, some of them didn't even show up. And we want to talk about civility?

We are in a shutdown, and the President of the United States says: I want to bring some Democrats in to see if we can resolve this. Then they don't even show up. And maybe they were told not to go.

So a few days later, the President invites a different group, and in that group we actually did have some Members that went.

The gentleman from Maryland, that day, was on a TV show, and he said—when they were asked do those Democrats who are going to the White House have the authority to negotiate, the majority leader of the House said they do not have the authority to strike a deal.

So now the Democratic majority is telling other Democrats who want to solve the problem and are going to the White House to try to solve the problem, he is telling them they don't have the authority to solve the problem.

So if the gentleman from Maryland is telling other Democrats they don't have the authority to strike a deal, I would ask the gentleman: Who does have the authority to strike a deal?

He is saying that physical borders are part of the solution. The Speaker of the House doesn't necessarily share that view, from the comments I have heard from her.

But if the gentleman from Maryland thinks physical borders are part of the solution, other Democrats want to negotiate a solution, who is authorized? Who does have the authority to strike a deal?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

□ 1130

Mr. HOYER. Let me first say that Mr. SCALISE and his party over the last 8 years that they were in charge passed bill after bill after bill after bill that

they knew without any doubt they had no chance in the United States Senate—none, zero, zip. They passed them for message. They knew that, we knew that, and America knew that. So that is not the reason they didn't bring the bill that they talk now so passionately about to the floor for 11 months and 20 days. They only brought it as they were going out the door.

Let me tell you what they rejected, Mr. Speaker. They rejected a bill from the United States Senate which would have opened up government and paid all 800,000 of the people who are now either furloughed or asked to work without pay. They rejected that bill that passed overwhelmingly and unanimously on voice vote from the United States Senate that the President of the United States was said, by the Vice President of the United States, to support.

But something happened during those 24 hours as it came from the Senate to the House. A bill that passed the Senate, they rejected that bill, the Republicans in this House, and then they, and only then, did they bring a bill which they knew would not pass the Senate. Talk about negotiation and compromise, and you have done that over and over and over, Mr. Speaker—not you but the Republican majority.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you who sent it over here: Senator MITCH McCONNELL of Kentucky, the Republican leader of the United States Senate.

Let me quote Senator McCONNELL in a CNN report:

In his strongest words to date, Senate GOP leader Mitch McConnell, Republican of Kentucky, tried to quash talk that he would allow another government shutdown if he becomes Senate majority leader next year.

What was his response? "'Of course not. Remember me? I am the guy that gets us out of shutdowns,' McCONNELL told CNN in an exclusive interview Wednesday.

Then he went on to say: "'It's a failed policy,' he said of shutdowns."

Now, sadly, in league with the Republican minority here in the House of Representatives and the President of the United States, he has done exactly the opposite of what he said he would do. He hasn't opened up, he has shut down government.

The minority whip is correct, Mr. Speaker. We are not going to pretend that this is business as usual as long as we have 800,000 of our employees—some working, some not—not being paid and not being treated with respect because it is a tactic that they have adopted. And I tell my friend again: it must be a tactic he believes in because he voted against his own Republican Speaker and the majority leader who is now the Republican leader who voted and urged Members: vote to open up this government.

Now, he was not alone in that vote. There were 143 other Republicans. Only 87 voted to open up the government. So apparently he believes this is a tactic

that is acceptable in a democratic government. We reject that emphatically and proudly.

We have passed bill after bill after bill after bill that would open up this government, and Mr. SCALISE, Mr. Speaker, and his colleagues have almost to a person—not always unanimously—rejected that effort.

So I tell my friend: open up the government and we will talk, but we are not going to talk while you hold hostage the employees of this government—not all of them, but 800,000 of them—who are worried about whether they can put food on the table.

There are food lines. Our people at food lines—public employees—do we have no shame?

Do we have no moral commitment to those whom we ask to work to protect this country and to serve these people?

What is it that the President and his party refuse to open up the government?

This is historic. Never in the history—he talked about going back to George Washington in 1799—has this ever happened before that we kept the government shut down. The longest before that, of course, was the Republican shutdown of 2013.

It is not a tactic I tell my friend that we accept. We reject it emphatically, and we are not going to subject ourselves tomorrow to the same kind of blackmail or the day after to the same kind of blackmail or the day after that to the same kind of blackmail.

I will tell my friend: we will have a Democratic President at some point in time. And he ought to reject this tactic as well because it is bad for the government. Much more importantly, it is bad for the people of this country, the economy of our country, and the national security of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing else to say.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, once again, we are in a government shutdown. I could clearly argue that the gentleman from Maryland voted to shut the government down in December before we had hit an expiration of funding. Before there was a shutdown, we had a bill to fund government and secure the border. My friend can say it was dead on arrival in the Senate. The reason it was dead on arrival in the Senate is because Senate Democrats refused to negotiate over securing the border.

So here we are. We could talk about 2013. We are in 2019, and we are in the middle of a government shutdown that could end tomorrow. The majority just voted to adjourn again. Literally—and here is the quote my friend just said—the gentleman from Maryland said: “We are not going to talk until the government is open.”

So during the shutdown, the gentleman is not going to negotiate how to get out of a shutdown.

The gentleman wonders why people look and say: why can’t you figure it out?

The President has offered idea after idea, and eventually you are negotiating against yourself when the other side says: we are not going to talk until we get everything we want.

Well, do you know what, Mr. Speaker? In divided government, Mr. Speaker, nobody gets everything they want, but you have to start talking today. The 800,000 people who are working or not working and not getting paychecks—which, by the way, we voted again today to pay all of them, we had a vote on the House floor to pay all of them, and we got 13 Democrats to vote for that. Last week it was only six. A growing number of Democrats are recognizing stop all this foolishness of saying: we are not going to talk to you when the President is trying to talk. We are going to reject your offer before you put it on the table. At 4 o’clock Saturday the Speaker rejected an offer that wasn’t even proposed until 4:07.

So to say: we are not going to talk while we are in the shutdown, how do we get out of the shutdown unless people are talking?

I think the gentleman from Maryland and I could solve this problem. He quoted: Physical barriers are part of the solution.

I agree with the gentleman from Maryland on that. Unfortunately, the Speaker of the House doesn’t agree with that. So rank-and-file Democrats who want to solve this problem are invited to the White House, but told by the Democrat leadership: you are not authorized to negotiate.

So I ask the gentleman from Maryland: Who is authorized to negotiate? And the gentleman from Maryland says: we are not going to talk until the government is back open.

But the government is not open because we are at an impasse, and the way you solve an impasse is to talk. You can’t say: “We are not going to talk” and expect it just to solve itself and expect the President just to keep offering and offering and offering and the Speaker of the House say: we are not even going to let you come talk to the country; we are not going to let you have a State of the Union; my way or the highway.

That is not how you solve this problem. You have to talk to solve this problem. The country expects you to talk to solve this problem.

It is divided government. Sure, we are not going to agree on everything. Our experts—it is not the Republican Party saying \$5.7 billion is what it would cost to secure our border—it is the experts who secure our border who say it is going to cost \$5.7 billion.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman disagrees with that number, if he doesn’t like the color of the wall or the style of the slats and the steel, if he wants to make it out of bamboo, I don’t know what the gentleman’s offer is because he has never put an offer on the table. But at some point the gentleman has to. He has to put a counteroffer on the table if we are going to get out of this.

I want to get out of this. I voted multiple times to get out of it and to pay people. The gentleman from Maryland can show votes, and I can show votes. Ultimately we need to talk to get an agreement.

So I continue to stand ready, the President stands ready; our minority here in the House and our majority in the Senate stands ready. But if only one side is saying: “We are going to talk,” and the other side says: “We are not going to talk”, that is not going to resolve itself.

We have to talk if it is going to resolve itself, and, hopefully, Mr. Speaker, we do.

I stand ready, and I yield back the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, is a motion to recess in order or is the Speaker empowered to recess on his own?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker has the authority to declare a recess.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o’clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. UNDERWOOD) at 4 p.m.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. FRANKEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Speaker, this week I met with south Floridians to talk about the impact of the cruel Trump shutdown, so many sad stories.

I learned about a TSA agent who just came back from maternity leave who had to send her baby to her mother in Massachusetts because she didn’t have the money for daycare or Pampers.

The air traffic controllers told me that their stress level is so high now, it is a danger to all of us. And I heard from the service providers of victims of domestic violence who are worried that their shelters are about to close.

Now, Democrats, we support smart border security, not an ineffective, wasteful wall. But, listen, we can debate that at another time.

Right now, we have to open our government so that we can get back to the business for the people.