

356, the Medgar Evers Home National Monument Act. The home is located in Jackson, Mississippi.

The Evers family home, which was designated a National Historic Landmark in 2017, is hallowed ground for those of us who lived through the struggle for racial equality and desegregation. That single-story, ranch-style home bore witness to one of the most consequential monuments in the civil rights era, the assassination of Medgar Wiley Evers.

I am honored to, in my capacity as Congressman of the Second Congressional District of Mississippi, to offer this legislation to honor the sacrifice of not just civil rights icon Medgar Evers, but his widow, Myrlie, by designating their home as a national monument.

Due to bipartisan efforts last Congress, this legislation passed through the Committee on Natural Resources and ultimately passed the House by unanimous consent. I am asking that we make this happen again and honor the legacy of an icon in American history, Medgar Wiley Evers.

I urge everyone to support this legislation.

LET'S REOPEN THE GOVERNMENT TODAY

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, we are about to witness the longest government shutdown in U.S. history. Hundreds of thousands of Federal employees, many in my own district, are not certain when or if their next paycheck is coming, and for what? For what? For a border wall?

Mr. Speaker, in San Diego, we know walls. We have a triple fence, and we know there are real concerns on the border. Let's work on solving those problems. Spending billions of dollars on a wall won't.

In San Diego, we have the most modern port of entry in the country. It works well to catch drugs and stop criminals. If the President wants border security, well, that, that should be our focus.

Paola Avila, of the San Diego Chamber said it best: "Our border region is an opportunity zone, not a danger zone."

Let's take that opportunity and work to improve our border, not waste money on a wall. And let's not waste any more time. Federal employees want to get back to work.

We have already passed legislation, bipartisan legislation, to end this shutdown. Let's reopen the government today.

□ 1230

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to deliver my first floor speech today speaking about an issue that is deeply personal to me, to the patients that I care for as a pediatrician, and to thousands of my constituents in Washington's Eighth District.

As you know, the lawful nature of the Affordable Care Act has been challenged, and if the decision stands, 17 million Americans will lose their health insurance. This includes many of my patients, children, and people with preexisting conditions.

Having seen families struggle to pay ever higher insurance premiums and deductibles every year, I understand that we need improvements in our system. The answer is to shore up the ACA, not dismantle it. And as the lone woman doctor in Congress and as a patient with type 1 diabetes, I look forward to leading that conversation.

The first step is to preserve the protections that we have now, and that is why I am so pleased that the House will take steps to intervene in this court case.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to consider the fates of their constituents who might not have access to medical care without the Affordable Care Act and to support this intervention. Millions of Americans and thousands in my district are counting on us.

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. 31

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

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Deutch, Chair.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION: Ms. Lofgren, Chair.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 264, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 265, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 266, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 267, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019; 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 28 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 28

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any bill specified in section 2 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such bill are waived. Each such bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such 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. The bills referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The bill (H.R. 264) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

(b) The bill (H.R. 265) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

(c) The bill (H.R. 266) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

(d) The bill (H.R. 267) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

SEC. 3. 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 15, 2019, relating to a measure making or continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend, the ranking member, pending which 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 be given 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 28, providing for consideration of H.R. 264, making appropriations for financial services and general government; H.R. 265, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs; H.R. 266, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies; and H.R. 267, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies, each for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019. The rule provides for consideration of each bill under a closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass these bills, because we need to reopen government.

Let me just say to my colleagues, quite frankly, this is not the way I had hoped we would start the new Congress, essentially cleaning up the mess that my Republican friends left us from the last Congress, but we are where we are, and this is an emergency. It is time to reopen the government.

Mr. Speaker, what we saw last night from the President, in my opinion, was a disgrace. He used the Oval Office to fearmonger and smear immigrants. There was nothing new, no plan to get us out of this shutdown, no solutions, just more of the same offensive rhetoric we have heard time and time again from this President.

But this Democratic majority is moving quickly to end the Trump shutdown. On day one of this new Congress, we passed a complete funding package using bipartisan language to reopen government, and now, today, we are taking further action to help the American people while responsibly protecting our borders.

This rule will allow us to pass individual appropriations bills to reopen key government agencies. That includes the Department of the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service, to prevent Americans' tax refunds from being withheld during the shutdown; the Department of Agriculture, to prevent hungry families from losing the lifeline of SNAP benefits and assure that our farmers get the services that

they need; the Department of the Interior, to prevent our national parks and monuments from being further degraded and allow EPA to resume its work protecting public health and our environment; and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to help hardworking families in the process of realizing the dream of homeownership. These bills offer us a way out of the President's shutdown, an embarrassing spectacle that never should have happened in the first place.

Nineteen days ago, the President of the United States threw a temper tantrum. He went back on his word, breaking his promise to sign bipartisan appropriations bills that would have prevented a quarter of our government from shutting down.

He turned on FOX News or some rightwing radio show somewhere and changed his mind. Suddenly, the President demanded \$5 billion in funding for his offensive border wall just to keep the lights on—billions of dollars, by the way, that would just have been a downpayment on an unnecessary project that would cost tens of billions of dollars, and not at Mexico's expense like President Trump promised over and over and over again.

Now the costs have been shifted to the American taxpayer, when, according to Reuters/Ipsos polling, only 25 percent of the public says they support Trump shutting down the government over the wall—25 percent. This is crazy, but this doesn't have to continue.

At his press conference the other day, the President boasted he could keep our government closed for years. Now, he may not know how to get us out of this mess, but this Democratic majority does, and there are many responsible Republicans on the other side of the aisle who are with us on reopening the government.

Last week, our funding package passed with bipartisan support. Seven Republicans voted with us, including Republican Congressman WILL HURD, whose district includes much of the U.S.-Mexico border.

In addition, a growing number of Senate Republicans have encouraged the majority leader to bring those bills to the floor, including Senator COLLINS of Maine and Senator GARDNER of Colorado. Senator GARDNER said, recently: "The Senate has done it last Congress; we should do it again today," and I agree.

So let's send these bills to the Senate so they can once again pass Congress with overwhelming bipartisan support.

The Senate Majority Leader already supported these bills once. Why not support them again to finally reopen this government?

Because we can't wait for the President to publicly promise to sign these bills before we act—we already know his word isn't worth much; his broken promise is what got us here—it has fallen to Congress to get us out of this shutdown.

Congressman HURD said after voting for the Democratic appropriations

package last week: "Ultimately, Congress is a coequal branch of government, and it should operate that way." He is absolutely right. And these bills are this majority's latest attempt to fulfill our responsibility.

There are 40 million Americans who rely on SNAP to put food on the table. Their benefits will lapse shortly if this shutdown is allowed to continue.

Mr. Speaker, why should Americans go hungry just because the President wants to appease someone like Rush Limbaugh? Why in the world would Congress sit idly by as thousands of people trying to buy a new home or refinance FHA-insured mortgages are left in limbo?

We are now in tax season. If we don't end this shutdown, more than 2 million Americans who every month turn to tax assistance centers will find them closed as they try to complete their annual returns.

This is madness, and it is completely unnecessary. Tax returns delayed, home purchases in limbo, food assistance in jeopardy for the hungry, trash piling up in our national parks, it is an embarrassment—not to mention the 800,000 Federal workers who aren't getting paid, and countless more contractors.

It can be over in a heartbeat if we pass these bills and the Senate takes yes for an answer. These bills honor our responsibility to turn the lights back on. They don't waste even a dollar of taxpayer money on the President's immoral border wall, nor should they. People overwhelmingly object to building it.

I hope this President comes to his senses, that he stops holding our Nation hostage as he plays to the fringes of his base. But none of us can control that. We do have the ability, though, to do our jobs and to end the shutdown. That is what this Congress will do again today, and I urge all of my colleagues to join with us.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is constrained to again remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President of the United States.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, Chairman McGOVERN, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are back again on appropriations, and we are back again on the exact same set of bills as before.

Last week, the House agreed, over Republican objections, to pass a set of appropriations bills, six of which would fund the relevant departments for a full year, the seventh of which would fund the Department of Homeland Security until February 8.

Today, not content with already having passed these bills once, my friends in the majority are again bringing up four individual bills that were part of the same package covering the Transportation and Housing and Urban Development bill, Financial Services and

general government bill, the Agriculture bill, and the Interior and Environment bill. Nothing substantive in these bills has changed. Indeed, nothing substantive has yet changed anywhere in this process:

The government remains partially shut down;

The Senate is refusing to pass the bills my Democratic Party colleagues are proposing;

The President is refusing to sign them; and

The majority is proposing to fix the problem by passing the exact same bills.

To quote the great Yogi Bera: “It is deja vu all over again.”

While I commend my friends in the majority for trying to reopen the government, let’s be clear about what they are proposing. The four bills under consideration here represent only the Senate-passed versions of the bills covering the fiscal year 2019 appropriations process. They represent no input at all from the House, no input at all from the Appropriations Committee, and no input at all from the joint House and Senate conference committees that were appointed to iron out the differences between these bills and their House counterparts.

In essence, the Democrats’ only plan is for the House to swallow the Senate’s original bills, abrogate our authority and responsibility as a coequal House of Congress, and declare victory. What is more surprising is that my friends now expect that having tried this same thing before, they will now get a different result.

To be clear, last week, when the House passed these exact same bills, the Senate made it known these bills would not come to the floor; and even if they did, the President has made it known that he would not sign them. I don’t know what they think is so different about this week over last to make my friends think that all they need to do is to pass them again and, magically, the Senate will pass these bills and the President will sign them.

□ 1245

Perhaps even more surprising, the majority now wishes to bring these four bills forward under a closed rule, with no opportunity for the House to amend them and no opportunity for Members to weigh in. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I understand how hard it is to have a full process on appropriations bills. But it is, indeed, possible, even when funding bills carry over into a new year or even a new majority.

In 2011, right after Republicans took majority control of the House, we considered a bill on the floor to fund the entire Federal Government. We did it under an open rule, with only a preprinting requirement. When we considered that bill on the floor, 162 amendments were offered from both sides of the aisle, and we had a grand total of 66 hours of floor debate on the bill, stretching out over 5 days.

Given the amount of time we used in 2011, I fully understand what an undertaking that would be. But unless the majority believes that these bills will quickly pass the Senate and quickly be signed by the President into law, then there is plenty of time for thoughtful debate and plenty of time to hear ideas from all Members of this House. Instead, the majority has chosen to push forward with an appropriations strategy that they know cannot succeed.

Mr. Speaker, the House should be taking steps this week to negotiate with the Senate and the President to end this shutdown. That means that, whether the majority likes it or not, they need to engage on border security.

The American people have told us time and time again that they want action on border security. The solution they are proposing today does nothing on that front.

Even if we pass these bills today, and even if they, ultimately, became law, the border would remain unsecured and the Department of Homeland Security would remain shut down. Nothing the House will do in this package will change that essential fact, and nothing in this package is a step on the road to changing that essential fact.

Mr. Speaker, it wasn’t always this way. In 2006, 64 Democrats joined Republicans in passing the Secure Fence Act, which President Bush signed into law. Those 64 Democrats then included 13 current Members now and one additional Member who has since gone on to the Senate. Even liberal lions of the House, like our good friend and former colleague Congressman Barney Frank, joined the Republicans in voting for border security. I am unclear what has changed, from then until now, that would cause the entire majority Caucus to refuse to work with Republicans on border security when so many did so back in 2006.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, while I agree with the good intentions of the majority in seeking to fund the government, their method of doing so is in no way sufficient. Instead of abrogating our own authority, embracing a Senate-only product that the President will not sign, and kicking the can down the road, we should be taking concrete steps to reopen the government, secure the border, and move on to the many important needs of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Oklahoma’s comments. I just want to make a couple of quick points before yielding to my next speaker.

We, as Democrats, are struggling in support of border security, and we have supported initiative after initiative to basically make our borders more secure. We believe in investing in infrastructure and more personnel. We be-

lieve in providing more judges to be able to adjudicate asylum claims so we can process people more expeditiously. We believe in technology. It is 2019, yet the President insists on this medieval approach to border security, which most experts say is just ineffective.

On top of all of that, our objection is that it is going to cost tens of billions of dollars. The President said that Mexico is going to pay for it, but now he is saying that the American taxpayers are going to pay for it. I mean, give me a break.

As far as why we are doing the strategy of taking up these Senate-passed bills, let me remind my colleagues: They passed the Senate 92–6 back in August.

I would have liked a different process. My friends were in charge of everything up to a week ago. They controlled the House; they controlled the Senate; and they controlled the White House. Yet they sent people home during the holidays and just kicked the can down the road, and we have inherited this mess from the last Congress. So we are doing the best we can.

If the Senate would vote, like they did in August, again for these bills—92–6—we won’t need the President. We could override his veto; we could reopen the government; and we could stop all of this nonsense right now. That is my hope.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, it is time for this administration to choose people over politics.

As we are talking about the shutdown, the stories of real people are getting lost in the mess created by this administration. I want to share the serious impact of the shutdown on my constituents and Americans around the country.

These stories come from hardworking families, like newlyweds in my district who just had a premature baby. They spent 3 weeks in the NICU and are just now getting back home. They told me: “We have so many bills and a mortgage, and the shutdown happened just as we are sending in our first mortgage payment. Our baby requires special formula because he was not able to breastfeed. My husband has been asked to work overtime and is not getting paid. We are scared about how we are going to get by.”

This is a national crisis, one our President has created, and we have a responsibility to fix it.

I call on the White House, my colleagues across the aisle, and their colleagues in the Senate to stop holding our government hostage and allow the government to reopen as we debate effective and humane border security.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make a couple of quick points, and then yield to another speaker, if I may.

Mr. Speaker, I want to disagree a little bit with my friend’s memory on

what the last Congress did and did not do. Quite frankly, it was the most successful Congress in enacting appropriations bills in 22 years, 75 percent of them across the floor on time. We will see how good the record is as my friends are in the majority. And I am going to work with my friends on that, because I know it is the intention to do that, but it is no easy task.

To say that the last Congress didn't act when, in fact, it put a bill over in the United States Senate that the President would have signed is simply untrue. To suggest that Republicans controlled the Senate in this process, when a Democratic minority in the Senate kept us from getting to 60 votes, there is where your real obstruction was. Quite frankly, this problem would have never happened if the Senate chose to operate the way we do, by simple majority vote, and the President would have had a bill.

One last point, if I may. The President did offer to negotiate. The reports in the media are that he actually offered to reduce his request by half. That is normally, around here, considered a real negotiation: Let's split the difference and find the common ground.

My friends didn't choose to take up that offer. So the idea that they have somehow been innocent bystanders when they were in the minority, in a process out of control, simply misstates reality.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my good friend, a member of the Appropriations Committee, and a former member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Oklahoma for yielding me some time.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here we are again. Last night, the Rules Committee, under its new chairman, Mr. McGOVERN, voted to bring four spending bills to the House floor, four bills that have never had a hearing in this body, have never had a markup in this body, and now, under Democratic control of the House, will have no amendments made in order.

These bills may sound familiar to my constituents because these are the exact same bills that House Democrats forced votes on last week, only now we will be considering them one by one, rather than in a large package.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Rules Committee over the last 4 years, I can tell you I had the distinct honor of listening to the now-chairman of the Rules Committee spend hours, literally hours, berating those of us in the majority for not allowing amendments on bills.

So, Mr. Speaker, you can understand my full expectation as Democrats took control of this body that we would be seeing open rules allowing for vigorous debate on amendments and healthy, open dialogue and transparency on these important pieces of legislation. Unfortunately, that is not the case.

If I could, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote the now-chairman who spoke of his frustrations with the Rules Committee in recent months.

First of all:

The Rules Committee ought to be a place where people who have good ideas, whether you agree with them or not, have legitimate ideas, ought to be able to have the opportunity to be able to offer them. Increasingly, we're moving away from that.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker:

I'm always intrigued by the excuses why we can't be open . . . and decry this very closed process.

And lastly, Mr. Speaker:

I hope if we're lucky enough to take over this place, I hope that we're more accommodating.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they were, in fact, lucky enough. The Democrats took control of this body and very well could be allowing amendments today. But, unfortunately, that is not the case.

For instance, last night, I offered three amendments to two of the bills before us, all three of which were accepted unanimously in the 115th Congress in the House Appropriations Committee, again, on a bipartisan basis.

Unfortunately, the chairman isn't allowing a single amendment on the Republican or Democratic side to be offered on any of these four bills, including bipartisan amendments like those that I had offered.

I thank my good friend from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for his effort to push these amendments to be made in order. It is sincerely disappointing to see the chairman and House Democrats manage legislation in the very manner they so vehemently decried.

Mr. Speaker, I will be voting "no" on this rule and "no" on these spending bills.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. My constituents' priorities deserve to be represented in the people's House. Unfortunately, in this bill, they are not.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my friend from Washington State, a former member of the Rules Committee. I should just tell him—and I am a little bit surprised, since he was on the Rules Committee—two of his amendments that he offered didn't even comply with the House rules, so that is why they wouldn't be made in order.

But let me just say to him, as I began my remarks, it is unfortunate that we had to start this Congress cleaning up after the last Congress, but that is where we are. That is what you have given us. And I am eager to return to regular order as soon as we reopen this government.

What we are witnessing is extraordinary. In fact, it is unprecedented. For

the first time in history, we have begun a new Congress in the middle of a government shutdown.

I tried last month to bring up appropriations bills, bills that Mr. HOYER offered on the floor to reopen this government, but you shut me down every single time, so here we are.

We meant it when we said that we would do everything we can to reopen this government, because this is a real emergency. 800,000 hardworking civil servants are either furloughed or working without pay. That is what an emergency looks like. This is an emergency.

I appreciate the kind of laid-back attitude of some of my friends on the other side of the aisle who are like: Well, let's start all over again. Let's reopen the process. Let's have endless debate from now until whenever.

But do you know what? It is not us who are not being paid; it is our constituents. So this is an emergency. It is time that all of us come together and end this ridiculous shutdown and then get on to the business of the future. That is what I am committed to.

I hope that the Rules Committee will be much more accommodating to my friends on the other side of the aisle than my friends were to us, by the way, overseeing the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. McGOVERN for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the rule and the four underlying bills to help fully reopen the United States of America. Here we are, 19 days into the Trump shutdown, and all we see is political posturing from the White House and the Republican-controlled Senate, which has failed to take any steps to reopen the government.

The President has made Federal employees political pawns to try and get his way. He has put America and the hardworking men and women who work for her in jeopardy.

□ 1300

Last week, I joined a bipartisan majority of the House in supporting two bills to fully reopen the government. Unfortunately, the Senate has failed to take up those bills. They would immediately reopen the government and put 800,000 people back to work.

I know that the gentleman from Oklahoma said we have plenty of time. Those were his words just now. We don't have plenty of time. We need to get people back to work.

I want to share some stories from my district. Denver Federal Center is in the middle of my district, and it has the highest concentration of Federal agencies anywhere in the country outside of the D.C. area.

More than 15,000 of these and other Federal workers in Colorado have either been furloughed or forced to continue working without knowing whether they will be paid or not.

One of these employees is Sherry who works for the EPA. Sherry is furloughed and doesn't know when she will get back to work or if she will be paid when the EPA reopens. Sherry has two sons with disabilities who rely on counseling and treatment not covered by her insurance. She is being forced to make decisions about how to continue their treatment, pay for groceries, and keep up with her family's other expenses.

Or take Shannon, who is a supervisor for the TSA. Shannon is still on the job but doesn't know when she and her coworkers are going to get paid for work. Shannon told my office: If the shutdown lasts through this month, it will be nearly impossible for her family to make rent. They barely made January payments and still have outstanding utility and credit card bills.

I also met with Matt this morning who is an air traffic controller in Denver. He and his coworkers have stayed on the job keeping our skies and the traveling public safe, but will not receive paychecks on Friday.

One more story is from Gabe who lives in Wheat Ridge, Colorado, where I live. Gabe is a student who called my office concerned he won't be able to start classes at the University of Colorado because his registration with the Selective Service System cannot be processed until the government reopens.

These are just a few examples of why we need to fully reopen the government. I urge my friend from Oklahoma to work with Mr. HOYER, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. MCGOVERN to come up with solutions to this, to get these people back to work as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, and "yes" on the underlying legislation.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and then I will yield to my good friend from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to take up the challenge. I would be happy to meet with anybody to reopen the government. I would be happy if we had a product in front of us, which we did have in late December that had actually been agreed to by the United States Senate.

Why my friends chose to just simply take the Senate bills—which I will assure you, are not nearly as good as the conference bills between the two bodies—and throw all of the work out that this body did over a year, the appropriators, and the rest of the authorizing committees that play a supplemental role in this, I will never know.

It would have been a lot harder to vote "no" than just simply sit here and strip 435 Members of their ability to legislate, which is effectively what my friends in the majority have chosen to do.

I hope going forward we can do exactly what my friend suggests. I would also suggest that the people he mentioned go meet with the President of the United States. He was here all December, happy to negotiate with anybody. He wasn't in Hawaii. He was here. He offered to split the difference. That was an unacceptable offer to my friends.

So if you want to negotiate, negotiate with the President. If you want to do something with the Senate, I would expect that you should probably sit down and talk to them because you are sending them something this week that you sent last week, that they didn't take up then, and they are not going to take up now.

So whenever we want to negotiate, I would be thrilled to be at the table, but I haven't seen any evidence that my friends do want to negotiate. Instead, they simply want to dictate. They simply want to dictate the outcome and achieve what they think is a political victory, and that is coming at the expense of the American people. Real negotiations mean sitting down and settling differences. It doesn't mean shooting paper back and forth across the rotunda.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), my good friend and a distinguished Member.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman has to recognize the irony, how, despite 2 years of claiming that he wants open rules, the Democrat rule package talking about regular order, and here we have a closed rule for advancing these bills.

The gentleman talks about the most closed Congress was the 115th Congress. I will wait and see if the gentleman's side in leading Congress' score is better than the 115th Congress was. It would be interesting to keep that scorecard.

In the past, I have supported bills like these, especially appropriations bills for agriculture, transportation, housing, and urban development.

On the whole, the agriculture bill has priorities that are critical to my district, including the farm safety net, rural broadband, food safety, and more. However, I can't support these bills because they are offered in bad faith. It is a charade. Let's be honest. It is simply a charade. It is not a serious attempt to fund agriculture or any other priorities in my district or in this country.

It is, in fact, distract and delay in order to put pressure on, to squeeze the American people to get what you want.

It is madness, I will agree with you. It is madness where we are going right now because 17,000 people with criminal convictions were stopped at the United States southern border last year.

That doesn't count the ones we didn't catch because they came in in other ways. Yet, somehow, we want to ignore that rather than worry about our border security. Without borders, without secure borders, we are not a country.

The President, the administration offered a package. My colleague on the

other side of the aisle, Mr. MCGOVERN, I want him to see this letter. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, you have it. It talks about the priorities of the administration.

It talks about funding, yes, for a wall or barrier for 234 miles. Only 234 miles, not the 2,000 miles suddenly people are talking about, which is a top 10 priority of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in order to funnel people crossing the border to entry points.

It talks about additional immigration judges. It provides funding for additional border patrol. It provides funding for infrastructure at the borders—many things the other side of the aisle was talking about. So why is it, that rather than going to the White House, closing the door, and not coming out until you come up with an answer, there is a press conference being held in the Rayburn Reception Room where once more we talk about, well, we are not doing anything.

If you want to reopen the government, go to the White House, close the door, and don't come back here until we have a deal. A deal requires all parties. These bills will not be taken up in the Senate. The President said he will veto them.

Negotiation, I spent 35 years in private business, and negotiation means you never get everything you want, but you walk away where all parties say: We could have gotten a little more. But you solve the problem rather than put people at risk.

We are putting people at risk in this country. People won't get paid Friday. You are right. We are also putting the American people at risk by not securing our border. We have kicked that can down the road my entire time I have been here, 2 years now, and long before that.

One final point: We know that Democrats previously have supported funding for border walls, border security, and a border fence. Call it what you want.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, so why is it now we can't simply agree that we need to do more to secure our border along the lines of this, including 234 miles of wall, only because the President's name is on it?

Come on, let's solve the problem. Let's be adults here.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning I met Chrissy, an air traffic controller from Ventura, California. Her job is to ensure the safety and efficiency of air travel, but the Trump shutdown has caused chaos. Air traffic controllers will not receive their paychecks on Friday. The FAA support staff has been furloughed, and the students in the air traffic control

academy have been sent home. Because of this, air traffic controllers like her are being forced to slow down everything in order to ensure the same level of air safety.

But it is not just Chrissy's work that is being impacted. She and her husband, who is also an air traffic controller, lost their home in the Thomas fire, and now, as they try to rebuild their home and their lives, Trump is forcing them to do it without a pay-check.

How can we do this to our workers? Last night, Trump tried to make his case to the Nation. What we heard was a lot of xenophobia and division. What we didn't hear was any urgent threat that would justify a shutdown right now over a wall that would be built in the future.

That is why we are bringing up today's bills to reopen government. If Trump wants to negotiate over border security, he should show concern for workers like Chrissy and sign these bills. Nineteen days into the shutdown, Trump is making the American people suffer for the sake of his ego.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, and join us in passing these bills to reopen government functions that have nothing to do with Trump's demand for a wall.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded not to use personalities when referring to the President of the United States.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to notify the body, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to report modified open rules for each bill before us today: H.R. 264, H.R. 265, H.R. 266, and H.R. 267. The rule would include a preprinting requirement.

Mr. Speaker, the bills before us today are simply nothing more than Senate products. House Democrats would rather try to win political points against the Senate than allow this House to do its job. Again, the Senate hasn't indicated they will take up these measures, and the President has not agreed to sign these measures. There is time to do this the right way.

In 2011, right after Republicans took the majority control of the House, the government was operating under a continuing resolution, and we considered a bill on the floor to fund the entire Federal Government, and we did it under one open rule with just a preprinting requirement.

There were a total of 66 hours of floor debate from the afternoon of February 15, 2011, to the early hours of February 19, including one stretch of debate that lasted 42 hours.

I do understand what an enormous undertaking it would be, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't and can't take the time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extra-

neous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) left the floor, but I know Mr. NEWHOUSE is still here, and I am complimented by the fact that they quote me so much. But I want to quote me, too, because I am going through what I have said about open rules and about the way this House should be run.

On November 14 on the floor I said:

And I am not suggesting that every rule needs to be an open rule or that there is never a time for a closed rule, but there is never a time for more than 100 closed rules. There is no justification for that.

That is me. And on April 24, I said:

I am under no illusion that every bill has to be an open rule; although it would be nice to have at least one symbolic open rule before the year is out.

On April 13, I said:

I can't promise that every rule is going to be an open rule, but I can say that there would be a greater attempt to try to accommodate Members.

On September 2, I said:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that everything that the House considers should be under an open rule. There are times when a closed rule might be necessary. But more than 100 closed rules? There is no justification for that.

So I think I am being pretty consistent here, because I have actually voted for closed rules on this floor that have been suggested in times of emergency. I voted for one to actually bring a continuing resolution to the floor so that we wouldn't have to deal with the mess that we are in right now.

So in times of emergency, in times of life or death, yes, there are justifications for a closed rule, and this is one of them because this is last year's work. This is what my friends on the other side left us with, unfinished business from last year. Not only unfinished business, but they allowed the President to shut the government down.

So hundreds of thousands of American workers are in a panic right now because last year's majority, my Republican friends, did not do their job.

This is ridiculous. We ought to figure out a way to have our discussions without shutting the government down. This is not the way you are supposed to run government. And so we are offering a solution here so that we can reopen the government and continue our conversations about whatever you want.

The gentleman from Oklahoma said we should split the difference on the border wall.

□ 1315

Mexico was supposed to pay for it.

Why are we splitting the difference? Why are we assuming the cost of a border wall when the President said that Mexico was going to pay for it, a border wall that most experts say is useless and ridiculous and that that money could be better spent on other ways of enforcing border security?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, breaking news to the American people: all the other body has to do, the Senate, is to take the bills passed by the Democratic majority in the House and the government will open in minutes, simply with the signature of the President of the United States and the opportunity to work on the kind of barrier that is appropriate for the border, a State of which I come from, Texas, a border State, and have deep knowledge about which borders work and which don't. Then the government could open—breaking news.

It is shameful for my Republican colleagues to come to the floor of the House and not acknowledge that the simple problem is with the White House.

We are not interested in not talking about border security. Democrats have been working on border security for decades and have been successful in the funding to provide barriers that are there now, that I just saw in the last week, myself, at the border, as I have done on many occasions, and simply acknowledging that we helped build up the Border Patrol agency. We as Democrats have built up Customs and Border Protection.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note that, when you take \$5.7 billion out of the budget, you are not writing a paper check. What it means is that you will cut into Border Patrol agents; you will cut into Customs and Border Protection; you will cut into dollars for education; and you will cut into dollars for healthcare.

How shameful, again, it is for the President to use the opioid crisis that we have been working on well for many, many years. Does he understand that most drugs come through a tunnel and, as well, through legal points of entry? They are not coming across with families—women and children.

Does he understand, when he asks for \$5.7 billion, that we need \$78 billion to deal with the opioid crisis throughout America, where 115 people die every day? That is money that could be used for providing treatment, providing reverse drugs, and providing access to hospitals and medical care.

We should not be distorting facts to alter the thinking of the American people on untruths. We simply need to say, yes, barriers are appropriate where they can be placed. But this administration is wrong. It pains my heart as a senior member on the Homeland Security Committee to acknowledge that he is holding the American people hostage.

Let me say to all the Federal workers: We thank you.

On my way back to Washington, I stopped to talk to TSA, transportation security agents. They are on the front lines of securing this Nation.

Thank you.

They are on the front lines, along with air traffic controllers. Aviation is still one of the greatest targets for terrorism.

What does this President do? He blocks them from getting paid this very Friday.

Open the government now.

To the other body: Put our bills on the floor of the Senate. Vote and send it to the White House.

I dare the White House to reject the pain of the American people and refuse to open this government so that mothers can have childcare, so that TSA agents can be able to pay their mortgage, so that agricultural workers can continue doing rural development and food stamps, which are going to end in a couple of weeks.

We can't fool around like this anymore. All this chitter-chatter on the other side is nothing but chitter-chatter saying nothing, absolutely nothing.

Open the government, to the White House, and open it now.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I was amused—and I actually mean this in very good spirit—when my friend mentioned how frequently he had been quoted in today's debate, and I have to say I consider my friend one of the great debaters in this Chamber, and I enjoy hearing him quoted on the floor of the House. So I accept that, and I hope the gentleman knows it was a compliment to him in many ways.

I also want to tell him—and I mean this very seriously—I take him at his word. I don't have any doubt my friend wants to operate differently than we have operated in the past and that he wants this institution to be more open to inclusion of various points of view and very sincere debate, and I pledge to my friend I will work with him in that endeavor.

Now, it is hard to resist pointing out the gentleman's first six bills have all been under closed rules. I suspect we will continue to point that out until we have an opportunity to say to my good friend—and I think we will in the very near future—"Congratulations, you are following through on the things that you said." Again, I know my friend will do that at what he considers and the majority considers the appropriate time.

We have a lot of discussion, Mr. Speaker, about who did and didn't do their jobs in the last Congress. I would tell you, in my view, that the House did its job. It passed its bills. It sent to the Senate a product that the President would sign.

Mr. Speaker, I would tell you, you are doing your job here, as well, right now in the majority. You passed bills

last week. You sent them over to the United States Senate.

In our case, the minority in the Senate blocked consideration of our bills. Had those bills been placed on the floor, we wouldn't be here today. They would have all passed. They had majority support in the Senate; they had a President willing to sign them; and they had already passed the House.

The only reason why we are here today is because the Democratic minority in the Senate manipulated the rules of the Senate in such a way that they could stop action. I suspect we all have had frustration with that as House Members in the past. I think we will again in the future.

I also want to reflect with my friends, and I draw this conclusion not so much out of their actions, but actions that my own party, from time to time, has committed, and I suspect I will say this to this Chamber many times: Pursuit of absolute victory in domestic political disputes is always a mistake. It always leaves a divided country and an embittered opponent, and you will rue the day when you pursue it. We have certainly done that, Mr. Speaker, on my side of the aisle.

I think that, to some degree, though, is what is going on today. Sooner or later—and we are going to live with a Republican Senate for the next 2 years and a Republican President for the next 2 years—my friends in the majority will have to decide whether they want to govern or debate, because that is all we are doing now.

Mr. Speaker, you are not the opposition party anymore. You are the majority party, and you have every right to pursue your agenda. But if you really want to govern, if you really want to get something done, in the end, you are going to have to work with the Republican Senate, and you are going to have to work with the Republican President.

We learned that hard reality when we were in the majority but dealing with a Democratic Senate and a Democratic President in 2011 through 2014. I hope my friends learn the lesson more quickly and become wiser than we were. I hope they benefit from our experience.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge opposition to this rule and the underlying measure. The majority today is putting forward a closed rule to bring up four appropriations bills, each of which the House has already passed last week.

But, unfortunately, each of these bills is not a product of the House of Representatives. These bills are Senate products that do not reflect any House input. What is worse, they do not solve the fundamental problem of border security, and they do not represent a serious effort to reopen the government.

Since the Senate will not pass these bills and the President will not sign them, all we are accomplishing here today is spinning our wheels. The majority would be better served to undertake serious negotiations with the President and the Senate over the need

for border security and to find a way out of the crisis of their own making rather than hoping that something will be different this time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" on the previous question, "no" on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) that I think he is one of the best Members of this Chamber. I admire him, and I think that he is absolutely right when he says that the Appropriations Committee did its work, and that goes for Republicans and Democrats. People worked together, and they moved appropriations bills forward. So I find no fault with and I have no blame for the appropriators.

What I do blame is his leadership that, at the last minute, when the President decided to have a temper tantrum and threatened to shut the government down, the Republican leadership was complicit, basically, and said: We will go along with this. And here we are.

By the way, I can't wait to get this over with so we can get on to other business. By the way, we are going to bring up the disaster appropriations bill next week. We have a notice out asking for amendments. I think the deadline is on Friday at noon. I can't recall the last time a disaster appropriations bill ever solicited amendments. We are going to do that. But I appreciate his words.

Mr. Speaker, this is an emergency. We are now dealing with a major crisis in this country, and it is not just Federal workers. USA Today reported last week: "Government shutdown 2019: Homebuyers with USDA mortgages can't close on house sales."

Mr. Speaker, I include this article in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN 2019: HOMEBUYERS WITH USDA MORTGAGES CAN'T CLOSE ON HOUSE SALES

[From USA Today, Jan. 3, 2019]

(By Janna Herron)

Jordan and Tracey Smith of Madison, Maine, were scheduled to close on their first home on Friday. But the government shutdown has gotten in the way.

The couple needs the U.S. Department of Agriculture to help finalize their mortgage that is guaranteed by the agency. But the USDA's operations have been closed for 13 days, so the couple and their five children remain in limbo.

"We're living out of boxes. We're paying our landlord on a week-to-week basis, but he has people waiting to move in," says Jordan Smith, 32. "We just want to move and get this process over with."

It's the same for other borrowers who depend on the USDA. The department provides—through private lenders—mortgages with no down payment requirements and low interest rates and fees to rural and suburban homebuyers. It's a small program, helping just over 140,000 people to buy a home in 2017, but is considered one of the best options around if you're eligible.

"We just can't close a USDA loan without a commitment letter from them. 'Your loan

is at a standstill," says Pava Leyrer, the chief operating officer of Northern Mortgage Services in Grandville, Michigan. Leyrer's company is an approved USDA lender.

Leyrer is telling her affected clients to call their representatives. Otherwise, they may ultimately need to switch into a different loan. "How long will the seller wait, especially if the sales contract expires?" she says.

WAITING FOR REPAIR MONEY

In other cases, those who already have a USDA mortgage are running into trouble. Jenneffer Azcuy, a homeowner in Lynn Haven, Florida, with a USDA mortgage, is waiting to get the insurance money she needs to repair her house after it was damaged by Hurricane Michael in October.

"Since my insurance repair check is over \$7,500, the USDA controls the disbursement of funds," Azcuy says. "But the money is tied up."

On mortgages it guarantees, the USDA requires that it oversees how insurance claims funds are used to make sure they are spent properly. When insured losses exceed \$7,500, the agency requires the funds to be deposited into an escrow account it controls.

Azcuy has a contractor lined up to repair her leaky roof, replace a fence, and fix the gutters and outside doors. She has called the USDA for help but can't leave messages because the voicemail is full.

"It's ridiculous. This town is devastated as it is from the hurricane," she says.

WHAT ABOUT OTHER MORTGAGES?

The other mortgages backed by the government are unaffected so far by the shutdown. Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac and the Veterans Administration—which all back home loans—are running as normal.

The Federal Housing Administration, which guarantees mortgages popular among first-time homebuyers, is operating with a smaller staff because of the shutdown but is still approving loans.

"You can get some answers," Leyrer says, but adds: "They are slower to respond, and it takes longer to get through on the phone because of limited staff."

Lenders are also working around other shutdown-induced hiccups.

For instance, they can't verify a person's tax information with the Internal Revenue Service, which has limited services. As a result, many lenders are still approving those loans conditionally and will confirm the information later when the IRS reopens, says John Stearns, a loan originator with American Fidelity Mortgage Services in Mequon, Wisconsin.

"If there is a problem, then I have to figure it out then," Stearns says.

ON CAPITOL HILL

Azcuy and the Smiths hope the new House of Representatives convening on Thursday can end the shutdown. Democratic House leaders have scheduled votes on a package of bills to reopen the federal government and provide more time for Congress to negotiate a border funding deal with the White House.

Until then, they wait.

"My wife and I support Donald Trump. We agree with border security," Jordan Smith says. "But he has to look and see that this is affecting other people's lives."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the article reports on the situation of Jordan and Tracey Smith of Madison, Maine, and their five children. They were scheduled to close on their very first home last Friday, but this ridiculous Trump shutdown ruined that. They need the Department of Agriculture to finalize their mortgage, but USDA has been closed for weeks.

Here is what Mr. Smith said: "We're living out of boxes. "We're paying our landlord on a week-to-week basis, but he has people waiting to move in."

So lives are being thrown into turmoil, and we don't have a lot of time to just carry on these conversations and endless debates. This is a time for action.

This is the first time a prior Congress ended in a government shutdown. It is fitting. It is almost like an exclamation point to the President's first 2 years in office.

But it is a new Congress, and we are ready to responsibly clean up this mess and do what the last Congress could not do. We are offering an extremely reasonable solution to this unnecessary government shutdown. The underlying legislation is virtually identical to the four appropriations bills that already passed the Senate, 92-6.

Compare that to what the prior Republican majority put forward in the waning days of last Congress. They passed a partisan funding bill with billions of dollars for the President's wall, legislation they knew Democrats would never support and that the Senate would never pass. Then they left town. They refused to even recognize me when I tried again and again to bring up a bipartisan bill to end the shutdown.

800,000 workers stopped receiving paychecks. That includes, by the way, thousands of border and law enforcement officers, more than 41,000 Federal law enforcement officers, people like FBI agents and DEA agents, nearly 54,000 Customs and Border Patrol agents and Customs officers, and almost 90 percent of the Department of Homeland Security employees.

This Trump shutdown is an embarrassment. We owe our Federal employees and all Americans better than this. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote for this rule and the previous question and join with us in supporting these underlying bipartisan funding bills. This is another chance for us to do the right thing. Let's take it and bring an end to this unnecessary and painful Trump shutdown.

The material previously referred to by Mr. COLE is as follows:

Strike sections 1 and 2 and insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent section accordingly):

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 264) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate on the bill shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of

clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 2. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 264, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 265) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate on the bill shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 3. Immediately upon disposition of H.R. 265, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 266) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate on the bill shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of

[Roll No. 17]
YEAS—231

DesJarlais Joyce (PA) Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart Katko Rooney (FL)
Duffy Kelly (MS) Rose, John W.

[Roll No. 18]
YEAS—414

Adams	Gomez	Omar
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Allred	Gottheimer	Panetta
Axne	Green (TX)	Pappas
Barragán	Grijalva	Pascarella
Bass	Haaland	Payne
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Perlmutter
Bera	Hayes	Peters
Beyer	Heck	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Higgins (NY)	Phillips
Blumenauer	Hill (CA)	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Pocan
Boonamici	Horn, Kendra S.	Porter
Boyle, Brendan F.	Horsford	Pressley
Brindisi	Houlahan	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Raskin
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jayapal	Richmond
Carbajal	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Carson (IN)	Johnson (TX)	Royal-Allard
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruiz
Case	Keating	Ruppersberger
Casten (IL)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Ryan
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Sánchez
Chu, Judy	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kilmer	Scanlon
Cisneros	Kim	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Kind	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Schrader
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schrrier
Glyburn	Lamb	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Langevin	Scott, David
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Correa	Lawrence	Shalala
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Sherrill
Cox (CA)	Lee (NV)	Sires
Craig	Levin (CA)	Slotkin
Crist	Levin (MI)	Smith (WA)
Crow	Lewis	Soto
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Spanberger
Cummings	Lipinski	Speier
Cunningham	Loebbecke	Stanton
Davids (KS)	Lofgren	Stevens
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Suozzi
Davis, Danny K.	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)
Dean	Lujan	Takano
DeGette	Luria	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Malinowski	Titus
Delgado	Maloney,	Tlaib
Demings	Carolyn B.	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean	Torres (CA)
Deutch	Matsui	Torres Small (NM)
Dingell	McAdams	Trahan
Doggett	McBath	Trone
Doyle, Michael F.	McCollum	Underwood
Engel	McEachin	Van Drew
Escarbar	McGovern	Vargas
Eshoo	McNerney	Veasey
Espaiplat	Meeks	Vela
Evans	Moore	Velázquez
Finkenauer	Morelle	Visclosky
Fletcher	Moulton	Wasserman
Foster	Mucarsel-Powell	Schultz
Fudge	Murphy	Waters
Gabbard	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Gallego	Neal	Welch
Garamendi	Neguse	Wexton
Garcia (IL)	Norcross	Wild
Garcia (TX)	O'Halleran	Wilson (FL)
Golden	Ocasio-Cortez	Yarmuth

Duncan	King (IA)	Rouzer
Dunn	King (NY)	Roy
Emmer	Kinzinger	Rutherford
Estes	Kustoff (TN)	Scalise
Ferguson	LaHood	Schweikert
Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Fleischmann	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Flores	Latta	Shimkus
Fortenberry	Lesko	Simpson
Fox (NC)	Long	Smith (MO)
Fulcher	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Gaetz	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Gallagher	Luetkemeyer	Smucker
Gianforte	Marchant	Spano
Gibbs	Marino	Stauber
Gohmert	Marshall	Stefanik
Gonzalez (OH)	Massie	Steil
Gooden	McCarthy	Steube
Gosar	McCaull	Stewart
Granger	McClintock	Stivers
Graves (GA)	McHenry	Taylor
Graves (LA)	McKinley	Thompson (PA)
Graves (MO)	Meadows	Thornberry
Green (TN)	Meuser	Timmons
Griffith	Miller	Tipton
Grothman	Mitchell	Turner
Guest	Moolenaar	Upton
Guthrie	Mooney (WV)	Wagner
Hagedorn	Mullin	Walberg
Harris	Newhouse	Walden
Hartzler	Norman	Walker
Hern, Kevin	Nunes	Walorski
Herrera Beutler	Olson	Waltz
Hice (GA)	Palazzo	Watkins
Higgins (LA)	Palmer	Weber (TX)
Hill (AR)	Pence	Webster (FL)
Holding	Perry	Wenstrup
Hollingsworth	Posey	Westerman
Hudson	Ratcliffe	Williams
Huijzenaga	Reed	Wilson (SC)
Hunter	Reschenthaler	Wittman
Hurd (TX)	Rice (SC)	Womack
Johnson (LA)	Riggleman	Woodall
Johnson (OH)	Roby	Wright
Johnson (SD)	Rodgers (WA)	Yoho
Jordan	Roe, David P.	Young
Joyce (OH)	Rogers (AL)	Zeldin
NOT VOTING—7		
Buck	Hastings	Mast
DeFazio	Jones	
Frankel	Kelly (PA)	
□ 1403		
So the resolution was agreed to.		
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.		
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.		
—————		
CLARITY ON SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION IN CATEGORIZED MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2019		
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 226) to amend the Small Business Act to include best in class designations in the annual report on small business goals prepared by the Adm		

[Roll No. 18]	YEAS—414
DelBene	Keating
Delgado	Kelly (IL)
Demings	Kelly (MS)
DeSaulnier	Kennedy
DesJarlais	Khanna
Deutch	Kildee
Diaz-Balart	Kilmer
Dingell	Kim
Doggett	Kind
Doyle, Michael F.	King (NY)
Duffy	Kinzinger
Duncan	Kirkpatrick
Dunn	Krishnamoorthi
Emmer	Kuster (NH)
Engel	Kustoff (TN)
Escarob	LaHood
Eshoo	LaMalfa
Espaillat	Lamb
Estes	Lamborn
Evans	Langevin
Ferguson	Larsen (WA)
Finkenauer	Larson (CT)
Fitzpatrick	Latta
Fleischmann	Lawrence
Fletcher	Lawson (FL)
Flores	Lee (CA)
Fortenberry	Lee (NV)
Foster	Lesko
Fox (NC)	Levin (CA)
Fudge	Levin (MI)
Fulcher	Lewis
Gabbard	Lieu, Ted
Gallagher	Lipinski
Gallego	Loebssack
Garamendi	Long
Garcia (IL)	Loudermilk
Garcia (TX)	Lowenthal
Gianforte	Lowey
Gibbs	Lucas
Golden	Luetkemeyer
Gomez	Luján
Gonzalez (OH)	Luria
Gonzalez (TX)	Lynch
Gooden	Malinowski
Gottheimer	Maloney,
Granger	Carolyn B.
Graves (GA)	Maloney, Sean
Graves (LA)	Marchant
Graves (MO)	Marino
Green (TN)	Marshall
Green (TX)	Massie
Griffith	Matsui
Grijalva	McAdams
Grothman	McBath
Guest	McCarthy
Guthrie	McCaul
Haaland	McClintock
Hagedorn	McCollum
Harder (CA)	McEachin
Harris	McGovern
Hartzler	McHenry
Hayes	McKinley
Heck	McNerney
Hern, Kevin	Meadows
Herrera Beutler	Meeks
Hice (GA)	Meng
Higgins (LA)	Meuser
Higgins (NY)	Miller
Hill (AR)	Mitchell
Hill (CA)	Moolenaar
Himes	Mooney (WV)
Holding	Moore
Hollingsworth	Morelle
Horn, Kendra S.	Moulton
Horsford	Mucarsel-Powell
Houlihan	Mullin
Hoyer	Murphy
Hudson	Nadler
Huffman	Napolitano
Huizenga	Neal
Hunter	Neguse
Hurd (TX)	Newhouse
Jackson Lee	Norcross
Jayapal	Norman
Jeffries	Nunes
Johnson (GA)	O'Halleran
Johnson (LA)	Ocasio-Cortez
Johnson (OH)	Olson
Johnson (SD)	Omar
Johnson (TX)	Palazzo
Jordan	Pallone
Joyce (OH)	Palmer
Joyce (PA)	Panetta
Kaptur	Pappas
Katko	Pascarell