Steube	Trahan	Watson Coleman
Stevens	Trone	Weber (TX)
Stewart	Turner	Webster (FL)
Stivers	Underwood	Welch
Suozzi	Upton	Wenstrup
Swalwell (CA)	Van Drew	Westerman
Takano	Vargas	Wexton
Taylor	Veasey	Wild
Thompson (CA)	Vela	Williams
Thompson (MS)	Velázquez	Wilson (FL)
Thompson (PA)	Visclosky	Wilson (SC)
Thornberry	Walberg	Wittman
Timmons	Walden	Womack
Tipton	Walker	Woodall
Titus	Walorski	Wright
Tlaib	Waltz	Yarmuth
Tonko	Wasserman Schultz	Yoho
Torres (CA)	Waters	Young
Torres Small (NM)	Watkins	Zeldin

NAYS—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—21

Abraham	Gabbard	Mast
Bucshon	Gosar	Payne
Carter (TX)	Griffith	Ratcliffe
Crow	Jones	Sánchez
Davidson (OH)	Larson (CT)	Schrier
Flores	Lawson (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Frankel	Marino	Wagner

□ 1223

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 29.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, on roll call vote 29, I was unavoidably detained and unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on HR 221, the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I unexpectedly had to return to my district this morning and was unable to attend the vote series. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 26, "nay" on rollcall No. 27, "yea" on rollcall No. 28, and "yea" on rollcall No. 29.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on Friday, January 11 due to personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: "yea" for rollcall No. 26, "nay" for rollcall No. 27, "yea" for rollcall No. 28, and "yea" for rollcall No. 29.

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 my friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the majority leader of the House, for our first official colloquy.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. We have reversed positions, of course. For a number of years now I have had the privilege of having a colloquy with Mr. MCCARTHY who was then the majority leader. So Mr. SCALISE has now undertaken my role, a role probably he didn't welcome, but I know that he will do well as minority whip.

As majority leader I am still here doing the colloquy, and I am proud to be doing it with Mr. SCALISE who is an outstanding Member. I congratulate him on his position and look forward to working with him through the years toward trying to create agreement, consensus, and action by the Congress on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

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, as is the natural order, will be announced at the close of business today.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we will consider H.R. 268 which is the Disaster Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2019. Chairwoman LOWEY released this legislation last week. It will provide relief and recovery assistance for Americans affected by recent hurricanes—some of which were historic in their power and devastation—wildfires, typhoons, and other natural disasters.

Mr. Speaker, we will also consider additional legislation related to fiscal year 2019 appropriations.

We are on day 21 of the shutdown. The House Democrats will continue to work so that it comes to an end as soon as possible.

Members will also be advised that additional legislative items are possible. I might add to that, it is possible we will deal with one, two, or three of the appropriation bills that haven't been passed, but it is also quite possible that, hopefully, we will deal with the balance of the appropriation bills which have not been enacted. We will have to see what transpires over the next 24, 48, 72, or 96 hours. Hopefully, we will be able to move forward to get our Federal employees back to work.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland. I appreciate his kind remarks and would return those as well.

The gentleman is well-versed at this process and is a noble battler in the debate of ideas. I look forward to having continued conversations about, not only the areas where we may have some differences, but how we can find common ground. The gentleman is very good at working with both sides to find common ground, and, obviously, right now we are in the middle of one of those differences that hopefully can get resolved.

As we have been in these meetings at the White House with the other leaders, both House and Senate, Republican and Democrat, the unfortunate thing is that we have been at an impasse. The President, through his Department of Homeland Security, has made a formal request and a detailed request for the amount of money it will take to secure our border; to properly give our agents—the people who are risking their lives to keep our country safe—the tools they need. It requires a lot of things. It might require more border patrol agents, more tools and technology, but clearly also physical barriers. That seems to be the area where we have had an impasse.

□ 1230

I know that as the President put a formal offer on the table backed up by the experts at the Department of Homeland Security for what it will take to secure the border, up until this point, we haven't seen a formal proposal response to counter that offer, if, in fact, the gentleman's side does agree that we need to secure the border. The President has made a formal request that came from our experts at the Department of Homeland Security.

The only offer I have seen put on the table is the Speaker's offer, and I am not even sure if it was serious, when she said she would support $1. Now, I know the gentleman from Maryland would hopefully recognize that $1 is not a serious counteroffer.

The President has had multiple meetings at the White House and has continued to extend an invitation for whenever there is a serious counteroffer that can be backed up with an explanation of how that can actually secure our border, if, in fact, that is the objective of the other side.

Can the gentleman from Maryland share with me when that counteroffer will be made, when a formal, serious proposal to get our government back open and secure our border will be put on the table?

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his observations.

Of course, as the gentleman knows, we have and continue to be and are today even more so concerned about the fact that the President of the United States has taken hostage the Government of the United States and shut it down. As a result, what we have asked for before we get into serious negotiations is to let us open up the government; for, after all, when we have border security being our focus, nobody that is protecting the borders for the United States of America is getting paid. The morale is low; the apprehension is high; and we believe very strongly that the first step we ought to take is open up government.

Then, as the gentleman well knows, we have articulated on numerous occasions—and I hope the gentleman believes we are honest. And when the gentleman reviews the record of when we were in charge of the House and the Senate, we made very substantial investments in border security, as I think probably the gentleman knows.

Furthermore, we have been ready to support and offered the bills that the Republicans have passed. And, in fact, I think the minority leader in the Senate said that he would accept the number that the President suggested, and

we made some counteroffers. They were rejected.

In fact, Senator MCCONNELL believed he had an agreement with the President on keeping the government open. He sent us a bill to do just that in the waning days of December, and as the minority whip well knows, that bill was not taken up on the floor of this House.

In fact, a bill which had been pending for 11½ months in committee first came to the floor with 10 days left in the year. That bill included a number far above the number that the President originally asked for and far above any number that had been discussed. Although it passed the House, the House knew then, very well, that it did not have the votes in the Senate to pass, and it did not pass. As a result, the government shut down.

And we continue to be in a place, as we said at the White House, to negotiate on border security to secure our borders, to protect our people from those who would come across our borders to commit crimes, protect against drugs being imported, protect against the trafficking of human beings. We all share that view: Republicans and Democrats. The issue is how we most effectively accomplish that objective.

Pending that, the government, as we took power—and it was our responsibility—what we have done over the last 2 weeks is to pass, essentially, your bills. I don't know how we can be much more bipartisan than that than to pass your bills.

Mr. SCALISE. Reclaiming my time, those were not our bills. The House had a negotiation going on with the Senate. The Senate, as the gentleman knows, passed some bills—not all of the bills that were brought to the House floor, but brought some bills that were different from the House bills. As you know, when the Senate passes a bill and the House has a different version, you go to conference committee. You don't just say: ''We are going to take the Senate bill.''

Also, as you brought that bill to the floor, the Speaker, the majority leader brought to the floor as part of that package a bill that did not pass the Senate floor, a bill that would have reversed the Mexico City policy. That change was dramatic because that would have allowed taxpayer money to go to foreign government entities that provide abortion.

It has been the policy of this country, since Ronald Reagan went to Mexico to deliver that speech and create the Mexico City policy, that we don't give taxpayer money to fund abortion. And I know that has gone back and forth through different administrations.

This President has made it very clear that he will strictly enforce the Mexico City policy. That bill on the floor would have reversed it. That is not language that passed the Senate floor.

In addition to that, if you go back throughout these negotiations, at the very beginning, the President has been talking about a crisis at the border. The crisis at the border is very real. In our first meeting with the leaders in the Situation Room at the White House, both the Speaker and the minority leader of the Senate interrupted the Secretary of Homeland Security every time she tried to go through this new crisis that we are seeing.

It is not just the drugs, which are dramatic and we need to stop. It is not just the human trafficking, which is dramatic and we need to stop. It is not just the murders that are happening. There are murders that happened in so many States.

In your State of Maryland, just recently, someone who is in this country illegally from El Salvador was sentenced to life in prison without parole in Montgomery County, Maryland, for the murder of someone, and he had no remorse for his crime.

We just saw a police officer in California who was murdered by someone who came back and forth through this country illegally multiple times because we don't have physical barriers to secure our border.

So that presentation was interrupted, and we never got through the full presentation; but ultimately, the Secretary of Homeland Security has laid out why we have a crisis at the border, and it needs to be resolved, and they went into a detailed breakdown of costs to secure the border.

So at issue right here, now, is a difference in amount. If your side truly does agree that we have to secure our border, which I have heard the Speaker, the minority leader, and others say they need to secure the border, yet they haven't been willing to agree to more than $1 in the request that has been made by the administration to secure the border.

So the real question is, at the heart of this debate, if we are all for border security, we can talk about border security.

In fact, back in 2006, President Obama, when he was a Senator, talked about the need for securing the border when he voted for the Fence Act. The minority leader, Mr. SCHUMER, at the time voted for the Fence Act. That language, the language—and you can call it whatever you like: a fence, a wall, cement, steel slats. But ultimately, it is law, language that allows what can and can't be built.

The language that Minority Leader SCHUMER at the time voted for in 2006 would have given the Department of Homeland Security many of the tools they need in language, but not the money. And so now we are at a point where, if it is all of a sudden he is against that kind of physical structure that he was for in '06, he ought to explain why, and so should others who have maybe changed their position.

But if the language in 2006 would give the Secretary of Homeland Security the tools they need and the authority they need to actually start securing the ports of the border that are between ports of entry—we have ports of entry, and everybody knows where those are. And we, by the way, stopped a lot of really bad people from coming into our country at ports of entry. What we don't know is how many people come through the areas where we have no ports of entry, where we have no borders.

Everybody recognizes that you can't just stop people at the points of entry and then have no protection in the hundreds of miles—we are talking about over 500 miles of unprotected area of this country on the southern border where there is a crisis that is growing every single day.

And if we acknowledge that—now, I know the minority leader and the Speaker went on TV the other night and said it is a fabricated crisis. How could you call this a fabricated crisis when you see deaths, when you see over 90 percent of the heroin that comes into this country and kills Americans every single day is coming across our southern border. That is not a fabricated crisis. Those are real serious things that are happening, that are bad.

There are good people who come to this country. America is the greatest country in the world for letting people in legally. We let over a million people into our country legally every single year, and it enriches our country. It is a legal process. And there are millions of people waiting to come to this country the right way.

So while we recognize that greatness of our country, we also recognize that there are people who are bad people who come into our country every single day as well, and we need to have the tools to secure our border so we can stop that.

So the real question is: How much money is the other side willing to support to actually secure the border?

If the department that is tasked with keeping our country safe is saying they need $5.7 billion, if you agree to a smaller number, if you want to put on the table a smaller number—it is not $1, and let's at least recognize that was an insult. So if it is not $1, then what is the amount you will support and put on the table to start a real negotiation to solve this crisis?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. President, the Government of the United States partially has been shut down. That is the issue here. We can have the debate that the gentleman just discussed—not a word about opening up the people's government, not a word about 800,000 people who are not getting their salaries, not a word of the financial instability that he is subjecting 800,000 people to, ''he'' being the President of the United States. They are being held hostage for the ransom of doing what they believe is the right thing to do on border security.

However, Mr. HURD says—a Republican who has more border mileage on

the border than any other congressional district in America—what the President wants to do is not the right thing.

Senator RON JOHNSON says a similar quote. LINDSEY GRAHAM said he thought it was a bad investment. Now, he didn't say it yesterday or the day before. He said it about a year ago.

Mr. SCALISE. Reclaiming my time, LINDSEY GRAHAM did say we need to build the wall. LINDSEY GRAHAM has a different solution, I am sure, than the gentleman from Maryland. So let's be clear.

And I was speaking to Senator GRAHAM last night about this. He wants to start building the wall. And clearly, your side has not been willing.

And the President, by the way, in the meeting in the Oval Office, in the Situation Room, 2 days ago looked at the Speaker directly and said: Okay. We don't agree even on some of these other areas of government that haven't been open, but if you will agree to work with me on the wall, I will support another 30 days of keeping all government going, even on the areas we disagree, but to open everything up and continue negotiations on the wall. And the Speaker said no.

We could have everything open today, but the Speaker is the one who is being held hostage by the far left elements of your party because she is yet to agree to anything, not putting more than $1.

She said on TV last week she would support $1. That is an insult. And I have yet to see, in any of the meetings I have been in, her willingness to support more than that.

And so we could have everything opened today. That offer has been put on the table. The President, himself, has said you can write the definition of the wall. You can ban cement wall. The President has already acknowledged he would be willing to support that. He would be willing to support a lower number if you can justify how it secures the border, but that offer has never been put on the table.

We could end this crisis today. Twenty-one days in is too long. And there is a solution. But the solution includes, it is not going to be your way or the highway. You can't say: ''No, we want everything or nothing.'' You have got to be willing to put something on the table that will secure the border of this country, or just say you are not for border security. But you can't say you are for border security and then not agree to more than $1.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. The government is shut down. There is no excuse for that. But the President wants his way, and he has taken 800,000 people hostage, and the ransom he demands is his wall.

□ 1245

NANCY PELOSI has nothing to do with shutting down this government. We have passed bill after bill over the last 2 weeks to open up this government.

If the minority whip thinks it is good for border security not to pay people who are protecting the border, he and I differ.

Let me tell you what Mick Mulvaney said. Now, he wasn't there last night, and I talked to Senator GRAHAM last night. He made the statement that I just reflected to you.

Acting Chief of Staff Mick Mulvaney said, in 2015—I understand it is not when he is working for the President, who is paying his salary—''To just say build the darn fence and have that be the end of an immigration discussion is absurd and almost childish for someone running for President to take that simplistic of a view.''

He said that on WRHI on 8/25/15. Look it up.

The government is shut down. If the minority whip will look at the record, we funded more money for border security in 2009 than was funded in the next 7 years under Republican control.

They didn't bring their bill, Mr. Speaker, to the floor until 11½ months had passed. But now border security has to be done right this second or we are going to close down government, keep it shut, and keep hostage 800,000 people and millions and millions and millions of Americans who rely on the services of government.

A, we are for border security. We do not want people coming into this country who are not authorized to come into this country.

B, we care about crime. We care about drugs. We care about investing money to stop drugs coming into the country and to treat those who are afflicted with drugs.

The record reflects that, Mr. Speaker. But the record also reflects that the Republicans have, over and over and over again, used the shutting down of government, the taking hostage of the people's government, to get their way.

Newt Gingrich did it first for a long period of time in 1995 and 1996, 21 days. We are going to surpass that this time. He did it because President Clinton said: I am not going to allow you to cut education spending for the people of United States as deeply as you want to cut it.

Then Senator CRUZ came over here and talked to the so-called Freedom Caucus and said: Unless Obama agrees to repeal the Affordable Care Act, we are going to shut down government.

And they shut down government. Very frankly, when we tried to open it up, the minority whip didn't vote to open it up. So maybe he doesn't care about opening up government, paying people who are working for the people of the United States. I don't know.

Then, just recently, a few weeks ago, when they came to the end of the fiscal year, they had not done their job. The Republicans are in charge of the Senate; they were in charge of the House; and they have the Presidency of the United States.

So we did a CR, and we voted for it because we didn't want to shut down government. Then we came to the December date to which that CR ran, and, lo and behold, the majority leader of the United States Senate sent us over a bill. It was not our bill; it was a bill from the Republican majority leader. It came here under unanimous consent. Their Republican-led Senate sent it here, and, lo and behold, the leadership in the House would not take up that bill.

Why? The President, who had told Senator MCCONNELL he would sign it, changed his mind. Whether it was Ann Coulter, Sean Hannity, Rush Limbaugh, I don't know who the principal adviser in that decision was, but one person communicated: I won't sign that bill.

So the Republican leadership decided: We won't put that bill on the floor.

They put a bill on the floor—they said over and over and over again: This week, we put bills on the floor that wouldn't pass the Senate.

They put a bill that they knew would not pass the United States Senate on the floor, sent it over there. It didn't pass, and government has been shut down.

The gentleman continues to want to talk about, can we negotiate? We can negotiate. The President walked out. He walked out because NANCY PELOSI, when asked, ''Thirty days from now, will you support the wall?'' said, ''No.''

The President had a tantrum, and he walked out. He said: Well, this is a waste of my time.

This is not a process where the President tells us to do things. As I recall, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States, Article I, says we are the policymakers; we are the ones who pass the laws; we are the ones who say what the executive department carries out as policy.

So we ought to pass these bills. Then, yes, we ought to deal, honestly and openly and together, to make sure the borders are secure.

The gentleman said the immigration system does not work; it is broken. He is absolutely right. The Senate, 5 or 6 years ago, passed a bill, in a bipartisan way, with over 62 votes, 14 Republicans, and sent it to the House under Republican leadership 6 years ago. They have never brought that bill to the floor. We have pleaded with them to bring that bill to the floor to fix the immigration system. It has never come, Mr. Speaker, to the floor of this House.

But what we should never do, we should never take hostage the government of the United States, the employees who toil every day on behalf of the policies that we adopt and on behalf of the American people. We should never take them hostage and say: If you don't do what I say to do, we are going to keep them in an unpaid status, working if they are critical employees and locked out if they are not.

Mr. Speaker, it is very, very unfortunate that we find ourselves in this position. I would urge that the Republican

whip, who is my friend and whom I respect, talk to the President of the United States and say: Let's open up the government. Mr. HOYER has told me we will sit down and have a rational, reasonable, fact-based, expert-based discussion on how, in fact, we accomplish the objective we all say we want to accomplish, and that is to make our borders secure.

We are prepared to do that, open this government.

Mr. SCALISE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is finished. We will, obviously, have more time to go back and forth on this, but let's keep in mind a few facts.

First of all, the last shutdown of the United States Government was dubbed the Schumer shutdown because the Senate minority leader wanted to force his way on DACA.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman for one moment.

Mr. HOYER. Does the gentleman remember how long that lasted?

Mr. SCALISE. Oh, it lasted very shortly because the gentleman from New York realized he was on the wrong side of the issue, just like right now your side is on the wrong side of this issue opposing border security.

Let's be very clear what the fight is about, and it shouldn't be a fight. It is a fight because the President has said: Here is a proposal that my Department of Homeland Security has brought that said these are the tools they need to keep the country safe with a crisis at the border.

It can't be denied. I know some on your side want to deny it. I don't think the gentleman from Maryland denies it. But, clearly, when the Senate minority leader and the Speaker of the House go on national TV and say it is a fabricated crisis at the border, the American people see what is happening at the border. We can debate how best to solve it.

The President, through the Department of Homeland Security, has put down a proposal of what it is going to take. This is not a new idea.

Obviously, the President ran on this as a front-and-center issue. He not only ran on it, but he was elected by the American people as President to carry out border security and build a wall. It was part of the national debate.

I know some people on your side don't even want to recognize that that election occurred and the result, but it happened.

Mr. HOYER. Oh, no. I think there was an election, and he did raise that question. As I recall, that is why I am the majority leader and you are the minority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. You were not the majority leader when that happened. He was elected on that. We were still in the majority.

Let's remember why we are here. To think that this is some new idea the President is bringing forward is ignoring the history, and let's go through some of that history.

Obviously, it was front and center in the presidential election, and he was elected in large part on building a wall to secure our country's border.

Then we go to the first spending bill as he was President, and we had a disagreement. There were a lot of things that we were in disagreement on.

We wanted to rebuild our military, and we finally came to a 2-year agreement to do just that. It was critically important to start rebuilding the military of this country that was decimated, to give our men and women in uniform who risk their lives for our country a much-needed pay raise. We finally did that.

In that negotiation, the President wanted and he was talking about $25 billion for full border security, to build out the full 550 miles that are not secure right now, and they are well identified. The gentleman from Maryland knows those areas where we haven't built walls. Sure, we have got some money to build walls. There is about 120 miles of wall being built, wall that is not all cement. Some of it is steel slats.

Let the experts figure out the best way to secure our border. We are not the architects of the border. Let the experts be that.

But there is some wall being built, but not enough, especially in the areas where Federal law today prohibits wall from being built.

You want to know how ridiculous some of the laws are right now that we are trying to change? Federal law prohibits the President from building walls in the most cost-effective way, in the most efficient way. Why would we have those kinds of prohibitions in law?

We passed a bill through the House before the shutdown happened. You voted no. A lot of your side voted no. I think all your side, in fact, voted no. But it was a bill the President would have signed that would have given him the tools he needs to secure the border.

It went over to the Senate. The reason it didn't get to the President's desk is not because there wasn't Republican support. They have a 60-vote rule in the Senate.

I can disagree. You might even disagree, I don't know. I disagree on that. On appropriations bills, they should at least let the majority rule so we can properly govern this country in a more efficient manner. But they have a 60-vote requirement.

So the Senate minority, the Democrats in the Senate, all voted together to block it, and that led to a shutdown. That bill would have kept the government running and secured the border, but Democrats voted no in the House, Democrats voted no in the Senate, and so we have a shutdown.

How are we going to get out of this? How are we going to get it resolved? We can talk about hostages. We can talk about the people on your side of the aisle who refuse to support any border security with a dollar amount behind it. You can use words all day, but words don't secure our borders. Borders secure our border. Walls and barriers secure our border.

The President has said that you can call it and define it whatever you want. He has been very flexible in wanting to negotiate. But in every one of those meetings, there has not been a counteroffer put on the table by your side.

If we want to resolve the crisis, it involves both sides coming together. The President is already out there publicly, in our meetings, saying he is willing to negotiate and come to a different place.

You should work with your side to come up with definitions, to come up with a different dollar amount. But it has to end in securing our border. If we all agree on that, it has to end in the actual language and dollars to accomplish that objective.

The President said: I will give you 30 more days. Even though we don't agree on some of these other things, I will agree to sign that into law, if you will agree to work with me on the wall.

The Speaker said no. It was the Speaker who said no, not the President. That is why we are at day 21.

We didn't even need to be at day 1. We passed a bill out of the House. The Senate killed it because every Democrat voted no.

So here we are. Republicans and Democrats and everybody in this room know how we can solve this problem, but it is not by you all sitting there and saying we only are going to support a dollar and nothing more. Real money has to be put on the table to solve the crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. We could go on and on, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is the Senate sent us a bill to keep the government open. They passed it unanimously, under Republican leadership. The President said he would sign it. He changed his mind, and this House folded. And the Republicans who were in charge at the time wouldn't even put the Senate bill on the floor.

We are not prepared to be bludgeoned by taking hostage 800,000 people who work for the Federal Government and who are not now being paid, some of whom are working.

□ 1300

And, ironically, they are working to protect the border and to make sure our planes are flying, to make sure people who fly on planes are not in danger.

We want the President of the United States to open up this government. We want the Republicans to help us open up this government. We just passed four bills that are the Senate bills. Senator MCCONNELL is not going to take ''yes'' for an answer because the President tells him: I am not going to sign those bills.

Let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker. I have been a Member of this body for some period of time, and I served with George Bush. He was President of the United States, and we had a Democratic House, and we didn't have a shutdown. He signed appropriations bills. We worked together. We respected one another.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that the whip would, in fact, help us open up the government, and then we are prepared to sit down—he knows me—and talk about how we make our borders secure and protect our people and, yes, give humanitarian services to those who are seeking asylum, running from violence and mayhem and murder. We are prepared to do that. We want to do that.

I would hope the whip, I would hope Senator MCCONNELL, who was quoted just a few years ago as saying, ''shutdown is a failed policy''—shutdowns ought not to occur. Adults who are responsible ought not to allow that to happen, realizing full well that in order to preclude that from happening, compromise is absolutely essential on both sides.

President Trump is the President of the United States. We have to work with him to compromise, to come to agreement. But there are an awful lot of Republicans—I quoted WILL HURD; I quoted RON JOHNSON; I quoted some other Republicans—an awful lot of Republicans who think the President has the wrong idea. And, frankly, as Mr. Mulvaney said during the course of the campaign, it wasn't a very realistic idea.

But, that aside, it is time for us to open up the government, and then we will have an extensive discussion, as we must, as we should, in the best interests of the American people, to keep our borders secure and keep them safe.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I know that we are closing this. I do want to go back.

Last year, when the President signed the omnibus bill to keep the government open, at that time he said: This won't happen again. He laid down a marker last year that, okay, he will go along with a bill that is far short of what he needs to secure the border, but he wasn't going to do it again. That was a year ago.

So everybody has known that this issue is going to have to get resolved because lives are at risk. The President, like we did, took an oath to protect this country. That is what this is about. We surely want to open up all areas of government, but keeping the border secure is part of that. And so when the President signed the bill last year, he said: It is not going to happen again.

Now, obviously, when we came to this year, there were some people telling the President the votes weren't there to put the money in place to secure the border. In fact, the now Speaker, when she was minority leader, went to the White House and told the President: The votes aren't there in the House to fund your request for the wall.

Mr. HOYER. How many Republicans were in the House at that point in time?

Mr. SCALISE. We had over 218, clearly.

Mr. HOYER. You had 240-plus.

Mr. SCALISE. Good for you, and, obviously, things have changed.

But when the minority leader then told the President the votes weren't there to fund the wall, maybe the President took her at her word and thought that was an accurate assessment of the House. It turned out she was wrong. We passed the bill to fund the President's request.

The House had a difference with the Senate. It is surely not the first time in this country's history where the Senate passed one bill that was short of what we needed to secure the border, and we came back and passed a bill to fully fulfill the President's request to secure the border. So we ended up at an impasse not because there weren't enough Republican votes, but because there were no Democratic votes to do that. And now we are here today.

Let's talk about quotes. He wants to quote Republicans. I will quote a Democrat. I won't tell you who it is first.

In 2006, when there was a bill to put $50 billion in place, over 25 years, for border security, this Democrat in the Senate said it will authorize some badly needed funding for better fences and better security along our borders, and that should help stem some of the tide of illegal immigration in this country.

That was in 2006, for over $50 billion for border security, and the Democrat who said that was then-Senator Barack Obama. So you can quote Republicans. I will quote Democrats.

Mr. HOYER. That bill passed, did it not?

Mr. SCALISE. That bill passed, but it didn't put the money there, and that is why we are here.

And again, he can talk and give great speeches and say we need $50 billion, but if you don't appropriate the $50 billion, the money is not there to actually build the fencing that is needed.

Mr. HOYER. Was that bill brought up in the House?

Mr. SCALISE. And so now we need to talk about how to fund the wall, how to fund the structure, call it what you will. And again, the President, himself, has said you can title it however you want. You can ban cement fencing.

But at the same time, what Barack Obama and CHUCK SCHUMER voted for in 2006 is the authority to build what is needed, but they didn't put the money there. It is time to finally back up the word. It is hot air until you put the money on the table.

So the money has been put on the table by the Republicans, at least an offer, backed up with real data of where the money would be spent to secure this country. There has not been a counteroffer.

So let's talk now about the final issue, and that is adjournment.

I know later today the House will be voting to adjourn. Last week, the House, under the Democratic majority, as you proudly talk about the fact that you all are in the majority, you all voted to adjourn. We voted not to adjourn.

We should stay here to get this job done, to finally have a real negotiation to solve our differences. We can solve our differences, but we are not going to solve them by continuing to adjourn every weekend when we should be negotiating and getting the government back open and securing the border.

On this final thought, would the gentleman address the vote, the motion that will be made later to adjourn that we oppose?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman has a different concept of negotiating than I do. If somebody takes somebody that I care about hostage and says now I want to negotiate with you, it is not a negotiation. That is a demand. That is a ''if you don't do it, I am going to harm people.''

When you said the President of the United States said: This is the last time I am going to open up government, I am going to sign an almost overwhelmingly supported piece of legislation by Republicans and Democrats—George Bush never did that. I don't ever remember Ronald Reagan doing that or George H.W. Bush doing that or Bill Clinton doing that. They did it when it was a close vote, but not when it was overwhelming that we ought to open up the government.

As long as hostages are held by your opponent, you are not negotiating. You are subject to being demanded, ''Do what I say.'' That is not the democratic process, and it is harming, literally, millions, tens of millions of people in the process in order to get his way. I have not seen that before.

The other two shutdowns were legislative shutdowns. There is no doubt this is an executive shutdown, and you just said it: I will never sign something like this again unless it gives me what I want.

Frankly, that is what we saw in the negotiations over the 3 days we were there. The last day, of course, was about a 10-minute day because the President stomped out.

Mr. SCALISE, all I can tell you is I share your view of the objective, but because we don't agree with the same ways and means to accomplish that objective, shutting down government ought not to be the alternative. The alternative ought to be to keep talking and getting to a place where I think you and I both want to get, where these borders are secure, where people are not being transported across it for human trafficking purposes, where murderers don't come across the border.

But there is a surge right now across our border, and that surge is of mostly

mothers and children seeking asylum, coming to ports of entry—not across any fences or borders, coming to ports of entry. The border guards are telling us they are turning themselves in. They want to, because they are seeking refuge from a country that has purported to be a country of refuge, that raises a statue in New York Harbor to send that message. But we need to make them known to us when they come into the country. We agree on that.

So, rather than all this rhetoric back and forth, Mr. Speaker, it is a simple proposition. Senator MCCONNELL has said, unless the President says he will sign on opening up the government, he won't put it on the floor. That is the only person who is stopping you, because we have sent bills.

Mr. COLE of your side said: I don't like the bills because they are only Senate bills. We don't like them either, but we like, less, government being shut down. We like, less, 800,000 people being put at risk. We like, less, the anxiety that we are causing our Federal employees in terms of the financial stability of their homes and their ability to put food on their tables and pay their mortgage and pay their rent.

Surely—surely—we ought to be able to come to agreement that that is not what we ought to inflict to get our way. I hope we open up our government.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

And when you look at the women who are coming across through this trek to try to cross the border, first of all, asylum has been offered by Mexico to all of the people as part of that caravan. Thousands of people were offered asylum, work permits—turned it down. There is a legal way to seek asylum.

It seems to me, if another country offers you asylum and you want to leave your country, you take the asylum, but they turned it down. But the women who are coming over, Doctors Without Borders has done a study and said that over 30 percent of the women who are on this trek have been sexually assaulted or worse.

We should all want to address this crisis. There is a way to solve the crisis. If we talk about hostages, both sides can use terms. But when the President of the United States and the White House look at the Speaker and say, ''I will sign a bill that contains things that we have yet to negotiate that I don't agree with; I will sign it if you agree to keep negotiating,'' and the Speaker of the House said no, that is the my-way-or-the-highway approach that is wrong.

The President has put multiple things on the table, has offered to negotiate on terms, on dollars, on every front, and not one counteroffer. That has got to change. We can solve this crisis, but it is going to involve both sides being willing to put something on the table to solve the border security crisis. I hope we can get there, and we will keep working at it.

I appreciate the comments and the thoughts of the gentleman from Maryland, and I truly do believe that he wants to solve this. We have some differences. Let's keep working and get it done.

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

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 11, 2019, TO MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, January 14, 2019, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALLRED). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

SHUTDOWN IMPACT ON CENTRAL VALLEY

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

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind Members of the everyday faces being hurt by this government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, 21 days into this crisis, the Central Valley has had enough. I spoke to a woman from Modesto who drives 30 miles to work every morning to serve our country as a TSA agent. She goes paycheck to paycheck, supports her kids, pays her rent, healthcare, groceries. She is not getting paid right now, and her daughter may have to drop out of college because her mom can't afford her tuition.

What are we doing?

And it is not just Federal employees. Farmers in my district can't apply for tariff relief because the Farm Services Agency isn't open. Because HUD is closed, I have hundreds of families who won't be able to pay their rent and are worried about being evicted.

This is an unnecessary crisis. The Central Valley—America—needs this to stop. I urge everyone on this floor to put politics aside, to work together, and to reopen our government.

□ 1315

STRENGTHENING BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of Florida's Second Congressional District who stand in strong support of the Trump administration's efforts to secure our southern border. Unfortunately, obstructionist leadership on the other side of the aisle is unwilling to even consider a commonsense solution to the problem that hurts the security of our Nation.

This has become a needlessly divisive issue. We simply must secure our borders. Despite the steadfast efforts of law enforcement, human traffickers, drug dealers, and other violent criminals continue to enter our country from the southern border daily. Furthermore, the majority of heroin, fentanyl, and methamphetamine in America are smuggled into America from Mexico.

With the opioid epidemic and drug addiction costing our economy hundreds of billions of dollars annually, and taking countless lives, we must take action.

I stand with my colleagues and President Trump in our commitment to secure our Nation and protect our people.

RESTORE FUNDING TO THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, this shutdown is tearing at the fabric of our society, and one of the clearest examples is the lack of funding for the Justice Department.

As a practicing attorney for the past 30+ years, I know that many people, when facing some of the most challenging times of their lives, often depend on Justice Department services. When we fail to provide those resources, our fellow citizens are forced to suffer in silence.

This lack of funding has led the Violence Against Women Act to expire, jeopardizing protections for domestic abuse and sexual assault victims. Constituents in my district, who provide assistance to these survivors through such fine organizations as Turning Point of Lehigh Valley, and the Crime Victims Council, have said that their programs could soon be at risk.

And because of Washington's failure to fund programs like the Victims of Crime Act Assistance Grant Program, organizations that look out for children suffering abuse aren't getting the resources they need either.

As promised, when this shutdown began, I will be making regular charitable contributions to individuals and agencies in my district who are adversely affected by the shutdown, but that will, by no means, offset loss of Federal funding.

Our constituents are suffering, and they need us to act.

END THE TRUMP SHUTDOWN NOW

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government, the greatest Nation on Earth, should never shut down. Never. It is outrageous, it is totally unnecessary, and it must end immediately.

Today, 800,000 Federal workers who go to work every day to serve this Nation and the American people won't get