



Steube	Trahan	Watson Coleman
Stevens	Trone	Weber (TX)
Stewart	Turner	Webster (FL)
Stivers	Underwood	Welch
Suozi	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	Yoho
Torres (CA)	Schultz	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

□ 1233

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