

It is clear that Americans do support President Trump's security stance, despite exaggerated reports by the media and my colleagues on the other side.

I have heard from hundreds of my constituents who are in support of the wall. Their voices have been heard, and I will remain strong for border security and protecting this Nation.

□ 0915

### SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I rise to implore the President to stop holding Federal workers hostage and immediately end this shutdown.

I think every day of the TSA agent I recently spoke with at the airport. She is now working without pay, a young single mother raising her 15-year-old daughter. She told me she is really struggling to make ends meet without her paycheck. Her story is not unique.

A constituent from Mundelein shared that she doesn't know how she will pay her bills, including her mortgage, and has had to borrow money from her family.

Another constituent, a Federal employee in Round Lake, has been working without pay. He wrote: "Why are we a bargaining tool for something beyond our control?"

Why indeed, Mr. President?

We may disagree on the best way to secure our border, but we can all agree that the good women and men working on our Nation's behalf should be paid for their work—the TSA and FAA workers keeping our skies safe, the FDA workers keeping our food safe, and the Coast Guard protecting our borders.

Do the responsible thing: reopen our government, and then let's have a robust, honest debate about how to secure our borders.

### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 28, FURTHER ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 52 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 52

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 28) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous

question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of January 25, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), 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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam 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 gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 52, providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 28, the Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act of 2019 to fund the government until February 28.

The rule provides for consideration of the legislation under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. Additionally, the rule provides suspension authority through the legislative day of January 25, 2019.

Madam Speaker, we are in day 27 of this government shutdown, the longest government shutdown in our Nation's history.

Nearly 800,000 Federal employees have now missed a paycheck since the shutdown began. Some estimates say those employees have lost an average of \$5,000 each so far.

These hardworking Americans are law enforcement officers and National Park Service, EPA, FDA, and IRS employees, and so many others in dedicated Federal service whose families are needlessly suffering. These employees are either furloughed or being forced to work without pay. This is not an acceptable way to govern.

I may not have been a Member of this body as long as some people here, but I don't think there is a single Member, Democrat or Republican, who doesn't care about securing our border, but it is foolish to think that keeping our government shut down will in any way help secure the border.

You know what Border Patrol and Coast Guard members want more than

a wall? They want their paychecks to come on time.

Democrats have made it clear, we are more than willing to come to the table to talk about sensible border security, but the first step has to be to reopen the government and get our government back to functioning.

This majority has already voted to open the government seven times, with support from across the aisle. But Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL has yet to act on any of these bipartisan pieces of legislation, the same legislation, I might add, that has already passed the Senate.

There are more than 100 freshmen Members of this body, comprising over 20 percent of the House, who have never worked in a functioning Federal Government due to the Senate's inaction. All of our constituents, both Republican and Democrat, are suffering because of that failure to act.

Let me share with you the traumatic impact of the shutdown on my constituents and Americans across the country.

Jennifer, the wife of a Coast Guard gunner's mate, wrote to my office to detail the hardships her family is facing. Her husband has served in the Coast Guard for 19 years. They are used to stressful deployments, and her children are proud of their father's service. But now Jennifer has new hardships to face: how to feed her family on only her income, how she could make the holidays special while not knowing when her husband's next paycheck would come, and how to shield her kids from her constant worry over the absence of that income.

This is an embarrassment. Too many Federal workers were already living paycheck to paycheck before those paychecks stopped. Having to put a mortgage payment on a credit card, deal with an eviction notice, or plead with a bank to delay a student loan payment should not be the reality forced upon hardworking Federal employees.

The debts these workers incur during the shutdown will follow them long after the government is reopened. The hits to their savings accounts and marks on their credit scores will serve as painful reminders that they are represented by a government that will put them in harm's way over a policy dispute.

Fran, a newlywed with a premature baby who spent more than 3 weeks in the NICU, has been without an income since her husband's paychecks stopped coming. Their child requires an expensive special formula due to his premature birth, and her husband is now being asked to work overtime without pay.

The fear and anguish in these messages from our neighbors is palpable. It should resonate with every Member of this body. These stories should keep all of us up at night. If we didn't come to Washington to serve these dedicated and hardworking Americans, then just who are we here to serve?

When the government does eventually reopen, fortunately, many of these Federal employees will receive back-pay, but the plight of Federal contractors is worse. The term “Federal contractors” can conjure up an image of highly paid executives or CEOs of private detention facilities, but they are not the real ones harmed by the shutdown.

Federal contractors are generally small businesses, cleaners, builders, food service workers, and tech support workers. They are our neighbors who rely on these contracts to make their rent or pay their employees or contribute to our local economies.

The callousness with which these Federal contractors are being treated is repulsive. They and their families deserve so much better. The American people deserve so much better.

The longer the Senate Republicans keep our government shut down, the worse things will get.

The Small Business Administration has already stopped approving loan assistance and guarantee applications from commercial banks and small businesses, programs that are critical to the health of local economies.

Security lines at the airports are long, and they will get longer. TSA has already been forced to close security lanes at major airports across the country. This is not because the hard-working men and women of the TSA do not want to keep our skies and our passengers safe, but because they have been forced to take second jobs to pay the rent or look after their children at home because they cannot afford childcare. Without a paycheck, some cannot afford gas or carfare to get to work at all.

Just a few days ago, I met with the air traffic controllers from my district. They shared that not only is the shutdown impacting their current workforce, but it is drastically impacting their recruiting efforts to hire and train new employees for this workforce. Can we blame people for being fearful of taking a job that hinges on the Federal Government’s functionality, given what we have seen during this shutdown?

A National Air Traffic Controllers Association official warned recently that if the shutdown continues to drag on, there may not be any air traffic controllers left working.

Let me pause to make those statements abundantly clear. This shutdown is making us less safe. If it continues much longer, there will not be enough employees on duty to make sure passengers are safe to board a plane, not enough employees left to make sure planes are safe to land, and not enough employees to direct air traffic in our skies.

If you think you are insulated from the effects of a government shutdown because you are not a Federal employee, you are wrong.

What I fear this administration and Republican leadership in the Senate

have forgotten is that this is the people’s House. We have an obligation to work for them. Refusing to uphold that commitment, that promise, is a slap in the face to the American people.

Before I conclude, let me share with you one final story of how the shutdown is harming American families.

Jessica from my district is a mother of six with a special needs child. Her husband is Active Duty Coast Guard. She has been forced to tell her children they can’t have seconds at dinner, because she doesn’t know if she will have enough food to last the week. Her daughter has an ultrasound coming up, and she is unsure if she can afford the specialist copay.

She writes that she and her husband supported President Trump, but that after this, she does not see “how we could support someone so out of touch and willing to damage so many people in order to save his own face.”

Jessica ended her message by saying that they are prepared to stand strong, but she is also prepared to stand at the corner of an intersection with a cardboard sign if that is what she has to do to feed her children.

This is not the America I was raised in.

Let’s end the shutdown today and get our country back on track.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative SCANLON from Pennsylvania for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I agree with Representative SCANLON. I want to open the government. Republicans want to open the government. Democrats want to open the government. So I respectfully ask House and Senate Democrats to stop holding our Federal workers hostage.

You know, on December 20, I voted for and Republicans voted for in the House a bill right here, standing right here on December 20, that would have kept the government open, and then we would not have had any of these discussions or need for these bills, because the government would still be open. Unfortunately, not one Democrat Member of the House voted for it.

I, too, have Federal workers in my district who are hurting, these great men and women who work hard each and every day of their life, single mothers who are waiting for their paycheck. So I call on my colleagues across the aisle to please come to the negotiating table.

I believe the number one rule in Negotiations 101 is you have to show up. Repeatedly, we have seen the Republicans and the President request the Democrat leadership to come and negotiate, give a counteroffer. They refuse to show up.

I say, if the House Republicans already passed a bill that would have kept the government open and now we are at this impasse, but the Democrat

leadership refuses to come to even a negotiating table or a counteroffer, I just don’t know what to say.

Well, Madam Speaker, once again, we have returned to the House floor to consider yet another short-term spending bill that once again is most likely going nowhere. For what is now the fourth time in 3 weeks, we have returned to the House floor on a rule to consider an appropriations bill as part of the majority’s efforts to fund the government without working with President Trump.

Unfortunately, we think this effort is just as shortsighted as the previous bills over the last couple of weeks, and today’s rule is again destined to ignore the fundamental realities at issue.

But first, as I said before, let’s take a quick look at how we got to this point.

On December 20, the House of Representatives passed a bill that would have funded the government and prevented the shutdown. It included a continuing resolution through February 8. It included disaster relief and funding for border security that the Democrats say they want, but are not listening to our own law enforcement on the border on their recommendations. That was a bill the majority of the Senate supported and the President said he would sign.

□ 0930

Unfortunately, as we all know, the Senate refused to take up the House measure, mostly because of their 60-vote rule, where they need Democrats to get on board, and parts of the government shut down when appropriations lapsed. Again, not one single Democrat in the House voted for this bill, which would have avoided this whole, entire partial government shutdown.

On January 3, when the new Congress was sworn in, the House took up a continuing resolution through February 8, only this time swept clean of essential disaster relief funding or funding for border security. To date, the Senate, as we know, has refused to take up this measure, and the President has said he would not sign it because it doesn’t have additional money for border security.

Last week, then again, the House took up four more spending bills, that covered four of the outstanding seven appropriations titles. Unfortunately, like the week prior, these bills also did not include funding for border security. Even more unfortunately, these bills were ones that were produced by the Senate alone during the last Congress, and that did not even reflect any work by, or input from, the House of Representatives. Just as publicly stated the Senate has not taken up any of these bills during this Congress and has no plans to take this one up either.

On Tuesday, the majority put up yet another continuing resolution. This one a suspension bill, to fund the government through February 1, but, yet

again, omitting any funding for border security, which is the key ingredient to get negotiations done. That bill failed to reach the two-thirds threshold to pass under suspension of the rules.

And then, yes, yesterday, the House took up a supplemental disaster appropriations bill that was intended only to provide just over \$12 billion in necessary disaster relief for affected communities. This was a bipartisan bill. We could have passed it out of here.

But instead of bringing up this bipartisan disaster relief bill to the floor, the majority chose to play politics once again and decided at the last minute to attach yet another continuing resolution to this bill, again, without any border security funding, and, again, to fund the government through February 8. That bill passed the House yesterday, yet there is no sign that the Senate ever has any intention of taking that bill up. In any event, the President has made it clear, and I believe the American public has made it clear, that we want border security.

And that brings us to today. I have to tell you, I am running out of ways to describe what the majority is doing, but I imagine the Speaker knows where I am going with this. Once again, the majority is bringing up yet another continuing resolution—this one goes to February 28—and, again, with no funding for border security. And yet again, it is clear that if we pass this bill, the Senate will not consider it and the President will not sign it because it does not include funding for border security.

We now see the common thread in all the majority is doing: bringing up bills again and again and again, to fund the government, without dealing with the fundamental problem. All of these repeated continuing resolutions are the same. Only the date has changed. All of them fail to fund border security, which Americans have told us again and again they want and need. And all of them are continued avoidance of what needs to happen in order to end this shutdown: real, sincere negotiations with the Senate and the President over border security.

I feel that this is an exercise in futility. The majority is failing to acknowledge the crisis happening at our southern border. As you know, I am a Member from Arizona, a border State. When will the Democrats get serious about ending this government shutdown and come to the negotiating table to work out a deal that has a real chance of being signed into law?

Listen, I know that border security is a crisis. The other night on TV, when Speaker PELOSI and CHUCK SCHUMER said it is a manufactured crisis, I can tell you firsthand, that is not accurate. We do have a crisis on the border, and we need to fix it. I have been to the border. I have been to the border several times. I recently visited the United States-Mexico border in Nogales, Arizona, where I met with

Customs and Border Protection agents. The crisis we are dealing with at the border is not just illegal immigration, they said. There is illicit drugs flowing through our borders, which are killing our children and adults, human trafficking, and they told us that dangerous cartels are using our loose immigration laws to exploit the women and children, having them travel thousands of miles.

Do you know that Doctors Without Borders say that, I believe one in three of these women have been sexually abused? This is unconscionable. We need border security. And it is the law enforcement, the Customs and Border Protection, that have said repeatedly, have told me personally, yes; part of the solution is a border fence.

In 2006, Democrats supported a border fence. CHUCK SCHUMER and then-Senators Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton funded \$2 billion for 700 miles of fencing. Now the President is asking for \$5.7 billion. That is only 1/10th of 1 percent of the Federal budget. And, unfortunately, because of their refusal to add this to any bills, it has shut down the government.

This rule before us today is just another ploy. Democrats are refusing to negotiate and refusing to deal with this national security issue. Please, let's stop these games and pass a real bill that funds border security, that opens the government, that funds disaster relief, send it to the Senate, and have it signed into law.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I understand the frustration of the gentlewoman from Arizona with the lack of progress in ending this shutdown, but I would suggest that her frustration is misdirected.

The House has sent seven bills to end the shutdown to the Senate, and the Senate leadership has refused to entertain any of them or bring them to a vote: #whereismitch.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. GOLDEN).

Mr. GOLDEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, this shutdown has been brutal on working people across the country. Many of them are my constituents, and I came down here to let their voices be heard.

Back home, a Border Patrol agent from my district said about all of us here in the House, in the White House, in the Senate: "I blame all of you for the financial and emotional damage you are causing to the very people tasked with protecting your Nation and your homeland, but ultimately, this falls on the White House."

Suzette from my district, her husband is an essential Federal employee

working without pay. She asked me, "to bring sensibility to this senseless power struggle that is currently going on. The Democrats," she says—and she is a Democrat, by the way—"need to back down from their 'must punish Trump and deny him everything' stance and the Republicans need to get some control over the ill-equipped man who is running our country."

Another Federal employee from Milford, Maine, tells me: "I am very concerned with the furlough, lack of negotiations, and lack of pay. I do not know who is right or wrong. I just want to get back to work, complete my job, and receive my pay."

We owe these people a solution that gets them back to work and gets them paid. I can only imagine that, back home, people are amazed to hear the ways in which both sides are right now talking past each other. I think it is wonderful that we expressed, on both sides of the aisle this morning, a desire to reopen the government and to secure our borders.

I would like to point out that the CR that will be voted on today does have border security funding: over \$1 billion in new funding for new border security. I know that the Republicans say that they want to reopen government and secure our borders, I also know that my party has said the same, so let's do it.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule, support the CR today, let's reopen government, let's put people back to work, let them work. They are public servants. They want to serve the people. Let's start securing our border. And with those extra billion dollars we can also move on to a more robust debate about border security that I look forward to.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), my good friend.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time to speak on this important issue.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this rule. I think we are talking past each other, as the previous gentleman from Maine just indicated. We want the government to reopen, but we want something called border security. I am told that this bill has \$1 billion in it for border security, but we are not going to build a wall.

Now, here is the thing that happens. Down in Arizona, where we live—we don't live 2,000 miles away from that southern border where the immigration problem is that the illegal border crossings are monumental—we actually see the humanitarian crisis. That crisis exists when people, who are coming to America, they don't go through the ports of entry, they are going between the ports of entry, in some of the most rugged land and terrain in the world, coming down from the Sierra Madres in northern Mexico in the summertime, blazing heat of 120 degrees or more; in the winter time, the evenings cool down to the 20s.

I saw people, just yesterday, being shown on the news, who are getting ready to try to make this trek. They are carrying plastic grocery bags with their supplies. They are dressed casually. They have no comprehension of the danger that they are bringing to themselves when they are coming across. It is a humanitarian crisis. Do you know what a border wall would do? It would provide a deterrent.

In the San Diego-San Ysidro port of entry, when that border wall was created, crossings declined almost 90 percent. It forced people to a different place. They began crossing away from the ports of entry at San Diego over to Arizona and Texas. So we built a wall around the Yuma port of entry. Do you know what happened? Those crossings decreased to 75 to 80 percent. They moved on to more dangerous places in the desert, down towards Nogales, between Nogales and South Bisbee, between Naco and the Douglas port of entry. More than 100 individual's bodies were found last year trying to enter. It is a humanitarian crisis.

The opioids that come across the southern border: 141 tons of heroin seized coming across the southern border last year; 140 tons of cocaine seized coming across the southern border.

When I hear people say border security, they start talking about drones and unmanned aerial vehicles and sensors and cameras. Guess what? That does not deter anyone. We get to watch the videos of people coming across. But do you know what a wall does? It channelizes people. It forces them to go to places where we can interdict them. We provide hundreds of millions of dollars of humanitarian aid to people who are risking their lives trying to enter this country.

If it wasn't so serious, I would find it laughable to hear folks say, "We are putting \$1 billion into this as border security," because they don't want a political victory for President Trump. It is not about political victories. It is about national security, it is about humanitarian concern, and you are not going to get a better bang for your buck than to build a border wall.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0945

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), my good friend.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, folks in the audience, and folks that are watching this on TV, this is all theater. This is all just political theater.

Everybody knows. I know. My good friends on the other side of the aisle know that this isn't going to solve anything. This is not a solution.

If we were serious about solving this, we wouldn't be voting on another bill here that doesn't fix anything, that is never going to be moved through the Senate, that is never going to be signed by the President.

If we were interested in opening the Federal Government, we would be ne-

gotiating. We would be talking about what our differences are about border security.

Remember, this is a bill that includes the funding for border security. That is why we have this partial shutdown, because we have a disagreement about border security. And we are trying to work it out, but we can't work it out just by running the same bills that don't do anything and that are never going to move through the Senate and aren't going to be signed by the President.

It is time to get serious.

Last year, this government was shut down for a few days over amnesty. Now it is shut down because the other side doesn't want to talk about border security. You put amnesty and the lack of border security together, and that is open borders. That is completely open borders.

Just on the news, if you were watching the last couple days, more caravans heading north out of Central America through Mexico to the United States border. That is what is happening right now while our Border Patrol agents are out there working but not being paid.

Here come these folks. We don't know what their circumstances are. I am sure there are a lot of fine people in there. I am sure there are children in there, and the horrors that they are going to suffer on this trek north up through the desert in these points between the points of entry.

Madam Speaker, the most recent numbers out of Homeland Security in November, 51,000 people—that is the ones we caught—51,000 people came across the border between the ports of entry.

If they were coming to the ports of entry, this wouldn't be half of a problem, but the problem is they are coming between the ports of entry. That is one month, 51,000. And those are the ones we caught. We don't have any idea how many other ones made it through.

And yet some folks are saying: Well, we are going to give you an extra billion dollars to fix this problem.

It is not an extra billion. It is the same billion, and it is to fix problems at the ports of entry.

Madam Speaker, the problem is between the ports of entry and the ports of entry. But we are not going to do anything about the ports of entry. The billion dollars we are talking about is to muddle around and maintain things at the ports of entry but do nothing between the ports of entry, nothing at all. That is the status quo.

That is why we are in this argument, because we are saying we cannot withstand, we cannot maintain the status quo of 51,000 people a month coming illegally across our border and do nothing.

We are pleading with the other side: Please, let's do something. Let's do something different than the status quo, because the status quo gives us 51,000 people coming illegally across the border.

And they are saying: Well, we are just going to run the same bill to open the government and do nothing.

We cannot abide that. The American people cannot abide that.

People are working, Madam Speaker, without being paid while people pour across our border, and we are expecting them to stop them. They don't have the resources because we are not providing them.

It is time to end this needless show of work. We are here working, right? We are all here working. We are not doing anything to solve the problem.

What it is going to take is somebody to sit down at the table and say, "Look. See here. This is what I think the issue is," and find some solution somewhere in the middle. But you can't do that if you are not willing to have a discussion.

We are asking to have a discussion so we can get past this, so people can get paid and the American people can be assured that their government is securing their border, their property, their country, and stopping all these illegal immigrants from coming in; and making sure that, if they are going to come in—and we are a country of immigrants.

My grandmother, my great-grandmother came here from Colombia, South America, with the shirts on their backs. They came through Ellis Island because we had a process. We are all immigrants, and we welcome immigrants more than any other country on the planet, but we want you to come legally.

We have a process. We don't want you to just pour across the border into our country with gang-related violence, with fentanyl, with opioids that are killing people in our own communities, all these drugs and crimes and violence. We are asking you to come to the ports of entry and quit pouring in between the ports of entry. But our laws now invite them to do that, which is why they are coming.

So I just beseech you, Madam Speaker—and I thank you for your indulgence and for your time—let's quit this show. Let's quit this charade. Let's quit this theater. Let's get serious for the people who are working, for the American people who expect more, and get down to negotiation, come to a solution, and move on with things, the important things that plague our Nation.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I am surprised to hear my colleague talk about political theater. We have a reality-show President in the White House who is ignoring the real lives impacted by the shutdown, all to try to make another made-for-TV moment to please his rightwing base and radio pundits. Government isn't a game. Real lives are at stake, and we need to reopen the government.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire if the gentlewoman has any remaining speakers. If not, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close as well, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, in closing, this is the fourth time we have deliberated on this floor, in the last 3 weeks, on the exact same type of package.

The date keeps changing—sometimes it is February 1; sometimes it is February 8; sometimes it is February 28—but it is all the same. None of them include funding for border security. It is the fourth time that the same result will ensue. The House of Representatives is in a perpetual cycle of Groundhog Day that we cannot seem to escape.

Representative SCANLON and I serve, of course, on the Rules Committee together, and it is Groundhog Day. We just say the same things each and every day. Really, let's get to the negotiating table, and, really, let's get something done.

The majority seems to be insistent on reviewing these same appropriations packages again and again, fully knowing that the Senate has made clear they will not take up these bills because there is no border security in them.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not mention that this bill is again coming to the floor under a closed rule. Of the eight bills the House has considered under a rule this Congress, seven have been closed, with no opportunity for Members to present new ideas and new amendments.

Now, I know that Chairman MCGOVERN has assured us he wants a more open process, and I believe he is sincere in his assurance. We saw a more open process on the disaster supplemental bill we considered earlier this week, which has so far been the outlier of this Congress, with 15 amendments made in order on a structured rule. I look forward to considering more rules that have a more open process than the one we are considering today.

Madam Speaker, I urge “no” on the previous question, “no” on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I don't know when this shutdown will end, but I know that Democrats and all the Republicans who are serious about getting Federal employees back to work will vote in favor of this rule and the underlying resolution.

I am heartened by my colleagues from across the aisle who have already voted to reopen the government, and I am hopeful that even more will join us this time around.

No serious person can claim that any Member of this House is against border security. Not only have we sworn an oath to protect and defend this country, but we have voted repeatedly to

fund billions of dollars in border security appropriations.

The discussion about the best methods for protecting our border is a valid policy question that should be debated thoughtfully and deliberately by both sides of the aisle, not used as a vehicle for the President to fulfill a campaign promise at the expense of American families.

It cannot be overstated: this is the longest government shutdown in history. The House has done its job. We have passed bills to reopen the government on bipartisan votes and will continue to do so for as long as it takes.

We have committed to working on solutions to border security once the government is opened back up. The votes are there in the Senate. They have already shown that. And given the chance, I am sure they would show it again.

Why won't Senator MCCONNELL bring to the floor any one of the House-passed bills to open the government?

I will end by saying this: Senator MCCONNELL, do the right thing for working families in your State, in my State, and across the country. Hold a vote to open the government.

Let's end the pain American families and businesses are feeling from the shutdown and get to work on making this country a better place for all.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1004

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. PINGREE) at 10 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's ap-

pointment, pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Member of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. WELCH, Vermont, to rank after Mr. HECK of Washington

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in following order:

Adoption of House Resolution 52; and The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 150.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 28, FURTHER ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 52) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 28) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 190, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—230

Adams	Cisneros	Deutch
Aguilar	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Allred	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Axne	Clay	Doyle, Michael
Barragán	Cleaver	F.
Bass	Clyburn	Engel
Beatty	Cohen	Escobar
Bera	Connolly	Eshoo
Beyer	Cooper	Espallat
Bishop (GA)	Correa	Evans
Blumenauer	Costa	Finkenauer
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Fletcher
Bonamici	Cox (CA)	Foster
Boyle, Brendan	Craig	Frankel
F.	Crist	Fudge
Brindisi	Crow	Gabbard
Brown (MD)	Cuellar	Gallego
Brownley (CA)	Cummings	Garamendi
Bustos	Cunningham	García (IL)
Butterfield	Davids (KS)	García (TX)
Carbajal	Davis (CA)	Golden
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny K.	Gomez
Carson (IN)	Dean	Gonzalez (TX)
Cartwright	DeFazio	Gottheimer
Case	DeGette	Green (TX)
Casten (IL)	DeLauro	Grijalva
Castor (FL)	DelBene	Haaland
Castro (TX)	Delgado	Harder (CA)
Chu, Judy	Demings	Hastings
Cicilline	DeSaulnier	Hayes