

Senate passes a bill, and, yes, they require 60 votes. Well, what does that mean? It means they have to come to a compromise at a higher number.

We didn't have to do that. We got some Republican votes for some of the bills. But the fact is, we did our business and, frankly, we did it before—it has been done since I have been here—96 percent of the government funded, and we sent them to the Senate.

The Senate has not considered a single one of those bills because they had no stomach for compromise, which was why we are negotiating with Mr. Mnuchin and not the Senate leadership to listen to what, apparently, the President will accept.

I agree with the minority whip that considering the administration's views is important because, of course, we want the bills signed. But we have known for a very long time that the Republicans could not—on this floor—neither Speaker Ryan, nor Speaker Boehner could negotiate with Mr. Mulvaney.

The minority whip knows that, Madam Speaker. As a matter of fact, a lot of the Republicans have talked to me, Madam Speaker, about how difficult Mulvaney is to deal with. But we waited for checkoff, either from Chief of Staff Mulvaney or the President himself. But we waited. Not we in the House, in the Senate.

So I tell my friend, the Senate was not prepared to bring their bills, not our bills, to the floor to try to achieve that bipartisan agreement of which the minority whip speaks. Not a single bill was brought to the floor before the end of the fiscal year.

You are not going to get any kind of an agreement if you don't try to move forward, if you just wait for what Mr. Mulvaney wants us to do.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I was just working with Mr. Mulvaney yesterday on USMCA, something I would hope to see us bring to this House floor. Clearly, by the end of this year, it should have been done a long time ago, but something I know he and many others in the administration—Mr. Lighthizer has been taking the point on trying to get a negotiation concluded so that we can create more jobs in this country and create better trade opportunities for our families that we represent.

Even if Mr. Mnuchin were to get an agreement, we all know that Mr. Mnuchin doesn't have a vote in the Senate. And even if every Republican in the Senate agreed with Mr. Mnuchin, you still can't pass a bill in the Senate because it takes Democrats working as well.

The families that we represent are much less concerned about whose side thinks they are right, as they are about saying, just go in a room and work it out. It has been done before. It ought to be done this time. And I would just encourage that between now and December 20—we don't have to wait until December 16—I would hope

that those leaders on your side in the majority would go get with the leaders in the Senate and come to an agreement.

I am sure they will have conversations along the way with the White House, too, but at a minimum, to get the House and Senate to come to agreement, not complain about who passed bills and who didn't.

The NDAA was passed here in partisan way. It never had happened before in the history of Congress. The gentleman's side chose to do a partisan bill where there was a bipartisan bill to be had, and, yet, that was put on the side.

□ 1230

So there is a bipartisan way to do it or a partisan way to do it. Ultimately, you are in the majority; you get to decide that.

The Senate has their own different set of rules, and we might want to change them, but that is how they operate.

At the end of the day, both sides have to get in a room and work it out, and I would just encourage both sides to do that.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just make one additional comment.

It is ironic that the minority whip, Madam Speaker, addresses such great concern about funding the Armed Forces of the United States. We passed a bill at a figure that the Joint Chiefs of Staff thought was a figure that was acceptable and supportive of our national security, and almost every Republican—maybe every one—

Mr. SCALISE. Every Republican.

Mr. HOYER.—voted against it.

Mr. SCALISE. Because it had poison pills in it. The level of funding wasn't the issue. It was the limitations on the Defense Department to be able to do their job properly that were added in, when everyone knew those were partisan additions that had never been in previous bills.

So we can get it done without partisan bills. If you want to do the partisan poison pills, it is your prerogative, but it is not going to get signed into law. Our job should be to make law and to put the differences on the side and work through and get it done.

It has always been done before, by the way. NDAA has never been a partisan bill until this year.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I would say that is not accurate.

But having said that, we hope we can move forward. But to absolve the United States Senate, led by Republicans, have a majority of Republicans controlling the Senate Committee on Appropriations and controlling what goes on the floor—Democrats don't control that; the Republicans control it—they didn't bring a single appropriations bill to the floor.

Now, if you don't like our ideas, put your ideas on the floor. Have them voted up or down. If they lose, then you either have to get a compromise or you don't get a bill passed.

I will leave it to the American public, Madam Speaker, to determine who is being partisan on this issue and who is not.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, again, we know the rules of the Senate. They operate differently. We might both agree that we would do things differently. We do things differently in the House than they do. Ultimately, both sides have to come to an agreement, and, hopefully, that happens in the next few weeks, not at the midnight hour by December 20.

Madam Speaker, unless the gentleman from Maryland has anything further, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2019, TO MONDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2019

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCHRIER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

EAGLE SCOUT WILLIAM MCLEES

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, today, I would like to commend William McLees of south Jersey on achieving the admirable rank of Eagle Scout.

William led his fellow boy scouts of Troop 79 in his Eagle Scout project to install an information kiosk at Somers Mansion. This information booth will educate visitors about the past of this old historic building, which is one of the oldest buildings in the region, dating back to 1725.

McLees carefully outfitted the kiosk with solar panels for lighting and a waterproof exterior so the structure will now be as long-lasting as Somers Mansion itself.

Madam Speaker, I applaud William's craftsmanship and his leadership in coordinating this project, and I thank him for this informative addition to our entire south Jersey community. I congratulate him on his high title of Eagle Scout, and I wish him the very best.

Americans look for heroes all over the world. Our hero is William McLees. He truly deserves our praise.

HONORING THE CITY OF MURRAY FOR SAFETY AWARD

(Mr. COMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1