

Spano	Turner	Williams
Stauber	Walberg	Wilson (SC)
Steil	Walden	Wittman
Steube	Walker	Womack
Stewart	Walorski	Woodall
Stivers	Waltz	Wright
Taylor	Watkins	Yoho
Thompson (PA)	Weber (TX)	Young
Thornberry	Webster (FL)	Zeldin
Tipton	Wenstrup	
Tlaib	Westerman	

NOT VOTING—11

Flores	Lofgren	Omar
Gabbard	Marchant	Serrano
Gallego	Marshall	Timmons
Herrera Beutler	McEachin	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1204

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 619, I was detained. If I was present, I would have voted “aye” on the McAdams amendment to H.R. 4863, the United States Export Finance Agency Act.

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. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for the purpose of inquiring from the majority leader the House floor schedule next week.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. 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 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Madam Speaker, we will consider several bills under suspension of the rules, including H.R. 4634, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act, a very significant and very bipartisan bill.

The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

In addition, Madam Speaker, the House will be considering a continuing resolution through December 20 to keep the government open and operating on behalf of the American people.

Madam Speaker, I am deeply disappointed by the Senate’s failure to complete their work on appropriations, forcing us to consider another con-

tinuing resolution. This is evidence of failure, not of success. It is absolutely essential that we pass the CR to keep our government operating, but it is an indication that we have not gotten our business done as we should.

I would remind House Members that we passed 96 percent of the funding of government by June 26 this year, or approximately 3 months before the end of the fiscal year, a little over 3 months.

By the end of the fiscal year, the United States Senate had passed not a single appropriations bill. I am disappointed by that but recognize that passing a CR is absolutely essential.

Rather than kick the can further down the road, however, we must use that time between now and December 20 to work on an agreement on 302(b) allocations, which will allow us to move appropriation bills done in line with the bipartisan budget caps agreement.

Lastly, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 1309, the Workplace Violence Prevention for Health Care and Social Service Workers Act. This bipartisan bill directs the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to issue a standard requiring healthcare and social service employers to write and implement a workplace violence prevention plan to prevent and protect employees from violent incidents at work.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for walking through the schedule.

As we have been hearing about the CR, I express similar disappointment that we have not been able to get the full-year appropriations bill agreed upon by both the House and the Senate, as we worked incredibly hard to get a 2-year budget deal, a very bipartisan agreement.

The objective of getting a 2-year budget deal in last year’s Congress was to ensure that we could agree on levels of funding for our troops, which we did to make sure that, instead of having CRs, we were actually able to have a full-year spending bill that is agreed to by both sides so that we can get certainty to our troops. They are not getting the tools they need.

We already agreed on the levels of funding, and yet, there is still not an agreed negotiation. This is not a case where the House can just sit back and wait for the Senate to do something. We are in a CR now where there is a limited amount of time. I understand this CR will go through December 20, so for a few more weeks.

It is not a matter of waiting for the Senate to come to an agreement between Republicans and Democrats there. It is a matter of getting the House and the Senate to get an agreement.

At some point, somebody in the leadership of the House majority is going to have to go sit down with somebody in the leadership of the Senate majority. Everybody has their different parties and their different ideas, and they

are going to have to stay in that room until they get an agreement. It has happened before. It has to happen this time. It hasn’t happened yet.

I don’t know if those honest, earnest negotiations are going on between whoever in your House majority is going to be in the lead position to head that negotiation and whoever it is on the Senate side. It might be their appropriations chairs and your appropriations chairs, whoever has been designated by the House.

There has to be a commitment that they are just going to go sit in a room until they figure out their differences. We agreed on a number. We passed a bipartisan 2-year budget deal for the purpose especially of making sure our military doesn’t go in limbo, and these other Federal agencies that are important, too, that need to get the agreed numbers that they can come to an agreement on to spend.

But, ultimately, we know the cost—we are hearing the cost from our military generals—of the CR. It is probably \$1.5 billion a month that they lose, that they are not able to properly go and buy the equipment our troops need when we are operating under a CR.

I hope we get to that agreement soon where whoever it is on your side that is going to be the point person that is authorized to get a deal can go sit down with the Senate and just stay until they get that deal.

□ 1215

And I know there are a lot of other things going on over here. We are not going to get into the impeachment infatuation and what it has taken away from. I hope it has not taken away from the ability to get this agreement.

This is something both sides are going to have to do: House, Senate, Republican, Democrat. Until both sides get that agreement, we are at an impasse. And the most disappointing thing is, we already agreed on the budget numbers. That is usually the big fight.

We had that fight and we had an agreement. Bipartisan. This is how much we are going to spend on defense. This is how much we are going to spend on nondefense and, yet, even with that agreement, we can’t get the final bills brought to the floor. Not partisan bills, but bipartisan bills that can ultimately get signed. And so I hope that gets done soon.

It is both sides that are going to have to do it: House, Senate, Republican, Democrat. I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, the gentleman talks about a bipartisan agreement. He does not talk about the stark fact that the House did its job. We passed bills. We passed 96 percent of the funding of the government.

The Senate, led by Republicans, prior to the end of the fiscal year, passed 0 percent. It is hard to come to an agreement when the Senate doesn’t pass anything. Nothing. Zero. Mainly because they needed the President to say: Simon says.

I know that, for a fact—based upon conversations with the leadership of the Senate, that the President signing off, and we know that the Acting Chief of Staff, when he was here in this body, voted to shut the government down and voted against opening up, and said we ought to have a sequester for this fiscal year—that that was his position. It was Mr. Vought's position as well, who is the acting director at OMB. A mirror, Madam Speaker, in my opinion, of the Acting Chief of Staff.

So for the Republican whip to say, oh, gee whiz, we are wringing our hands, and we passed partisan bills, of course we passed partisan bills because the gentleman's side would not work with us on our bills. That was the strategy, I would suggest, Madam Speaker, not simply a difference of opinion.

As a matter of fact, on the defense spending that the gentleman mentions, I know for a fact, because I talked to them on the Republican side in both of the committees on appropriations and authorizing, the 733 figure that we used was an acceptable figure. A figure, by the way, acceptable to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But it is very hard to reach an agreement if one side doesn't say anything, doesn't send any bill, doesn't take any action.

There was nothing to negotiate on. And the gentleman talks about a bill. First of all, the only thing that was agreed to was how much money we are going to spend overall on discretionary spending, about 30 percent—a little over 30 percent of the entire budget. But there was no agreement on the distribution of those dollars to the various committees.

Now, the gentleman says so much on defense side, so much on nondefense side. The gentleman is correct. But, very frankly, what the Senate Democrats are concerned about is that they will be passing bills, and money will be cut from programs that we feel are very important, to build a wall, a wall that somebody bought a \$100 saw at Home Depot and cut a hole in.

So I would reiterate my disappointment with the total failure of the United States Senate, led by Republicans, to enact any bill that appropriated money for the operations of government prior to the end of this fiscal year.

So I say to my friend, there are people meeting. As the gentleman knows, the Speaker and Mr. Mnuchin had an agreement. Now, what does that reflect? Simon says. Because the Senate will not act as an independent body, coequal branch of the Government of the United States. Mr. McCONNELL has said as much. We won't pass anything unless the President will sign it, as if we have no mind of our own; as if—the Representatives of the American people who vote by majority and pass something or by 60 votes in the Senate—only one vote counts, the President of the United States.

And I say, I lament that fact, Madam Speaker. I tell the minority whip that

I regret, and I will tell him—and I hope he believes me, because I believe it—if it were a Democratic President, I would be prepared to vote for bills on this floor that I believe the American people would support and that this body would support.

And if the President signs it. He signs it. If he doesn't, then we see if we have two-thirds under our Constitution. And if we don't, the bill does not become law. That is the way the system ought to work. But, no, we are negotiating with Mr. Mnuchin, not with the Senate, not with Mr. LEAHY, not even, apparently, with Senator McCONNELL. We are simply waiting for the President to tell the Senate: This allocation is okay.

That is why, in my view, they didn't pass a single bill before the end of the fiscal year. But I hope we pass the CR. I hope it is as clean as it can be. There are anomalies that have to be taken care of, and we will take care of those, things that have to be extended because they are going to expire on the 21st of the month, this month.

So I hope we do that, and I hope we can join together in a bipartisan way to do that. And then I join my friend, the minority whip, Madam Speaker, and hope we can get to bipartisan agreement. There is nobody in this body that served with me for any length of time that doesn't know I work toward that end, and I will continue to work toward that end.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, let's be clear that we both know the Senate operates differently than the House. The Senate has a 60-vote requirement, which means for the Senate to move anything, it actually takes Republicans and Democrats to come to an agreement.

The gentleman can talk about issues where Republicans are in disagreement. I could surely go through areas where Democrats are in disagreement; for example, funding over border security, which is a clear sticking point, one of the holdups in getting an agreement.

We probably have a pretty good agreement on defense, even though while the gentleman says the House did its job, the House's job is to pass bills that can ultimately become law to advance all the things that we agree upon, and there is a President that is part of this process.

So like in previous administrations, when we have these negotiations, oftentimes it is not just the House and Senate. Clearly, we need more serious agreements and negotiations between House and Senate leaders to come to an agreement. But, ultimately, you also have to produce a bill that the White House is in agreement with where they will sign. It doesn't mean you take what they want. In fact, the President is not getting many of the things he requested. But at some level, if the President is going to veto a bill, it is probably worth having negotiations to see if you can get beyond that.

So this would not be the first administration where the House and Senate negotiated with the White House. The gentleman has been in meetings, as I have been in meetings, with many Presidents where we negotiate and try to come to an agreement. It doesn't mean they all end up being signed into law. It might be vetoed.

The President has the power of veto, so it is worth all of our time to see if, not only the House and Senate can get an agreement, but also we can get an agreement with the White House, too. This is not the first time that has happened. Those negotiations are going on, but the wall is a big sticking point.

We are building a wall. Probably about \$8.5 billion this previous year was allocated, and we are going to negotiate what that is going to be next year. That is part of the negotiation. And, hopefully, we can come to an agreement over it. It shouldn't be that difficult to do it, but it is one of the sticking points. There are a number of sticking points, but as those sticking points happen, we all acknowledge it costs us.

It costs our defense. Our Nation's defense suffers when we operate under CRs. The CR that is being talked about currently goes through December 20. My question to the gentleman is: Currently, the week of December 16, the House is scheduled not to be in session. And that would be the same week that the CR that is being contemplated would expire.

Are we planning on coming back into session that week of December 16 if December 20 is going to be the expiration of this current CR that is being negotiated? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I would advise all Members on both sides of the aisle not to schedule any business outside of Washington, D.C., between the 16th and the 20th of next month. And I will advise them further if, in fact, we do not fund the government by the 20th, they may well be here longer than that. We will not leave here without funding the Government of the United States of America.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate that update from the gentleman on the schedule. Obviously, next week we will have a number of other items. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, it is December 20, not November 20.

Mr. SCALISE. So the week of December 16, you are suggesting we should keep that open?

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I am advising all Members to ensure that their schedules accommodate sessions between the 16th and the 20th of December, which was originally, as the gentleman points out, not scheduled. But that was on the thought that we would rationally get past the only bills we really have to pass, and that is appropriation bills.

By the way, Madam Speaker, the way that should work is we pass a bill, the

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 co-ordinating 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