Wenstrup

Smith (MO) Hill (AR) McKinley Holding Meadows Smith (NE) Hollingsworth Meuser Smith (NJ) Hudson Miller Smucker Mitchell Huizenga Spano Hunter Hurd (TX) Moolenaar Stauber Mooney (WV) Stefanik Johnson (LA) Mullin Steil Johnson (OH) Newhouse Steube Johnson (SD) Norman Stewart Jordan Nunes Stivers Joyce (OH) Olson Taylor Joyce (PA) Palazzo Thompson (PA) Palmer Thornberry Keller Pence Timmons Kelly (MS) Perry Tipton Kelly (PA) Posey Turner King (IA) Ratcliffe Upton Kinzinger Reed Wagner Kustoff (TN) Reschenthaler Walberg LaHood Rice (SC) Walden Riggleman LaMalfa Walker Lamborn Walorski Rodgers (WA) Latta Waltz Lesko Roe, David P. Watkins Long Rogers (AL) Weber (TX) Loudermilk Rogers (KY) Webster (FL) Rooney (FL) Lucas Wenstrup Luetkemeyer Rose, John W. Westerman Marchant Rouzer Williams Marshall Roy Wilson (SC) Massie Rutherford Wittman Mast Scalise McAdams Schweikert Womack McCarthy Scott, Austin Woodall McCaul Wright Sensenbrenner McClintock Shimkus McHenry Simpson Young

# NOT VOTING-1 Wild

#### □ 1647

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### FAIRNESS FOR HIGH-SKILLED IMMIGRANTS ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1044) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to increase the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 365, nays 65, not voting 2, as follows:

# [Roll No. 437]

# YEAS-365

Adams	Balderson	Bishop (UT)
Aguilar	Banks	Blumenauer
Allred	Barr	Blunt Rochester
Amash	Barragán	Bonamici
Amodei	Bass	Bost
Armstrong	Beatty	Boyle, Brendan
Axne	Bera	F.
Babin	Beyer	Brady
Bacon	Bilirakis	Brindisi
Baird	Bishop (GA)	Brooks (IN)

Granger Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)

Griffith

Green, Al (TX)

McNerney

Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS) Thompson (PA)

Meeks

Meng

Miller

Meuser

Brownley (CA) Grijalva Mitchell Buchanan Moolenaar Guest Buck Guthrie Moore Bucshon Haaland Morelle Budd Hagedorn Harder (CA) Bustos Butterfield Hartzler Mullin Hastings Byrne Murphy Calvert Haves Nadler Carbajal Heck Hern, Kevin Cárdenas Neguse Carson (IN) Herrera Beutler Carter (TX) Hice (GA) Higgins (NY) Cartwright Nunes Case Hill (AR) Casten (IL) Hill (CA) Castor (FL) Himes Olson Holding Castro (TX) Palazzo Chabot Hollingsworth Pallone Chu, Judy Horn Kendra S Cicilline Horsford Pappas Cisneros Houlahan Hoyer Huffman Clark (MA) Payne Clav Pence Cleaver Hurd (TX) Cline Jackson Lee Perry Cohen Javanal Peters Cole Jeffries Collins (NY) Johnson (GA) Comer Johnson (OH) Pingree Connolly Johnson (TX) Pocan Cook Jordan Porter Joyce (OH) Katko Cooper Correa Keating Costa Courtney Keller Kelly (IL) Raskin Cox (CA) Kelly (PA) Craig Reed Crawford Kennedy Crenshaw Khanna Crist Kildee Crow Kilmer Cuellar Kim Roby Cummings Kind Cunningham King (NY) Curtis Kinzinger Davids (KS) Kirkpatrick Krishnamoorthi Davis (CA) Davis, Danny K. Kuster (NH) Rouda Davis, Rodney LaHood Rouzer LaMalfa DeFazio Lamb Ruiz DeGette Lamborn DeLauro Langevin Larsen (WA) DelBene Delgado Larson (CT) Ryan Demings Latta DeSaulnier Lawrence Lawson (FL) Deutch Diaz-Balart Lee (CA) Dingell Lee (NV) Schiff Lesko Doggett Doyle, Michael Levin (CA) F. Levin (MI) Emmer Lewis Engel Lieu, Ted Escobar Lipinski Eshoo Loebsack Espaillat Lofgren Estes Long Lowenthal Evans Finkenauer Lowey Fitzpatrick Lucas Luetkemeyer Fleischmann Fletcher Luián Flores Luria Sires Foster Lynch Frankel Malinowski Fulcher Malonev. Gabbard Carolyn B Gaetz Maloney, Sean Gallagher Marshall Soto Gallego Massie Garamendi Mast Spano García (IL) Matsui Speier Garcia (TX) McAdams Gianforte McBath Gibbs McCarthy Golden McCaul Steil McCollum Stevens Gomez Gonzalez (OH) McEachin Gonzalez (TX) McGovern Stivers Gooden McHenry Suozzi Gottheimer McKinley

Moulton Mucarsel-Powell Napolitano Newhouse Norcross O'Halleran Ocasio-Cortez Panetta Pascrell Perlmutter Peterson Phillips Presslev Price (NC) Quigley Ratcliffe Reschenthaler Rice (NY) Rice (SC) Riggleman Rodgers (WA) Roe, David P. Rogers (KY) Rose (NY) Rose, John W. Roybal-Allard Ruppersberger Rutherford Sánchez Sarbanes Scanlon Schakowsky Schneider Schrader Schrier Schweikert Scott (VA) Scott, Austin Scott, David Serrano Sewell (AL) Shalala Sherman Sherrill Shimkus Simpson Slotkin Smith (MO) Smith (NJ) Smith (WA) Smucker Spanberger Stanton Stauber Stefanik Stewart Swalwell (CA) Takano Taylor

Thornberry Timmons Tipton Titus Tonko Torres (CA) Torres Small (NM) Trahan Trone Turner Underwood Upton an Drew Vargas Abraham Aderholt Allen

Arrington Bergman Biggs Brooks (AL) Brown (MD) Burchett Burgess Carter (GA) Cheney Clarke (NY) Cloud Clyburn Collins (GA) Conaway Davidson (OH) Des Jarlais Duffy Duncan

Dunn

Wagner Walberg Walden Walorski Waltz Wasserman Schultz Waters Watkins Watson Coleman Weber (TX) NAYS-65 Ferguson Fortenberry Foxx (NC) Fudge Gohmert Gosar Graves (LA) Green (TN) Grothman

Veasey

Velázquez

Visclosky

Vela

Westerman Wexton Williams Wilson (FL) Wilson (SC) Wittman Womack Woodall Varmuth Young Zeldin Marchant

McClintock Meadows Mooney (WV) Norman Omar Palmer Posey Richmond Harris Rogers (AL) Higgins (LA) Roonev (FL) Hudson Roy Huizenga Scalise Hunter Sensenbrenner Johnson (LA) Smith (NE) Johnson (SD) Steube Joyce (PA) Tlaib Kaptur Kelly (MS) Walker Webster (FL) King (IA) Kustoff (TN) Wright Loudermilk Yoho

#### NOT VOTING-

Wild Neal

### $\square$ 1656

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi changed his vote from "yea" to "nay.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1078

Mr. BRINDISI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1078.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATION ASMEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Washington, DC, July 10, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: I write to respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, It has been an honor to serve in this capacity. Sincerely.

Francis Rooney. Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 481

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following committees of the House of Representatives:

- (1) Committee on the Budget.—Mr. Kevin Hern of Oklahoma, to rank immediately after Mr. Norman.
- (2) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.—Mr. Keller.
- (3) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM.—Mr. Keller.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SUR-VIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2500.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 476 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2500.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Cuellar) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

#### □ 1702

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2500) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. Cuellar in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chair, this, as always, is an incredibly important piece of legislation. This is a piece of legislation by which we provide for the national security of this country, and every little bit, as importantly, we provide for the men and women who put their lives on the line to provide for the national security of this country.

For 58 years, we have passed the National Defense Authorization Act. It is the one piece of legislation that has not failed to pass in that timeframe, and there is a very good reason for that: It is enormously important, and it is our opportunity to show those men and women who serve in the military that we support them, we support what they do, and we are going to make sure that they have all that they need to carry out the missions that we ask them to do.

One of the reasons that we have always been able to be successful on this is because of the very strong bipartisan tradition of our committee. We have worked with various chairmen and ranking members across the aisle for all of those years and really made sure that we worked together, regardless of who was in the majority, to produce a product that we can be proud of—and we have.

On that measure, as we have moved in the majority this year, my staff and I have worked very hard with the ranking member and with all the members of the committee and their staffs to maintain that bipartisan tradition.

When we had the bill in committee, we had a large number of proposals, which I will read to you.

There were 736 proposals from Republicans, 889 from Democrats. We put into our bill 53 percent of the Republican requests and 52 percent of the Democratic requests.

In amendments, there were more Democratic amendments in committee, 266 to 248 for the Republicans, but, still, we accepted 57 percent of the Republican amendments.

On the floor, there were a lot more amendments from Democrats, 480 to 201, but, again, we accepted 50 percent of the Republican amendments.

My staff and I and other members, personally, on a large number of issues, most notably on nuclear issues—Mr. TURNER, who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, was concerned that we weren't working together properly on a number of nuclear issues. There were 10 or 12 or more. I reached out to him. We worked together, and we resolved half of them, because that is what we do. This is a very strong bill that everybody on this floor should feel proud to vote for.

Now, there are a couple of issues, but the biggest thing is remember what is in this bill. Once again, we give a very high pay raise to the men and women who serve, 3.1 percent pay raise.

We have also, through the amendment process, included a priority that has over 300 cosponsors in the House, and that is JOE WILSON'S bill to finally eliminate the offset that cuts the amount of money that goes to widows of men and women who have passed away in the military. This is the bill to eliminate that offset. There is a lot in this bill that we can be proud of.

Now, the issues that we have had disagreement on, I understand, but we always have disagreements. It is a large bill. I don't like everything in this bill. I don't think anybody does, but we cannot forget the central mission of this bill: to support the men and women who serve the military and to make sure that we have a strong national security.

The number one issue is how much money we spend.

Let me just say—and I think there is bipartisan agreement on this—we need a budget caps deal. A continuing resolution is unacceptable.

It is unacceptable for the entire discretionary budget, and it is certainly unacceptable for the Department of Defense, which can't simply keep doing what it has been doing. There are always programs they need to get rid of and new programs they need to create. We need to get a deal on that. But the number that we marked to, \$733 billion, was the number that the Pentagon planned for for over a year.

After we got the last budget deal to get \$716 billion, the Pentagon planned on what their next year's budget would be, and the President and the Pentagon put together a \$733 billion budget for over a year. But then, at the end of last year, the President felt that number was too high.

By the way, I think I might agree with him. I think there are greater efficiencies to get out of the Pentagon.

So he said it ought to be cut by 5 percent; it ought to be \$700 billion. A number of people protested that, went to the Pentagon and said: You can't cut it to 700