

Hill (AR) McKinley Smith (MO) Brownley (CA) Grijalva Mitchell Thornberry
Holding Meadows Smith (NE) Buchanan Guest Moore Timmons
Hollingsworth Meuser Smith (NJ) Buck Moore Tipton
Hudson Miller Smucker Bucshon Morelle Titus
Huizenga Mitchell Spano Budd Hagedorn Moulton Tonko
Hunter Moolenaar Stauber Bustos Harder (CA) Mucarsel-Powell Torres (CA)
Hurd (TX) Mooney (WV) Stefanik Butterfield Hartzler Mullin Walden
Johnson (LA) Mullin Steil Byrne Hastings Murphy (NM) Walorski
Johnson (OH) Newhouse Steube Calvert Hayes Nadler Trahan
Johnson (SD) Norman Steward Carbal Heek Trone Wasserman
Jordan Nunes Stivers Taylor Thompson (PA) Hice (GA) Hill (AR) O'Halleran
Joyce (OH) Olson Turner Casten (IL) Himes Olson
Joyce (PA) Palazzo Timmons Case Castro (TX) Chabot
Katko Palmer Pence Castor (FL) Holding Pallone
Keller Perry Tipton Chabot Hollingsworth
Kelly (MS) Posey Turner Casten (IL) Hollingsworth
Kelly (PA) Ratcliffe Upton Chabot Panetta
King (IA) Reed Wagner Chu, Judy
Kinzinger Reschenthaler Rice (SC)
Kustoff (TN) LaHood Riggleman Walden
LaHood Rice (SC) Cisneros
LaMalfa Roby Walker
Lamborn Rodgers (WA) Walorski
Latta Roe, David P. Waltz
Lesko Rogers (AL) Watkins
Long Rogers (KY) Weber (TX)
Loudermilk Rogers (KY) Webster (FL)
Lucas Rooney (FL) 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 Sensenbrenner Wright
McClintock Shimkus Yoho
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)

Brownley (CA) Grijalva Mitchell Thornberry
Buchanan Guest Moore Timmons
Buck Moore Tipton
Bucshon Morelle Titus
Budd Hagedorn Moulton Tonko
Bustos Harder (CA) Mucarsel-Powell Torres (CA)
Butterfield Hartzler Mullin Walden
Byrne Hastings Murphy (NM) Walorski
Calvert Hayes Nadler Trahan
Carbal Heek Trone Wasserman
Cárdenas Hern, Kevin Neguse
Carson (IN) Herrera Beutler Newhouse
Carter (TX) Hice (GA) Hill (AR) O'Halleran
Cartwright Higgins (NY) Nunes
Case Hill (AR) O'Halleran
Casten (IL) Himes Olson
Castor (FL) Holding Pallone
Castro (TX) Chabot Hollingsworth
Chabot Panetta
Chu, Judy Horsford Pappas
Cicilline Houlahan Pascarell
Cisneros Hoyer Payne
Clark (MA) Hoyer Payne
Clay Huffman
Clever Hurd (TX) Perlmutter
Cline Jackson Lee
Cohen Jayapal
Cole Jeffries Peterson
Collins (NY) Johnson (GA) Phillips
Comer Johnson (OH) Pingree
Connolly Johnson (TX) Pocan
Cook Jordan Porter
Cooper Joyce (OH) Pressley
Correa Katko Price (NC)
Costa Keating Quigley
Courtney Keller Raskin
Cox (CA) Kelly (IL) Ratcliffe
Craig Kelly (PA) Reed
Crawford Kennedy Reschenthaler
Crenshaw Khanna
Crist Kildee
Crow Kilmer
Cuellar Kim
Cummings Kind
Cunningham King (NY)
Curtis Kinzinger
Davids (KS) Kirkpatrick
Davis (CA) Krishnamoorthi
Davis, Danny K. Kuster (NH)
Davis, Rodney LaHood
Dean LaMalfa
DeFazio Lamb
DeGette Lamborn
DeLauro Langevin
DelBene Larsen (WA)
Delgado Larson (CT)
Demings Latta
DeSaulnier Lawrence
Deutch Lawson (FL)
Diaz-Balart Lee (CA)
Dingell Lee (NV)
Doggett Lesko
Doyle, Michael F. Levin (CA)
Emmer Levin (MI)
Engel Lewis
Escobar Lieu, Ted
Eshoo Lipinski
Español Loebback
Español Lofgren
Estes Long
Evans Lowenthal
Finkenauer Lowey
Fitzpatrick Lucas
Fleischmann Luetkemeyer
Fletcher Luján
Flores Luria
Foster Lynch
Frankel Malinowski
Fulcher Maloney,
Gabbard Carolyn B.
Gaetz Maloney, Sean
Gallagher Marshall
Gallego Mast
Garamendi Matsui
García (IL) McAdams
García (TX) McBath
Gianforte McCarthy
Gibbs McCaul
Golden McCallum
Gomez McEachin
Gonzalez (OH) McGovern
Gonzalez (TX) McHenry
Gooden McHenry
Gottheimer McKinley
Granger McNeerney
Graves (GA) Meeks
Graves (MO) Meng
Green, Al (TX) Meuser
Griffith Miller

Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas

Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)

NAYS—65

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Arrington
Bergman
Biggs
Brooks (AL)
Brown (MD)
Burchett
Burgess
Carter (GA)
Cheney
Clarke (NY)
Cloud
Clyburn
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Ferguson
Fortenberry
Foss (NC)
Fudge
Gohmert
Gosar
Graves (LA)
Green (TN)
Grothman
Harris
Higgins (LA)
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
Kustoff (TN)
Loudermilk

Marchant
McClintock
Meadows
Mooney (WV)
Norman
Omar
Palmer
Posey
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Roy
Scalise
Sensenbrenner
Smith (NE)
Steube
Tlaib
Walker
Webster (FL)
Wright
Yoho

NOT VOTING—2

Wild

□ 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 AS MEMBER 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.

□ 1702

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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 AUTHORIZA- TION 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.

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.