

McBath	Reed	Stivers
McCarthy	Reschenthaler	Suozzi
McCaul	Rice (NY)	Swailwell (CA)
McClintock	Riggleman	Takano
McCollum	Roby	Taylor
McEachin	Rodgers (WA)	Thompson (CA)
McGovern	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)
McHenry	Rooney (FL)	Thompson (PA)
McKinley	Rose (NY)	Thornberry
McNerney	Rouda	Timmons
Meadows	Rouzer	Tipton
Meeks	Roy	Titus
Meng	Roybal-Allard	Tlaib
Meuser	Ruiz	Tonko
Miller	Ruppersberger	Torres (CA)
Mitchell	Rush	Torres Small
Moolenaar	Rutherford	(NM)
Mooney (WV)	Ryan	Trahan
Moore	Sanchez	Trone
Morelle	Sarbanes	Turner
Moulton	Scalise	Underwood
Mucarsel-Powell	Scanlon	Upton
Mullin	Schakowsky	Van Drew
Murphy	Schiff	Vargas
Nadler	Schneider	Veasey
Napolitano	Schrader	Vela
Neal	Schrier	Velázquez
Neguse	Schweikert	Visclosky
Newhouse	Scott (VA)	Wagner
Norcross	Scott, Austin	Walberg
Nunes	Scott, David	Walden
O'Halleran	Sensenbrenner	Walker
Ocasio-Cortez	Serrano	Walorski
Olson	Sewell (AL)	Waltz
Omar	Shalala	Wasserman
Palazzo	Sherman	Schultz
Pallone	Sherrill	Waters
Palmer	Shimkus	Watkins
Panetta	Simpson	Watson Coleman
Pappas	Sires	Weber (TX)
Pascarella	Slotkin	Webster (FL)
Payne	Smith (MO)	Welch
Pelosi	Smith (NE)	Wenstrup
Pence	Smith (NJ)	Westerman
Perry	Smith (WA)	Wexton
Peters	Smucker	Wild
Peterson	Soto	Williams
Phillips	Spanberger	Wilson (FL)
Pingree	Spano	Wilson (SC)
Pocan	Speier	Wittman
Porter	Stanton	Womack
Posey	Stauber	Woodall
Pressley	Stefanik	Yarmuth
Price (NC)	Steil	Yoho
Quigley	Steube	Young
Raskin	Stevens	Zeldin
Ratcliffe	Stewart	

NAYS—12

Amash	Buck	Hice (GA)
Arrington	Cloud	Massie
Biggs	Gosar	Norman
Brooks (AL)	Harris	Rose, John W.

NOT VOTING—19

Brady	Graves (LA)	Rice (SC)
Cleaver	Graves (MO)	Richmond
Clyburn	Grothman	Roe, David P.
Doggett	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Duffy	Khanna	Wright
Fudge	Lawrence	
Gabbard	Perlmutter	

□ 1336

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.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2092, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to complete the vote series on July 12 as I needed to return to my district to support preparations ahead of Tropical Storm Barry. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 468, "nay" on

rollcall No. 469, "nay" on rollcall No. 470, "nay" on rollcall No. 471, "yea" on rollcall No. 472, "nay" on rollcall No. 473, and "yea" on rollcall No. 474.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2500, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2500, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section and title numbering, cross-referencing, conforming amendments to the table of contents and short titles, the insertion of appropriate headings; and to provide instructions that amendment No. 234 printed in part B of House Report 116-143 be inserted at the end of subtitle G of title 28, and that the instruction in amendment No. 64 printed in part B of House Report 116-143 be changed from "page 387, after line 7" to "page 387, after line 15."

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. 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. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and majority leader to immediately schedule the Born-Alive bill so we can stand up and protect the sanctity of human life, and I would ask all others to join in that request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

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. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for next week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the schedule, I know that all of our thoughts are with my good friends in Louisiana and my good friend who represents Louisiana, his constituents, and the people of Louisiana as they brace for Tropical Storm Barry, expected to make landfall tomorrow.

This is a serious storm, and, when combined with the flooding we have already seen along the Mississippi, it poses a serious threat to the safety and welfare of many.

We hope everyone is safe and taking the necessary steps to get out of harm's way, and I want the gentleman from Louisiana to know how much we are paying attention to his constituents in the State he represents and the region he represents.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I truly appreciate the concern, support, and prayers that have been offered. Obviously, we are all praying for the people of south Louisiana as Tropical Storm Barry approaches. In the next 24 hours, we expect landfall. We are surely expecting heavy rain.

I know, as I have talked to local officials, from the Governor to the mayor of New Orleans and other elected officials on the ground, they are prepared. They have asked for different things, including the Governor had asked for an emergency declaration.

I spoke to President Trump yesterday, and he did, in fact, issue that emergency declaration. So, all of the Federal agencies, from FEMA to the Corps of Engineers, to other Federal agencies, are working well with State and local officials to make sure they have the tools they need.

Our first priority, of course, is the safety of the people of south Louisiana. As they protect their homes and protect their property, we just encourage them to listen to their local officials, and, if evacuation orders are issued, we ask those folks to heed those warnings because it is a serious storm. And it is a storm that we are preparing for, but, as they say, you prepare for the worst but hope for the best, and we are doing all of that.

I appreciate the gentleman's concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. I know the gentleman is concerned. We share that concern, and we share the concern for the people of south Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour debate, 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 noon 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. on that Thursday.

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, we will consider several bills under suspension of the rules, including H.R. 748, Middle Class Health Benefits Tax Repeal Act of 2019. A complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

The House will consider H.R. 3494, the Intelligence Authorization Act. I am pleased to say that the bill was approved by unanimous voice vote in committee and would authorize funding and enable congressional oversight of the U.S. intelligence community.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider a resolution to hold Attorney General Barr and Secretary Ross in contempt over efforts to ignore congressional subpoenas and subvert the 2020 Census with the addition of a citizenship question meant only to deter minorities from participating, leading to an undercount in parts of the country.

In addition, the House will also consider S.J. Res. 36, S.J. Res. 37, and S.J. Res. 38.

Mr. Speaker, last month, the Senate passed 22 resolutions of disapproval related to the Saudi-UAE arms sale for which the administration declared an emergency, thereby bypassing the Congress of the United States. The House will take up three of these resolutions related to precision-guided munitions, the most controversial and significant sales contemplated.

Lastly, the House will consider H.R. 582, Raise the Wage Act. This legislation, authored by Chairman SCOTT, would gradually increase the minimum wage to \$15 by 2024. This bill is an important step toward lifting millions of American workers out of poverty.

We believe that one should not be working a 40-hour week and still remain under the poverty level in our country. We raise the minimum wage for the first time in nearly a decade, essentially, 10 years.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, as we look at the calendar next week and, specifically, the bill dealing with the minimum wage, I would ask the gentleman if he has looked at some of the studies that have been done, as well as some of the other actions.

If you look at the city of Baltimore, they had proposed and actually passed a \$15 minimum wage, and the Democratic mayor of Baltimore vetoed that, specifically citing the job losses that would come with that kind of change.

The CBO report that just came out a few days ago, as the majority leader knows, cited that you could have up to 3.7 million jobs lost in America if that bill were to pass.

Mr. Speaker, we have a growing economy, a robust, growing economy. We are the envy of the world right now with our economy. People at every income level are receiving the benefits of that in terms of higher wages and more jobs—in fact, more job openings today than there are Americans looking for work.

This is the kind of opportunity we want for all people. In fact, as we are

seeing, people at even the lower income, entry-level job levels are the ones benefiting the most from the tax cuts and the growing economy we have as a result of it.

So why, I would ask, would we want to reverse course and pass legislation that not only studies estimate would devastate low-income people—literally, the entire State of Oklahoma, 3.7 million people, eviscerated job losses. That many job losses would come from this bill passing.

You don't need to just look at estimates. You can actually look at what happened in the city of Seattle.

Mr. Speaker, in 2014, the city of Seattle instituted a similar \$15 minimum wage. So now, we have a few years of actual data to look at what happened in a city like Seattle.

Mr. Speaker, the University of Washington did a detailed study of that minimum wage increase. What they found were similarly devastating numbers for low-income workers, the same people who would be hurt by the bill that the majority is going to be bringing up next week.

In fact, what the University of Washington study found was that you had roughly 3 million work hours lost, 5,000 jobs lost. They, in fact, found that the cost to low-wage workers in Seattle outweighed the benefits by a margin of 3-to-1, devastating low-income workers the most.

If you look at not what might happen if we do this at the Federal level—where the estimates are we would lose 3.7 million jobs in America, mostly hurting lower income, entry-level jobs, those jobs where we want people to be able to get started to become part of the middle class, to become part of the American Dream, and taking that away from them—go look at what they did in Seattle when they actually did this, not when they talked about it, but when they did it, 3 years of data. The study showed it was devastating to low-income people.

I would hope that the gentleman has looked at some of this, the concerns that we have expressed along the way, and the recent CBO score that has underlined how bad and devastating this would be to low-income workers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observations. He, I think, told a partial story of the CBO study and some other studies. Of course, he mentioned the city of Baltimore.

The problem with the city of Baltimore, as the mayor who vetoed it indicated, was that next door, the minimum wage was lower. Had the minimum wage been the same, there would not have been the same transfer, I suggest to the gentleman.

That aside, he mentions the CBO report on the impact of gradually raising the minimum wage to \$15 an hour. The minimum wage was last raised in 2007. It then incrementally raised over 3

years to the present \$7.25. It has not been raised in a decade. The poorest workers in America have not had a raise in 10 years.

We don't think that is right, as we see this extraordinary disparity of income, where presidents of corporations now are making 1,500 times what their average worker makes.

Very frankly, we are a consumer-based economy. Seventy percent of our GDP is based upon consumers. If we raise their salaries, they are going to spend more, grow the economy, and, I suggest, grow jobs, not shrink jobs.

Let's look at the CBO study. The CBO study had a number of different averages that were perceived, three of which were zero loss of jobs. 3.7 million was the maximum, not the average, the maximum loss.

I am not surprised that opponents of raising the minimum wage would point to that as if it were the figure. It is a maximum, the worst-case scenario.

We have a growing economy. I don't expect the worst-case scenario to occur. The fact of the matter is that we believe that this bill and this raise will have little, if any, adverse impact.

What we do know is this, which the gentleman did not mention. CBO said the bill will give 27 million workers in America a raise, and that the worst-case scenario—we don't want to see anybody lose their job—would be 3.7 million, but the average would be less than 2 million. That was their average estimate, and three of them were zero.

We believe that 27 million Americans, which will lift 1.3 million Americans out of poverty, is something that will be good for America. It will be good not only for those workers but good for business, for families, for children, and, frankly, for all of us.

The benefits of the Raise the Wage Act for America's workers, in our opinion, far outweigh any potential risk. We think the risk is minimal.

More than 10 years with no increase in the Federal minimum wage, I might point out, Mr. Speaker, is the longest period since the adoption of the minimum wage in 1938, the longest period we have gone without raising the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 10 years since we Democrats were in the majority. I point that out because the last time we were in the majority, we passed and, very frankly, President Bush signed the raise that was to \$7.25 an hour. But this is the longest time in history it hasn't been raised.

The Raise the Wage Act is a critical step, in my view, toward restoring the value of work and ensuring that working families—we all say we are for working families. Well, we ought to pay them, and we ought to pay them a decent wage.

By the way, this raise is probably a very, very infinitesimal percentage of the raises that those at the upper level, in the top 10 percent and the top 5 percent, have received.

This will allow working families to achieve some type of financial security. We believe that is essential.

We are very pleased that this bill is moving forward, and we urge all of our Members to support it.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to point out it is not we who are paying those wages. It is small businesses, small and medium-sized businesses that are paying those wages to workers.

What we have seen from the current economy, from cutting taxes, not from the government coming in and saying we are going to have some \$15 minimum wage that has been proven in other places to eviscerate jobs, to kill jobs and hurt lower-income people, with our current economy, because of cutting taxes, lower income people are benefiting the most. They are seeing wages go up. They are actually seeing wages go up, and the data shows that.

That is why you are seeing such strong economic numbers right now, because the tax cuts are benefitting people at every income level, especially at the lower income levels.

When you talk about the jobs that would be lost, if we split it in the middle, if we go with the median of the study, that is 1.3 million jobs lost. Don't take my number. Don't take your number. Take the median number in the study, 1.3 million jobs. That is the entire State of Maine losing their jobs.

What we have also seen is that small businesses, as minimum wages go to a higher level, look at automating jobs, which means those jobs go away.

It is the low-income workers, the first job for many people, their first entry into opportunity where they can then become a homeowner, then become part of the American Dream, those are hit the hardest. In fact, the study shows that this bill would reduce family income by \$9 billion.

I know we can look at it from different sides, but, again, if you just took the median, split the difference between your numbers and mine, you end up with 1.3 million jobs lost and devastation for a lot of people at the lower incomes.

The Seattle study shows not theory but what really did happen in a city like Seattle where they did this. By a 3-to-1 margin, low-income people were hit the hardest and hit very hard in a negative way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

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

I would simply say that he said the entire State of Maine. Maybe he missed the fact that I said 27 million people, under this bill, are going to get an increase in their salary and in their ability to support themselves and their families. That, by the way, is about the size, perhaps, of New York. It is not quite California, which is 38 or 39 million people. But 27 million are going to get a raise.

My suggestion is, and I believe this sincerely, that that increase and raise, because they are consumers, those con-

sumers all spend their spendable money. They need it to support themselves, and that is going to be an infusion.

When the gentleman says small business, I understand that. We all pay it in the end because the consumer of services and goods is who will pay it. We understand that. But not paying it perhaps advantages us because some families can't support themselves and, very frankly, may be on public assistance, so we pay for it one way or the other.

This is the right thing to do. Twenty-seven million Americans, that is about a sixth, I think, of our workforce, somewhere in that neighborhood, are going to get a raise under this bill.

I hope that the estimate of 1.3 million is wrong. I think it is wrong, as I explained. If everybody is doing the same, then the employer that needs to have things done is going to get those things done. He or she will be on a competitive level because others will be doing the same thing, in terms of the level of pay. They won't be competing with people who are paying their folks at a very low level, and people will be able to survive.

I understand the gentleman's position. By the way, I would say the gentleman's argument has been made since 1938.

□ 1400

Every time the minimum wage came up for increase, we have heard this. I didn't hear it in '38, I want to make that very clear. But that argument has been made every time the minimum wage, while I have been involved in this floor over the last 30 years, has been made. And I suggest to you, as a result of the raising of the minimum wage, our economy has been better, it has grown more, people have been better off, and we have had a better country.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the 27 million, let's keep in mind that, as you look at what they studied on the impacts, it is the lower income workers, as the wages might even go up.

And, by the way, wages are already going up today. Without this bill, wages, real wages, are going up and especially benefiting the lower income, the entry-level jobs.

What President Trump wanted to do to rebuild our middle class that was evaporating—it, literally, was going away. We were losing our middle class to foreign countries because we were not competitive as a nation. And now we are competitive—not only competitive, but the envy of the world, the economic leader of the world.

Again, why would we want to bring a bill that would devastate?

And so those 27 million people, if you look again at the Seattle study, what they showed was that the cost to low-wage workers in Seattle outweighed the benefits by a ratio of 3 to 1.

So even for those people who were getting a higher wage because other

costs went up and their hours went down, the amount of time they were able to work was reduced, it actually had a devastating impact to those low-income workers.

So on one hand it might sound really good: Hey, you are going to get a higher wage; but, Oh, by the way, we are not going to be able to give you as many hours to work. And you saw that over and over again in the study, it showed millions of hours lost.

So somebody that is working two jobs, struggling to get by because they want to become part of the middle class, today they are actually seeing a wage increase if that was evaporated because of this.

Even for the people who would see a higher wage, the costs to them would be more devastating by a 3-to-1 margin if you go by what actually did happen in Seattle when they did it.

So that is why I just say that study would be important to look at, because it doesn't show just in theory, which the CBO has a lot of good underlying data to back up with, but then Seattle is where it really did happen and it was devastating to lower income workers.

If the gentleman had anything else on this, I would yield back. I did want to bring up another issue, though, but I yield to the gentleman.

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

I think we have exhausted that subject. I think the positions have not changed since 1938, and I don't expect them to change in the next few minutes.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, maybe next week as this debate continues, we will see if I can be more persuasive with my friend, but likely not, but at least we ought to have that debate and at least get these sides out and aired.

Now, I do want to talk about something where I do think we have agreement but maybe a lack of understanding of a timeline, and that is the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement. And we have had many meetings. I know we were in a meeting together with the Prime Minister, Prime Minister Trudeau of Canada. We know our friends in Mexico want this. Our friends in Canada really want this. We want this, too.

With only 8 legislative days left before the August recess, could the gentleman give an indication if there is the ability to include USMCA on the calendar in these next 2 weeks that we have available?

And I yield to the gentleman.

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

We did have a meeting, and in a bipartisan fashion, I think we are all hopeful that we can pass the USMCA.

I was here when we passed NAFTA, as was the Speaker. There were a number of promises made, as the gentleman knows from his knowing experience of NAFTA. We are very focused, as the gentleman knows, on workers' rights, environmental protections, the price of

biologics, and the length of time that they would be protected from generic competition and bringing prices down.

But we are, as we discussed in the meeting to which the gentleman referred where we met with the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Trudeau, and many of his Cabinet, we are very concerned about enforcement. We want to say if we make this agreement that it will, in fact, be enforced. And, as the gentleman knows, there were meetings as late as yesterday on this issue.

The good news is, as the gentleman probably knows, Ambassador Lighthizer has great respect and confidence on both sides of the aisle. I would say that he is one of those people who both sides of the aisle believe is credible, knowledgeable, straightforward and an honest broker. So we are working very hard with him.

Almost every Democrat has said we are trying to get to "yes" on this. I don't think you have heard many Democrats, if any, say we are not for this agreement.

So I am hopeful that we can get there, personally. I think this is an improvement over the existing NAFTA.

I would say, however, that I think it would be a mistake if, in fact, we don't get to an agreement, which I hope we will, to back out of NAFTA, as the President has indicated. I think that would cause chaos in our economy and with respect to Canada and Mexico, as well. So I think that would not be a good policy. But I think a good policy would be, if we can get enforcement and the assurances that the agreements that are made will, in fact, be carried out by all parties, then, hopefully, we can get this done.

Whether we can get this done by the August break, I can't make that representation to the gentleman, which does not surprise him, I am sure. But I can tell you, yesterday, as you know, there was work being done on it, and I trust that there will be work being done on it in the coming days. And if we can get to an agreement, we will move it as quickly as possible.

But we may need to make sure that the protections that are referenced in the document will, in fact, be the protections that are affected and enforceable.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman, and I share the same sentiment that Ambassador Lighthizer has done a great job of working with Members on both sides to address questions, concerns, find ways to make sure that those concerns are addressed, whether they are already inside the agreement or if there are other things that can be done to double underscore and highlight those concerns.

But, in the meantime, hopefully, we can move beyond trying to get to yes and actually have a bill where we can whip that and get to yes. I know we have a whip team that I have put together on our side that is ready to go and, hopefully, your side will be able to get there.

It would be ideal if we can do that before we recess. Clearly, that is not the only way to get this done, but we do have to respect, as well, that the other countries, our friends, Mexico and Canada, have an interest in this, as well.

Canada has elections coming up. We don't want to have this jeopardized and become something that gets pushed behind their national elections. Ideally, we can get it done well in advance of their elections and respect the fact that they would like this done, as well, and the good will that is being created between our three countries.

So I am hopeful that we can get through these final issues, get a bill that we can bring to the floor, work together to pass, and then see the benefits in our economy, see an improved NAFTA, a bill that is better for American workers and opening up more access to markets in Canada and Mexico that right now are closed.

So I thank the gentleman for the encouragement, and I remain hopeful, as well, and would continue to encourage that we get this done as quickly as possible.

Finally, on the NDAA bill that we just finished, we had, of course, disagreement on a number of fronts in terms of the priorities of our military, but I would want to bring up one point, and that was the piece of legislation, the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act by our colleague, JOE WILSON.

When you all took the majority, you created a new mechanism for Members to bring bills to the floor called the Consensus Calendar. This was the first bill that actually met that criteria, in fact, far exceeded the 290 signatures—he had 365 cosponsors, incredibly bipartisan—to address a real serious problem for spouses of men and women in uniform who died fighting for our country, to make sure that an inequity is corrected that we both agree needs to be fixed.

Here is a bill that can quickly get to the President's desk, and maybe it gets included in other pieces of legislation that might come months away, but here is a bill where a Member worked in good faith, under the rules that were created, and it was unfortunate that the rule to bring the NDAA bill to the floor turned off the Consensus Calendar specifically for that bill, that one bill which happened to be the first bill that met that requirement.

I would just ask if the gentleman could maybe look again at bringing that bill to the floor as a standalone bill in respect of the hard bipartisan work that Congressman WILSON made to address a serious problem for spouses, widows of our men and women who die in uniform.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment, JOE WILSON, of course, a member of his party.

JOE WILSON filed that bill five Congresses ago, 8 years ago, and it languished. It was not brought to the floor. It did not pass.

I understand the gentleman's concern, but he ought to also reflect upon

the fact that JOE WILSON introduced it four Congresses ago, so that we have now included it in the bill. We think it was a proper provision to have in our bill.

Of course, all your people voted against that bill, and I would observe, they voted against a bill that, frankly, the chairman of your committee, now the ranking member, wrote an op-ed in *The Wall Street Journal* that said the appropriate level of funding was exactly what we put in our bill. The Joint Chiefs of Staff said that the figure for 2020 was 733.

I was deeply regretful that a bill which was the figure that Mr. THORNBERRY put forward in an editorial in *The Wall Street Journal*—and, I might say, I had conversations with him subsequent to that, recently, which confirmed to me that he still held that view.

Notwithstanding that, every one of your Republicans voted against it. And it was the largest—there was this complaint about the size of the military pay raise. It was the largest raise for our military in 10 years. Now, we were in charge 10 years ago and we are now back in charge, which means we have had the two largest raises, and that was included in your MTR.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope the whip would, as we do so often, work in a bipartisan fashion on these issues. The committee did work in a bipartisan fashion. I am very disappointed that this was made a political issue. Mr. Speaker, it was made a political issue on the theory that maybe the Democrats can't pass this bill, and if we all vote against it, we will say: Look, the Democrats don't support defense.

Mr. Speaker, we did pass that bill. We passed it with over 218 votes—220, to be exact—and it included some very, very important things for our men and women in uniform, for weapons systems, for operations, for training to strengthen our national security.

It was turned into, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, a partisan issue, and that is sad and unfortunate because, at least on the national security of which I have been supportive for 38 years—I supported much of the Reagan buildup. I supported the deployment of missiles in Europe. I supported the MX missile, which was somewhat controversial in my district. I did it because I thought America needed to be strong and to make sure the world knew we were going to be strong.

When you talk about JOE WILSON's amendment, which we included in our bill, which you were supportive of and I think the level of funding was also, frankly, intellectually supported, if not politically supported, I regret that we did not have a bipartisan vote on the defense bill.

With respect to his specific question, I respond to the whip, Mr. Speaker: We hope this bill is signed. If not, we hope it goes to conference. We hope we have a conference agreement, Mr. Speaker, and we hope that the Wilson amendment is kept in the conference report.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, let's be crystal clear about what happened.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee made this a political bill by putting poison pills in the bill that undermined our national security. That is not a partisan issue.

And so if you go back to the funding levels—I yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman specify what they were?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I will absolutely be happy to specify what those are, but first of all, let's talk about funding levels.

It is not just about funding levels. If you have a funding level and then you put policy underneath it that limits our men and women in uniform's ability to train safely and to do their job safely and effectively, that is a poison pill approach.

□ 1415

It is a partisan approach. It should have never happened.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 58 years where Republicans and Democrats have worked alike together to pass a National Defense Authorization Act, not making it political, specifically in committee.

There is no Member of our Congress who works better with people on both sides of the aisle to support our men and women in uniform than MAC THORNBERRY. Mr. THORNBERRY worked overtime to try to heal this divide, to make sure a bill could come out of committee that was bipartisan, reflecting those 58 years.

In fact, the Senate did this, and I think the gentleman from Maryland knows this well. The Senate did not make it political. The Senate passed a bill with an 86-8 vote, with all the leadership of the Republican side and Democratic side voting together.

That was the approach we wanted to take, Mr. Speaker. If there was a better way, we should have done it together.

But the majority side went against even what Senate Democrats did and chose an approach, for example, that undermined our nuclear missile defense and that went against the AUMF agreement that, if your bill were to become law, would have made it harder for us to counter terrorism activities in the Middle East.

Why would we want to do that in legislation and hamstringing our men and women in uniform? In fact, the bill that the majority just passed would undermine the gains we have made in enabling our men and women in uniform to train more safely.

Before we came up with the 2-year budget agreement that we got together, Republicans and Democrats, when we were in the majority, we were seeing our men and women in uniform die in training missions more than they were dying in combat. It was by a 5-to-1 margin that men and women in uniform were dying in training missions, planes falling out of the sky because they didn't have enough spare parts.

We finally started to address that. This bill undermines that, making our men and women in uniform less safe. That is not the approach we should be taking. If the gentleman wants to call that bipartisan, then go look at the fact that no Republicans voted for that bill and eight Democrats voted against it. It was a partisan approach. It was a bill that undermines our national security.

The Senate didn't do that. The Senate came together the right kind of way. It is the way we should have done it here.

If the gentleman wants to talk about the pay raise, let's be very clear and upfront about it. If we didn't even have this bill, our men and women in uniform get that pay raise. It is current law. It is like they are putting a provision in their bill saying the Sun is going to come up tomorrow, and then if it does, they take credit for it.

The pay raise was already going to happen, so they put it in the bill and say they gave the pay raise. It was already there. We got it into law when we were in the majority working with the Democrats. We didn't just say it was our way or the highway.

The NDAA bill, every year we were in the majority, was a bill that was worked on with Republicans and Democrats, and they didn't send it out of committee until they had complete agreement. That was an area where we didn't have political differences.

We are going to have political differences on minimum wage and some of these other issues, but we shouldn't have our men and women in uniform become part of the political divide in Washington. The Senate didn't do it. Our Members didn't do it and tried to work together.

If the chairman wanted to go his own way, that is not the approach we should be taking. It is not the approach we have taken for 58 years. It is not the approach that Senate Democrats took when they worked with Republicans to come up with a bill that put our men and women in uniform as a priority.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader can look at the bill and talk about what is in it. I will tell the gentleman that is already current law anyway. I will also tell him what the Senate did to make sure that they didn't have those poison pill provisions.

They shouldn't have been in the bill. Ultimately, they are not going to be in anything that becomes law. The gentleman knows it, and I know it.

What happened today shouldn't have happened. Maybe it is a lesson that when we get beyond this and we see what the final product is going to be, it will be a bill where we come together.

Ultimately, we will come together to make sure our men and women in uniform have the tools that they need to train safely and defend our Nation safely, but the bill that came out of the House today did not achieve that. It fell very short of where this House should have been in representing our men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, obviously, we could debate a bill we just passed, a bill that has been debated on this floor for 3 days, a bill that was chairmanned and supported by somebody equally, if not more, bipartisan in terms of his work over the years on this matter of defense, ADAM SMITH, period.

It is a good bill, Mr. Speaker. It takes care of the men and women. It provides them the necessary resources. And, yes, it says we ought to have a new AUMF that is now 18 years old.

With respect to the pay raise that was going to happen anyway, I presume that the gentleman refers to the recommendation of the President of the United States, a Republican. We took the recommendations of the President of the United States and put it in our bill. It is higher than any figure that was put in for our men and women in uniform during the previous 10 years that the Republicans controlled the House and controlled this bill.

There were poison pills, from my perspective, in the defense bills in years past. I now note that I voted against those bills when they passed the House. I voted for the conference committee when it came back.

I am hopeful that the Republicans will decide that the rhetoric they used, "If you vote against this bill," meaning the defense bill, to our side, "you vote against the men and women in the Armed Forces, the men and women in uniform, the men and women at the point of the spear," I hope you will remember that language, Mr. Speaker. I hope my Republican colleagues will remember that language. Now, apparently, it doesn't apply.

That was a good bill. That was a bill worked on in a bipartisan fashion.

I will tell the whip, Mr. Speaker, that I had conversations with some of the top Republican leaders on that committee with respect to funding levels. I was told that the funding levels that were in our bill, as the Joint Chiefs said and as the ranking member said in an editorial in *The Wall Street Journal*, were appropriate levels that will fund the priorities of our country and the needs of our national security, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly, I hope that the Senate and the House can work on this. By the way, the Senate number is the same as our number as it relates to compensation, I believe, for members of the Armed Forces.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, when this bill comes back from conference, that we will have agreement, will pass it, and will send it to the President for signature. That is the way it ought to be.

I am sorry that we didn't get significant support, as is almost always the case, except when political games were played, not just that items were put in that the Republicans didn't like or the Democrats didn't like. There were a lot of things in the defense bills that I

voted for that I didn't like, but I thought the overall bill was a bill that supported our troops and supported our national security, as I think this bill did. We will see.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, as we continue this debate as the bill moves through the process, and we look at where the Senate started with a very large 86-8 vote, Republicans and Democrats working together and coming together, we can agree on funding levels. But if the underlying policy undermines the actual money that is being spent, undermines the mission, the ability for our men and women to train safely and defend our country safely, then the funding levels are not being spent properly.

It is about not just the money but how the money is being spent, the policies behind it that allow our men and women to train safely, to defend our country safely. That is an issue. We will continue debating that.

I would predict, in the end, a final product that goes to the President's desk is going to look a lot more like the Senate bill than the bill that came out of the House and, hopefully, addresses all of those problems that were identified earlier. We will continue that debate as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman if he has anything else.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I only want to say that I do not accept the premise that anything in this bill we just passed with a majority vote undermines training, operations, or acquisitions, period.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JULY 12, 2019, TO MONDAY, JULY 15, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Mr. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING LAKE LITTLE

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

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, Mississippi lost a talented young woman when she tragically died in an airplane accident.

Lake Little had accomplished a great deal in her lifetime. She was an honors student, a skilled athlete, and a volunteer in her local community.

Lake had a bright future. She held dreams of serving her country in the United States Air Force and had already enlisted in the Mississippi Air National Guard.

Mississippi is proud of the life that Lake lived, and we are grateful for the positive impact she had in her community and on our State.

Today, Lake's friends, family, and community have gathered to remember her and celebrate her life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a moment of silence on the House floor at this time as we join Lake's loved ones in honoring her memory.

ELIMINATING UNNECESSARY ENVIRONMENTAL AND SAFETY REGULATIONS FOR HOUSING

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the Trump administration's latest efforts to combat the skyrocketing housing costs in the United States.

There is likely no State in the country feeling the ill effects of unaffordable housing more so than my home State of California. That is why I applaud the President's recent executive order establishing a White House Council on Eliminating Regulatory Barriers to Affordable Housing.

Over the past 20 years, there have been countless regulations implemented in California that make building a home so expensive that many people can no longer afford to buy them or even rent. The cost of building a home is nearly six times higher per square foot than it was 30 years ago, due to uncompromising and often unnecessary environmental and safety regulations.

I am glad there will now finally be a council tasked with looking into the true reasons behind these costs instead of continuing to offer Federal subsidies to simply mask the problem.

In my home area of the First District, housing is a critical issue, with the loss of the town of Paradise and so many people displaced there and the housing that needs to be put in place back in Paradise or in surrounding communities to help these people. The mandates that are put upon them make it almost impossible to afford.

I look forward to working with HUD Secretary Ben Carson and this White House council to examine and, hopefully, alleviate the housing crisis in California.

RECOGNIZING COACH JESSE BURLESON

(Mr. ARRINGTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a special guest who is here with us in the gallery today, Jesse Burleson, the head coach of the Hardin-Simmons University Cowboys football program, located in the heart of the big country, Abilene, Texas.

Coach is joined today by his wife, Lois, and his daughters, Lainey and Marisa.

Under Coach Burleson's leadership, the Cowboys have enjoyed unprecedented success, going 36 and 4 in the past four seasons, making four consecutive playoff appearances, and graduating 14 All-Americans and two Rimington Trophy winners.

Coach stresses the importance of hard work, discipline, and the necessity of making sacrifices to achieve goals. The most important thing that these Cowboys will learn while they are playing football at Hardin-Simmons is that God loves them, that He has a plan for them, and that if they follow Him, there is nothing they cannot overcome or achieve in this world.

Thank you, Coach Burleson. Hooyah, Cowboys. Go west Texas.

□ 1430

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been an interesting day. It is amazing we voted on a National Defense Authorization Act. That is normally a bipartisan action here in the House. It is normally quite a compromise. But this NDAA didn't end up being that way because it had so many different leftist dreams inserted into it that had nothing to do with the national defense. It is rather a shame. It is something that has to be worked on. We have got to be able to defend ourselves and properly pay those who are doing so, or trying to do so.

It was a sad day that we did not pass that with the same bipartisanship that we have had in the past. I hope that changes for the future. There are only a few areas like that where we have had bipartisanship in the past, and I hope we can get back to it.

One area where there hasn't been a lot of bipartisanship at all has occurred in the area of the great tragedy, crisis, emergency now, that is occurring on our southern border. It is amazing because we have heard for months that there was a manufactured crisis, it wasn't really a crisis on our southern border, that President Trump was just making it up, that Republicans were just making it up. There was no crisis there. Nothing to see. We can just keep moving along because there is no problem on the southern border.

Well, there was a crisis. There wasn't a disaster occurring there. And by virtue of the fact that people in other countries saw that the majority of the House of Representatives was sending them messages about what they were doing and saying here, that there was not going to be any wall, there was not going to be the kind of border security that we should have, and, in fact, more and more people seem to be advocating that we have no border at all.