

of her from minute one. Kendra may have left my office, but she never left my heart.

Sadly, at the end of July, Kendra lost her battle with cancer at the tender age of 39. And although my heart is heavy, I am recalling the final words written by Kendra before her death, where she urged those who loved her to not mourn, but to “live life, to go to the beach, go rock climbing, skydiving, do what you want to do.” This exemplifies her spirit, her courage, and her life which, unfortunately, ended too soon.

Kendra is survived by her beloved twins, her husband, her father, her sister, and my thoughts and prayers are with her and her family and friends. I loved her dearly, and I will miss her deeply and will always remember her.

PROTECTING DACA

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the 800,000 DREAMers in our Nation, 200,000 in my State of California.

Now, these DREAMers are students, entrepreneurs, volunteers, and neighbors. They go to school, they work, and they pay taxes. They are young men and women like my constituent, Karem, a DREAMer who recently graduated from the University of California at Berkeley.

Karem now works as a paralegal, helping people like herself navigate our complicated immigration system. Karem came to America when she was only 3 years old.

In a message to my office, she wrote: “The United States is all I’ve ever known.”

I have to tell you, she is as American as I am. Forcing Karem or any hard-working DREAMer out of this country or back into the shadows is heartless and un-American. This is her home.

Deporting DREAMers from the only country they have ever known is an extreme betrayal of our values. We care about family values. Ending DACA breaks families up.

Let me be clear: Now President Trump has turned his back on these innocent young people. Now it is up to Congress to have the courage to do the right thing. I call on Speaker RYAN to bring up the bipartisan and bicameral Dream Act now.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3354, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 504 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 504

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant

to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution, and available pro forma amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 500.

(b) Each further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment except amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 500, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 500, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1245

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a good day. It is going to be a good day.

I don’t know if you came down to Washington as a young man. I remember sitting right up there on the second row of the gallery, and I came into the Chamber and I was so excited. It was my first visit to see the people’s House.

The Reading Clerk was standing there at that podium and read and read. I had absolutely no idea what was going on, and here nobody hands you a pamphlet or anything to tell you what is happening on the floor of the House. I thought the activity was going to happen down here, and it was all going on up there at the podium.

That has been 40 years ago now. I now see that however long that conversation happens, it lays the groundwork for what is going to be an even greater conversation here on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am fond of saying that if you come to this institution on the right day, you are going to see a festival of democracy take place right here. Today is going to be one of those days.

If you were on the House floor yesterday, you saw us take up the first of these divisions in this appropriations bill. Today, because of the work that my friend from New York and I did with the rest of the members of the Rules Committee right up there last night, we are bringing to the floor the remaining four divisions of H.R. 3354; 224 additional amendments, 224 additional amendments. Division A is the Interior section; division C is the Commerce, Justice, Science section; division D is the Financial Services section; division F is the Labor, HHS, and Education section.

When I was on the floor yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I talked about how proud I was of the work that we have all done here together. This annual appropriations process has been conducted in a more comprehensive fashion this year than in any other year in my memory.

When we get jammed, you end up with one of those long-term, yearlong continuing resolutions that shut out every Member’s voice. In a good year, maybe, you end up with one of those giant leadership-negotiated White House and the leader of the House and the Senate omnibus appropriations bills that shut out all but two or three voices.

This year, the Appropriations Committee, beginning its work way back in April, has worked through every single appropriations bill one by one at the committee level, and we are seeing the culmination of that effort here on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, it has been since 2010 that the House has finished its work before the September 30 fiscal year deadline. It was the 2009 calendar year. They were doing the work for the 2010 fiscal year. It is hard to get this done, and it doesn’t happen because Democrats are successful or Republicans are

successful. It happens because the collaboration that we have together is successful, and we are seeing the result of that today.

If we pass the underlying rule, we will make in order those 224 amendments, we will begin that process of debating the last four divisions, and we will have the voices of this House heard.

We went until midnight last night, Mr. Speaker. We went until midnight the night before that. I suspect midnight is going to seem early to us where we are headed over the next couple of days. But at the end of that process, Republicans, Democrats, folks from all regions of the country, are going to be able to look each other in the eye and know that—in a way that makes folks back home proud—we worked through each and every appropriations bill and we got our work done on time.

That is why I ran for Congress, Mr. Speaker, to deliver results back home, and that is why I am proud to be standing with my friend from New York today delivering on those promises.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, my good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening with the appropriations bills is unprecedented. After passing four appropriations bills earlier this year, we are now considering the remaining eight appropriations bills this week in 2 days. That means that we are debating the funding for roughly two-thirds of discretionary Federal spending bills in just over 4 days.

Has any Member here really had the time to read all 1,035 pages of these eight bills? Better yet, has anyone had time to read nearly all the thousand amendments and determine what the impact of each one would be?

This is the appropriations process we are talking about; the process that used to take us days and weeks and was perfectly open so that all Members of the House were able to propose amendments on the floor. These are the bills that fund programs that impact the life of every American every single day.

But we are not giving them any serious consideration they deserve, and the minority has been virtually, literally, I would say, shut out of the process altogether.

When the majority took control of Congress and the White House, they promised regular order. They have not only broken that promise, they have shattered it and stomped on it. Speaker RYAN is the only speaker in the history of tracking statistics to never have had a truly open rule.

An open rule would allow any Member to offer an amendment that complies with the standing rules of the House and the Budget Act. Not a single

one. A bad process, I believe, will lead to a bad product, and these bills are no exception. They are full of provisions that would do real harm to millions of Americans.

Inside these bills, the Dodd-Frank financial reform law, passed in the wake of the biggest recession since the Great Depression, would be tattered. The biggest banks still in control of the people who got us in trouble in the first place would be allowed to run roughshod over the economy again, paving the way for another Great Recession or worse.

Try as we could to find out what would be the substitute for Dodd-Frank to prevent them from doing that again, there is no answer they would be able to do it. Under Dodd-Frank, we have had a record-setting streak of more than 80 consecutive months of private sector job growth. Mr. Speaker, this growth didn't come despite this law; it came because of it.

There is also language here that would ramp up the majority's assault on women's health; provisions that would zero out funding for Title X, the Nation's only Federal program devoted to family planning. More than 4 million women depend on it for access to contraception.

The bills would also eliminate funding for Planned Parenthood, which serves 2.5 million women and men every year. It is relied on not just for contraception, but for services like breast cancer screenings, wellness visits, and STI testing.

The bills would be truly destructive if they ever became law. They don't appear to have the necessary votes to pass the Senate, since there are not 60 Senators willing to vote for this legislation, and that would make one wonder why are we even going through this charade, because we have only 9 legislative days left in the month of September. During those 9 days, we need to raise the debt ceiling to pay the bills we have already incurred, to fund the government for the following year, to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program; the Perkins Loan Program, which many low-income students rely on for their college education; and, very importantly, the Federal Aviation Administration. All of those expire on September 30.

We also need to address the National Flood Insurance Program, which, on its current course, faces a shortfall of more than \$25 billion. And that will expire at the end of this month. We all know the horror of going through Hurricane Harvey, and now Irma, and with two more, as I understand it, starting their aim at us in the Atlantic.

If we are going to do all of this, we have to get back to the orderly and thoughtful process. Congress can't wait for a disaster to always be at its doorstep before acting. We need to abandon legislation by chaos or emergency, which we often do for something that we could have done by scheduling.

Two-thirds of the discretionary spending bills considered in a single

week is absurd and irresponsible, and I would doubt has ever taken place before in the House of Representatives. It is time we took control of the House and got back to regular order, which we talk about all the time, but hardly anybody remembers. We hope for a better day, and we hope for it soon.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My friend is absolutely right, there is a lot of work to get done. That is why we both ran for Congress, to get that work done. I am incredibly optimistic that we will get that work done.

I wish from time to time we would celebrate our successes as fiercely as we observe our failures. My friend is absolutely right, there was a time in congressional history where appropriations bills came to the floor and any Member could offer any amendment they wanted at any time, and the process could go on for days or weeks or months.

To my friend's point, we can reminisce about those days and celebrate them, but we can't do it at the same time we observe the very limited deadlines that we have now trying to get work done.

It was back on August 24 that the Rules Committee created a deadline and said: We want to have every Member have their voice heard. We want to hear from every single Member on every single appropriations bill to understand what it is you would do differently to have the bills serve America better.

We created that deadline, Mr. Speaker, for exactly the reason my friend from New York suggested, and that is so folks would have the time to look at those amendments, to digest those amendments, to be thoughtful about those amendments.

Now, it turns out even in a body of 435 Members, you can have some repetitive ideas. It turns out a lot of us think a single amendment is a good idea. The Rules Committee looked at amendments and found multiple Members had exactly the same idea. In order to speed the process along, we let one of those Members offer the amendment; we asked the other Members not to.

That is not closing down the process. That is a good use of the American people's time, because we have so much that we must get done together.

Mr. Speaker, for folks who care about openness—and I am one of those Members—I just want to remind you that it is not just the 1,000-plus amendments we looked at in the Rules Committee. It is thousands upon thousands that were worked through the Appropriations Subcommittee process, and then the Appropriations full committee process.

□ 1300

The appropriations process is one of the best opportunities for any Member

in this Chamber to make their priorities known, act on those priorities, change the law of the land for the men and women they serve back home. Every single Member of this Chamber knows of that process, avails themselves of that process, and if we pass this rule, we will make several hundred more amendments in order and complete this process for the first time since 2009.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN).

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am disgusted by House Republicans' continued efforts to end DACA and help this heartless administration tear families apart. Yesterday, House Republicans had a chance to rectify the Trump Administration's despicable decision to betray DREAMers in Nevada and across this country.

Instead, they chose to block the immediate consideration of the bipartisan Dream Act. And then last night, House Republicans in the Rules Committee doubled down on this President's cowardly assault on DREAMers by blocking an amendment that I helped file with my colleagues JULIA BROWNLEY and LUIS CORREA.

That would have prohibited funds from being used to deport DACA recipients. In Nevada, DACA has allowed more than 13,000 young people to come forward, pass background checks, and live and work legally. These young men and women who are brought here as children are patriotic and brave. They include college students, members of our military, and so many others who are contributing to our society.

They fear they will be taken from their homes and their families torn apart. President Trump's decision to end DACA is an affront to everything our Nation stands for and only cements his legacy of shortsighted cruelty.

House Republicans ought to be ashamed of themselves for helping this administration push DREAMers one step closer to deportation. I will continue to fight for our values, our principles, because as Americans, we do not turn our backs on people who represent the best of our Nation.

We must take the Dream Act up without delay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), one of our leaders from the great State of California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for providing me this time. I rise in opposition to this rule, which prohibits a vote of the House of Representatives on an amendment that would prevent the Department of Justice from using its power

and resources to supersede all State laws that have legalized the medical use of cannabis.

For 3 years, States have been shielded from having the will of their voters and their people by a prohibition on the Department of Justice that would prevent the Department of Justice from thwarting the will of the people of the States by superceding those State laws when they have determined in the States that the medical use of marijuana should be permitted with their citizens.

The Rules Committee has, thus, been basically—it will be changing the law of the land for 3 years where the 50 States have been permitted, if they so chose, to have the medical use of marijuana.

After this vote, because of this rule, we have been prevented from again providing that prohibition that passed this House on a number of occasions that would prohibit the Department of Justice from superceding State law. In short, a vote for this rule is anti-States' rights. A vote for this rule is against permitting the people of your State to legalize the medical use of marijuana if the Federal Government, if the DOJ, decides.

A vote for this rule will, thus, prevent medical use of cannabis by our doctors in States that would like to permit their people to benefit from illegal use of medical marijuana. Instead, those doctors now will, as they have been, prescribing opiates. That is right, opiates. Our people have ended up being prescribed opiates because marijuana has not been an option.

It is a vote to cut off our veterans, and our seniors with arthritis, those people who have children who are plagued with seizures, all of these things now are permitted in the States where they have legalized the medical use of marijuana. These people are provided an avenue to at least try this as a method of dealing with these horrible maladies that they have to deal with in their lives, whether they are seizures, or whether they are people who have arthritis, or whether they are our veterans who are coming back.

We need to make sure that the billions of dollars that right now are being invested in medical marijuana businesses and clinics throughout our country, those billions of dollars will go to the benefit of our people. Instead, this rule prevents us from standing in the way of the Justice Department from obliterating those rights in the States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, so a vote against this rule is a vote to permit those States to make that decision. The rule, as it is now, prevents us from getting in the way of the Justice Department's obliteration of these rights.

But one of the most important things, whether it is States' rights, or whether it is trying to listen to the seniors who are begging for us to give them some relief from some of their suffering and let them at least try this if the doctors so prescribe, but let us just remember this: that billions of dollars, \$3 billion or \$4 billion have been invested in this industry to provide honest businessmen and doctors the right to try medical marijuana on some of these maladies.

Those \$3 billion will immediately be transferred to the drug cartels in Mexico if this rule goes through. That is what it means. Now, I would suggest that whether it is opiates, or the drug lords down in Mexico, we need to side with the States' rights to make this determination and decide—and to make our determination to let the people decide in those States and let them have the choice there.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule for those reasons.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act, this bipartisan, bicameral legislation. We have thousands of young people who are Americans in every way except on paper.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, in the past 5 years, the DACA program has given nearly 800,000 young men and women who came here as children, and have only known the United States as their home, a shot at the American Dream. It rightfully allowed them to come forward to live, work, and learn in the United States legally, and without fear of deportation.

President Trump, this week, made his most heartless decision yesterday by cruelly rescinding DACA protection for these young DREAMers. These DREAMers now face the painful reality of a President betraying their trust, forcing them back into the shadows, and kicking them out of their homes.

These kids put their faith in our government to protect them. They underwent rigorous background checks and paid the required fees, all for an opportunity to better themselves and their communities. And we are failing them.

I share a similar story as many of these DREAMers. I emigrated to the United States with my parents as a 5-year-old boy from Mexico. This great country since has given me the opportunity to work hard, raise my two children, and serve my country in local

government, the military, and here in Congress.

Terminating DACA and stripping DREAMers of that same hope and opportunity is unconscionable and incompatible with our American values. We are a nation of immigrants and are made stronger by their contributions. Following the President's shameful decision this week, Congress must take action and pass the bipartisan Dream Act which would provide a permanent legislative solution to allow DREAMers to remain in the United States and continue to contribute to our Nation's future.

They are our neighbors, our children's classmates, our coworkers. These are all hardworking and law-abiding individuals. We cannot afford to abandon DACA recipients who have lived in America all of their lives and contribute to this country in many ways.

Ending this program undermines our economic growth and competitiveness, costing our economy \$490 billion in lost GDP over the next decade, in addition to losing potential innovation and entrepreneurship.

This House has already passed the DREAM Act in 2010, and a majority of Senators also supported this legislation. However, it fell short with a filibuster from then-Senator Jeff Sessions, the same Attorney General who announced the termination of DACA this week.

This Congress must now ensure the well-being and future of these 800,000 youth living and working in the United States. I urge my colleagues to stand up for DREAMers by bringing H.R. 3440, the bipartisan Dream Act, immediately to the floor for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that admonition. As my friends all know, the truth is, the vote in the Senate was a bipartisan vote against the consideration of that bill.

We are going to find a bipartisan solution to this difficult problem and continuing to characterize this as a partisan issue does nothing but harm to our shared cause.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), one of the great leaders of the big freshman class in 2010.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support the Make America Secure and Prosperous Appropriations Act, and I encourage my colleagues to support this rule.

As a pro-life conservative, I have long fought to make sure that taxpayers' dollars aren't being used to fund abortions or to fund abortion providers. Whether it is in the Appropriations Committee or here on the House floor, I have repeatedly made the cause for increasing protections for life under

the law. Those fights haven't always been easy, and we haven't won every time. But Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the appropriations bill before us does contain important pro-life provisions.

First, the bill states: "None of the funds made available by this act may be used to conduct or support research using human fetal tissue if such tissue is obtained pursuant to an induced abortion."

We all remember the 2015 scandal that revealed how Planned Parenthood officials were systematically altering abortion procedures in order to preserve the organs of babies to sell them to researchers. I said it at that time, and you don't have to be staunchly pro-life like me to be appalled by the thought of harvesting and trafficking aborted babies' body parts for profit.

Our bill will prevent these atrocities from removing any incentives abortion providers might have to harvest and sell babies' organs. Instead, the bill directs agencies to find research using modern, more efficient alternatives to human fetal tissue.

To be clear, I am a strong supporter of the National Institutes of Health. Their research is critical for development of lifesaving medical breakthroughs. However, I believe we must set a clear line of distinction between what is acceptable and what is not.

Second, the bill expressly prohibits the Department of Health and Human Services from steering Title X public health funding to abortion providers. Of course, the Hyde amendment has long made it against the law to actually pay for abortions with taxpayer dollars. But the Obama administration had a bad habit of pushing hundreds of millions of dollars to Planned Parenthood in forms of grants and reimbursements for other services. This amounts to a pipeline of funding propping up the Nation's largest abortion provider. It is an abuse of taxpayer money, and I am pleased that this bill cuts it off.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my chairman, TOM COLE, for including these important pro-life provisions in our base bill for the first time.

□ 1315

It represents real progress for the pro-life movement, and I will continue to fight to see it through the process.

Mr. Speaker, I am unapologetically pro-life, and I believe that every human life is precious and our laws and policies should reflect that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank our ranking member for yielding and, really, for her tireless advocacy on behalf of all Americans.

I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill, the so-called Make America Secure and Prosperous Appropriations Act.

Mr. Speaker, let's make one thing clear: this bill breaks Republicans' promise to get back to regular order, while blocking the majority of amendments to be considered on the floor. Also, as an African-American woman, I can't help but see how these cuts impact communities of color.

It may be easy to think of budgets in terms of dollar signs and decimal points, but the disturbing truth is that the decisions we make here affect lives. If we are honest, many of these decisions in this bill disproportionately affect Black and Brown lives.

For instance, the bill eliminates the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Initiative, the Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Communities Health Program—just eliminates it—and Title X family planning, which many women of color and men rely on. It eliminates the Health and Career Opportunities Program, which provides training and grants for health careers for minority-serving institutions, and it eliminates the Minority AIDS Initiative, just to name a few. These are just under the Health and Human Services provision.

This bill cuts \$3 billion from the Pell Grant Surplus Program, \$190 million in 21st Century Community Schools, and eliminates the comprehensive literacy program. All of these are critical education programs that predominantly help people and students of color.

I am also disappointed that this bill divests in our workforce, especially for communities of color, by eliminating the proven apprenticeship programs and cutting millions of our Nation's job training programs, including reintegration of ex-offenders—again, majority African-American and Latino ex-offenders—reentering into society. This budget cuts millions from that.

It refuses to make in order Congressman BOBBY SCOTT's amendment to strike the prohibition against using Federal funds for transportation to desegregate public schools. We are talking, still, about desegregating public schools in 2017.

What is worse, I offered an amendment in Rules to combat these devastating cuts to communities of color, and Republicans refused to make them in order. I offered an amendment that would have prohibited funds from being used to implement the policy memo that Attorney General Sessions has presented that rolls back the failed War on Drugs and reinstates the harshest sentences for low-level drug offenses, the majority of whom—guess what—are African Americans.

I offered another amendment that would have expressed the sense of Congress that race-conscious admissions policies, which are designed to achieve a more diverse student body, which allows for the use of race as one factor, only one factor, in admissions—these policies, we have to remember, are beneficial to all students. So the Department of Justice should not take action to limit these benefits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 16 minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding another minute.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be trying to limit students of color access to education, which the Justice Department is trying to do. Affirmative action is critical to mitigating discriminatory practices that prevent students of color from being admitted into the schools of their choice. Attorney General Sessions needs to back off of this. I tried to do this through an amendment to send that message. Of course, that amendment was not made in order.

Congress can help, though, renew their faith in minority communities, and the minority communities can renew their faith in Congress by not accepting this Trump agenda and support clear policies that demonstrate to people of color that our lives also matter in America. Unfortunately, this spending bill does just the opposite.

So I hope the Members will understand the message that we are sending to communities of color. I just mentioned a few of the cuts that have been put into this bill. I hope that we work to rectify the problems with it.

It is past time to get back to regular order. It is past time to move each bill individually, also. It is past time to make strong investments in the American people, which include people of color. It is past time to help grow the economy and to create good-paying jobs for everyone.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule and “no” on the underlying bill. There is simply too much at stake.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the comments of my friend from California. She is absolutely right. When Republicans took control of this Chamber, they committed themselves to having a more open process. I was a part of that freshman class that came in to give Republicans a majority, and we have made good on that process. I want to talk about that just for a little bit.

My friend from California serves on the Appropriations Committee, and I thank her for her service, Mr. Speaker. When you want to talk about an open process, that Appropriations Committee went through every single bill one subcommittee at a time, hour after hour, day after day, week after week, indeed, month after month. I am grateful to her for that service. The bill would not be as good as it is but for the men and women who serve on the Appropriations Committee.

But I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons I was proud to

be carrying the rule today is that we haven’t gotten the appropriations process completed on time since Democratic leadership was able to achieve that back in 2009. They couldn’t do it in their last year in power, 2010. In fact, they didn’t do the appropriations bills at all. They punted it off to the next Republican Congress. But in 2009 they did.

When I talk about that commitment to openness, let’s remember, last time we had this shared success together and my friends on the other side of the aisle were leading, they allowed 17 amendments to the Financial Services bill. We are allowing twice that many today.

When my friends were leading this institution the last time we completed this process, they allowed 13 amendments to the Interior bill. We are allowing six times that many.

When my friends on the other side of the aisle were leading this institution, the last time we successfully completed this process, they allowed five amendments to the Labor-HHS. We are allowing 10 times that many.

When my friends on the other side of the aisle were leading this institution, the last time we successfully completed this process on time, they allowed zero amendments to the Commerce-Justice-Science bill. We allow 49—infinity more.

My friends, can we always do better together? We can. I am grateful to my friends for the hard work they put in showing up day after day to do that better. But this bill is better, and if we pass this rule, we will move to the debate on this bill, and we will complete this process on time in the most open fashion that any of my colleagues have seen in decades.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I am really very fond of my colleague over there, and I appreciate his wonderful sunshine attitude.

The fact is we have never seen anything like what we are going through now. Twice, in just the last few months, one amendment by Ms. LEE, to finally get an AUMF so that we could authorize the wars that seem to be going on forever in the name of the United States of America was voted on in committee, passed in committee, and should have been in the bill. Lo and behold, it disappeared. I don’t think we ever did anything like that to my knowledge, and if we did, shame on us.

In this very bill today, there was, again, an amendment presented in committee for the DACA people to be able to get jobs while they are waiting with the Federal Government. I am paraphrasing that because I never saw it, but that is my understanding of what that did. Once again, it was presented at the committee, voted, passed, and should have been in this bill. But before it got to Rules, just like Ms. LEE’s amendment, it just disappeared.

How can you run the Government of the United States by saying that the people do their will through us? We are not sitting here to represent ourselves and do what we want to do and take one from column A and one from column B. We follow rules. That is what we are supposed to do. We have to answer for that.

I want the people of the United States to know that what we are talking about here today is probably not going anywhere. As far as we know, it will not get past the Senate. Now, some miracle may happen. Who knows? Or maybe the whole thing will disappear—I don’t know—with no explanation, by the way.

But we haven’t really done anything here yet except what I would call a crazy amalgamation of what the rules of the House wouldn’t even come close to allowing us to do. Any body, any Congress, any House of Representatives, any legislature anywhere can do what they have to do to get their budget ready if they throw it all in one mix and let one committee, the Appropriations Committee, do it. The other committees had no right to talk about it.

As I pointed out, again, the majority has really cut out the minority completely. Do you think we knew before it got to Rules that those two amendments that I talked about that were terribly important had disappeared? We didn’t know that until it was given to us.

Many times what we get at Rules are emergency meetings, which means one thing: no committee action. We have decided we would like to do this one this week, so let’s call it an emergency.

Enough. Enough already. This is the premier legislative body in the world. The hopes, the dreams, and the aspirations of all Americans lie in this House. We do or we do not do what is in the best interests of the people who sent us here. I promise you it is not in the best interests to cut out all of the population of the United States—about half, almost half. In fact, I believe numerically we got more votes than the other side—just cut us out of the process.

I have already talked about no open rules. If you can’t have an open rule whereby you can talk about amendments, there is nothing else for you to do. We are out of it because Democrats get very few amendments. I don’t think the Rules Committee people get hardly any at all, and then we beg for some of the best ones we would like to be made into order—never happens.

We are pretty discouraged. As a matter of fact, we were talking about maybe we should stage a coup, but I know that is illegal and would not work in the United States of America. So it was kind of a fleeting thought brought about by pure frustration.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. SCOTT had a wonderful amendment. He is the ranking member on the Education and the Workforce Committee and is known throughout the United States for the

work that he does, as is BARBARA LEE, who is probably more well known than almost any other Member of this House. To be treated that way, to have to go back to her district and say, "Well, we tried to do these amendments"—enough already.

We can do it the right way. We used to. When I got here, it was entirely different. The bipartisanship was strong. We all liked each other. It was a pretty wonderful thing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), whose amendments should have been allowed.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the number of amendments that were made in order by the Rules Committee, but I am appalled that the majority chose not to include one of my amendments, No. 63, to division F of H.R. 3354, which would strike a prohibition against using Federal funds for the purpose of transportation needed to desegregate public schools. This language has found its way into every appropriations act since at least 1974.

The language in sections 301 and 302 of division F of the bill really represent a relic of an ugly history when States and school districts across the Nation resisted meaningful integration of public education for decades after the Supreme Court's ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education*. That resistance has worked.

According to the GAO last year, our schools are more segregated by race and class today than they were in 1968. The persistence of these riders, if unchallenged, is morally reprehensible and has no place in 2017. I stand with the Congressional Black Caucus in calling for a total removal of this offensive language in any fiscal 2018 appropriations act.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have a long and proud history in this House, but it is sometimes tough to remember exactly how that history goes, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1330

My friend from New York has her picture up on the wall in the Rules Committee room. If you haven't been up there, Mr. Speaker, you should go see it.

My friend from New York is the first woman to have ever led the United States House of Representatives Rules Committee. She led it ably and proudly for the 4 years that the Democrats were in the majority the last decade.

It is a hard job because, as the chairman of the Rules Committee or the chairwoman of the Rules Committee, you have to make decisions. When the bills come to you from the committees of jurisdiction—the authorizing committees—you often have to completely reorganize those bills. You have to meld those bills together. It is a power-

ful committee because it has a solemn responsibility.

Yes, in the area of Rules Committee jurisdiction and the melding of all of those pieces of legislation is what amendments get added and what amendments get taken away.

My friend from California (Ms. LEE), has an absolutely legitimate gripe, as does my friend from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT). Mr. Speaker, we all think our amendments are the greatest amendments to be known.

Mr. SCOTT led, to his credit, with saying: I am glad so many of my amendments were made in order, but I am appalled my one amendment was kept out.

We all want all of our amendments in. But to my friend from New York's comment that Democrats don't get a fair shake, I will remind you, Mr. Speaker, when my friend was leading the committee, the entire House of Representatives was offered 139 chances to change the appropriations bill in 2009, the last time we completed it.

With PAUL RYAN leading the institution, with my friend from Texas, Pete Sessions, leading the Rules Committee, we made 214 Democratic amendments in order. We have made more minority amendments in order in this process than my friends on the other side made in order for the entire House.

Mr. Speaker, we have nothing to fear from openness. We have nothing to fear from a robust debate. I am so glad that we have had a chance to do that. But history should be reported accurately. The accuracy is: we can always do better. But we are doing better today than we were just a few short years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are really getting somewhere here. What my colleague failed to say is, as far as I know and I imagine as far as he knows, that no committee has ever sent a bill to the Rules Committee completely taking away amendments that had passed in that committee and were legitimately a part of that bill.

In just the last, let's say, 2 or 3 months, two amendments legitimately passed by Democratic members in the proper committee disappeared between that committee and the Rules Committee. If that is not a violation of rules, I don't know how in the world you would ever describe it.

Sure, we had a lot of open rules—I mentioned PAUL RYAN has never had one—which gave everybody an opportunity to do an amendment, all 435 us, if we chose to, but we don't. When you talk about something coming to us from a committee, large bills sometimes don't come to us from committees, but oftentimes they are written somewhere—we are not sure where—but they come to us in an emergency procedure because they have to get to the floor that week.

I am not just talking about improving. I am talking about following the rules of procedure laid down by history, by circumstance, and by geniuses. I am talking about not appropriating those in ways that say: We just don't want that amendment on the list. Pretend it never happened. Throw it in the garbage and maybe nobody will remember it.

We remember. We think that some amendments are a few things that would really move the country forward, and we don't have a chance to get them put in place simply because we are the minority. That is absolutely wrong. It is undemocratic. It is hurtful to the institution and hurtful to America.

We can do better. You and I should pledge right now to work on that. I am game if you are.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I will say to my friend that I have no better days than the days that you and I are working together. I absolutely look forward to that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Reclaiming my time, I don't want to see that anymore. It is an embarrassment when I have to even get up to do my half of the rule and talk about what awful things have happened to us. There are more things that I need to talk about than that.

I think we should cut out the games and the cuteness and all the rest of it and do our job.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today, as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, embarrassed. At the same time that I am embarrassed, I am also dumbfounded.

I know that there are people at home that are thinking: Why would a Member of Congress, the most prestigious body in the world, be embarrassed, dumbfounded?

Well, I was always taught that if you show me your budget or if you show me your legislation, then you are showing me your values.

Representative SCOTT, my good friend from Virginia, had an amendment that would strike the prohibition that Federal funds could be used to desegregate our public schools in this country.

If you look at the GAO study, there are more schools now that are desegregated than in 1968. We can talk eloquently about the history of the House and what the Democrats did when they were in control and how many amendments were made in order. I am not talking about how many amendments. I am talking about a specific amendment, a specific issue.

We are perpetuating segregation in the United States of America in our

public schools. We are not allowing the States to use funds to promote integration and diversity among our schools.

My State—and I will own this—is still the only State under a Federal desegregation order, because we have not completely desegregated our schools. We still have that ugly history.

With everything going on in this country and school kids probably huddled around a TV right now watching this institution work and they are saying: These are our leaders? We elected them to run this country? Why wouldn't they want me to go to school with other kids of other races?

That is why I am embarrassed. It is wrong. I don't think we should just hide behind procedure, but address the issue and the moral failure and the message that we are sending to our children.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from New York that I do not have other speakers remaining, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

These bills don't have the support they need to pass the Senate. It takes 60 votes to even bring them to the floor. That means that this entire exercise this week has been an exercise in futility. All the while, the clock is ticking and Congress has so much to do, as I have elaborated several times this afternoon, over the next 9 legislative days.

If this process has been good for anything, it is revealing just how broken the legislative process has become under the majority's rule.

Legislation regularly comes to the House floor without any committee consideration. It just goes to rules. The majority even rammed through a healthcare repeal bill not long ago—I am sure everybody remembers that—that would impact one-sixth of our entire economy without first—what we need to do again in regular order—getting a score from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

They are very important. They tell us what cost and what impact it would have on the budget and on the country. So that means we had no idea of the impact of that bill on our markets or what it would cost when voting for it.

The minority is routinely shut out of the process, often unable to get so much as a vote on an amendment on the House floor. When Speaker RYAN assumed the gavel, he promised to return to regular order and an open process. We have been waiting a mighty long time. Every time we offered an amendment to the bill before us in the Rules Committee, we asked that the rule be open; again, giving all Members a chance to affect that bill. Unanimously, we are voted against and we lose all those votes 9-4. That means that both sides will not be able to affect that bill and it means that regular order is as far away as it ever was.

Here we are, less than a month away from the end of the fiscal year, and we

haven't passed a budget resolution through the House. We were supposed to have a budget through the House, the Senate, and the conference—the conference is necessary to reconcile the House and Senate bills—by April 15.

We blew through the debt limit in March and still have not dealt with that. We have yet to have a single open rule in the Rules Committee under the Speaker's leadership. Believe me, I am sure that an awful lot of Members of this House have something to say about what is going on.

It is no wonder that, according to the latest figures from Gallup, 79 percent of the public disapproves of how Congress is doing its job. No wonder.

CBS News highlighted that it costs the taxpayers an estimated \$24 million a week to operate the House of Representatives. They know that they are not getting their money's worth.

They needed 60 votes to repeal and replace healthcare, when there was no replacement in sight. I am not sure how to describe that as a legislative proposal, but what it sounds like to me is a hoax. We are going to fool you that we have really got a replacement here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, the rule, and the bill. I hope that my good colleague, Mr. WOODALL, and I can help fix this place to do a little better.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I don't dispute the polling numbers my friend from New York cites. In fact, I am as saddened by those numbers, as she is. But I also feel culpable; not culpable because of the work we are doing today—I think we should be proud—I feel culpable because we all find ourselves in conversations with one another where, instead of building the institution up, we run the institution down.

What my friend from New York said about Ms. LEE's amendment being changed in the Rules Committee, she is absolutely right, the amendment was changed. But, Mr. Speaker, let's be clear: it wasn't changed in some backroom deal with smoke-filled air where no one knows what is happening and can't read the bill. It was noticed. There was an entire paragraph dedicated to saying: Hey, this is unusual. This doesn't happen that often. We want all the cards on the table so everybody knows. Just understand we made this change this time around.

Mr. Speaker, getting the work done in this institution is hard. It leads to conflicting goals. You heard folks from the other side of the aisle say: We are not spending nearly enough time on this bill. We need to make even more amendments in order. And you heard folks on other side of the aisle say: This whole bill is an exercise in futility. I don't know why we are wasting even one moment on it.

It is tough to satisfy both of those concerns simultaneously.

We have got this rule book called the United States Constitution. It doesn't ask a whole lot of the United States Congress. It does ask us to appropriate the money. Under the leadership of both parties, Mr. Speaker, this House has failed to get that done on time year after year.

This year, the bipartisan Appropriations Committee in subcommittee, in full committee, worked tirelessly, as I said, not for days, not for weeks, but for months. One bill at a time. In fact, one line at a time.

That product was brought together by the Rules Committee last month, August 16, Mr. Speaker. That amalgamation of bills was posted on the internet for all the world to see and read. Every Member of this Congress had a chance to bring their ideas about how to make it better.

The Rules Committee got together, looked at those ideas, made more of those ideas in order for debate than we have seen in decades for bills that get completed on time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. The Rules Committee did not get together. The majority of the Rules Committee got together. We had no action in that game whatsoever.

□ 1345

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am always compelled to yield to my friend from New York because I am so fond of her and because her leadership has meant so much to this institution.

My friend has served on the Rules Committee for even longer than I have, and so my friend understands how the Rules Committee works even better than I do.

I don't want to engage my friend in a colloquy, at least not in my closing statement. We should have this conversation on day 1. Please, my friend from New York, give us one more word.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, just to speak on accuracy: don't say the Rules Committee got together and went over those. Say the Rules Committee majority got together and went over those. You know, that is all I ask.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I welcome my friend's constructive counsel, but I know for a fact that her calendar looks just like mine does, and that means that we are going in in the early afternoon and we are not getting out till late at night.

Why? Because you and I are sitting just three Members apart listening to Member after Member make their case, and in the spirit of accuracy, don't let it be said that our Members coming and testifying doesn't make a difference because it does. You and I both believe that. We know it to be true, and it is important that it be true.

Those Members come and they testify, they make their case, and then we vote up or down on those amendments.

Mr. Speaker, can we do better? We can. And I will work with absolutely any colleague of any political stripe of any region to do better at any time, but let's do recognize that we made a commitment to ourselves to get this job done for the first time in a decade.

By coming to the floor right now, Mr. Speaker, quarter of 2 on a Thursday afternoon passing this rule, we are going to get this job done together for the first time in a long time.

Will we wake up tomorrow and try to do better? You know that we will. Should we take a moment to thank the folks who helped us get here? You know that we should.

Mr. Speaker, you are surrounded left and right by Members of the House team. The parliamentarians worked tirelessly to approve the amendments, to make sure they are all written and drafted properly. I want to thank the parliamentarian team for the work that they do.

Mr. Speaker, we kick CBO a lot in this place because we don't like their score one day, we like it the next. CBO has to go through these amendments, score these amendments. I am grateful to them for the work they did to make this possible.

Legislative counsel goes through, with each Member of Congress, making sure that every "i" is in the right place, every "t" is crossed. It is not a small task. It is a gargantuan task, and they do it on these big bills day in and day out. I am grateful for that.

You are starting to see some of the appropriators come down, Mr. Speaker. Long after my friend from New York and I have left this Chamber, the appropriations team is going to be here until the wee hours of the morning once again going through each and every line and each and every amendment.

I think about what my friend from Louisiana said about the school children who are turning on C-SPAN and watching this process. I don't know what they think goes into making this happen, but what I know goes into making this happen is a lot of hard work, staff work, Member work, a lot of big hearts, and a lot of big brains sitting down together hashing through these issues.

This rule is worth supporting. The underlying legislation is worth supporting, Mr. Speaker, and I ask all of my colleagues to do exactly that.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 504 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for

other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is ENTITLED to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he

then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5-minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 186, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 457]

YEAS—227

Abraham	Comer	Graves (LA)
Aderholt	Comstock	Graves (MO)
Allen	Conaway	Griffith
Amash	Cook	Grothman
Amodel	Costello (PA)	Guthrie
Arrington	Cramer	Handel
Babin	Crawford	Harper
Bacon	Culberson	Harris
Banks (IN)	Davidson	Hartzler
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Hensarling
Barr	Denham	Herrera Beutler
Barton	Dent	Hice, Jody B.
Bergman	DesJarlais	Higgins (LA)
Biggs	Donovan	Hill
Bilirakis	Duffy	Holding
Bishop (MI)	Duncan (SC)	Hollingsworth
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (TN)	Hudson
Black	Dunn	Huizenga
Blackburn	Emmer	Hultgren
Blum	Estes (KS)	Hunter
Bost	Farenthold	Hurd
Brady (TX)	Faso	Issa
Brat	Ferguson	Jenkins (KS)
Brooks (AL)	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Johnson (LA)
Buchanan	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Buck	Fortenberry	Johnson, Sam
Bucshon	Fox	Jones
Budd	Franks (AZ)	Jordan
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Joyce (OH)
Byrne	Gaetz	Katko
Calvert	Gallagher	Kelly (MS)
Carter (GA)	Gianforte	Kelly (PA)
Carter (TX)	Gibbs	King (IA)
Chabot	Gohmert	King (NY)
Cheney	Goodlatte	Kinzinger
Coffman	Gosar	Knight
Cole	Gowdy	Kustoff (TN)
Collins (GA)	Granger	Labrador
Collins (NY)	Graves (GA)	LaHood

Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson

Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—186

Adams
Aguilar
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
F.
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks

Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Donovan

Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch

Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford

NOT VOTING—20

Bridenstine
Costa
Crist
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
DeGette
DeSantis

Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Garrett
LaMalfa
Lowenthal
Posey
Ros-Lehtinen

Ross
Scalise
Tsongas
Wagner
Wasserman
Schultz
Webster (FL)

□ 1412

Ms. PINGREE changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ROKITA and Mrs. HARTZLER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 190, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

YEAS—222

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Donovan

Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam

Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry

Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Rice (SC)
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford

Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—190

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Neal

Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suoizzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—21

Bridenstine
Costa
Crist
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
DeGette
DeSantis
Deutch

Diaz-Balart
Garrett
LaMalfa
Meadows
Pelosi
Posey
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross

Scalise
Tsongas
Wagner
Wasserman
Schultz
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1422

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 500 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3354.

Will the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1424

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, with Mr. PALMER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 88 printed in part B of House Report 115–295, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 115–295 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 71 by Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

Amendment No. 74 by Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD of California.

Amendment No. 75 by Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

Amendment No. 76 by Mr. CORREA of California.

Amendment No. 77 by Mr. HUNTER of California.

Amendment No. 80, as modified, by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment No. 81 by Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

Amendment No. 84 by Ms. JAYAPAL of Washington.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) on which further proceedings were post-

poned and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 205, noes 207, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]

AYES—205

Adams	Gallego	Neal
Aguilar	Garamendi	Nolan
Barragán	Gomez	Norcross
Barton	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Halleran
Bass	Gottheimer	O'Rourke
Beatty	Green, Al	Pallone
Bera	Green, Gene	Panetta
Beyer	Grijalva	Pascrell
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Payne
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Blunt Rochester	Hastings	Peters
Bonamici	Heck	Peterson
Boyle, Brendan	Herrera Beutler	Pingree
F.	Higgins (NY)	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Himes	Poe (TX)
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Bucshon	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Burgess	Jayapal	Raskin
Bustos	Jeffries	Reed
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Carbajal	Kaptur	Rosen
Cárdenas	Katko	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Keating	Ruiz
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Rush
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Kihuen	Sánchez
Ciulline	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schiff
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schrader
Clyburn	Lance	Scott (VA)
Coffman	Langevin	Scott, David
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Lawrence	Shea-Porter
Cooper	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Correa	Lee	Sinema
Costello (PA)	Levin	Sires
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Crowley	Lewis (MN)	Smith (NJ)
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Soto
Davis, Danny	LoBiondo	Speier
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Suo zzi
Delaney	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Takano
DelBene	Lowe y	Thompson (CA)
Demings	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	M.	Titus
Dingell	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
Doggett	Lynch	Torres
Doyle, Michael	MacArthur	Upton
F.	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Dunn	Matsui	Veasey
Ellison	McCollum	Vela
Engel	McEachin	Velázquez
Eshoo	McGovern	Visclosky
Españalat	McNerney	Walz
Esty (CT)	Meehan	Waters, Maxine
Evans	Meeke s	Watson Coleman
Farenthold	Meng	Welch
Fitzpatrick	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Moulton	Woodall
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
Fudge	Nadler	
Gabbard	Napolitano	

NOES—207

Abraham	Amodei	Banks (IN)
Aderholt	Arrington	Barletta
Allen	Babin	Barr
Amash	Bacon	Bergman

Biggs	Harper	Paulsen
Bilirakis	Harris	Pearce
Bishop (MI)	Hartzler	Perry
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Pittenger
Black	Hice, Jody B.	Poliquin
Blackburn	Higgins (LA)	Ratcliffe
Blum	Hill	Reichert
Bost	Holding	Renacci
Brady (TX)	Hollingsworth	Rice (SC)
Brat	Hudson	Roby
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga	Roe (TN)
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Buck	Hurd	Rohrabacher
Budd	Issa	Rokita
Byrne	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney, Francis
Calvert	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney, Thomas
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	J.
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Cheney	Jones	Rouzer
Cole	Jordan	Royce (CA)
Collins (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Russell
Collins (NY)	Kelly (MS)	Rutherford
Comer	Kelly (PA)	Sanford
Comstock	King (IA)	Schweikert
Conaway	King (NY)	Scott, Austin
Cook	Kinzing er	Sensenbrenner
Cramer	Knight	Sessions
Crawford	Kustoff (TN)	Shimkus
Culberson	Labrador	Shuster
Davidson	LaHood	Simpson
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Denham	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Dent	Latta	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Long	Smucker
Donovan	Loudermilk	Stefanik
Duffy	Love	Stewart
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Stivers
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Taylor
Emmer	Marchant	Tenney
Estes (KS)	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Faso	Marshall	Thornberry
Ferguson	Massie	Tiberi
Fleischmann	Mast	Tipton
Flores	McCarthy	Trott
Fortenberry	McCaul	Turner
Fox	McClintock	Valadao
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Walberg
Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Walden
Gaetz	McMorris	Walker
Gallagher	Rodgers	Walorski
Gianforte	McSally	Walters, Mimi
Gibbs	Messer	Weber (TX)
Gohmert	Mitchell	Wenstrup
Goodlatte	Moolenaar	Westerman
Gosar	Mooney (WV)	Williams
Gowdy	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Graves (GA)	Newhouse	Womack
Graves (LA)	Noem	Yoder
Graves (MO)	Norman	Yoho
Griffith	Nunes	Young (AK)
Grothman	Olson	Young (IA)
Guthrie	Palazzo	Zeldin
Handel	Palmer	

NOT VOTING—21

Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Ross
Costa	Garrett	Scalise
Crist	Maloney,	Tsongas
Cummings	Carolyn B.	Wagner
Curbelo (FL)	Meadows	Wasserman
DeGette	Pelosi	Schultz
DeSantis	Posey	Webster (FL)
Deutch	Ros-Lehtinen	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1429

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MS. ROYBAL-ALLARD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.