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 think of the ideal environment 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 Kendra’s life, her courage, and her legacy, 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, Kareem, who recently graduated from the University of California at Berkeley.

Kareem now works as a paralegal, helping people like herself navigate our complicated immigration system. Kareem 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 Kareem 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) to provide 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 amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying 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 a Member designated in the report, may be withdrawn by a Member designated in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, 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 put 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 fixed, without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), yields himself such time as he may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1245

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 will yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

RESOLVED

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. That is 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 and remember sitting right up here 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, reading that podium up, 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: Commerce, Justice, Science section; Division D is the Financial Services section; Division F is the Labor, HHS, and Education sections.

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 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 2015 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 suppose that tonight 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 1,933 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.

And I 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 us once again along 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 the law.

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 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 are 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 next 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 millions of dollars 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 in 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 have.

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 appropriation 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 of dollars that were worked through the Appropriations Subcommittee process, and then the Appropriations full committee process.

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 all amendments 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, and an attempt to end DACA that the House of Representatives 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 with the priority it deserves.

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 in 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 superseding 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 decriminalizing 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 to go that route.

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 permitted to do 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. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, so a vote against this rule is a vote to permit the States to make that decision. The rule, as it is, prevents us from getting in the way of the Justice Department's obliterating these rights.
government, the military, and here in Congress.

Terminating DACA and stripping DREAMers of that same hope and opportunity is unconscionable and incom-parable with our American values. We are a nation of immigrants who have made 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.

Ms. ROBY. 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 gentleman 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 such organs. This 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 life-saving 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 using 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.

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 (Mrs. 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 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 help 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, the decisions and actions 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 helping careers for rising 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.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my chairwoman, 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 to 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 plans, which are needed 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 a zero 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 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. 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 from California. She is absolutely wonderful amendment. He is the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee and is known for the hard work they put in their 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.

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 allowed five 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—infinitely 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 from the United States by saying that the Congress, any House of Representatives, any legislature anywhere can do what they have to do to get things done. 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 things done. Now, some miracle may happen. Who knows? Or maybe the whole thing will disappear—I don't know—with no explanation, by the way.

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 should not accept any 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 amendament. He is the ranking member on the Education and the Workforce Committee and is known throughout the United States for the
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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 went 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 condemning this language.

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 friend 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.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are really getting somewhere. 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 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 amendments get taken away. What he kept is the 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. When 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 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. Rich- mond).

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 Mem- ber 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 de- segregate our public schools in this country.

If you look at the GAO study, there are more schools now than are deseg- regated 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 amend- ments were made in order. I am not talking about how many amendments. I am talking about a specific amend- ment, a specific issue.

We are perpetuating segregation in the United States of America in our
Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The minority is routinely shut out of 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 workforce. You heard it 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 process, often unable to get so much as a vote on an amendment on the budget and on the country. 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 have no idea of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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. 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.

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 box. 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 are sitting at the conference table and 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 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 the other side of the aisle say: This whole bill is an exercise in futility. I don’t think 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.

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? I 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 parliamentary 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 for 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 I have left this Chamber, the ap-"
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 was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on the 2nd demand of the ayes and nays.

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

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 (NY)
Albon (NY)
Amodei (NV)
Babin (LA)
Baxley (GA)
Birch (IN)
Burgos (TX)
Butler (MS)
Burr (NC)
Buck (CO)
Bygg (NY)
Calder (NY)
C showAlert (FL)
Clay (OH)
Clyburn (AL)
Connelly (OH)
Cosgrove (OH)
Craven (NC)
Crowley (LA)
Culbertson (KY)
Davis (AR)
DeLauro (CT)
DelBene (WA)
DeSimone (NJ)
Dingell (MI)
Doggett (TX)
Doyle, Michael F (PA)
Ellison (MN)
Engel (NY)
Espi (CA)
Espy (OH)
Espy (MS)
Farr (CA)
Frankel (FL)

### NOT VOTING—21

Bridenstine (OK)
Crist (FL)
Cummings (MD)
Curbelo (FL)
DeGette (CO)
DeSantis (FL)

### NAYS—190

Adams (CA)
AgUILA–9

Barragan (CA)
Bass (CA)
Beatty (OH)
Berman (NY)
Blumenauer (OR)
Boustead–2

Boyle, Brendan F
Brown (OH)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos (IL)
Butterfield (NC)
Capuano (MA)
Carbalaj (CA)
Cicilline (CT)
Clark (MA)
Clay (OH)
Clyburn (SC)

Connolly (MA)
Cooper (NY)
Correa (CA)
Cosgrove (OH)
Crowley (NY)
Culbertson (KY)
Davis (AR)
DeLauro (CT)
DelBene (WA)
DeSimone (NJ)
Dingell (MI)
Doggett (TX)
Doyle, Michael F (PA)
Ellison (MN)
Engel (NY)
Espi (CA)
Espy (OH)
Espy (MS)
Farr (CA)
Frankel (FL)

### NOT VOTING—21

Bridenstine (OK)
Crist (FL)
Cummings (MD)
Curbelo (FL)
DeGette (CO)
DeSantis (FL)

### NAYS—190

Adams (CA)
AgUILA–9

Barragan (CA)
Bass (CA)
Beatty (OH)
Berman (NY)
Blumenauer (OR)
Boustead–2

Boyle, Brendan F
Brown (OH)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos (IL)
Butterfield (NC)
Capuano (MA)
Carbalaj (CA)
Cicilline (CT)
Clark (MA)
Clay (OH)
Clyburn (SC)

Connolly (MA)
Cooper (NY)
Correa (CA)
Cosgrove (OH)
Crowley (NY)
Culbertson (KY)
Davis (AR)
DeLauro (CT)
DelBene (WA)
DeSimone (NJ)
Dingell (MI)
Doggett (TX)
Doyle, Michael F (PA)
Ellison (MN)
Engel (NY)
Espi (CA)
Espy (OH)
Espy (MS)
Farr (CA)
Frankel (FL)
Mr. KING of Iowa.

Texas.

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

Mr. BUXBAUM of Georgia.

Mr. CARBONELL of Florida.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. Bustos of Illinois.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

Mr. BHATTACHARYYA of West Virginia.

Mr. CARDENAS of California.

Mr. BROWN (MD).

Mr. BUCSHON of Indiana.

Mr. BRAGG of Arizona.

Mr. BROWN (CA) of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BURLING of California.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.

Mr. BURK of Kansas.

Mr. BUMP of California.

Mr. BUCK of Georgia.

Mr. BURGESS of Virginia.