

The sponsor of the bill used two phrases with regard to this legislation that really struck me. He said it is “common sense” and “bipartisan.” Isn’t it a good thing that we have commonsense legislation that is bipartisan? Isn’t that what the people of the United States of America send us here to do?

Let’s come together, as one House, with one voice, help the people of Puerto Rico, and then, together, sit down and learn the lesson of what has happened here so that we don’t repeat those mistakes for our country and end up with the United States of America on the brink of collapse.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to discuss H. Res. 770, the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 5278—Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act (PROMESA).

Our consideration of PROMESA must be a very thoughtful analysis of an outcome where the people of Puerto Rico will be empowered and be on a path towards progress where working families, their children and pensioners can be on a pathway towards a better future.

PROMESA is a bipartisan measure and effort to assist the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in restructuring \$70 billion in currently unpayable debt, an amount that exceeds the size of its entire economy.

There are a total of 3,548 million people living on the island of Puerto Rico.

Since 2006, Puerto Rico’s economy has shrunk by more than 10 percent and shed more than 250,000 jobs.

More than 45 percent of the Commonwealth’s residents live in poverty—the highest poverty rate of any state or territory.

Furthermore, its 11.6 percent unemployment rate is more than twice the national level.

The challenges facing the people of Puerto Rico have ignited the largest wave of out-migration since the 1950’s, and the pace continues to accelerate.

More than 300,000 people have left Puerto Rico in the past decade with a record of 84,000 people leaving in 2014.

Puerto Ricans suffer from high rates of forced migration due to the better opportunities offered in the United States compared to in the commonwealth.

The gap between emigrants and immigrants has been continuously widening.

Indeed, this increase in emigrants caused a population decline, the first in its history, and the stateside Puerto Rican population grew quickly.

The median age of male Puerto Ricans is of working age from the ages of 25–49 and similarly for women from the ages of 25–59.

Most of the homes are family-led.

There are about 1,133,600 people in the civilian labor force but only 43 percent of them are employed.

In addition, most of those working work in minimum wage jobs.

Over 27 percent of the people in the Commonwealth are on welfare.

The median income in Puerto Rico is only half that of the poorest U.S. state, Mississippi, but welfare benefits are about the same in Puerto Rico as in Mississippi.

Swift action is needed in order to alleviate the pain and suffering of the people of Puerto Rico.

There is no time to waste.

H.R. 5278 appears to be an emergency default for Puerto Rico, an American territory where 3.5 million American citizens reside and continue to live in fear for their finances, their families and their future.

On July 1, Puerto Rico will face nearly \$2 billion worth of bond payments.

Already, businesses have closed, public worker benefits are in jeopardy, hospital care is restricted and basic governmental functions are at risk.

Should the Puerto Rican government default in early July, it faces certain litigation by its creditors, further erosion of its economy, and an inability to provide basic services to its people.

This measure creates a process for the Commonwealth to restructure their bond debts, avoiding a default that could lead to a humanitarian catastrophe and instead allowing Puerto Rico to return to economic growth and fiscal balance.

It would allow for the creation of a seven-member Financial Oversight and Management board which will approve annual budgets and fiscal plans.

This fiscal plan must be designed in a way that provides adequate funding for pension obligations.

Also, I have serious concerns about the minimum wage provision of the measure.

Specifically, regarding minimum wage and overtime, H.R. 5278 would extend the application of the existing federal subminimum wage of \$4.25 an hour to those under the age of 25 in Puerto Rico for as long as four years, while all other federal jurisdictions pay the subminimum wage to those under the age of 20 for only up to the first ninety days of employment.

We need to continue to work on ways to improve this measure to ascertain that American citizens in Puerto Rico are not languishing in poverty.

Indeed, the measure contains a provision that provides for a delay on the new Department of Labor overtime pay regulation until a Government Accountability Office (GAO) study is completed and the Department of Labor determines whether the rule could negatively impact the economy of Puerto Rico.

Additionally, the measure would create a “Revitalization Coordinator” that works closely with the Oversight Board to determine which energy and other infrastructure projects will be able to bypass local environmental, public health, and consumer protection laws.

Let me underscore again that I have serious concerns about the provisions in this measure, not the least of which is the expansion of the subminimum wage, the exemption from the new overtime Rule, and the exclusion of protections for pension benefits.

I commend my Democratic colleagues in their efforts of protecting the environment and wildlife refuge in the Commonwealth.

I look forward to working with my Democratic colleagues and our Republican colleagues across the aisle in continuing to improve the provisions of the measure for the betterment of fellow American citizens in Puerto Rico.

Let me conclude by highlighting that H.R. 5278 is not perfect but so long as we continue to work on a bipartisan basis in good faith, we can work towards our efforts of ensuring that Puerto Rico does not become a humanitarian crisis.

We must continue to work together to be our brother’s and sister’s keepers.

It is essential that we stand with the people of Puerto Rico and take action.

It is essential that we continue to work towards an orderly process that promotes the livelihood of U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico and alleviates the crisis.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5325, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 771 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 771

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 5325) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, 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 Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered 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, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments 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.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 5325 pursuant to this resolution, section 3304 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 shall not apply.

□ 1315

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against House Resolution 771 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act.

The resolution, in waiving all points of order against consideration of the bill, waives section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, thereby causing a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this year's appropriations process has been rocky to say the least. That trend is poised to continue this evening and tomorrow as the House considers the fiscal year '17 Legislative appropriations bill.

Buried in this bill's committee report is controversial language that forces the Library of Congress to continue using the derogatory term "illegal alien" in its subject headings. Mr. Speaker, I will explain the background on this issue.

Last month, the Library of Congress announced proposed changes to its subject headings that would replace the term "aliens" with "noncitizens" and replace the term "illegal aliens" with "noncitizens" and "unauthorized immigration."

It is not unusual for the Library of Congress to make changes to its subject headings. In fact, each year it makes thousands of such changes. In 2015 alone, there were 4,934 new subject headings that were added. An example of one such change that the Library has made in the past was to replace the word "Negro" with a less offensive word.

This sort of evolution of the Library's subject headings is not unprecedented by any stretch of the imagination. However, what is unprecedented is Congress' weighing in on these changes. In fact, the Library has confirmed that this is the first time that Congress will have legislated on any of its subject headings in the history of the Library of Congress. So never before in history has Congress so much as communicated with the Library of Congress about its subject headings, let alone introduced legislation concerning them.

With this bill, that is all about to change. House Republicans are poised to make history by—for the first time ever—interfering in the Library of Congress' subject headings process to preserve a prejudicial term.

Now, I am not going to lump everybody on the other side of the aisle together on this issue. When this bill was marked up in the Appropriations Committee, Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ introduced an amendment that would remove the "alien"-related language from the legislation's committee report. In fact, four Republicans in the committee joined Democrats to vote in favor of that measure, and the amendment only failed by one vote.

So there is bipartisan consensus on this matter, and it deserves debate and a vote in the full House of Representatives so that all of us can take a vote where, for the first time—again, this is the first time in its history—where the Congress is legislating on a subject heading of the Library of Congress, and it is to force the Library of Congress to continue using the word "illegal alien" rather than allowing them to do their job and, as they were considering doing, retiring that term.

Yesterday, three amendments were presented to the Rules Committee that would allow this to occur. Astoundingly, the Rules Committee rejected all three of those amendments. In other words, they would have allowed us to debate this and take a vote on it, but the Rules Committee rejected all three of these amendments, preventing a vote on this issue on the House floor.

As I mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, the language in the committee report that has sparked this debate refers to a portion of U.S. Code that contains the term "alien." I have introduced legislation that would remove "alien" from U.S. Code in instances where it refers to immigrants to this Nation. My bill, which is H.R. 3785, the CHANGE Act, would replace the terms "alien" and "illegal alien" in Federal law with the terms "foreign national" and "undocumented foreign national."

Let me be clear about why I am doing that. First, these folks may not be American citizens, but they are human beings. They are not people from outer space. When we think of the term "alien," we don't think of human beings; we think of people that are from somewhere else.

The word "illegal alien" has also been used oftentimes—although not by everyone—in a pejorative way, in a way that is meant to be pejorative and offensive. It stigmatizes immigrants in this Nation and diminishes the quality of discussion around immigration issues in the United States. When ugly, belittling names are used to describe groups of people, those terms can make discrimination seem okay.

There is precedent for changing language in our laws as words' meanings evolve over time. For example, our Federal code previously used the terms "lunatic" and "mentally retarded." Those words have since been taken out.

Just last month, President Obama signed into law a bill that I believe we can all be proud of, which was introduced by my colleague, Congresswoman GRACE MENG of New York, that removes the terms "Oriental" and "Negro" from Federal code. It is also time for "alien" to be added to the list of words we remove from Federal code.

So I urge my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, to stand up for the dignity of all people who call America home and vote in favor of the CHANGE Act.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I understand that my friend has great passion on this issue. What I love about this Chamber is that it allows people to come and express their passions.

But I serve on the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee has original jurisdiction of the unfunded mandate point of order, and it is designed to prevent Congress from imposing unfunded mandates—rules that we are not going to pay for—on outside institutions: State governments, local governments, and tribal governments.

By definition, this is the legislative branch appropriations bill. It funds the Library of Congress. We are absolutely funding what this bill is asked to do. To debate the merits of the underlying language is absolutely legitimate debate. But to use this point of order, which is almost a textbook definition of what this point of order does not apply to, is a dilatory tactic, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask that we vote to dispense with that, oppose this point of order, and get on to the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would make two points. The first is that this is an unfunded mandate because the Library of Congress was already well on its way to changing this term. Now, Congress is instructing it that it cannot do that. There is no way that money is not spent in following the instruction of Congress. So I disagree with the gentleman. This is an unfunded mandate.

To the issue itself, there was no argument from the other side that these words are pejorative, that this word is an anachronism. And, by the way, Mr. Speaker, this word is used in Federal code and applies to people who are here who are undocumented and also people who are here legally who are residents. So this is not only an issue of the undocumented. This is an issue of immigrants generally.

I know that, over the years, ours has been a very devout nation, a nation of faith, and that includes many of the people in this body. I, for example, have had an opportunity to visit with the faith study group that meets once a week that talks about the issues of their own personal faith, their own journeys, and the work that they do for their constituents.

As I think about my own district, which is 64 percent Hispanic in San Antonio, it is a town whose creativity, entrepreneurship, and spirit has been infused by the immigrant spirit. These are hardworking, often humble people who don't ask for much from their government, who work hard to provide for their families and who hardly ever will be heard to complain. Most of them, obviously, are documented; some are not.

But those people who are not and those who are considered resident aliens are human beings, and I believe that our faith would tell us that God considers those folks human beings, not illegals. I don't imagine that God thinks of those people as illegal. They are fundamentally human beings, and they should be respected.

They are not American citizens. We understand that, and there has been much debate over the last few years about passing comprehensive immigration reform or at least considering it here on the House floor. That hasn't happened yet. But I do think that each of us can at least extend some modicum of respect to these people.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to join me in voting for the CHANGE Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I applaud my friend for coming down here and speaking on the underlying bill. I think it is very important that we have the conversations that we will have on the underlying bill. But it is also important, in the name of good government, to use these points of order for the purpose these points of order were intended to be used.

The Library of Congress cannot spend one penny except for those dollars provided in the underlying legislation. Yes, the underlying legislation has mandates for the Library of Congress, but those mandates are funded because that is the only way the Library of Congress can be funded.

This is an incredibly important point of order, Mr. Speaker. The power that we have in this body to dictate to State, local, and tribal governments what they must do and then refuse to pay the bill is a dangerous practice that this institution recognized when it created this point of order to avoid.

I hope my friends on both side of the aisle will continue to bring up unfunded mandates points of order when they are applicable. But I implore my colleagues: Do not take a vote to suggest that a point of order designed to

prevent us from putting unfunded costs on local governments should apply when we are funding the responsibilities of the Federal Government. That perverts the intent, and it undermines our ability to use this point of order effectively in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge us to allow the House to continue our business for the day. Vote "yes" on the question of consideration of the resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the point of order has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 170, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

YEAS—231

Abraham	Foxx	Massie
Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy
Allen	Frelinghuysen	McCaul
Amash	Garrett	McClintock
Amodei	Gibbs	McHenry
Babin	Gibson	McKinley
Barr	Gohmert	McMorris
Barton	Goodlatte	Rodgers
Benishek	Gosar	McSally
Bilirakis	Gowdy	Meadows
Bishop (MI)	Granger	Meehan
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Messer
Blackburn	Graves (LA)	Mica
Blum	Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)
Bost	Griffith	Miller (MI)
Boustany	Grothman	Moolenaar
Brady (TX)	Guinta	Mooney (WV)
Brat	Guthrie	Mullin
Bridenstine	Hanna	Mulvaney
Brooks (AL)	Harper	Murphy (PA)
Brooks (IN)	Harris	Neugebauer
Buchanan	Hartzler	Newhouse
Buck	Heck (NV)	Noem
Bucshon	Hensarling	Nugent
Burgess	Hill	Nunes
Byrne	Holding	Olson
Calvert	Hudson	Palazzo
Carter (GA)	Huelskamp	Palmer
Carter (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Paulsen
Chabot	Hunter	Pearce
Chaffetz	Hurd (TX)	Perry
Clawson (FL)	Hurt (VA)	Pittenger
Coffman	Issa	Pitts
Cole	Jenkins (KS)	Poe (TX)
Collins (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin
Collins (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Pompeo
Comstock	Johnson, Sam	Posey
Conaway	Jolly	Ratcliffe
Cook	Jordan	Reed
Costello (PA)	Joyce	Reichert
Cramer	Katko	Renacci
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Ribble
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rigell
Culberson	King (IA)	Roby
Curbelo (FL)	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
Davis, Rodney	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Denham	Kline	Rogers (KY)
Dent	Knight	Rohrabacher
DeSantis	Labrador	Rokita
DesJarlais	LaHood	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Roskam
Dold	Lamborn	Ross
Donovan	Lance	Rothfus
Duncan (SC)	Latta	Rouzer
Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Royce
Emmer (MN)	Long	Russell
Farenthold	Loudermilk	Salmon
Fitzpatrick	Love	Sanford
Fleischmann	Lucas	Scalise
Fleming	Lummis	Schweikert
Flores	MacArthur	Scott, Austin
Forbes	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Fortenberry	Marino	Sessions

Shimkus	Trott	Whitfield
Shuster	Turner	Williams
Simpson	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Smith (MO)	Valadao	Wittman
Smith (NE)	Wagner	Womack
Smith (NJ)	Walberg	Woodall
Smith (TX)	Walden	Yoder
Stefanik	Walker	Yoho
Stewart	Walorski	Young (AK)
Stivers	Walters, Mimi	Young (IA)
Stutzman	Weber (TX)	Young (IN)
Thompson (PA)	Webster (FL)	Zeldin
Thornberry	Wenstrup	Zinke
Tiberi	Westerman	
Tipton	Westmoreland	

NAYS—170

Adams	Gallego	Neal
Aguilar	Garamendi	Nolan
Ashford	Graham	Norcross
Bass	Grayson	O'Rourke
Beatty	Green, Al	Pallone
Becerra	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Bera	Grijalva	Pelosi
Beyer	Hahn	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Hastings	Peters
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins	Pocan
F.	Himes	Polis
Brady (PA)	Honda	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Quigley
Bustos	Huffman	Rangel
Butterfield	Israel	Rice (NY)
Capps	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Jones	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	T.
Cicilline	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schiff
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Clyburn	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Langevin	Scott, David
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Lawrence	Sherman
Courtney	Levin	Sinema
Crowley	Lewis	Slaughter
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lowey	Takano
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Lujan, Ben Ray	Titus
DelBene	(NM)	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Torres
Deutch	Carolyn	Tsongas
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Van Hollen
Doggett	Matsui	Vargas
Doyle, Michael	McCollum	Veasey
F.	McDermott	Vela
Duckworth	McGovern	Velázquez
Edwards	McNerney	Visclosky
Engel	Meeks	Walz
Eshoo	Meng	Wasserman
Esty	Moore	Schultz
Fattah	Moulton	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Napolitano	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—32

Barletta	Fincher	Luetkemeyer
Black	Gabbard	Lynch
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Payne
Brownley (CA)	Hardy	Peterson
Capuano	Herrera Beutler	Price, Tom
Costa	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Cummings	Hinojosa	Rooney (FL)
Duffy	Hultgren	Sires
Ellison	Lee	Takai
Ellmers (NC)	Lieu, Ted	Welch
Farr	Lipinski	

□ 1350

Mses. EDWARDS and WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SHUSTER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days 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, the buzz you hear around this Chamber, I suspect, is enthusiasm for the underlying bill. This is the legislative branch appropriations bill for FY 2017, and it is the single piece of legislation that enables all of the constituent services that go on from this institution. I want to say that again. Not one act of constituent service would go on anywhere in this country but for this underlying text. It is the Legislative Branch Subcommittee, led by my friend and colleague from Georgia, cardinal TOM GRAVES.

They do great work on the Legislative Branch Subcommittee, Mr. Speaker. It is no surprise to my colleagues in this Chamber that the House Appropriations Committee has been hard at work in producing those 12 appropriations bills that we are required to pass every year. Our success record in getting that done as a body has been spotty, but the success record of our committee in getting that done has been historic.

Even more, unlike many bills that come to this floor, the Appropriations Committee has said: Do you know what? We did the very best that we could do, but we welcome the input and counsel from our colleagues because we all have different experiences; we all come from different parts of the country; and we all have something to add.

So this bill, Mr. Speaker, makes in order 13 different amendments—seven offered by Republicans, six offered by Democrats—so that we can improve this bill and discuss this bill even more.

Among the top line items in the bill is the funding for our Capitol Police. No more so than this year have folks had the Capitol Police on their minds. The service that those men and women provide is indispensable in this Chamber, and I would argue, more than it is valuable to us and more than it is valuable to our constituents who visit this Chamber every day throughout the

year, it is valuable to the families of those who send their loved ones to work here each and every day.

This bill funds the Architect of the Capitol. We talk so much about spending reductions and trying to be responsible. I am so proud of the spending record in terms of those reductions on inefficient programs that this Chamber has generated, but we have priceless American treasures right here in this building. I recall when you could see the water running down from the Capitol dome as it destroyed those precious American, historical treasures. So this bill funds the Architect of the Capitol so that we are not a penny-wise and pound-foolish in terms of our obligation to tend to America's treasures.

This bill funds the Government Accountability Office. I dare say there is not a Member of Congress in this institution who hasn't had a constituent ask about a GAO report, who hasn't had occasion on his own to ask our auditing agency—our accounting office—to do a study of the best ways to use our resources, to make use of the limited resources that we have. They provide an incredibly valuable, non-partisan service so that we can do the very best for our constituents back home.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is funded at a level that is lower than the level was when I arrived in this Chamber. It is lower than the level was in 2009 and in 2010. I think that is important, because I think thrift really does begin at home. Throughout every year that I have been in this institution—I am now in year 5—we have absolutely gone after inefficient programs elsewhere in the government. We have absolutely tried to make a difference in curbing that tidal wave of debt that threatens the next generation, but we have started here in each and every bill.

Mr. Speaker, folks don't know it. The newspapers always carry the stories of excess on Capitol Hill. I don't know where they find those excess stories. I will tell you that the allotment for the spending of my office—for all of the constituent service that we do—is less than was allotted 10 years ago. Inflation corrodes it, and the job market erodes it. Time and time again, every dollar buys less, as every American family knows. We have committed ourselves as an institution to do more with less—thrift beginning at home.

There is a modest increase in this bill from the last cycle to deal with those issues, like our Capitol Police, like the Library of Congress, like the preservation of the Capitol. I support all of those underlying measures, and I support the rule by which we are bringing this measure here again. Thirteen amendments are made available by this rule. If we pass the rule, we will then move to the underlying bill, vote on those 13 amendments, and move to final passage.

I urge all of my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

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

□ 1400

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

I thank my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

This legislation, as he indicated, provides \$3.48 billion for the House of Representatives and joint operations of Congress. That is a \$73 million increase over the current year's levels, but more than \$150 million below the President's request.

This legislation funds the salaries and expenses for the House of Representatives, the Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, the Architect of the Capitol, Government Accountability Office, and the Library of Congress.

Today is June 9. Nearly 2 months have passed since my friends in the majority sailed past the statutory deadline for passing a budget without even looking back. Nearly 1 month has passed since House Republicans began considering appropriations bills without first agreeing to top-line spending levels.

Republicans made passing a budget a top priority this year. They insisted that we would return to regular order. I really wish the American public understood the "regular order" concept. Yet here we are working without a roadmap and, instead, passing new rules to stifle debate on the House floor on controversial issues like equal rights.

But I will get to that in a bit, Mr. Speaker. For now, I will just say it is disappointing because, instead of considering appropriations bills funding critical investments for American families and communities, the House majority has again chosen to take care of itself. The partisan mishmash we are discussing today is no different.

Here is an example: This legislation forces the Library of Congress to continue to use the pejorative term "illegal alien" in its subject headings. Mr. Speaker, in another life, as a member of the judiciary, I refused to use that term when discussing persons that were before me. I can't help but laugh at the absurdity of this.

We—and I mean Congress—can't have a conversation about comprehensive immigration reform, yet we are forcing the Library of Congress to readopt politically charged rhetoric. For what? How is this a priority? The Legislative Branch Appropriations bill is certainly not the appropriate place for a political debate on immigration.

This legislation continues to fund the Energy and Commerce select panel to target Planned Parenthood, which, thus far, has conducted a completely partisan, political witch hunt and come up empty.

This legislation continues to fund the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi, which has already spent \$7 million on just four hearings over the

past 2 years in order to smear Secretary Clinton. And what has it produced? Nothing.

I will note that the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi has overlapped a number of previous investigations that also found nothing. You want to cut wasteful spending, Mr. Speaker? Look no further. Defund the Benghazi hearings.

I am happy to say that the bill provides \$563 million for Members' representational allowances for the coming fiscal year. This is 1.5 percent increase over the current level. But when we consider the fact that the MRAs have been cut by nearly 17 percent since 2011—that adds up to \$312,000—a mere 1.5 percent increase is clearly inadequate. I can make the argument that, because of that, we are unable to pay young people that come here and keep them with their institutional memory, and in addition we are unable to provide efficient services for our constituents; yet we cut that \$312,000 out of the budget, and now we are going to add back a little bit and claim that we are being efficient.

I won't even go into the salary and the cost-of-living adjustment but to say that people find it surprising that we are entering this legislation in 2017, year 9, without a cost-of-living increase for Members of Congress. I wonder if that is causing some of them to live in their offices. I wonder if it is causing them to breach tax considerations when they do that and, perhaps, even ethical considerations. But I won't go into that.

Furthermore, an amendment has been offered that will require a 1 percent cut across the board to the bill's spending levels. Such a cut would essentially wipe out this already diminutive increase. Members should vote this amendment down.

With salaries frozen where they are, I just got through saying we can't retain the best talent. We continue to lose staff. I have three staffers that were perfect for their jobs that had to leave because they couldn't afford to live on the salary that we were paying them.

Side note here, Mr. Speaker: the median rent for a one-bedroom apartment in Washington, D.C., was \$2,160 per month last December; and I will remind the Members of this body that many staffers start here at \$30,000 or less, annually. Do the math. We need to take better care of our people.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield back, I feel compelled to mention Speaker RYAN's new rules governing the appropriations process on the House floor. Three weeks ago, something particularly shameful took place in this room as we debated the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

An amendment by our colleague and friend, SEAN PATRICK MALONEY, reached the vote threshold needed to pass. Republican leadership, apparently caught off guard, held open the vote for

nearly 8 minutes in order to make Republican Members change their vote. They allowed this to happen in the back of the room, and the amendment failed.

And what contentious subject was the amendment focused on? I will tell you. Prohibiting Federal contractors from discriminating against LGBTQ employees. This episode demonstrated just how little courage some Members of the Republican Party have.

A week later, Representative SEAN PATRICK MALONEY offered his amendment again, this time to the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and it caused such a hubbub that the legislation collapsed on the floor. I will say that again. A provision ensuring that LGBTQ contractors can't be fired solely because they are LGBTQ proved so contentious to Republicans that they defeated their own appropriations bill—I might add, a good bill—to prevent it from taking effect.

As a result, beginning this month, House Republican leadership is closing down the process and requiring all Members to submit amendments for appropriations measures to the Rules Committee in advance and has announced regular order is being suspended in order to make sure Republicans aren't caught off guard by "embarrassing" amendments, for instance, ensuring basic civil rights to American citizens.

Remember Speaker RYAN's pledge to return to regular order? Where is that commitment now? Perhaps my friends should consider that the reason these amendments are embarrassing to them is because their position is, in and of itself, embarrassing.

I will note that Representative SEAN PATRICK MALONEY offered his amendment again for the current legislation, but this time Republicans won't even allow it on the floor for a vote.

So, Mr. MALONEY, offer it again and again so we can continue to point out how ridiculous this is.

This entire process is quickly turning into a joke. Enough already. Why don't we fold the tent, wait until after the conventions and the November election, and start all over again, because we are doing nothing here.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is not widely known, but I have believed, in the 5 years that I have been in this institution, that if you were to lock the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and myself in a room together, we could solve most of the issues that ail this Nation, that there really is more common ground in this institution than folks are willing to let on. But I find myself in the very uncomfortable position today of disagreeing with almost every conclusion that he reached, while I agree with so many of the fundamental issues that he believes brought us to this point; for example, regular order is bringing these appropriations bills to the floor.

The 1974 Budget Act lays out this process clearly. It lays out the process for passing a budget, and it lays out the process, if the disagreements over that budget become too great, how we can proceed with the appropriations bills. It is exactly what is happening here today and exactly the way we envisioned it in 1974 when they passed the first Congressional Budget Act. It continues to roll on that way today. This is a success; it is not a failure.

My friend is absolutely right; it has been 9 years since Congress last received a pay raise. I will say to my friend that I go down to townhall meetings and I say: One day, I am going to come down here and tell you that I have so satisfied you and your needs that I think I deserve a pay raise, too.

I listened to my friend, and my friend talks about how the process is broken and we can't pass budgets. My friend talks about particularly shameful episodes that go on here on the floor of the House. My friend talks about failure to do the right thing and shenanigans that go on from leadership.

I will tell you, I failed to find anything in those few minutes that I thought my constituents would find worthy of a pay raise, and I regret that, Mr. Speaker. Because these men and women that I have the great pleasure of surrounding myself with here, these Representatives that come from 343 other very different districts across the country, they work hard, and they are honorable men and women fighting the hardest for their constituents who often disagree with me and mine.

We did have a very important vote 2 weeks ago, Mr. Speaker. You remember it well. I heard my colleagues trumpeting victories for equality, trumpeting historic votes in favor of equal opportunity when they passed an amendment, and not 20 minutes later, they voted against sending that bill to the Senate so that that amendment could become law.

Hear me again. We have big debates in this Chamber about serious issues that matter; and at some point, it has to be incumbent upon each and every one of us, if we get what we want in the amendment process, we need to support the final bill and get it moving to the President. I don't need to be right about policy; I need to make a difference on policy.

Like it or not, there are only two ways to change the law of this land from this Chamber. One is sending a bill to the President's desk and winning his signature; and the second is sending a bill to the President's desk, receiving his veto, and overriding it right back here in this Chamber. Neither of those processes for change, Mr. Speaker, even begin if we don't send the legislation from this floor.

I say to the gentleman from Florida, I am not scared of tough votes. To our colleagues who want to be protected from tough votes, I say you need to get another job than running for Congress. I am sure there are other folks who

will have you. If you don't want to take votes, don't become a United States Congressman. The toughest votes are the best votes we take in this institution. They tell us who we are as a people.

But the issues on which we are voting are too important to reduce to a bumper sticker tagline that goes on a campaign commercial that is going to be useful for 6 months or less. Let's have the big debates; let's do the big things; and then let's send those bills to the President's desk so that it becomes the law of the land.

We can talk and we can talk and we can talk, and so much of that talk centers around bringing change to America. Whether it is restoring a value of old or bringing a new value, it relates to bringing change to America. But that change cannot start until we change a little bit about ourselves.

Vote for the amendments; vote for your conscience; send those bills to the White House so we can get this process going.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would like to address very briefly my friend—and he is my friend—that I agree with much of what he said. He said fundamentally much of what I said he did not agree with, but he pointed to the fact that the Maloney amendment passed and then we turned around and voted against the bill.

There were other measures in that bill that some of us didn't care for that caused us to vote against it as well, and among them was one that was particularly offensive to me since I represent one of our national parks, and that was carrying guns in national parks.

□ 1415

I could go on. There were at least seven other riders that were put on by the majority that caused me angst. I am not sure about everybody else.

Additionally, I agree with my good friend that he and I could solve many of these problems, but one thing that I know that he favors, and I know that he agrees with me, and that is that as often as possible that we have open rules in this body; where we are headed is, in many respects, not in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my good friend.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, this bill picks a fight with the librarians. In the bill, we seek to compel the Library of Congress to use an outdated and dehumanizing term to reference people who aren't citizens of the country.

Although the term "alien" is used in our statutes, it is outdated and deeply insulting to people born abroad who have worked hard to contribute to our economy and communities. In fact, this fall, the Republican Party in California itself decided not to use the term "illegal alien" in its platform. In

this bill, the Republicans in the House look like they are doubling down on vilifying immigrant communities.

Now, as part of a longstanding, often-used process for reviewing and updating subject headings, the Library of Congress apolitically decided to use the term "noncitizens" and "unauthorized immigration" instead of the pejorative term "illegal aliens." The Library makes these types of changes all the time. It is one of 90 such modifications proposed en masse by the Library this last March.

When a subject heading is changed, references to previous headings are retained so researchers can use them, but mandating the term "illegal alien," which is what Republicans are doing in this appropriations bill, is entirely political.

The rider countermands the Library's professional judgment. Now, it is noteworthy that the Library didn't choose the term "undocumented immigrant" favored by many because they didn't want to be political. They just wanted to be fair.

Applying these standards in the past, the Library of Congress changed the subject classification "Negroes" to "African Americans," the way we discuss African Americans today. The catalog used to say "cripples." That makes me cringe. That was changed over time, first to "handicapped" and later to "people with disabilities." But in this political season, it seems there is no limit to the racial invective that is being hurled around, and this bill plays into that.

Now, to my knowledge, Congress has never before told the Library of Congress what the heading in their card catalog has to be, and that we would do it in this case to promote a term that is so offensive to people is a darn shame.

Now, in the past, we have used the appropriations process to shut down the government. Republicans have done that repeatedly. I would hope that the Republicans in the House would not want to go down that path with this. It is true, this term is used in the statute. Our colleague, Representative CASTRO, has a bill to correct it. I would urge that bill be taken up and this unwarranted measure be rejected.

I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Library Association.

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
AND ASSOCIATION FOR LIBRARY
COLLECTIONS & TECHNICAL SERVICES,

April 28, 2016.

Re: Request to Remove "Library of Congress Classification" Amendment from Legislative Branch Appropriations Legislation.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROGERS, RANKING MEMBER LOWEY AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE: We write today on behalf of the more than 58,000 members of the American Library Association and of the Association for Library Collections & Technical Services (ALCTS): the division of ALA members expert in cata-

logging and classification. We do so to respectfully urge the House Appropriations Committee to strike language in legislation just adopted by its Legislative Branch Subcommittee that would bar the Library of Congress (Library) from implementing an appropriate and thoroughly researched change in its subject heading classifications announced in late March of this year.

Specifically, the Library proposes to replace the terms "Aliens" with "Noncitizens," and "Illegal aliens" with two headings: "Noncitizens" and/or "Unauthorized immigration." While some see politics in this decision, Mr. Chairman, as library professionals viewing the work of our colleagues we see only attention to historical detail, intellectual honesty, procedural transparency, and faithfulness to long-standing precepts and practices of librarianship. These have been the hallmarks of cataloging for all of ALCTS' nearly 60 years and of almost 130 years of library science. Stripped of polemic and sensationalism, these are the facts underpinning the Library of Congress' frankly routine and professional determination:

The Library of Congress has a long-established, often used process for reviewing and updating outdated subject headings and establishing new ones as needed that preserves all prior versions of updated headings. Such updates may be proposed from outside or within the Library of Congress, but the Library makes the final decision on all changes to subject headings. The Library reviews each change proposal individually and typically adopts over a thousand each year.

Indeed, the heading change now before the Committee was one of 90 such modifications proposed en masse by the Library in March. When a subject heading is changed, references to previous headings are effectively retained indefinitely so that researchers who perform a search for a former heading are certain to be directed to all relevant materials. No document in the Library of Congress' (or any library's) collection itself is ever substantively edited, modified, annotated or "corrected" in any way as the result of a subject heading update like the one interdicted by the Subcommittee's recent action. Only its catalog "label" is altered.

The Library's process in this case was rigorous, transparent, and consistent with the highest standards of professional cataloging practice. The Library was first asked 18 months ago, quite publicly, to review its use of the cataloging term "illegal aliens" by one of the nation's preeminent colleges. That request, with modifications, subsequently was echoed by the American Library Association upon debate and approval of a formal Resolution by its more than 180-member Council in January of 2016. A "stakeholders" meeting with all appropriate expert sections from within the Library then was convened just over two months ago at which both outside requests, and the broader issues they raised, were reviewed in detail. It is a measure of the Library's professionalism and independence that, in fact, neither external proposal as submitted actually was accepted. Rather, upon review of the totality of the facts and consistent with venerable cataloging practice, the Library apolitically crafted the proposed policy described above and now before the Committee.

Decisions to update a subject heading are based on many considerations, including "literary warrant": the frequency with which a term is or is not used in print and other dynamic resources that, by their nature, change with and reflect current social structures and norms. For subject headings that refer to groups of people, special attention is paid to: popular usage; terms used by members of the group to self-identify; and avoiding terms that are widely considered

pejorative toward the group being described. Applying these same standards in the past, for example, the Library of Congress uneventfully changed the subject classification “Negroes” to “Afro-Americans” and again to “African Americans” over a period of years. The catalog term “Cripples” similarly morphed over time, first to “Handicapped” and later to “People with disabilities.” Congress made no move to countermand those expert cataloging determinations.

The Library reasonably and properly concluded in this instance that, when used in reference to people, the long-used terms “illegal” and “alien” have in recent decades acquired derogatory connotations, become pejorative, and been associated with nativist and racist sentiments. As the Library has noted: the heading “Aliens” has been in use by the Library since 1910; “Aliens, illegal” came into official use more than 35 years ago; and “Illegal aliens” has been in service for almost a quarter-century. Over that long span of time, and particularly in recent years, referring to undocumented persons (as opposed to forms of conduct) as “illegal” increasingly has been widely acknowledged as dehumanizing, offensive, inflammatory, and even a racial slur.

This shift has been plain and pronounced, as the Library observed, in precisely the kind of dynamic materials that cataloging standards require any Library to assess in evaluating the suitability of a subject heading in use and its prospective modification. Indeed, in recent years many national news organizations (including the Associated Press, USA Today, ABC, Chicago Tribune, and Los Angeles Times) categorically have stopped using the word “illegal” to describe human beings as a matter of editorial policy.

Moreover, the Pew Research Center has documented that their actions were not merely anecdotal or aberrant in any way. To the contrary, Pew compared use of the term “illegal aliens” in U.S. newspapers during the same two-week period in 1996, 2002, 2007 and 2013 (all times when immigration matters were much in the news). It found that use of that phrase declined precipitously over the most recent 6-year period surveyed, appearing in 21% of news reports in 2007 but just 5% in 2013: a 76% reduction in use and all-time low.

We understand, Mr. Chairman, why some have chosen to politicize the Library’s proposed subject heading changes discussed above. In light of the foregoing, however, it is the view of our Associations that, at minimum, the Library of Congress’ recent proposed reclassifications discussed above are fully consistent with accepted professional cataloging standards and practices. Indeed, we believe that a compelling case can be made that the proposed changes are required by them. We hope that the foregoing description of the standards and practices of our profession, rigorously adhered to and unimpeachably applied by the Library of Congress in this case, will assist the Committee to accept the Library’s independent professional cataloging determinations.

Specifically, we urge you and all Members of the Committee to strike all language from any piece of appropriations legislation that would countermand or modify the Library’s recent determinations pertaining to the terms “Aliens” and/or “Illegal aliens,” and to oppose any other legislation that would have similar effect.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide the Committee with a factual context in which to consider its upcoming actions. Please contact us should you or your staff have any questions, or require any additional information.

Respectfully submitted,
SARI FELDMAN,

*President, American
Library Association.*
NORM MEDEIROS,
*President, Association
for Library Collections
& Technical
Services.*

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

My friend from Florida made reference to regular order earlier and, again, he and I see very much eye-to-eye on that issue. The gentlewoman who just spoke is one of my great friends on the Committee on the Judiciary.

I would like to read the offending language that folks are referring to. It says this in its entirety:

To the extent practicable, the committee instructs the Library to maintain certain subject headings that reflect terminology used in title VIII United States Code. To the extent practicable, the Congress directs the Library of Congress to use the laws passed by Congress.

That is the offending language.

My friend serves on the Committee on the Judiciary. If the Committee on the Judiciary did as she is suggesting and changed the law tomorrow, this language would reflect those changes passed by the Committee on the Judiciary tomorrow. This isn’t the Committee on Appropriations’ jurisdiction. We can, as an open appropriations process allows, make every political point that we want to make on every topic under the Sun, but longstanding policy is not changed in an annual appropriations bill. It is changed by authorizers like my friends on the Committee on the Judiciary, and I urge them to get to work on it.

There is no question, all of the examples the gentlewoman cited, I am with her 100 percent. We have made those changes, and we are the better for it, but let’s not suggest—again, to my friend from Florida’s point, why don’t folks think Congress is deserving of a pay raise? I listened to my friend describe the motivations that folks had for including this language. They were not described as motivations in friendly or admiring terms. The language that says from Congress to the Library of Congress, use the laws passed by Congress.

Ms. LOFGREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. I would just like to note and put into the RECORD the fact sheet from the American Library Association indicating that it is the Library of Congress’ belief that it will need to change its policy already underway on this, so if the gentleman is saying that the language in the bill doesn’t require a change on the Library’s part, I think that would be news to the Library.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I am not suggesting anything of the kind. I am suggesting that the language that folks are describing as offensive says from the Congress to the

Library of Congress, use the laws passed by Congress.

If we don’t like the laws of the land, we have a process to change them, and for better or for worse, that process begins in the committee on which the gentlewoman serves.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time so that I can continue my discussion with my friend from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the missive from the American Library Association entitled “Support Library of Congress Autonomy in Subject Heading Determinations.”

SUPPORT LIBRARY OF CONGRESS AUTONOMY IN SUBJECT HEADING DETERMINATIONS

[From the American Library Association and Association for Library Collections & Technical Services]

In late March of this year, after an extensive process consistent with long-standing library principles and practice, the Library of Congress proposed to replace the subject heading classification “Aliens” with “Noncitizens,” and “Illegal aliens” with two headings: “Noncitizens” and/or “Unauthorized immigration.” Similar, but not identical, changes previously had been requested by Dartmouth College and endorsed by the American Library Association.

In mid-April, the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee adopted language that would, in effect, countermand the Library’s professional judgments and reverse the proposed reclassifications noted above. (The Report adopted by the Subcommittee states: “To the extent practicable, the Committee instructs the Library to maintain certain subject headings that reflect terminology used in title 8, United States Code.”) The full House Appropriations Committee will meet in mid-May and has the power to undo the Subcommittee’s action.

On April 28, the Presidents of ALA and ALCTS (ALA’s division of members expert in cataloging and classification) wrote the attached letter to the Committee’s leaders and members on April 28 asking that they do so. Its principal points and specific requests follow on the reverse.

KEY POINTS: “LIBRARY LETTER” TO HOUSE APPROPRIATORS BACKING PROPOSED LIBRARY OF CONGRESS RECLASSIFICATIONS

The Library of Congress has a long-established, often used process for reviewing and updating outdated subject headings and establishing new ones as needed that preserves all prior versions of updated headings.

The Library’s process in this case was rigorous, transparent, and consistent with the highest standards of professional cataloging practice.

Decisions to update a subject heading are based on many considerations, including “literary warrant:” the frequency with which a term is or is not used in print and other dynamic resources that, by their nature, change with and reflect current social structures and norms. For headings that refer to groups of people, special attention is paid to: popular usage; terms used by members of the group to self-identify; and avoiding terms widely considered to be pejorative toward the group being described.

The Library reasonably and properly concluded in this instance that, when used in reference to people, the long-used terms “illegal” and “alien” have in recent decades acquired derogatory connotations, become pejorative, and been associated with nativist and racist sentiments. Particularly in recent years, referring to undocumented persons (as opposed to forms of conduct) as “illegal” increasingly has been widely acknowledged as dehumanizing, offensive, inflammatory, and even a racial slur. This shift has been plain and pronounced:

in recent years many national news organizations (including the Associated Press, USA Today, ABC, Chicago Tribune, and Los Angeles Times) categorically have stopped using the word “illegal” to describe human beings as a matter of editorial policy; and

the Pew Research Center compared use of the term “illegal aliens” in U.S. newspapers during the same two-week period in 1996, 2002, 2007 and 2013 (all times when immigration matters were much in the news). It found that use of that phrase declined precipitously over the most recent 6-year period surveyed, appearing in 21% of news reports in 2007 but just 5% in 2013: a 76% reduction in use and all-time low.

The Library of Congress’ recent proposed reclassifications discussed above are fully consistent with accepted professional cataloging standards and practices. Indeed, a compelling case can be made that the proposed changes are required by them.

ALA and ALCTS, its division of experts in cataloging, urge the Committee to accept the Library’s apolitical subject heading judgment and, thus, to strike language from any piece of appropriations legislation that would modify or countermand the Library’s recent determinations pertaining to the terms “Aliens” and/or “Illegal aliens,” and to oppose any other legislation that would have similar effect.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California), my friend and the ranking member of the Committee on Ethics in this body.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the consideration of H.R. 5325, a deceitful effort by House Republicans to yet again dehumanize an entire group of people. It pains me to even say the phrase “illegal alien” out loud because it is pejorative, it is offensive, and has no place in our modern discourse. The Library of Congress is correct to leave this phrase in the pages of history and never to have it uttered again.

The importance of the Library of Congress’ decision to discontinue and remove the outdated phrase cannot be emphasized enough. Libraries nationwide and around the world look to the Library of Congress’ subject headings and other standards to publish information. As lawmakers representing a country of immigrants, Congress should not assist in the dissemination of information that perpetuates racism and promotes hate.

Of course, I am not at all surprised that congressional Republicans would resort to inserting themselves into bibliographic decisions that are normally reserved for librarians, not appropriators or politicians. Republicans hypocritically claim to want to keep government out of people’s lives, but want

government to intrude and dictate standards only when it benefits their bigoted views.

Sadly, today’s effort and other past maneuvers to block President Obama’s executive actions on immigration falls in line with the concerted effort to move our country backward. We are better than that. Instead of promoting antiquated and deplorable language, we should be tackling any number of important issues—affordable education, tax reform, and promoting job growth—not telling librarians and educators how to do their jobs.

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

Going back to my friend from Florida’s case that we have hardworking men and women here who haven’t had a pay raise in 9 years, if we are a part of a body that perpetuates racism and hate, I don’t want a single one of us to get a penny. I don’t want a single one of us to get a penny. My experience is that is not at all who we are. That is not who we are at all.

My quick text search of the U.S. Code—and I am a lawyer, but I haven’t read the Code cover to cover—tells me that “illegal alien” is referenced 32 times, even in a single title. Let’s go change it. If you want to get rid of it, let’s go in and get rid of it. Don’t act like this is beyond our control and if only we can fix the Library of Congress, suddenly we can solve all that ails us.

This is the United States Code. If you don’t like the Code, change the Code. Tell me that we are ineffective and we can’t get that done? We are talking about a title change here, one that we have already done, already this Congress. We eliminated the last reference to “Oriental” in the United States Code. We do these things together, but we don’t do them by accusing one another of promoting racism and hate. We do those things by talking to one another.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. The Library of Congress has made 90 subject head changes. Why this one? Why does it have to stick and can’t be changed? I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I confess that I had no idea the Library of Congress was even in the subject change heading business. It wasn’t until I read a press release from somebody talking about this issue that I even knew this issue existed. But now that I know it exists, I know that it doesn’t exist in subject titles at the Library of Congress. It exists in the United States Code that is the law of the land for the greatest free nation this world has ever known.

You want to talk about shame on us? Shame on us for letting the librarians decide when the debate begins and when the debate ends. It is the United States Code and the responsibility falls

to one body and one body only, and that body is here.

I want to go back home, Mr. Speaker. I want to tell my constituents they are getting every dollar’s worth out of this institution and, candidly, I believe they are getting more value today than they were yesterday and they got more value yesterday than they did a week ago or a month ago or a year ago. I think we are getting better.

I will give you a small example. We talk about legislative branch funding as if it is some sort of self-serving institution. That is just nonsense. We came here with one job and one job only, and that is to serve our constituents back home. This cycle we have passed the FAST Act, the first long-term transportation funding bill in 20 years. We did it together. We couldn’t do it alone. We did it together.

Mr. Speaker, after 17 years of kicking the can down the road on the sustainable growth rate, that Medicare tag line that threatened care for every single senior citizen on Medicare, 17 years of kicking it down the road, we came together and abolished it forever. Forever. We did it together because that is the only way we could get it done. The Visa Waiver Program improvement.

Mr. Speaker, S. 139, the bill that made it easier for people with rare diseases to get involved in clinical trials. Can you imagine? Can you imagine a government that in the name of helping people said: Oh, no, you can’t try that new cure. It might hurt you. When your response is, Mr. Government, I am dying, it is my only chance of survival. We fixed that. One of many things about what is best about this institution, Mr. Speaker, Time and time again, we come together to solve real problems that real people have asked of us. That is what this funding bill is about.

I hope we are going to move past this bill today. I hope we are going to get back to regular order. It pains me that in an election year, it threatens the free and open debate that this institution prides itself on. But I think that is just fear. I think we are better than that. I think we are going to get past it. But that is not the debate today.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to tell both sides how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that would disband the select investigative panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Mr. Speaker, this panel is just another waste of taxpayer money. Three House committees, 12 States, and one grand jury have already investigated the charges against Planned Parenthood, and none found evidence of wrongdoing.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, this panel is conducting a purely partisan political witch hunt, and it should be disbanded.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the distinguished ranking member of the select investigative panel, to discuss the proposal.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that Mr. HASTINGS can offer H.R. 769, a resolution to shut down the select panel that we call the select panel to attack women's health.

House Republicans created this panel based on a lie and fraudulent videotapes that have been discredited by three House committees, 12 States, and a Texas grand jury that actually indicted the video maker. They have used this fraud as a pretext to conduct a lethally dangerous witch hunt aimed at women's health clinics and scientists conducting promising research on diseases like Alzheimer's, MS, and the Zika virus.

Panel Republicans are bullying witnesses and abusing congressional authority in a manner not seen since the days of Senator Joe McCarthy. But this time, people's lives, not just their livelihoods, are at stake.

Republicans have issued dozens of unilateral subpoenas without first seeking voluntary cooperation. They are demanding the names of researchers, students, clinical personnel, doctors, and medical students, amassing a database that could be released publicly at any time.

Republicans refuse to put rules in place to protect these names and have reneged on public promises to do so. Instead, they have publicly released names and confidential documents.

They issued a press release naming a doctor who has already faced decades of harassment and violence; disclosed the time, place, and location of his appearance before the panel; and fueled the flames by comparing him to a convicted murderer.

They have repeatedly used inflammatory rhetoric, comparing researchers to Nazi war criminals and echoing words of antiabortion activists that were also used by the gunman who shot 12 people, killing 3, at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Colorado Springs.

Republicans have demanded and obtained information that they have no right or need to know, including records of victims of rape and personal financial information.

The Republicans are abusing power and putting people's lives in danger in pursuit of their agenda to limit legal abortion and a woman's right to choose and to shut down fetal tissue research.

Fetal tissue research has historically had broad bipartisan support. It is the basis for key vaccines that have saved millions of lives, including the polio vaccine.

The so-called investigative panel has already had a chilling effect on research, drying up the supply of needed tissue for research on multiple sclerosis and threatening other diseases, including Alzheimer's and diabetes.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. All I really need is the time to say this:

We should now be ending this dangerous and unjustifiable witch hunt. It is time to say "no" to this panel, and it is time to say "no" to the previous question so that we can finally have a really strong debate on this House floor and finally defund this panel.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend from Florida that I do not have any speakers remaining and am prepared to close when he is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my good friend.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida for his management of what is a difficult and trying legislative process and my distinguished friend from Georgia, as well, for his service. Both of them are on the Rules Committee.

It pains me to come to the floor on an appropriations bill when I know that there is so much opportunity for us to be able to work together. I know my good friend from Georgia will understand the pain of which I speak and will also attest to the fact that, in many instances in the appropriations process, we have an open rule and we allow our Members to express themselves on behalf of the people of their congressional districts but, more importantly, the higher goal, and that is, the people of the United States of America.

Let me first express my pain that this bill is the first bill that has come to the floor, when I know that there was vigorous debate and possibilities for the energy and water bill—certainly, in my congressional district, which has seen itself under inches and inches of rain, seeing people die, and losing individuals through these enormous rains and flooding—because we need the kind of infrastructure that comes under energy and water. That bill is not being able to pass. Seeing the funding for access to health care, community centers, community health

clinics not yet come to the floor; seeing the funding for infrastructure and transit that is so needed in our urban centers, like Houston, Texas, not coming to the floor. And then, of course, the Department of Justice, which is in the middle of dealing with commutation of sentences, dealing with youth justice programs, dealing with a number of issues that are paining Americans; and they need our relief.

Yet the bill that comes to the floor, I must again painfully say, is an appropriations bill that I will not be able to support. It is a bill that really keeps the wheels going in this place. It is not a more important bill, but it keeps the wheels going so that we can do the people's work.

Here is what is happening that I think is a dastardly reflection on what we have come to. Let me be very clear. As a senior member of the Judiciary Committee dealing with the mechanics of lawmaking, dealing with laws that ultimately provide people civil or criminal justice relief or constitutional relief, I want to tell my colleagues who wrote this language that the issue dealing with the Library of Congress is an administrative one.

The idea that noncitizens and unauthorized immigration have any impact on creating a comprehensive immigration system, which I have introduced legislation along with my colleagues, joining with them over the years, has no import and impact of law. It is truly an administrative task that the Library of Congress is attempting to comport with national experts of librarians.

Everybody loves a librarian. They give our children knowledge. They give our students knowledge. They give all of us knowledge.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an addition 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. They give us their best expertise.

Why we would intrude in an administrative process when it goes into nothing that impacts the scheme of the administrative or the legal structure here in the United States: it is to denigrate; it is to insult.

We understand that the word "illegal" does connote that you have violated a criminal act in certain instances. And there are those who are undocumented, noncitizens, et cetera, unauthorized, that have not violated any criminal laws.

Let me also say to you that defunding of the foolish Planned Parenthood investigation is warranted. Why? In my own home State of Texas, in Houston, the indictment did not go to Planned Parenthood, which was the attempt; but it went to the perpetrators of fraud on Planned Parenthood. There is nothing to investigate.

If you want to investigate, then investigate the lack of access of millions of women in the State of Texas who were using those clinics that Planned Parenthood had.

So my point is this is a bill we must vote against. Vote against the underlying rule and the bill, because it is nothing but fraud and foolishness, and that is not what we should do in this House.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 5½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rarely speak from the well of the House. I come down here today because, like my good friend from Georgia and many of us in this institution, those of us that have studied the institution genuinely love it and recognize that it is, fundamentally, what makes our Nation great.

When we speak of Congress, we are talking about the House of Representatives and the United States Senate. For a substantial period of time, both in the control of Democrats and Republicans, we have carried ourselves in a way that has caused us to appear dysfunctional. And, in many instances—validly—those that look at us feel that we are unable to get things done.

My younger friend from Georgia pointed out a significant number of things that we did do, and he is correct about that. But he also knows there are a significant number of things that we have not been able to do, largely for the reason that we are not acting in a bipartisan manner—in an openly transparent manner, in many instances—in order to provide for all of the Members of this body to have input.

I came to the well because, as I near my 80th birthday, I am in a different category than many of the younger Members in this institution. Many of the younger Members of this institution have young families.

We, the 434 of us that are seated—and we will swear in the 435th a little later today—and the delegates from the territories and the District of Columbia, are in a variety of categories, as Americans. Some substantial number of Members in this body are multimillionaires; a significant number of Members of this body easily qualify to be in the middle class or the upper class; and there are some Members here who are in the lower class in our society.

Fortunately for us, in the 22 years that I have been here, I have seen this body grow in its diversity. More women on both sides, African Americans, Latino Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans are part of this body from different walks of life. Some of us own our own homes here in the metropolitan Virginia-Maryland area. Some rent apartments. Some are in basements. Some are in one room. Some are gathered together because of the expenses here.

Now, my friend is right. I would like to go home and be able to show to my constituents and to his that we did ev-

erything that we could here to make for more efficiency. But I can cite the glut all over our agencies and, at the very same time, I make no apologies to anybody for how hard I work or how hard he works and the fact that we are entering our 9th year without a pay raise.

Now, I think it is wrong for Members of the House of Representatives to live in their offices. I think that there is an ethics provision that needs to be addressed, and I think there is a tax consideration that needs to be addressed.

□ 1445

And the public does not understand that nearly 100 Members, including the Speaker of the House of Representatives, live in their offices. Something is drastically wrong with that. Most of them are there for the reason that they can't afford to live in this town; and somehow or another, we are deserving, as are our staffs, deserving of being paid appropriately.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to remind my friends of the importance of the legislation we are debating today. This legislation allows us to run our operations here in Congress. Unfortunately, with this legislation, my friends in the majority are continuing their trend of putting politics above policy.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule and oppose the underlying measure.

And I want to make it very, very clear that the remarks that I made are my remarks. They are not the remarks of the Democrats in this institution. But I know this: I have had a lot of Members on both sides of the aisle say to me that they know that I am correct.

Courage, friends, courage, that is what it takes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I love watching my friend from Florida speak. The only thing I love more than watching him speak is talking to him one-on-one when the cameras are turned off.

It is not as easy as it ought to be in 2016 to come to the floor of the House and speak one's mind. Folks are worried about what the newspapers are going to say. Folks are worried about what the news is going to broadcast. Folks are worried about what the Twitterverse is going to do.

A lot of folks will tell you one thing when the cameras are on and another thing when the cameras are turned off, Mr. Speaker, but ALCEE HASTINGS is not one of those folks. It is the same message no matter who he is talking to and no matter where he is saying it because he comes from a place of conviction, and I love serving with people like that.

Truthfully, Mr. Speaker, if folks knew that it wasn't just their Member of Congress that was like that, but it was the one next door, and the one

down the road, and the one across the river, and the one upstate, I think we would have a very different discussion about whether Congress is working or whether Congress is failing.

But, Mr. Speaker, when I try to sort those issues out, I don't really have to go back home to figure out why folks are disappointed. I don't even have to go back to the public record. I don't have to go any further than this one debate on this one legislative day.

Just in our hour together, Mr. Speaker, I have heard Members suggest that this House is using tactics not seen since Joe McCarthy. I wouldn't pay for that. I have heard Members suggest that this House is perpetuating racism and hate. I wouldn't pay for that. I have heard that there are dastardly things happening in the work of this institution. I am not going to pay for that. I have heard that we have been involved in activities particularly shameful.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have all got a great relationship with the men and women who send us here to serve them. We have a special relationship, and a relationship that, I think, the men and women in this Chamber work exceptionally hard to make good on; but when we use the credibility that we develop in that relationship to tell folks that we are broken, to tell folks that we are worthless, to tell folks that the greatest experiment in self-governance that the world has ever known is failing, they believe us. They believe us.

Mr. Speaker, the discussions that we have, the differences that are brought to life on this floor, those are not failures. Those are successes. The back and the forth, the fights that we have, the headlines that get made when folks just can't agree, those are not failures: those are successes.

When the Framers put together this Constitution, Mr. Speaker, they made it hard—they made it hard to change the law of the land. It was supposed to be the rare thing that happened when we all came together and found agreement, and when we did, it was going to be in the best interest of a young Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard my colleagues challenge us to defeat this bill today, as if funding the United States Congress is a self-serving action. I don't know who the self-serving Members of this institution are, Mr. Speaker, because I have not met them.

My friend from Texas came to the floor, and she said: If we don't get our work done, NIH will not be funded. And she is right. She said: If we do not get our work done, justice reform will not happen. And she is right. She said: If we do not get our work done, families that are struggling to respond to floods in her home part of the country will not get the dollars. And she is right. She is right.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about changing the appropriations process to allow a little less openness, and I regret that. We are talking about it because, in the name of doing that energy

and water bill that she spoke of, in the name of passing those bills that are essential to the functioning of the country, in the name of doing that responsibility that the Constitution places squarely on our shoulders, we have folks who pass amendments to bills only to let those bills fail.

I would tell you, as someone who believes in an open process, who believes in an open process, that if we can have that festival of democracy that is an open rule on an appropriations bill, let's have it. Let's let the votes fall where they may, and then send that bill to the Senate and on to the White House and make it the law of the land.

But if in the name of making a point, we prevent this institution from doing its constitutionally mandated business, if in the process of making a political point, we prevent this institution from providing the money for that fundamental research, from providing the money for that flood relief, from providing the money for essential justice reform, I tell you, we have not honored this Nation with an open process; we have failed it.

And the question then falls to us: Are we going to have an open process that allows every Member to speak out on behalf of their constituency to fight for what may be best for this Nation that we all love? Or are we going to have election-year politics, decide that being able to produce that press release is more important than getting our work done?

I happen to know the answer, Mr. Speaker. I happen to know the answer because I happen to know each one of these Members on a personal level. There is not one of them who wouldn't turn in their voting card tomorrow if they could take a vote on the biggest issue that matters to them today. There is not one of them that wouldn't turn in their voting card tomorrow if they could make a difference for this generation and the next generation today, and I love that about them. I love it about each and every one of them.

Passing this bill lets those folks come to work and get this job done. Passing this bill allows us to get to work doing those things that I believe will honor the men and women who sent us here. Passing this rule allows us to get to the underlying bill that will keep the lights on not just for constituent service back in every district in this land, but the lights on in what I would argue is the greatest deliberative body, the greatest embodiment of self-governance that this world has ever known.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 771 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 769)

Terminating a Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Rules.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 769.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adopting House Resolution 770;
Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 771; and
Adopting House Resolution 771, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 5278, PUERTO RICO OVER-
SIGHT, MANAGEMENT, AND ECO-
NOMIC STABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 770) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5278) to establish an Oversight Board to assist the Government of Puerto Rico, including instrumentalities, in managing its public finances, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 178, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

YEAS—241

Abraham	Blum	Calvert
Aderholt	Bost	Carter (GA)
Allen	Boustany	Carter (TX)
Amodei	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Babin	Brat	Chaffetz
Barr	Bridenstine	Clawson (FL)
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Coffman
Benishek	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Bilirakis	Buchanan	Collins (GA)
Bishop (MI)	Buck	Collins (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Bucshon	Comstock
Black	Burgess	Conaway
Blackburn	Byrne	Cook