



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 2019

No. 41

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TAKANO).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 7, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK TAKANO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

REASONS TO OPPOSE H.R. 1

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, later today, we are going to be voting on H.R. 1, and I would like to make a few points for the RECORD.

To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, before you vote this afternoon, I would like you to remember one thing. This bill is nearly 600 pages, and it has been referred to 10 different committees, yet it has been subject to only one markup.

I want the supporters of this bill to think about how that really looks. You are bringing up the bill that is intended to expand the ability of Americans to participate in the political process by using a process that restricted the participation of their elected officials.

The second thing I want to point out is the section of this bill that creates a voucher program to allow people to use public funds for campaign donations. Mr. Speaker, instead of using taxpayer dollars for critical needs like border security or fixing our roads, we would be sending these dollars to political campaigns. That would be a complete disaster.

One last thing that I am going to point out about this bill is the fact that it would weaponize the FEC to favor the ruling political party.

Under current law, the Federal Election Commission is made up of six members, consisting of three Republicans and three Democrats. Four votes are needed to move forward with any kind of prosecution. The bill says that the new commission must consist of two Republicans, two Democrats, and one independent. By this logic, BERNIE SANDERS is technically an independent and would count, even though we all know he is a socialist and caucuses, though, with the Democrats.

I would say much more about this bill, Mr. Speaker, and in the coming weeks I plan to. But for now, I want my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to know that we have a real chance to put politics aside and pass some serious reform that would make our system work even better, but the more time we focus on partisan games like this, the less time we actually focus on draining the swamp.

MOTHERS RUNNING FOR ELECTED OFFICE FACE CHILDCARE OBSTACLES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am a single mom. When I ran for Congress last year, I spent thousands and thousands of dollars on childcare.

Running for Federal office requires 60- to 90-hour workweeks, and I worked every single day, including every single weekend. I also worked challenging hours, normally starting my day at 6:45 a.m. and ending with campaign events stretching late into the evenings.

I juggled dozens and dozens of childcare providers for nearly 2 years, without whom I would never have made it to Congress.

I have three children, Betsy, who is 7; Paul, who is 10; and Luke, who is 13. Leaving them alone while I was on the campaign trail was not an option. Bringing them along on the campaign trail was often impossible or inappropriate and sometimes could even have been dangerous for them.

For the past two centuries, Congress has written many, many laws about what women may and may not do. But until this year, women's representation in Congress was less than 20 percent. With the election of my historic class, we hit 23.4 percent—102 women.

But, Mr. Speaker, that number is still very low. There are even fewer moms in Congress and even fewer single moms, as in nobody but me. A major barrier to women running for elected office is their inability to afford the amount or type of childcare needed in a campaign.

That is why I worked to include language in H.R. 1, the For the People Act, and introduced an identical stand-alone bill, the Help America Run Act. It explicitly allows candidates for Federal office to use campaign contributions to pay for childcare.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2507

Right now, candidates can use campaign funds for a whole range of expenses, from pizza for exhausted staff to cybersecurity for digital devices, but the law does not make it clear that childcare is among those allowed expenses.

Like so many laws, there is an assumption of a female caregiver behind every male elected official. In part because of that, moms who continue to shoulder the majority of childcare responsibilities also struggle to run for Congress.

Until women are fully and equally present in Congress, women's perspectives will continue to be underrepresented. The result is a weaker democracy for the people.

Mr. Speaker, I very much look forward to the enactment of H.R. 1 and the Help America Run Act.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize March as Women's History Month.

Throughout history, countless women have contributed to the character and success of the United States of America. During Women's History Month, we celebrate the scores of women who have worked to improve our society and who have fought inequality and discrimination in every form.

These women have created a legacy that lives on and continues to inspire generations of Americans, from Harriet Tubman to Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Susan B. Anthony to Helen Keller. Women's History Month is a time to honor the lives and legacy of all women, living and dead. Through sharing their stories, we are able to acknowledge how their contributions have enriched our lives.

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, legendary journalist Ida Tarbell was born at the onset of the oil boom. She is best known for her 1904 book, "The History of the Standard Oil Company." Ida Tarbell was known for her ability to take complex subjects and break them down into articles that could be easily consumed by the general public.

She had a successful career as an investigative journalist, and the Oil Region Alliance in northwestern Pennsylvania recently completed a full restoration of Ms. Tarbell's childhood home in Titusville so that it would be preserved for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, by honoring women and their achievements, we can honor the past, inform the present, and inspire the future.

Many women have served as part of our Armed Forces throughout history and proudly continue to today, women like Mary Ludwig Hays McCauley, who fought in battles during the Revolu-

tionary War and was among the first women to receive a military pension, and modern-day women like Lisa Jaster, a major in the United States Army Reserve who completed Army Ranger School, which is one of the toughest courses in the military.

Major Jaster was in the first Ranger class that allowed women, and she is the first female Army Reserve officer to become a Ranger School graduate.

Mr. Speaker, many women have left their imprint on the pages of history, and there are numerous leaders who will continue to guide this Nation into the future. May we celebrate and honor them, not only during Women's History Month, but all year long, and thank them for their incredible contributions.

HEALTH AND NUTRITIONAL CHALLENGES FACING AFRICAN AMERICAN POPULATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, which prepared this statement for me in acknowledgement of Black History Month.

Minority populations, especially the African American population, continue to remain in relatively poor health when compared to the majority population and also continue to be underserved by the healthcare delivery system.

One of the biggest health challenges facing our country today is obesity, and the African American community is especially at risk. In a 2015-2016 study by the CDC, the report found non-Hispanic Black adults, at 46.8 percent, had a higher prevalence of obesity than non-Hispanic White adults, which was 37.9 percent.

Compared to other States, Illinois' obesity rate is a significant area of concern, with 31 percent of adults having obesity. This statistic is higher than the U.S. median.

Illinois has the 27th highest adult obesity rate in the Nation and the 7th highest obesity rate for youth ages 10 to 17. Chicago's African American community is the demographic with the highest obesity rate at 39.8 percent.

With such a high percentage of the African American community falling in the obese category, this demographic runs a higher risk for obesity-related conditions, including heart disease, stroke, type 2 diabetes, and certain types of cancer that are some of the leading causes of preventable, premature death.

Compared to the general population, African Americans are disproportionately affected by diabetes. African Americans constitute more than 35 percent of all patients receiving dialysis treatment for kidney failure but only represent 13.2 percent of the overall U.S. population.

High blood pressure is the second leading cause of kidney failure among African Americans and remains the leading cause of death due to its link with heart attacks and strokes.

With these troubling statistics, where do we go from here? Awareness, education, and access are the keys to changing our Nation's health, and food and nutrition practitioners play a very important role in leading the health revolution.

Obesity is partially attributed to poor nutritional intake and has been implicated as a contributor to cancer, heart disease, stroke, and diabetes.

Food and nutrition practitioners have an opportunity and an ethical obligation to positively influence the healthcare experience of individuals. These experts have the power to influence factors affecting health disparities at the individual and the population levels, including programs such as SNAP, WIC, adult care food programs, and other nutrition programs.

By connecting with individuals who are most at risk, food and nutrition practitioners can make a huge change when it comes to the health of African Americans, as well as the health of all Americans.

I thank the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics for preparing this information for me.

STATE OF AMERICAN WORKFORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about our economy and the state of the American workforce.

With reforms enacted by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, as well as needed regulatory relief, nearly every economic indicator is pointing up. The latest U.S. jobs report shows our economy is at its strongest rate in 13 years. Unemployment is at a record low across the board. Wages are growing at the fastest level in over a decade. Business investment is strong. Best of all, American families are keeping more money in their pockets. But new success brings a new set of challenges.

The number of job openings in the U.S. hit a record high last month of 7.3 million. We have gone from, "Where are the jobs?" to, "Where are the workers?" While it may seem positive that there are more jobs open than workers to fill them, I fear that, without addressing the needs of our workforce, we will stifle our incredible economic growth.

According to a study conducted by the National Federation of Independent Business, 22 percent of business owners cite the difficulty in finding workers as their single most important business problem. I hear this from every employer I meet with in my district. The number of job openings is staggering and must be addressed.

□ 1015

In fact, every few months I meet with a group of staffing companies. These individuals operate companies that fill positions ranging from temporary to permanent work in various industries. Between these staffing companies, they would be able to fill thousands of jobs today if they could find the necessary workers. Every day, these positions go unfilled and opportunities are lost.

To help alleviate this situation, I plan on introducing legislation to help build a workforce pipeline.

One bill, the USA Workforce Tax Credit Act, which I will be introducing next week, encourages charitable donations for community-based apprenticeship initiatives, career and technical education, workforce development, and K-12 educational preparedness.

Enacting this proposed legislation will help meet the urgent need to ensure the preparation of current and future workers for the changing needs of the U.S. economy. Job creation and job preparation must go hand in hand.

Another area we must evaluate to help fill out workforce shortages is our Nation's visa system. Our current system spans the spectrum of foreign work visas, but does not address a main driver of illegal immigration.

My bill, the Workforce for an Expanding Economy Act, would help address the gap in the spectrum. This legislation will create a market-driven immigration visa program targeted to workers in occupations that do not require a college degree, otherwise defined as "less skilled" to do year-round, non-farm work, creating a new "H-2D visa." This H-2D visa would only go into effect if the unemployment rate is 5 percent or lower in the metropolitan area where an employer is seeking employees.

Moreover, this bill would implement a two-track system in which employers and potential immigrant laborers are both required to receive a permit to work in the U.S.

Much like our other visa programs, employers will have to prove they are unable to hire a U.S. worker after undergoing the required market tests. Employees are only allowed to work for an approved employer, at the approved location, in the specific job that was approved, and all employers will be required to use E-Verify.

While just a start, Mr. Speaker, I believe these bills will help strengthen our workforce and help meet the needs of employers to continue supporting our economic growth. I urge my colleagues to support them and to help continue our country's track record of success and keep us on the right economic path.

GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE,
FOR THE PEOPLE, AND OF THE
PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address perhaps the most important reform legislation to protect and strengthen our democracy in a generation: H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

We have a responsibility, an obligation, to make sure that our government always remains one of the people, by the people, and for the people. But the truth is Congress has not done enough to protect the voices of everyday Americans and to make sure that our government institutions are working for them.

The American people know it, and, Mr. Speaker, I believe that is exactly why they voted for new leadership in our people's House. They know what is happening to our political system. The dark money, the attack ads from secret, fly-by-night groups, the incredible influence special interests seem to have over too many political leaders. They see it every day when the system that used to work so well for the middle class is now rigged against them.

So much of it is the result of the Supreme Court's Citizens United decision. Consider the facts: From 2008 to 2016, the amount of outside spending to influence our elections has increased tenfold, reaching an astonishing \$1.4 billion during our last presidential election.

These billions being spent to influence elections and politicians, they aren't coming from everyday Americans, but are more likely coming from Wall Street, Big Pharma, and other high-powered interests working against the rest of us. We can do better and, with H.R. 1, we will do better.

This transformative set of reforms will shine a light on dark money and return power to the people. It puts disclosure front and center by requiring political groups to disclose their large donors, bringing dark money out of the shadows for good.

H.R. 1 recognizes a simple principle: The American people ought to know who is writing big checks to their elected officials and candidates for office.

By curbing the influence of special interests, we can lift the voices of everyday Americans and we can better focus on the issues that matter most, like quality jobs, affordable healthcare, clean air and water, and strong infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, history has its eyes on us today. Let us, once again, resolve to make sure that our government remains one of the people, by the people and, of course, for the people.

UNNECESSARY TINKERING WITH THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise as leader of the Republicans on the Education and Labor

Committee, which had a referral on H.R. 1 that did not even have a hearing, much less a markup on the provisions that fall within our jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, a referral means a bill should be debated by a committee of jurisdiction, but that did not happen.

It appears that every corner of American life would be touched by this overreaching, politically-motivated bill. Even colleges and universities did not manage to escape its reach.

We fully recognize the opportunity colleges and universities can provide for traditional 18- to 24-year-old students to register to vote. That is why we have always been supportive of voter registration efforts on campuses. But mandating voter registration efforts on campus doesn't show good intentions for student engagement.

Instead, it reveals the true motive behind this unnecessary tinkering with the Higher Education Act. Colleges and universities have not, do not, and must not ever exist to serve the Federal Government.

The provisions in H.R. 1 take institutions of higher learning and put them in the same category as your local DMV. It is bad enough that colleges and universities barely resemble the free marketplace of ideas they once were. This bill turns them into full-fledged government offices, with all of the customer service and freedom of thought for which government offices are known.

The reasons to oppose H.R. 1 are many, but we could not allow the provisions that impact educational institutions to go unnoticed as House Democrats clearly hoped.

H.R. 1 is one of the most cynical political stunts we have seen and, for that reason, Mr. Speaker, we should oppose it and oppose it with all our might.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF SUZANNE KLING POST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory and in celebration of the life and legacy of my friend, Suzanne Kling Post, a tremendous force for good in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Suzy passed on January 2, after having spent her entire life in service to others, fighting for school desegregation, civil liberties, fair housing, women's rights, equality for all, and more. There was no challenge too daunting and no issue too controversial for Suzy to take on.

As reliable as the sun rising and setting each day, if there was injustice, prejudice, or discrimination, Suzy was right there, organizing and empowering. She helped lift the voices of those wronged, and demanded more from our city and our Commonwealth on behalf of those in need.

Born into a white, middle-class, Jewish family in the Highlands of Louisville in 1933, Suzy was quick to put others first. She joined the NAACP as a student at Indiana University. She returned home and helped organize sit-ins and demonstrations of civil disobedience in protest of housing discrimination; and she helped lead efforts for civil rights and against the Vietnam War.

She led the ACLU of Kentucky, founded by her uncle, Arthur Kling, and eventually became the founding director of the Metropolitan Housing Commission. After decades of service, she was inducted into the Kentucky Human Rights Commission Hall of Fame in 2007.

Though small in stature, she was larger than life. She had a fire in her belly and a passion for her work that was contagious. Her low voice had the power to move you, and she never missed an opportunity to use it and move us forward as a city.

In the Louisville Courier-Journal's thoughtful obituary recounting her life, they noted that, once asked why she became an activist, Suzy replied: I guess I just don't like injustice. It ticks me off; it really does. Although she didn't use the word "ticks."

She was as uncomplicated as she was powerful; straightforward, straight to the heart and an invaluable source of strength for me, our city, and our Commonwealth. To say we are better off because of her decades of service is an understatement. She expected more, gave more, and got more from all of us because she demanded it of her community and of herself.

I will always value her friendship, her leadership, and for never shying away from a fight.

To her children and grandchildren, I hope you can take some solace in knowing that your mother and grandmother was the conscience of the city that loved her dearly, and we will all work to carry her legacy forward.

May her memory be a blessing.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THIS CONGRESS AND LAST CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, let me point out an important difference between the last Congress and this one.

Last Congress, under Republican leadership, our number one priority was tax reform and jobs, putting more money into the pockets of the American people who have earned it. That is why our bill, H.R. 1, the Tax Cut and Jobs Act, was that first priority.

Even back in 1995, the first bill under Republican leadership was the Congressional Accountability Act, to make sure Congress and its staff had to abide by the same rules as the rest of Americans.

This Congress, under Democrat leadership, it appears their priorities are

much different. Their H.R. 1, supposedly, their most-prized bill, hence, they give it the number 1 bill, is not a generational policy reform to benefit Americans, but, rather, politics and rigging elections; that is the Democrat priority; sweeping Federal mandates that institute a 6-to-1 government match for small donor political contributions.

That means 6 to 1 of your tax dollars going to match contributions made for campaigns; \$200 would yield \$1,200 from the Federal Government into a campaign.

In what world is it defensible for the Federal Government to be forced to use your taxpayer funds, you to be forced for your taxpayer dollars to support a candidate for office, regardless of whether you support that candidate.

The bad news is it doesn't end there. Democrats want to take some of the corrupt policies already implemented in my own State of California and institute them nationwide.

For example: Ballot harvesting. Since its implementation in California, this practice has opened up our State to endless potential for election fraud. Just a couple of months ago, this exact practice sent one North Carolina election into chaos, with every Democrat in the State demanding a re-election. In the North Carolina one they were using similar practices.

Ironically, this bill is completely silent on ballot harvesting. In fact, Democrats blocked an amendment I worked on that would make ballot harvesting illegal in all States, not just where it is convenient for their elections.

In Orange County, California, 250,000 provisional ballots were counted after election night, with people delivering hundreds of them at a time.

Now, I am a staunch supporter of ensuring every voter has access to the polls, but this bill isn't about that. This legislation only undermines the security of our election system and limits the already-lacking safeguards that are in place to ensure the integrity of our electoral process.

How are the voters, the people, the citizens of America supposed to have confidence in their election system when they see these games being played?

To make matters worse, this bill will actually weaken voter ID laws. It automatically registers everyone in the DMV database, no questions asked, alive or dead.

When this issue has come up in California, we have seen numerous problems in the DMV process. California voter rolls have little integrity. We have tens of thousands of so-called voters that are registered that may not even be eligible, may not even be citizens.

□ 1030

This has also, in that process, made the REAL ID process in California questionable as well, where the people

are going to have to go get their ID redone in order to be able to use the airports.

While some of my other colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to peg voter ID laws as prohibitive, the National Bureau of Economic Research published a study proving that is not the case.

We all support easy and fair voter registration, but it has to come with sensible voter protections and fraud prevention safeguards. As we saw in California this past election cycle, thousands of ballots continued to be harvested even after election day. That is a huge problem.

If this bill needed another nail in the coffin, even the ACLU has condemned the legislation as unconstitutional. That is because it hurts free speech and attempts to silence those who would dare disagree with, in this case, Democrat priorities.

Just a few years ago, a California theater director was forced to resign over harassment due to a political donation, just for advocating for his own beliefs.

Democrats boldly dubbed this legislation the For the People Act, but a more appropriate title would be "Democrat Politicians Protection Act."

Once again, H.R. 1 under Republican leadership was the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act and, years ago, an accountability act. H.R. 1 under Democrat leadership is an unconstitutional bill to force Americans to help reelect more Democrats. That should paint a substantially contrasting picture for the American people what the priorities are of the two parties.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this terrible bill.

HONORING CONSTITUENT OF THE MONTH SHELBY JACOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress Member for California's 49th District, it is my distinct honor to represent over 700,000 Californians from North County San Diego and south Orange County.

I have met countless constituents across the district who do incredible work to make our community stronger, and I am proud to serve them in Congress.

With so many outstanding constituents, I thought it would be appropriate to start a new Constituent of the Month program to recognize individuals who have gone above and beyond to help their neighbors, give back to their community, and make our country stronger.

For our first constituent of the month, I am thrilled to recognize Mr. Shelby Jacobs of Oceanside, a retired aerospace engineer who worked for 40 years on NASA's Apollo and Space Shuttle programs.

Mr. Jacobs served in a number of roles, including project manager of the

Apollo-Soyuz orbiter and designed a breakthrough camera used to capture iconic images of a rocket separation on Apollo 6 in 1968.

As an African American in an industry with few people of color at the time, Mr. Jacobs faced significant difficulties, including unequal pay and, often, unfair treatment.

Now Mr. Jacobs serves as the role model he never had for himself, showing young people of color what they can achieve in the face of racism, discrimination, and inequality of opportunity, and calling for action to address injustices that still exist today.

He told the San Diego Union Tribune: "It's important to be a pioneer, but I want people to understand that while we appreciate the progress, things need to be done to address the inequality. That's something that was there when I started and it's still happening today right up to the very top level of our government."

Mr. Jacobs' story has helped highlight other "Hidden Figures" who have gone without recognition, particularly people of color and women, for their extraordinary contributions to our country.

I have no doubt that Mr. Jacobs' efforts to touch the lives of young people and address inequality has had a profound impact on our community and will continue to do so.

Shelby Jacobs is an inspiration to me and so many others, and I am proud to call him our first Constituent of the Month.

WORKING FOR THOSE WITHOUT A LOBBYIST OR PAC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TRONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

I ran for Congress to be a voice for those without a powerful PAC or a special interest group to represent them.

The wealthy and connected, they will be fine.

For the people is who we are here to fight for: for the people who are suffering from the addiction epidemic, for the people who are living with diseases with no cure, and for the people who are targeted by a broken criminal justice system that is anything but just. These people don't have a PAC. These people, they don't have a lobbyist.

We won't be able to help those people until we end the corruption and fix our democracy. That is why I am supporting the For the People Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to send this bill to the President's desk so we can get to work on behalf of those without a lobbyist, without a PAC.

2018: A BAD YEAR FOR CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, when Speaker PELOSI took the gavel on January 3, she was surrounded by children, and as she brought down the gavel to commence the 116th Congress, these were her words: "I now call the House to order on behalf of all of America's children."

The importance of Speaker PELOSI's words cannot be overstated. Last year was horrendous for children in our country.

If we look at gun violence or immigration or healthcare or poverty relief, children suffered last year under the Trump administration and a Republican Congress.

On February 14, 2018, a gunman walked into Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, to commit mass murder; 17 people were killed, another 17 were injured, and most of them were children.

The Parkland shooting wasn't the first school shooting in our Nation's history, and it wasn't the last. But the Parkland students, standing on the shoulders of student leaders before them, stood up and marched. They bound together in an intersectional, nationwide movement to demand that Congress and the President do something to make our country safer.

Unfortunately, their pleas fell on deaf ears. The President and his administration were too inept or too cowardly to confront the NRA. And because my colleagues across the aisle were too inept or too cowardly to confront the NRA, we witnessed preventable shooting after preventable shooting.

Then, when the Trump administration finally did release its School Safety Commission report, it completely ignored evidence-based violence and prevention strategies. Instead, the report suggested rolling back civil rights protections for students and making guns more easily accessible in schools.

Look, there is a commonality among the mass shootings in America's schools: easy access to firearms. But rather than address the root cause of school shootings, the Trump administration suggested that we put guns in classrooms, as if teachers are security guards and schools are prisons. Nobody thinks that is a good idea except for the NRA.

Meanwhile, educators across the country are clamoring for funding to install new locks on classroom doors, harden school entryways, and secure school facilities.

The 116th Congress was called into order on behalf of all children because Democrats will listen to teachers and students—not the NRA. That is why we passed two bills in February to institute universal background checks and close the Charleston loophole. That is why I introduced the Safer Neighborhoods Gun Buyback Act: to save children's lives.

We were called into order on behalf of all children, including those who are at our borders.

Under the Trump administration and Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen, both of whom were empowered by my colleagues across the aisle, the United States of America ripped children away from their parents and put them in cages.

Ripping children away from their parents and lying about it to the American people was evil, plain and simple, and it should have ended Secretary Nielsen's career. I feel Secretary Nielsen is incompetent, inept, and is not up to the task of securing the homeland's safety. Anyone who would put children in cages, fenced cages, taken from their parents can just not be trusted.

President Trump's deplorable, inhuman attempt to change our immigration system has killed people.

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

DEMOCRATS ARE LIVING UP TO OUR COMMITMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand before you today in strong support of H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking Congressman SARBANES, Speaker PELOSI, Chairwoman ZOE LOF-GREN, and my colleagues for their work on this issue.

H.R. 1 is historic legislation. It will restore transparency in our government and put the power back in the hands of the people.

It will reduce the role of dark money in politics and make it easier to vote.

Perhaps most importantly, it will reaffirm that this is the people's House and our work here is for them. There could be nothing more fundamentally important than that.

Too many have lost faith in the process; too many have lost faith in their government. They look around and wonder who is on their side, who is fighting for them. They see rules rigged against them, and every day it gets harder and harder for their neighbor to buy insulin or for their daughter to shake off the incredible burdens of student loan debt.

This legislation, H.R. 1, is an important step in how we stand up for our communities and for the people. It is a tool that allows us to act on the many issues impacting working men and women, the family that I was raised in.

It will also give Americans a greater voice in their government. This legislation will allow automatic voter registration and create a national holiday for election day.

I am also proud to submit an amendment to H.R. 1 that will expand election infrastructure grants to promote voter participation, secure our elections, and increase funding for these efforts to engage all parts of our society in our democracy.

Looking ahead to next week, I am looking forward to reintroducing with my colleagues the Native American Voting Rights Act. This legislation will make sure that communities are not left behind as we strengthen our democracy.

House Democrats committed to the American people that we would fundamentally change Washington if elected to the majority; we committed that our work would be for the people. This week, we are living up to that commitment.

ANTI-SEMITISM IS THE CANARY IN THE COAL MINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, today should not be about politics. I didn't rise to be political. This is personal.

A few years ago, I was invited to speak at the U.N. General Assembly special session on anti-Semitism. I told the representatives from the assembled countries that anti-Semitism is the canary in the coal mine, that if there is anti-Semitism in your country, there is hatred that will ultimately permeate throughout society if it is not checked. I never thought I would need to explain that to my colleagues.

This is not political. No one should make it political.

□ 1045

The use of anti-Semitic language and images can never be tolerated. When a Presidential campaign runs a commercial alleging a Jewish global conspiracy in an ad featuring George Soros, Janet Yellen, and Lloyd Blankfein, it is invoking classic anti-Semitic tropes and it must be condemned. When the same campaign tweets an image of their opponent featuring a Jewish star and piles of money, it does the same thing and it must be condemned. When one of our colleagues accuses Soros, Steyer, and Bloomberg of buying the election, it also invokes classic anti-Semitism that must be condemned. And when one of our colleagues invokes the classic anti-Semitic tropes that Jews control the world, that Jews care only about money, and that Jews cannot be loyal Americans if they also support Israel, this, too, must be condemned.

We have the opportunity to condemn all of that, by all of them, intolerable as it all is, by passing a strong condemnation of anti-Semitism. Mr. Speaker, because of anti-Semitism over millennia, millions of Jews have been hated, targeted, and expelled from their countries, violently attacked, killed, and exterminated. Words lead to action and to death.

There is too much hatred, too many other people who are targeted, and we need to support all of them. But we are having this debate because of the language of one of our colleagues, language that suggests that Jews like me,

who serve in the United States in Congress and whose father earned a Purple Heart fighting the Nazis in the Battle of the Bulge, that we are not loyal Americans.

Why are we unable to singularly condemn anti-Semitism? Why can't we call out anti-Semitism and show that we have learned the lessons of history?

It feels like we are only able to call the use of anti-Semitic language by a colleague of ours—any colleague of ours—if we are addressing all forms of hatred. And it feels like we can't say it is anti-Semitism unless everyone agrees that it is anti-Semitism.

Who gets to define what counts as stereotypes or discrimination? Isn't it the people who experience the bias? The people who have experienced that hatred for thousands of years?

If Jews whose families were persecuted or attacked or killed are talking about how anti-Semitic words can lead at their most hateful and violent extremes, then it is anti-Semitism. And take my word for it. If you don't do that, then please understand that an anti-Semite will hear those words as a dog whistle.

What has been so difficult for so many people in my community is that people who are fearful when anti-Semitic tropes are used are being told that they are wrong. Jewish elected officials are saying that this history that we know well is invoked by referencing dual loyalty, and some of my colleagues are saying that it doesn't matter what that history means to me. It is intensely personal because it is ongoing: in Europe, in Asia, in the Middle East, in South America, and in the United States.

Eleven people were killed less than 6 months ago in a synagogue because they were Jews. What is happening in our country should alarm us all. The attacks on our colleagues because they are Muslim or African American or Hispanic or members of the LGBT community, any attack must be condemned when it is based on hatred.

But when a colleague invokes classic anti-Semitism lies three times, then this body must condemn that anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism is worthy of being taken seriously on its own. It is worthy of being singularly called out.

Jews control the world? Jews care only about money? Jews have dual loyalty and can't be patriotic members of the country in which they live?

Words matter. For generations, they have had dangerous consequences for me, for my family, and for my people. This shouldn't be so hard.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CASTOR of Florida) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the days grow longer and many impatiently wait for more springlike warmth, we give You thanks for all the blessings we enjoy in our favored land.

We ask Your blessing on the Members of this people's House in the work they do. Though sometimes contentious, we ask Your blessing of Spirit upon all that, as colleagues in the important work of the House, they might seek to find agreement on issues that will redound to the benefit of our Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CRAWFORD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

COMMEMORATING TRIPLE NEGATIVE BREAST CANCER AWARENESS DAY

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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Triple Negative Breast Cancer Awareness Day, which took place earlier this week on March 3.

My daughter, Lauren, battled triple negative breast cancer for 2 years, with incredible strength, courage, humor,

and tenacity. She shared her story publicly with tens of thousands of people on a Facebook page called Lauren vs. Cancer, underscoring the importance of this serious health issue and encouraging everyone to get tested.

Sadly, Lauren died at the age of 31 from this horrible disease in August of 2017. In Lauren's memory, I have dedicated myself to efforts to eradicate the scourge of breast cancer.

As we recognize Triple Negative Breast Cancer Awareness Day, I want to extend my support to the thousands of women and men affected by this devastating and, at times, deadly disease. We must take this opportunity to highlight the need for continued education, research, and action to finally find a cure for breast cancer.

COMMENDING ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY FOR HOSTING 25TH ANNUAL COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AGRIBUSINESS CONFERENCE

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend my alma mater, Arkansas State University, for hosting the 25th Annual College of Agriculture Agribusiness Conference. This conference focuses on farm management, commodity and credit markets, and the economics and politics of trade and farm policy.

During this conference, Chancellor Damphousse announced a \$1 million gift for the College of Agriculture from the Judd Hill Foundation.

Farmers and those involved in the agriculture industry throughout Arkansas attend this meeting each year to learn about important deadlines and challenges that producers will encounter this growing season from a diverse group of speakers. This year, speakers included Tyne Morgan, host of U.S. Farm Report, as well as two of my past interns, Hunter Biram and Grant Wilson.

Instrumental to this conference's continued success has been Dr. Greenwalt, conference director and co-founder. Dr. Greenwalt, professor of agricultural economics at Arkansas State, also serves as a director of the Arkansas Agricultural Council. I had the pleasure of being one of Dr. Greenwalt's students while pursuing my degree in agricultural business at Arkansas State University.

Many others come to support this annual event. As the event grows, so does the attendance.

I would like to extend my congratulations and gratitude to Dr. Greenwalt, Dean Burcham, and everyone who contributed to the success of the ASU Agribusiness Conference for the last 25 years.

RECOGNIZING RUTH WEAKLEY ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, this Women's History Month, I rise to recognize Ruth Weakley of Arroyo Grande on her 100th birthday today.

During World War II, with many of America's young men serving overseas, U.S. jobs traditionally held by men began to open their doors to women.

While Ruth's husband, Harry, was away serving in the Army Air Force, Ruth stepped up to serve, and became one of a handful of women driving rural postal routes. She drove a route in Los Angeles County for nearly 2 years during the war, resigning when her husband returned from his military service in December 1945.

Contributions like hers were both critical to our Nation's war effort and to reshaping the role of women in our workforce and society.

Today, over 70 years after Ruth's time with the Postal Service and on her 100th birthday, I recognize and thank her for her service to our Nation and to women everywhere.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CHIEF ROBERT RICHARDSON

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

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of former Panama City Fire Chief and United States Navy veteran Robert Richardson. Chief Richardson passed away at the age of 79 on January 5.

Chief Richardson proudly served our Nation as a submariner in the Navy, and he went on to serve his community in Bay County for 33 years—first as a firefighter and then as the Panama City Fire Chief.

He was honored by the State of Florida for his work, earning the distinction of Florida's Firefighter of the Year and Florida's Fire Chief of the Year.

Chief Richardson was appointed by Governor Bob Graham to serve on the Florida State Fire Board and used that position to fight for stricter building codes. He dedicated his entire life to protecting others.

Madam Speaker, I can attest that Panama City is a better place because of the lifelong service of Chief Richardson. Please join me in honoring the life of Chief Richardson.

COMMEMORATING THE SOCIETY FOR NEUROSCIENCE DURING BRAIN AWARENESS WEEK

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, the Society for Neuroscience, SFN, is the world's largest organization of scientists and clinicians focused on studying the brain and the nervous system. This week, we welcomed them to Capitol Hill to give us an update on their progress and their impact.

Federal funding from agencies like the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation is absolutely critical to their work. Sustained, reliable funding is critical to continuing advancements in neuroscience and to scientific advancement in general.

This week is Brain Awareness Week, and I want to commend the BRAIN Initiative partners. The 2018 total for the BRAIN Initiative program at NIH is more than \$400 million.

I have long supported research investments in neuroscience research. It is opening up a vast understanding of our brains, and it is vitally important to the over 100 million Americans impacted by neurodevelopmental, neurodegenerative, and neuropsychiatric brain disorders.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting robust funding for the National Institutes of Health so that the BRAIN Initiative can continue its outstanding achievements.

ENDING SAUDI INCITEMENT IN SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, Saudi Arabia has a vital role in the global war on terrorism. Riyadh is a crucial counterterrorism partner. But, sadly, textbooks of Saudi Arabia have been teaching its students to hate others for too long.

One current textbook is inflammatory against Christianity, Judaism, and even other Muslims who do not subscribe to the Saudi interpretation of Islam, which they describe as "evil."

Saudi Arabia has committed to reforming curriculum for over a decade. That is why Congressman BILL KEATING and I have introduced H.R. 554, the Saudi Educational and Transparency and Reform Act. It will hold the Saudis accountable by requiring an annual report on any intolerant content of their textbooks. It will also send a clear, bipartisan message to end the incitement now.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

CONGRESS HAS THE MORAL RESPONSIBILITY TO STEP UP AND ACT

(Ms. DEGETTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, this week the House is considering H.R. 1,

the For the People Act. This bill takes on one of the biggest issues facing our democracy: campaign finance reform.

The Supreme Court's decision, in *Citizens United*, was one of the most disastrous decisions of our time. It opened the floodgates to the unlimited amount of unregulated dark money that is now corrupting our democracy.

And Congress not only has the authority to regulate the way our political campaigns are financed, but, I believe, we have the moral responsibility to step up.

This bill would shed light on the billionaires and special interest groups who are really behind some of the candidates running for office, and it would level the playing field by giving the power back to the traditional grass roots donors.

This, without a doubt, is one of the most important issues that we as a Congress will take on this year, and that is why I urge all of my colleagues to get in this fight to get unlimited dark money out of the political system once and for all.

FOR THE POLITICIANS ACT

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, ironically titled the For the People Act. A more accurate name would be the "For the Politicians Act."

This bill would, essentially, ban the interstate crosscheck system which 27 States, including Tennessee, use to prevent voter fraud by ensuring voters are not registered in multiple States.

Is that for the people or for the politicians?

Another provision would mandate that States use unaccountable, unelected commissions to draw their districts, further isolating Americans from their elected officials.

Is that for the people or for the politicians?

Still, another section would create a 6-to-1 taxpayer-funded match for political donations, giving politicians a massive boost for their campaign coffers from taxpayer dollars.

Is that for the people or for the politicians?

H.R. 1 is not for the people; it is for the politicians. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

RECOGNIZING MARCH AS NATIONAL NUTRITION MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize March as National Nutrition Month.

In 1973, the American Dietetic Association, now called the Academy of Nu-

trition and Dietetics, started National Nutrition Week as a way to deliver nutrition education messages to the public.

Fast-forward 7 years, and the week became a month-long celebration thanks to the growing public interest in nutrition.

Madam Speaker, during the last Congress, I had the honor of being chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Nutrition. From women and children who use the WIC program to adults and families who utilize the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or what we refer to as SNAP, formerly called food stamps, I know that good nutrition is important at every stage of life.

National Nutrition Month focuses on the importance of making informed food choices and developing sound eating and physical activity habits.

Next Wednesday is Registered Dietitian Nutritionist Day, and this occasion increases awareness of registered dietitian nutritionists as the indispensable providers of food and nutrition services, while recognizing their commitment to helping people enjoy healthy lives.

Happy National Nutrition Month.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF JAMES PATTERSON

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding patriot and advocate for Tennessee veterans, James Patterson of Columbia, Tennessee, who recently passed away.

James was a Vietnam veteran who earned medals for his service. He had a 35-year career at Union Carbide, but locals know him best for his many volunteer affiliations in life. He was the true embodiment of what makes America great.

James was an American Legion commander and Legionnaire of the Year, also a member of the Disabled American Veterans and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

He was Maury County's veterans services director, and every week, as sergeant at arms, he led the Pledge of Allegiance at Columbia's Rotary Club.

James loved his country and loved, most of all, the men and women who fight for it. My staff and I have worked with him often to help Tennessee veterans receive the benefits and honors they deserve.

We were saddened to learn of his passing. The entire community lost a friend.

My condolences to the Patterson family. Here in the Capitol and in my home State of Tennessee, I will do my best to carry on James' work on behalf of the brave men and women who risk their lives to defend the United States of America. He set an example for all of us.

Thank you for your service, James.

□ 1215

HONORING JOAN ESPENSHADE

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, March is Women's History Month, and I am proud to honor some remarkable women in my district.

Today, I would like to recognize Ms. Joan Espenshade, a woman from Lancaster, Pennsylvania, who gave back to our community by creating an extraordinary program to feed those in need.

In 2005, Joan learned that some local children were food insecure on weekends when the school's free lunch program was not available to them, so she decided to step in and help parents make better use of their limited food dollars.

She founded the Power Packs Project to provide food and nutritional information to low-income families. Not only did she help those families, but Power Packs now extends to 45 schools in 13 districts with 350 volunteers.

Joan stepped down as president of Power Packs after 9 years in 2014, but her vision and impact can still be seen as the program continues today.

We are thankful for people like Joan who remind us of the importance of caring for those in need. It is an honor to recognize her today.

HONORING SHERIFF MIKE BROWN

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

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of retiring Bedford County, Virginia, Sheriff Mike Brown. The county's top law enforcement officer since 1996, Sheriff Brown has devoted nearly 50 years to protecting the citizens of his home county and the Commonwealth of Virginia.

In his time as sheriff, Mike has led efforts to modernize the department and expand cooperation with surrounding departments. These efforts led to the 1998 creation of the Southern Virginia Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force, an organization whose purpose is locating and prosecuting individuals who prey on our children.

In the most recent reporting year, the task force arrested 227 individuals accused of crimes against children and identified 127 child victims. Over 20 years, an untold number of children have been protected and hundreds of predators have been put behind bars because of Sheriff Brown's efforts to establish the task force.

In 2017, Sheriff Brown was appropriately named National Sheriffs' Association Sheriff of the Year.

Madam Speaker, I thank Sheriff Brown for his service to the citizens of

Bedford County and all of Virginia, and I wish him and his family all the best during a well-earned retirement. His service leaves a legacy we can all be proud of.

HONORING BOB HUDZIK

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bob Hudzik, a constituent in my district who has made a profound difference in his community.

Bob, a world champion dart player and custodian at Mt. Olive High School, began Darts for Kids, a non-profit organization that hosts an annual dart tournament. The proceeds go to families of children with life-threatening illnesses, usually to contribute to the cost of unforeseen medical expenses.

Their first tournament in 2013 raised about \$10,000. To date, Darts for Kids has raised almost \$175,000 and helped over 90 families with medical costs for children.

I recently cosponsored legislation that shines a light on individuals like Bob. H.R. 276, the RISE Act, would establish the Recognizing Inspirational School Employees Award Program within the Department of Education to highlight the dedication of education support professionals like Bob.

Bob is a perfect example of the people who make our communities great. I could not be prouder of all that Bob has done to better the lives of families in Mt. Olive, Illinois.

Keep up the great work, Bob.

BETTER REFORM FOR THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I am here today to speak out against H.R. 1.

When Republicans were in the majority, we reserved H.R. 1 for legislation that actually benefited the American people by putting more money in their pockets and growing the economy through the historic tax reform bill passed last year. Now here we are, under a new majority, planning to vote on a bill telling folks that their hard-earned taxpayer dollars will be going to a political candidate that they would never support.

This bill goes too far and is nothing more than a power grab from the Democrats to try to ensure one-party rule. This socialist, top-down, one-size-fits-all election system violates States' rights, fails to criminalize fraudulent voter registration, and eliminates every American's constitutional right to free speech under the First Amendment.

We do not need the heavy, overreaching hand of the Federal Govern-

ment corrupting every single election across this great Nation.

Madam Speaker, I have said it before and I will say it again: This legislation is not reform for the better, and it is not for the people.

STATE AND LOCAL TAX DEDUCTION

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, forcing Americans to pay Federal tax money they have already paid to State and local governments is double taxation, and it is wrong. But that is just what the tax law passed by my Republican colleagues in 2017 did.

The law places a severe \$10,000 restriction on the State and local tax deduction. According to the United States Department of the Treasury, more than 11 million households will exceed this new cap. In my district, around 42 percent of filers use the SALT deduction, and I have heard from many constituents stuck this year with a higher tax bill.

Madam Speaker, Illinois already pays approximately \$1.36 for every dollar we receive in Federal spending. It is not right that our communities now must bear the burden for the President's irresponsible tax law.

Lifting these punishing caps is a top priority for my constituents, and I am pleased that there is growing bipartisan support for the effort. This week, I cosponsored legislation introduced by Chairwoman NITA LOWEY, a Democrat, and PETER KING, a Republican, to restore the full SALT deduction.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort and help bring needed tax relief to the communities we all represent.

TERM LIMITS FOR CONGRESS

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

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, my esteemed colleague, Representative ROONEY, has introduced a bill, H.J. Res. 20, to limit the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve to three terms. I signed on to cosponsor this bill right away.

Term limits would take power away from special interests and lobbyists and give it back to the people. When Members stay in Congress for too long, they lose touch with the people back home and allow special interests to hold sway more than regular people.

A Congress out of touch with its constituents cannot do a good job representing the American people. This bill would make sure our constituents will have a representative body that they recognize.

The power of incumbency is a counterbalance to the will of the people.

Term limits would encourage independent congressional judgment and reduce election-related incentives for wasteful government spending.

This bill would create a much better political system by inspiring political leaders with a desire to serve their constituents, not themselves; political leaders who respond to voters' concerns, not a career path in special interests.

Madam Speaker, I call on my fellow Members to support this bill.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 172 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) kindly take the chair.

□ 1223

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes, with Ms. CASTOR of Florida (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 6, 2019, amendment No. 22 printed in part B of House Report 116-16 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 172, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 35, 36, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 59, 60, 65, 66, and 67 printed in part B of House Report 116-16, offered by Ms. LOFGREN of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 323, insert after line 6 the following new section:

SEC. 4103. PROHIBITION ON CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN CONNECTIONS WITH BALLOT INITIATIVES AND REFERENDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 319(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “election;” and inserting the following: “election, including a State or local ballot initiative or referendum;”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to elections held in 2020 or any succeeding year.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN OF WISCONSIN

Page 539, insert after line 16 the following (and redesignate the succeeding subtitle accordingly):

Subtitle E—Clearinghouse on Lobbying Information

SEC. 7401. ESTABLISHMENT OF CLEARINGHOUSE.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Attorney General shall establish and operate within the Department of Justice a clearinghouse through which members of the public may obtain copies (including in electronic form) of registration statements filed under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) and the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.).

(b) **FORMAT.**—The Attorney General shall ensure that the information in the clearinghouse established under this Act is maintained in a searchable and sortable format.

(c) **AGREEMENTS WITH CLERK OF HOUSE AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE.**—The Attorney General shall enter into such agreements with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate as may be necessary for the Attorney General to obtain registration statements filed with the Clerk and the Secretary under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 for inclusion in the clearinghouse.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle A of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 8006. LIMITATION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS AND CONTRACTING AT BUSINESSES OWNED BY CERTAIN GOVERNMENT OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.

(a) **LIMITATION ON FEDERAL FUNDS.**—Beginning in fiscal year 2020 and in each fiscal year thereafter, no Federal funds may be obligated or expended for purposes of procuring goods or services at any business owned or controlled by a covered individual or any family member of such an individual, unless such obligation or expenditure of funds is necessary for the security of a covered individual or family member.

(b) **PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS.**—No federal agency may enter into a contract with a business owned or controlled by a covered individual or any family member of such an individual.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF OWNERSHIP.**—For purposes of this section, a business shall be deemed to be owned or controlled by a covered individual or any family member of such an individual if the covered individual or member of family (as the case may be)—

(1) is a member of the board of directors or similar governing body of the business; or

(2) directly or indirectly owns or controls 51 percent or more of the voting shares of the business.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COVERED INDIVIDUAL.**—The term “covered individual” means—

(A) the President;

(B) the Vice President;

(C) the head of any Executive department (as that term is defined in section 101 of title 5, United States Code); and

(D) any individual occupying a position designated by the President as a Cabinet-level position.

(2) **FAMILY MEMBER.**—The term “family member” means an individual with any of the following relationships to a covered individual:

(A) Spouse, and parents thereof.

(B) Sons and daughters, and spouses thereof.

(C) Parents, and spouses thereof.

(D) Brothers and sisters, and spouses thereof.

(E) Grandparents and grandchildren, and spouses thereof.

(F) Domestic partner and parents thereof, including domestic partners of any individual in paragraphs (2) through (5).

(3) **FEDERAL AGENCY.**—The term “federal agency” has the meaning given that term in section 102 of title 40, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO OF CALIFORNIA

In title VI of the bill—

(1) redesignate subtitle C as subtitle D (and conform the succeeding subtitle accordingly); and

(2) insert after subtitle B the following:

Subtitle C—Disposal of Contributions or Donations

SEC. 6201. TIMEFRAME FOR AND PRIORITIZATION OF DISPOSAL OF CONTRIBUTIONS OR DONATIONS.

Section 313 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30114), as amended by section 5113 and section 5302, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) **DISPOSAL.**—

“(1) **TIMEFRAME.**—Contributions or donations described in subsection (a) may only be used—

“(A) in the case of an individual who is not a candidate with respect to an election for any Federal office for a 6-year period beginning on the day after the date of the most recent such election in which the individual was a candidate for any such office, during such 6-year period; or

“(B) in the case of an individual who becomes a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, before the date on which such individual becomes such a registered lobbyist.

“(2) **MEANS OF DISPOSAL; PRIORITIZATION.**—Beginning on the date the 6-year period described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) ends (or, in the case of an individual described in subparagraph (B) of such paragraph, the date on which the individual becomes a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995), contributions or donations that remain available to an individual described in such paragraph shall be disposed of, not later than 30 days after such date, as follows:

“(A) First, to pay any debts or obligations owed in connection with the campaign for election for Federal office of the individual.

“(B) Second, to the extent such contribution or donations remain available after the application of subparagraph (A), through any of the following means of disposal (or a combination thereof), in any order the individual considers appropriate:

“(i) Returning such contributions or donations to the individuals, entities, or both, who made such contributions or donations.

“(ii) Making contributions to an organization described in section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(iii) Making transfers to a national, State, or local committee of a political party.”.

SEC. 6202. 1-YEAR TRANSITION PERIOD FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of an individual described in subsection (b), any contributions or donations remaining available to the individual shall be disposed of—

(1) not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section; and

(2) in accordance with the prioritization specified in subparagraphs (A) through (D) of subsection (c)(2) of section 313 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C.

30114), as amended by section 6201 of this subtitle.

(b) **INDIVIDUALS DESCRIBED.**—An individual described in this subsection is an individual who, as of the date of the enactment of this section—

(1)(A) is not a candidate with respect to an election for any Federal office for a period of not less than 6 years beginning on the day after the date of the most recent such election in which the individual was a candidate for any such office; or

(B) is an individual who becomes a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995; and

(2) would be in violation of subsection (c) of section 313 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30114), as amended by section 6201 of this subtitle.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 153, insert after line 13 the following:

(3) **ACCESS AND CULTURAL CONSIDERATIONS.**—The Commission shall ensure that the manual described in paragraph (2) provides training in methods that will enable poll workers to provide access and delivery of services in a culturally competent manner to all voters who use their services, including those with limited English proficiency, diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds, disabilities, and regardless of gender, sexual orientation, or gender identity. These methods must ensure that each voter will have access to poll worker services that are delivered in a manner that meets the unique needs of the voter.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER OF ILLINOIS

Page 528, insert after line 19 the following (and redesignate the succeeding subtitle accordingly):

Subtitle C—Recommendations to Ensure Filing of Reports Before Date of Election

SEC. 6201. RECOMMENDATIONS TO ENSURE FILING OF REPORTS BEFORE DATE OF ELECTION.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Election Commission shall submit a report to Congress providing recommendations, including recommendations for changes to existing law, on how to ensure that each political committee under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, including a committee which accepts donations or contributions that do not comply with the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of such Act, will file a report under section 304 of such Act prior to the date of the election for which the committee receives contributions or makes disbursements, without regard to the date on which the committee first registered under such Act, and shall include specific recommendations to ensure that such committees will not delay until after the date of the election the reporting of the identification of persons making contributions that will be used to repay debt incurred by the committee.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

Page 71, strike lines 6 through 13 and insert the following:

(b) **BREAKDOWN OF INFORMATION.**—In preparing the report under this section, the State shall, for each category of information described in subsection (a), include a breakdown by race, ethnicity, age, and gender of the individuals whose information is included in the category, to the extent that information on the race, ethnicity, age, and gender of such individuals is available to the State.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. ESPAILLAT OF NEW YORK

At the end of part 2 of subtitle E of title II of division A (page 246, after line 8), add the following new section:

SEC. 2415. REPORT ON DIVERSITY OF MEMBERSHIPS OF INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSIONS.

Not later than May 15 of a year ending in the numeral one, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the extent to which the memberships of independent redistricting commissions for States established under this part with respect to the immediately preceding year ending in the numeral zero meet the diversity requirements as provided for in sections 2411(a)(2)(B) and 2412(b)(2).

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Insert after section 8035 the following:

SEC. 8036. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEE TRAVEL IN CONTRAVENTION OF CERTAIN REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, no Federal funds appropriated or otherwise made available in any fiscal year may be used for the travel expenses of any senior Federal official in contravention of sections 301–10.260 through 301–10.266 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORT ON TRAVEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act and every 90 days thereafter, the head of each Federal agency shall submit a report to the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate detailing travel on Government aircraft by any senior Federal official employed at the applicable agency.

(2) APPLICATION.—Any report required under paragraph (1) shall not include any classified travel, and nothing in this Act shall be construed to supersede, alter, or otherwise affect the application of section 101–37.408 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(c) TRAVEL REGULATION REPORT.—Not later than one year after enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Government Ethics shall submit a report to Congress detailing suggestions on strengthening Federal travel regulations. On the date such report is so submitted, the Director shall publish such report on the Office's public website.

(d) DEFINITION OF SENIOR FEDERAL OFFICIAL.—In this Act, the term "senior Federal official" has the meaning given that term in section 101–37.100 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and includes any senior executive branch official (as that term is defined in such section).

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Insert after section 8035 the following:

SEC. 8036. REPORTS ON COST OF PRESIDENTIAL TRAVEL.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Air Force, shall submit to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report detailing the direct and indirect costs to the Department of Defense in support of presidential travel. Each such report shall include costs incurred for travel to a property owned or operated by the individual serving as President or an immediate family member of such individual.

(b) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER DEFINED.—In this section, the term "immediate family member" means the spouse of such individual, the adult or minor child of such individual, or the spouse of an adult child of such individual.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Insert after section 8035 the following:

SEC. 8036. REPORTS ON COST OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE TRAVEL.

(a) REPORTS ON SENIOR EXECUTIVE TRAVEL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report detailing the direct and indirect costs to the Department of Defense in support of travel by senior executive officials on military aircraft. Each such report shall include whether spousal travel furnished by the Department was reimbursed to the Federal Government.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Required use travel, as outlined in Department of Defense Directive 4500.56, shall not be included in reports under subsection (a)

(c) SENIOR EXECUTIVE OFFICIAL DEFINED.—In this section, the term "senior executive official" has the meaning given the term "senior Federal official" in section 101–37.100 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and includes any senior executive branch official (as that term is defined in such section).

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. MCADAMS OF UTAH

Page 537, insert after line 7 the following (and redesignate the succeeding subsection accordingly):

(b) REDUCTION OF PERCENTAGE EXEMPTION FOR DETERMINATION OF THRESHOLD OF LOBBYING CONTACTS REQUIRED FOR INDIVIDUALS TO REGISTER AS LOBBYISTS.—Section 3(10) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1602(10)) is amended by striking "less than 20 percent" and inserting "less than 10 percent".

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. PHILLIPS OF MINNESOTA

Page 552, strike lines 1 and 2 and insert the following:

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "1 year" in each instance and inserting "2 years"; and

(B) by inserting ", or conducts any lobbying activity to facilitate any communication to or appearance before," after "any communication to or appearance before"; and

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. PHILLIPS OF MINNESOTA

Page 499, line 4, strike ", consisting" and insert "that includes individuals representing each major political party and individuals who are independent of a political party and that consists".

Page 499, line 11, insert "The President shall also make reasonable efforts to encourage racial, ethnic, and gender diversity on the panel." after the period.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. HARDER OF CALIFORNIA

Add at the end of subtitle C of title VII the following new section:

SEC. 7202. REQUIRING LOBBYISTS TO DISCLOSE STATUS AS LOBBYISTS UPON MAKING ANY LOBBYING CONTACTS.

(a) MANDATORY DISCLOSURE AT TIME OF CONTACT.—Section 14 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1609) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

"(a) REQUIRING IDENTIFICATION AT TIME OF LOBBYING CONTACT.—Any person or entity that makes a lobbying contact with a covered legislative branch official or a covered executive branch official shall, at the time of the lobbying contact—

"(1) indicate whether the person or entity is registered under this chapter and identify the client on whose behalf the lobbying contact is made; and

"(2) indicate whether such client is a foreign entity and identify any foreign entity required to be disclosed under section 4(b)(4) that has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity."; and

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to lobbying contacts made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. HORSFORD OF NEVADA

In subtitle A of title VI of the bill, insert after section 6006 the following new section (and redesignate the succeeding provision accordingly):

SEC. 6007. REQUIRING FORMS TO PERMIT USE OF ACCENT MARKS.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Section 311(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30111(a)(1)) is amended by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting the following: ", and shall ensure that all such forms (including forms in an electronic format) permit the person using the form to include an accent mark as part of the person's identification.";

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect upon the expiration of the 90-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MS. FINKENAUER OF IOWA

Page 201, line 7, strike "subsection (c)" and insert "subsection (c) and subsection (d)".

Page 204, insert after line 10 the following:

(d) TREATMENT OF STATE OF IOWA.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the State of Iowa, so long as congressional redistricting in such State is carried out in accordance with a plan developed by the Iowa Legislative Services Agency with the assistance of a Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission, under law which was in effect for the most recent congressional redistricting carried out in the State prior to the date of the enactment of this Act and which remains in effect continuously on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Page 204, line 13, strike "section 2401(c)" and insert "sections 2401(c) or section 2401(d)".

Page 252, line 4, strike "paragraph (2)" and insert "paragraph (2) and paragraph (3)".

Page 252, insert after line 19 the following:

(3) EXCEPTION FOR STATE OF IOWA.—In the case of the State of Iowa, the Commission may not make a payment to the State under this section until the State certifies to the Commission that it will carry out congressional redistricting pursuant to the State's apportionment notice in accordance with a plan developed by the Iowa Legislative Services Agency with the assistance of a Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission, as provided under the law described in section 2401(d).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This package of 17 important amendments was made in order by the rule. The substance of these amendments ranges from commonsense information-gathering to protecting our Nation from foreign influence.

For instance, one amendment expands an existing ban to protect against a greater universe of threats. It provides that the Federal Election Campaign Act, which already bans foreign nationals from contributing to American elections, ought also to ban them from contributing to State or local ballot initiatives or referenda, where their undue influence might allow outside control of State and local matters.

Our colleagues have also joined with us in efforts to understand and appreciate the different experiences of American voters and to ensure that voters of all kinds are included at the ballot box by supporting information-sharing between States and the Election Assistance Commission.

One amendment focuses on greater reporting of demographic information, shining a light on who is voting so that we can better grasp who is participating or perhaps feels left out of our diverse electorate.

In States where information about age, gender, race, and ethnicity is already available to the State, this amendment will simply require States to include that demographic information about voters in their annual report to the Election Assistance Commission on voter registration statistics.

Our colleagues also support efforts by the Government Accountability Office to study the extent to which membership diversity requirements have been met in State redistricting commissions, ensuring that justice and fairness in representing the people is the priority, not partisan advantage to either party.

In a similar vein of being welcome to diverse voters, an amendment requires that the poll worker training manual provided by the Election Assistance Commission ensures that services are delivered in a culturally competent manner to voters who need these services, including voters with disabilities, those with limited English proficiency, and voters of diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds, all regardless of the gender, sexual orientation, or gender identity of the prospective voter.

This amendment seeks to give each voter full and equal access to the poll worker services that are critical to inclusive and efficient election administration and engagement with our sacred duties in this election.

This amendment also contains several component parts that focus on transparency and accessibility of information to everyday citizens so they can feel confident about the integrity, prudence, and independence of this government.

One amendment would stop campaign contributions providing an endless piggybank to candidates long after they have left office, or their campaign.

Another amendment gives citizens an important and accessible window into lobbying information. It would require the Attorney General to establish within the Department of Justice a single lobbying information disclosure portal through which members of the public could obtain hard copies and electronic copies of registration statements filed under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 and the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938. The effect of this amendment would be to combine and make easily accessible information that is currently available from disparate sources, including the House, the Senate, and the Department of Justice. Efforts like these increase information flow, transparency, and confidence in our government.

Madam Chair, I think these amendments are worthy of our support.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my friend and chairperson of our committee, Ms. LOFGREN. It is great to be able to work together and show some bipartisanship.

As many who may have been paying attention yesterday to our long debate on this bill know, that has been one of my chief complaints about H.R. 1. We haven't seen the bipartisanship that the new majority, the new Democratic majority, promised.

□ 1230

Every one of these amendments were offered by members of the Democratic conference. While our amendments in the only markup process that we had for this 622-page bill were all shot down on a partisan roll call, I want the RECORD to show that Republicans believe in bipartisanship and this en bloc group of amendments clearly shows that.

While individually I may not have supported every one of them, this is what bipartisanship and good principle compromise leads to. It leads to us spending a lot less time on the floor debating individual amendments, but also saving time for the amendments that are that much more important.

And I certainly hope that, unlike I have seen throughout the process already, this en bloc of bipartisan amendments, this en bloc of really Democratic amendments that have been accepted on a bipartisan basis, could be the linchpin. As we move forward today, I certainly hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle can accept some Republican amendments because we have yet to accept one. So I hope this is a goodwill gesture that will lead to more bipartisanship as the day goes on.

Again, while I and many members of our conference may not have supported

these amendments individually, we felt it was a good faith effort to be able to work together. And, again, I want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, especially with the House Administration Committee, a committee that has done its due diligence in putting a massive, mammoth bill forward to the floor today. I still have problems with the process, I still have problems with the overall bill, but this en bloc amendment should not be one of those.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, a few of the Members who have offered amendments would like to speak briefly on them.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HARDER).

Mr. HARDER of California. Madam Chair, I thank Chair LOFGREN for her leadership on this issue.

Madam Chair, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my amendment to limit the influence of lobbyists on elected officials.

Here is a stat that blows me away. D.C. is home to 11,000 registered lobbyists. That is 25 lobbyists per Member of Congress.

During one of my first nights in D.C., I got invited to dinner with some of my freshman colleagues. I thought it was going to be a chance to talk about the issues that I hear from families in my community: the cost of healthcare, education, maybe jobs. But imagine my surprise when the only thing these lobbyists wanted to talk about was what would benefit their clients.

This happens in the city every day. Thousands of lobbyists here, in one city, creating an ecosystem of easy access where they can push their client's agenda in front of elected representatives.

My amendment is simple. It says that if you are a lobbyist and you reach out to a Member of Congress, you must make clear that you are a lobbyist, you must make clear who your clients are, and you better tell us who pays you. This is common sense.

Back home, I hear a common frustration that Washington doesn't listen. This problem is real and it has got to stop. My community has had enough with back-room deals. This amendment is one step in the right direction, and I urge this body to vote in favor.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN), who has several amendments.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Madam Chair, as I travel throughout my district, I hear Arizona's concerns about the integrity of our elections, our elected leaders, and those who serve them in the highest positions of our government.

At a time when millions of Americans feel uncertain about the state of our democracy, Congress must act.

I am proud to support H.R. 1, which will strengthen our democracy and close ethics loopholes.

I want to thank the chairwoman and the ranking member for agreeing to adopt my three amendments to the underlying bill. These amendments, which include my Taxpayers DIME Act and my Protecting Defense Dollars Act, will do right by our taxpayers by increasing transparency and accountability when it comes to travel, including on government and military aircraft.

These amendments will crack down on bureaucrats abusing ethics rules in place of lavish travel on private jets, first-class flights, and more. Several of these amendments have previously received bipartisan support.

Regardless of party, those who serve the American public must be held to the highest ethical standards. Our ability to hold government officials accountable to taxpayers is a hallmark of our democracy, and we must work to uphold that right.

Again, I thank my colleagues for including my commonsense amendments in this package.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), who has an amendment here.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Chair, I want to thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Chair, the American people elected a new Congress to clean up corruption and make Washington work for them.

To that end, this week we will pass H.R. 1 to elevate the people's voice in our politics, restrict the influence of dark money in our campaigns, expand voting rights protections, and limit corporate influence.

At the foundation of this effort is a commitment to increasing transparency, so the American people know who is behind the money funding the political ads they see and how much these individuals are spending.

Currently, too many political action committees, including so-called super-PACs, have an easy way around the important disclosure requirements. By officially organizing a PAC or super-PAC just before an election, these committees can spend on ads to influence an election, without disclosing anything until after the voting has already occurred.

In another scheme, PACs borrow money to pay for advertising and operations and incur debts that are not paid off by donors until long after the election.

Both of these practices are extremely troubling and obfuscate who is donating to PACs. Voters are left in the dark until it is too late.

This amendment is a simple first step to address these abuses by requiring the Federal Election Commission to re-

port recommendations to Congress for how we can crack down on these practices by PACs.

I call on my colleagues to join us to increase transparency and support this amendment.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. HICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 565, strike line 12 and all that follows through "court." on line 20.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, the Office of Government Ethics is a prevention and education agency. OGE is responsible for ensuring compliance with ethics requirements, such as financial disclosure and conflict of interest rules.

These are the folks that the executive branch employees call when they have an ethics question. Their mission is to advise Federal employees on ethics matters.

OGE is not an investigative office, but that is exactly what H.R. 1 wants to turn OGE into, by granting the director the authority to subpoena information and records.

Here is the thing. OGE does not even need to have subpoena authority. It already has the power to request any information needed from Federal agencies, and the Federal agencies are required to comply under the Ethics in Government Act.

The only reason to give subpoena authority is to empower OGE to harass executive branch employees. This is not farfetched, Madam Chair.

The former director of OGE, Shaub, was openly hostile to the Trump administration and to Mr. Trump personally, even before he took office. Under Shaub, OGE went so far as using its official Twitter account in an attempt to coerce President-Elect Trump to divest his business interests. That is not what OGE's role is supposed to be.

We don't want to allow an office that has become so partisan to have subpoena authority and thereby open the door to overt harassment to executive branch employees.

I would just remind my Democrat friends that if this bill does become law—and it won't—but if it does, a future Democratic administration will eventually also have to deal with the same type of issues with the Office of Government Ethics.

Let me further remind everyone that the inspector general of the agency already has authority to subpoena information and documents, so we don't need to expand this and extend it to the director.

At the end of the day, this bill has much bigger problems than this small OGE subpoena authority provision. It is a bad bill. I will not be supporting it, obviously, but I know that many of my friends on the other side of the aisle will be supporting this bill.

Frankly, there is no amendment that is made in order by the Rules Committee that can fix this legislation. Some amendments, I believe, including this one, can at least make it marginally better, but it is a bad bill through and through.

I believe the American people, frankly, are going to be outraged when they find out what is in this piece of legislation, such as public financing for congressional candidates. The American people don't want that. They don't want tax dollars, particularly, six times going to Federal candidates.

And then there is the automatic voter registration requirement. I think the American people will be irate when they find out about this. This particular provision forces States to transfer individuals' personal information from government agencies and services and then transfer those over to election officials for voter registration.

Obviously, that is a violation of the 10th Amendment, but it is even worse than that. The Democratic authors of this legislation will not tell the American people that this provision will lead to huge numbers of illegal aliens and noncitizens being registered to vote.

And here is the problem. Illegal aliens and noncitizens use government agencies and services. Their information, according to H.R. 1, would then be sent to election officials, along with everyone else's, and they will be registered to vote.

The only safeguard that H.R. 1 has to prevent an illegal alien from being automatically registered to vote is if the alien proactively declines, which is not likely to happen because they don't want to draw attention to themselves to begin with because they are here illegally. So for us to expect that they would go publicly and draw attention to themselves, it just simply is not going to happen. That just flies in the face of logic.

Not only does H.R. 1 make it significantly more likely for ineligible voters to be registered, it also makes it next to impossible for States to remove ineligible voters from the voter registration list once they are on there. I doubt that anyone could have devised a better way, or a worse way, as it really is,

to ensure illegal aliens get registered to vote.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 1, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I must oppose the gentleman's amendment. It strips the subpoena power from the Director of the Office of Government Ethics.

Recent years have made it clear that the OGE needs to be strengthened. The subpoena power is a key enforcement tool, and a necessary one, for the Office of Government Ethics.

The former head of OGE said, in working with the current administration it has become clear we need to strengthen the ethics program. That individual resigned as head of the agency in July of last year, after almost 5 years as its head.

The OGE was set up in the aftermath of the 1970 Watergate scandal to clean up government. Some of that cleanup has relied on norms of behavior that are no longer in effect. We need to make sure that we have the ability with the OGE head to actually obtain information so they can do their job.

□ 1245

I do want to touch on a few other points raised by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE).

You know, there has been a lot of discussion over and over that the small donor program is funded by taxpayers. That is incorrect. You can just read the bill and see that is incorrect.

The freedom from influence fund is entirely funded by a nominal, additional assessment on criminal tax fraud cases, at the upper end, and corporate malfeasance fines and forfeitures. That is the entire source of funding. If there is not enough funding from those sources to fully fund the program, then the program is not fully funded.

That is in the bill itself; so I think it is important that we all understand that.

In terms of the automatic voter registration system, this has worked very successfully in a number of States, and six more are in the process of implementing it.

There are quite a few—we think, ample—safeguards to make sure that only those eligible to vote are, in fact, registered to vote. AVR agencies have reliable data about citizenship status and age, and there are separate rules for those agencies that don't collect that information.

I would note, also, that there has been discussion about how this is an unfair Federal imposition on States. This is only for Federal elections. This whole bill, H.R. 1, is about Federal elections. And why is that? Article I,

Section 4 gives the authority to Congress to pass laws about the conduct of Federal elections.

We have seen over and over, throughout the United States, efforts to suppress the vote in ways we think are improper by purging eligible voters from the rolls, by preventing people from registering through bogus and arcane ID rolls, by making sure that voters can't get to the polls because they have moved the polls, by eliminating early voting that is so helpful to people who work so hard that they might not be able to get to the polls before the poll closes. So this is for Federal elections.

And why is that important? Each one of us here in the House of Representatives has one vote. That is as it should be, as the Founders established it.

The people who send us here should have the equivalent right to vote for their Representative. There shouldn't be a way that one person in one State has an adequate right to vote but the vote is suppressed in some other State. That is not democracy; that is not fair; and that is what H.R. 1 will fix.

Madam Chair, I urge that we oppose the gentleman from Georgia's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 72, insert after line 2 the following:

SEC. 1052. LOWERING MANDATORY MINIMUM VOTING AGE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

(a) LOWERING VOTING AGE TO 16 YEARS OF AGE.—A State may not refuse to permit an individual to register to vote or vote in an election for Federal office held in the State on the grounds of the individual's age if the individual will be at least 16 years of age on the date of the election.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to elections held in 2020 or any succeeding year.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

H.R. 1 is bold, transformative legislation which seeks to restore the people's faith that government works for the public interest, not special interests.

We were sent to Washington with a sacred task to do everything in our power to reinstate Americans' hope and faith in our democracy.

My amendment to H.R. 1 strikes at one of the fundamental goals of this

legislation by ensuring that those who have a stake in our democracy will also have a say in our democracy. By lowering the voting age from 18 to 16 years of age, my amendment will allow young people to have a say in our Federal elections, to help shape and inform the policies that will set the course for the future.

From gun violence to climate change, our young people are organizing, mobilizing, and calling us to action. They are at the forefront of social and legislative movements and have earned inclusion in our democracy.

Beginning at the age of 16, young people are contributing to both the labor force and their local economies by paying income taxes, and yet they are deprived of the opportunity to exercise their right to vote.

In this country, we affirm that when a person walks into the voting booth and pulls that lever, there is no meritocracy or hierarchy. The booth is the equalizer.

Despite many reasons in our lives growing up—in my family—to feel invisible and small, my mother reminded me, as a super voter each election day that, on this day, we were powerful. I believed that then, and I still do. When we step into that voting booth, we bring the totality of our lived experiences. The vote we cast absorbs and honors it all.

Some have questioned the maturity of our youth. I don't.

A 16-year-old in 2019 possesses a wisdom and maturity that comes from 2019 challenges, hardships, and threats.

A 16-year-old will bring with them the 2019 fears that their father's insulin will run out before the next paycheck.

A 17-year-old will bring with them the 2019 hopes to be the first in their family to earn a college degree.

A 16-year-old will bring with them the 2019 lessons they learned picking up shifts, waiting tables to support their family while their mother was deployed.

A 17-year-old will bring with them the 2019 solemn vow to honor the lives of their classmate stolen by a gunman.

And now is the time for us to demonstrate the 2019 courage that matches the challenges of the modern-day 16- and 17-year-old.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Representatives MENG and SCHKOWSKY, for their leadership on this issue and for cosponsoring my amendment; the Rules Committee, under the leadership of Chairman MCGOVERN, for bringing my amendment to the House floor for consideration; and I also wish to thank my staff, Aissa and Lynese, specifically.

Madam Chair, I respectfully request my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

Ms. MENG. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) for yielding her time.

I strongly agree with my friend from Massachusetts. I thank her for sponsoring this important amendment, and

I am proud to cosponsor it with her. It addresses a crucial and often ignored issue that I have been fighting to raise awareness of during my time in Congress.

I have met with students across the State of New York and across the country and am incredibly impressed with their drive and passion directed at the democratic process.

Across the country, these students are getting involved. They are marching. They are advocating for their generation's future, and they are asserting their position in our society.

This is why I am proud to have introduced a constitutional amendment in the 115th and the 116th Congress to lower the voting age to 16 for Federal, State, and local elections.

The amendment in front of us today gives 16-year-olds the right to vote in Federal elections. In localities that have already granted 16-year-olds the right to vote, we have seen an increase in voter participation and better debate.

Madam Chair, 16-year-olds participate in our democracy already. They are legally permitted to work. They pay Federal taxes on their income and can even be tried as adults in court. It is only just that they are given the right to vote.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) for championing this cause. I know this fight will continue.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY), my new colleague, for participating in the legislative process. This is why we are here. We are here to debate the issues, whether we agree or disagree. That is what this institution is all about. And it is great to see new Members be active on very important issues.

I have to say, I think there might be a constitutional issue with this amendment. The last time we lowered the voting age, in 1971, I believe we had 18-year-olds fighting for our country in Vietnam.

It seemed wrong back then. The kids that were eligible for the draft. Through no fault of their own, through no choice of their own, they were asked to go fight for our freedoms in a foreign country. Being 1 year old at the time, I don't really remember that debate, but I can tell you, it was the right thing to do.

However, for constitutional reasons—and, also, I am of the opinion that we shouldn't arbitrarily lower the voting age just because, right now, I believe Democrats think they will gain more votes.

H.R. 1 is bad enough because I believe it will institutionalize a Democrat ma-

ajority here in this House of Representatives, but to be so brash and, possibly, unconstitutional to decide and lower the voting age only for political reasons is something that I don't think this institution should be doing.

I have two 18-year-old boys who got to cast their first vote this year. There was some thought before election day. I didn't know if I would get their votes, but since then, they told me they have voted for me. And a close race like mine, it made a difference.

But this policy is not well thought out. It is not constitutional, and it should not be part of this bill. I am going to urge a "no" vote.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Chair, I respectfully disagree with the gentleman from Illinois, and I, too, appreciate the opportunity to engage in a civil discourse with him.

The data supports the fact that by extending the table of democracy, given what we have learned in Maryland, that, in fact, we have seen more robust voter participation by both 16- and 17-year-olds and those over the age of 18. I think that we should be cultivating that relationship with the young people and their government and their participation as early as possible.

Although a constitutional amendment is one approach, I do think that we have a mandate from this electorate, as a Congress, to be bold; and this is the opportunity to do exactly that, and we should be acting.

There is nothing spontaneous about this. There have been advocates who have been organizing in communities for decades on this very issue and, of course, colleagues in this very House.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, how much time is remaining?

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I just want to share a thought on this.

It is interesting that recently we just raised the alcohol purchasing age to 21. We don't allow a 16-year-old to buy a beer, and the decisionmaking is because of their ability to reason at that age. That is why we moved their ability to buy a simple beer to age 21. And now the other side wants to grant a 16-year-old the ability to decide the future of the country. I think this is foolish.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, it is a great debate to have.

The problem we have here in this country, all 16-year-olds are still legally minors. They can't be tried as adults in the court of law unless, under special circumstances, of heinous crimes.

They can't join the military. They won't even be eligible for the draft that took so many of our young men to Southeast Asia, where many never came home, the last time the voting age was lowered.

In some States, 16-year-olds can't even drive their car alone. They can't take out a loan. They can't take out a mortgage. They can't open a credit card. And they can't even run for the offices that we would be asking them to be allowed to vote for.

This is an amendment that has political reasons behind it. It is the reason that I believe the Democrats are pushing it. It is because they believe they will be able to increase the number of Democrat votes that are put forth in the next election.

This institution should not be used for that. This bill is political enough. This bill, as a whole, is nothing more than a charade to make permanent the Democratic majority that just came into existence just a few months ago.

□ 1300

That is why I believe H.R. 1 is a bill that should be voted against. Please vote "no" on H.R. 1, and please vote "no" on this amendment for the reasons that I put forth.

Again, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts and my colleague from New York for being here and participating in this process.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TENNESSEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 315, line 1, strike "**Relating to Illicit Money Undermining Our Democracy**".

Page 317, insert after line 6 the following: **SEC. 4002. FINDINGS RELATING TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH AS A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) The First Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees the most fundamental right of our democratic society: "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech".

(2) The right to free speech guarantees that the American people can freely speak about their political beliefs.

(3) The Federal government should not concern itself with the political ideology or affiliation of any of its citizens, when applying the law, offering services, or evaluating applications for federal benefits or awards.

(4) The protection of free speech is broad and covers expressive and political speech.

(5) Political speech, including the financial contributions to political or issue advocacy campaigns, is a vital part of our Nation's free exchange of ideas and avenues of free expression must be preserved and protected.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today to offer my amendment expressing the sense of Congress that free speech should be protected.

H.R. 1 is a misguided bill with many problems. One problem, in particular, has united everyone from the Heritage Foundation to the ACLU. It is the bill's assault on free speech.

The ACLU itself says H.R. 1 will "chill speech essential to our public discourse." When the ACLU admonishes a Democrat bill, everyone should take notice.

My amendment is simple. It reaffirms the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The First Amendment, after all, guarantees the most fundamental right of our Democratic society: "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech."

Our Founding Fathers knew that in order for the American experiment to work, the people must be free: free to participate in the democratic process, free to vote in elections, free to help candidates and causes they believe in, and free to speak up when their elected officials are no longer representing them.

The freedom of speech enshrined in the First Amendment has helped make America the most exceptional country in the history of the world. Unfortunately, H.R. 1 tramples on that very freedom.

Madam Chair, I offer this amendment to express the sense of Congress that the freedom of speech must be preserved and protected because, without it, the American experiment won't ever be the same again.

A vote against this amendment is a vote against free speech. If you don't believe me, ask the ACLU.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chairwoman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, reluctantly, because it is only the last paragraph in the amendment that causes concern.

The amendment expresses a sense of Congress that free speech should be protected. Who can disagree with that? Our Founding Fathers envisioned a robust and open discourse. They did not fathom speech that was unaccountable to anonymous corporations that would drown out the voices of individual Americans.

The concern we have on this amendment is the last paragraph, really, is an attempt to protect the Citizens United decision and the flow of unlimited dark money into our politics and elections.

It is important to note that, under the guise of free speech, some are suggesting that we need to protect anonymous special interests. Nothing stops people or entities from donating to political campaigns or politicians, but they must be transparent about it.

Justice Brandeis indicated, and I think he is very wise, that sunshine is the best disinfectant, and the American people cannot fully exercise their First Amendment rights if they do not have all of the information necessary to react in an informed manner.

We all have the right to know who is trying to influence elections, and it may well change our minds if we know who is saying what. Ultimately, this amendment is flawed because disclosure does not limit speech.

In *Citizens United*, the Court affirmed holdings in other cases, that disclaimer and disclosure requirements impose no ceiling on campaign-related activities and do not prevent anyone from speaking. Indeed, the Court held the disclosure is "a less restrictive alternative to more comprehensive regulations."

Lauded conservatives have long espoused this principle, and the Supreme Court has repeatedly endorsed disclosure because it helps voters hold elected leaders accountable. In fact, eight of the nine Supreme Court Justices upheld disclosure in the *Citizens United* case as necessary for voters to hold leaders accountable.

Perhaps no one said it better than Justice Antonin Scalia in *Doe v. Reed*. Justice Scalia said: "Requiring people to stand up in public for their political acts fosters civic courage, without which democracy is doomed."

Much has been said about the ACLU, and I appreciate what the ACLU does on many scores, but they have a storied history of litigating constitutional issues that I support. However, we have differed on our approach to campaign finance laws. They have upheld and supported the *Citizens United* decision and they oppose McCain-Feingold. While I support so much of the good work they do, I think they are mistaken on this issue.

I include in the RECORD a letter from Democracy 21, which is a very thoughtful rebuttal to the ACLU's position.

DEMOCRACY 21,

March 7, 2019.

Re Response to ACLU Letter on H.R. 1.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Democracy 21 strongly supports H.R. 1, the "For the People

Act of 2019," and urges you to vote for the legislation, which is the most comprehensive effort to repair our democracy since the post-Watergate reforms of the 1970's.

In particular, the bill contains a series of important reforms to address serious problems with our campaign finance system. The legislation provides a small donor, matching funds system for House and presidential elections that will encourage small donations and remove candidate dependence on wealthy contributors and special interest money. It also contains important improvements to the disclosure laws to address the growing problem of undisclosed "dark money" that is being spent to influence federal elections. And it provides effective standards to ensure that supposedly "independent" spending is not done in cooperation or coordination with candidates or their agents, thus evading contribution limits.

We want to address constitutional concerns about some of these measures that have been raised by the ACLU in a letter dated March 6, 2019. We note that the ACLU has participated as a plaintiff or amicus to seek invalidation of reform measures in key Supreme Court cases, including *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1 (1976), *McConnell v. FEC*, 540 U.S. 93 (2003) and *Citizens United v. FEC*, 130 S.Ct. 876 (2010). Many of the ACLU's challenges to campaign finance reform measures, including disclosure requirements, were rejected by the Court in these cases.

ACLU concerns about disclosure provisions

The provisions of the DISCLOSE Act incorporated into H.R. 1 are essential to closing gaping disclosure loopholes through which, in the last four elections, wealthy donors and special interests gave \$1 billion in secret, unlimited contributions to nonprofit groups that spent the money to influence federal elections. Unlimited, secret contributions, also known as dark money, are the most dangerous contributions in American politics because there is no way to hold the donor and officeholder accountable for corrupt practices.

In its March 6 letter, the ACLU particularly criticizes the DISCLOSE Act incorporated into H.R. 1. Those provisions require disclosure of the sources of funding used for "campaign-related disbursements" that are intended to influence federal elections. Dating back to the *Buckley* case, and as reaffirmed in *Citizens United*, the Supreme Court has consistently upheld disclosure requirements because they serve the important governmental interests of "providing the electorate with information about the sources of election-related spending" in order to help citizens "make informed choices in the political marketplace." *Citizens United*, 130 S. Ct. at 914.

As Justice Kennedy wrote for an 8-1 majority in *Citizens United*, disclosure provisions "impose no ceiling on campaign-related activities" and "do not prevent anyone from speaking." *Id.* In *Citizens United*, the Supreme Court upheld disclosure provisions applicable to section 501(c)(4) nonprofit groups.

The ACLU's principal objection is that H.R. 1 requires disclosure of spending that "reaches beyond the bounds" of express advocacy. ACLU Ltr. at 12. Yet the Court in *Citizens United* addressed precisely this issue and upheld a disclosure requirement for a broadcast ad that referred to a candidate in the pre-election period, but that did not contain express advocacy.

The Court explicitly stated that "we reject *Citizens United's* contention that the disclosure requirement must be limited to speech that is the functional equivalent of express advocacy." *Id.* at 916.

Thus, the principal constitutional argument raised by the ACLU with regard to the

DISCLOSE Act—that disclosure requirements cannot extend beyond express advocacy—has already been squarely and overwhelmingly rejected by an 8 to 1 vote in the Supreme Court. While the ACLU states that it particularly objects to disclosure requirements for “electioneering communications,” i.e., non-express advocacy ads that refer to a candidate in the pre-election period, ACLU Ltr. at 13, this is the very issue that the Court addressed in upholding such disclosure requirements in *Citizens United*.

The ACLU also objects to disclosure requirements for money spent on ads that promote, support, attack or oppose (PASO) the election of a candidate, complaining about “applying vague and subjective standards to regulation of political speech.” ACLU Ltr. at 14. Yet again, the Supreme Court directly addressed this issue, and rejected an identical criticism of the same test in the *McConnell* case.

In *McConnell*, the Court stated that the words used in the PASO test—promote, attack, support, oppose—are not unconstitutionally vague because they “‘provide explicit standards for those who apply them’ and ‘give the person of ordinary intelligence a reasonable opportunity to know what is prohibited.’” 540 U.S. at 170 n. 64 (internal citations omitted).

The Court further stated that “any public communication that promotes or attacks a clearly identified federal candidate directly affects the election in which he is participating. The record on this score could scarcely be more abundant.” Id. at 170. These rulings should put to rest the objections raised by the ACLU about the PASO test.

The ACLU also raises privacy and associational concerns with the disclosure requirements in the legislation. It invokes the Court’s decision in *NAACP v. Alabama*, 357 U.S. 459 (1958), which protected the associational interests of a civil rights group against disclosure of the group’s membership lists when the group was under attack from government officials in the 1950s South. We note that the NAACP today is itself a supporter of H.R. 1, and that the disclosure provisions in H.R. 1 could not be more different from the disclosure requirements addressed by the Court in the 1958 *NAACP* decision.

The DISCLOSE Act provisions in H.R. 1 require disclosure only of donors who give \$10,000 or more in a two-year election cycle to a group which engages in campaign-related spending. That high dollar threshold alone will exclude disclosure of the vast majority of donors to, and members of, most membership organizations, and instead will require disclosure only of very large donors to such groups.

Furthermore, the Supreme Court in both *Buckley* and *McConnell* has already rejected the analogy between campaign finance disclosure requirements and the disclosure of membership lists that was struck down in the *NAACP* case. The Court said in *McConnell*, “In *Buckley*, unlike *NAACP*, we found no evidence that any party had been exposed to economic reprisals or physical threats as a result of the compelled disclosure.” Id. at 198.

Indeed, H.R. 1 has an explicit safe harbor from disclosure for any donor who may be subject to “serious threats, harassment or reprisals.” Sec. 4111(a) adding Sec. 324(a)(3)(C). This again aligns with the Supreme Court’s requirements on this issue.

The Court has made clear that disclosure requirements are not invalid because of a generalized or theoretical concern about “public harassment,” but instead are invalid only in specific cases where a group can show a “reasonable probability” that disclosing the names of its contributors would “subject to threats, harassment, or reprisals

from either Government officials or private parties.” *Citizens United*, 130 S.Ct. at 916.

Absent such a showing, campaign finance disclosure requirements are constitutional. And even if there is such a specific showing of a specific threat, the disclosure requirements would be held unconstitutional only for the specific group involved based on the specific showing of harm to that group. The disclosure laws would otherwise remain constitutional.

The ACLU states a concern that the bill would “require disclosure of an overbroad number of donors,” ACLU Ltr. at 15, but it fails to acknowledge or to give proper weight to other protections for privacy interests that are contained in the bill. A group can set up a separate bank account for its spending on campaign-related disbursements and then is required to disclose only those donors of \$10,000 or more to this separate account. All other donors to the organization would not be disclosed.

In addition, any donor can restrict his or her donation to the organization from being used for campaign-related disbursements. If the group agrees to the restriction and segregates the money, the identity of the donor is not disclosed. By these measures, groups and donors can ensure that donors whose funds are not used for campaign-related expenditures are not subject to any disclosure, thereby respecting any donor’s particularized privacy interests.

ACLU concerns about coordination provisions

A second area of concern with H.R. 1 raised by the ACLU is the provisions related to strengthening the coordination rules in the campaign finance laws. These rules play a major role in protecting the integrity and efficacy of contribution limits which are, in turn, the major bulwark against corruption.

While independent spending is not subject to contribution limits, any spending that is coordinated with a candidate or his agents is treated as a contribution and therefore is subject to limits. Because of weak rules and even weaker enforcement by the Federal Election Commission, the existing coordination rules do not effectively restrain campaign-related spending by Super PACs, non-profit groups and other outside spenders from being functionally coordinated with the candidates supported by the spending.

In this fashion, the rise of individual-candidate Super PACs has played an especially pernicious role. These Super PACs are typically set up with the involvement of the candidate or his or her close associates, and the candidate is often involved in helping to raise unlimited huge contributions for the Super PAC.

This money is then spent, purportedly independently of the candidate, to promote the candidate’s election. But because there are not effective rules against coordination, these individual-candidate Super PACs have operated in *de facto* coordination with the candidates they are set up to support. In practice, they have become dedicated soft money campaign accounts for candidates, thus eviscerating the contribution limits which should apply to money raised and spent by federal candidates.

While the use of individual-candidate Super PACs began after *Citizens United* with presidential candidates in 2012, they rapidly have spread to congressional races. By the 2018 election cycle, 259 individual-candidate Super PACs supporting federal officeholders and other candidates had raised \$176 million in unlimited contributions.

The coordination provisions in H.R. 1 strengthen existing coordination rules to conform to Supreme Court decisions which require independent spending to be “totally”

independent of a candidate. *Buckley*, 424 U.S. at 47.

The ACLU tempers its objections to these provisions of the bill, noting that it “strongly supports stricter enforcement of rules restricting coordination between campaigns and outside groups” and acknowledging that “H.R. 1 would make strides in the right direction by clarifying the definition of coordinated expenditures treated as contributions to a campaign.” ACLU Ltr. at 17. Yet it objects that the definition of coordination could encompass “communications with the candidate about the public policy issues of the day without a sufficient nexus to the potential corrupting influence of very large expenditures.” Id. at 18.

In stating this objection, the ACLU fails to give proper weight to an explicit provision in the bill which protects such communications by creating a safe harbor from application of the coordination rules for any person’s “discussions with the candidate or committee, or with any agent of the candidate or committee, regarding that person’s position on a legislative or policy matter (including urging the candidate or committee to adopt that person’s position) . . .” Sec. 6102 adding sec. 326(b)(2).

The ACLU acknowledges this safe harbor, Ltr. at 19, but misinterprets it. As set forth in the text of the bill, the safe harbor applies to legislative or policy discussion “so long as there is no communication between the person and the candidate or committee . . . regarding the candidate’s or committee’s campaign advertising, message, strategy or policy,” id. (emphasis added).

The ACLU’s concern that “[d]iscussion of ‘message’ or ‘policy’ is integral to discussion of legislative and policy positions,” id., is already adequately addressed by the safe harbor provision, which permits all legislative message and policy discussion so long as it is not about campaign policy, or the campaign’s message.

Raising additional concerns, the ACLU objects to treatment as a coordinated expenditure of a payment by an outside spender for republication of a candidate’s own campaign material, although it correctly notes that this same republication provision has long been part of existing law. ACLU Ltr. at 18. It notes that there are regulations issued by the FEC which have interpreted this provision of existing law, and claims those regulations are necessary to the constitutionality of the law. Even if true, there is nothing in H.R. 1 which would prevent the FEC from similarly construing the bill’s re-promulgation of the same republication language, which is all that the bill does on this matter.

Finally, the ACLU notes that the coordination provisions of H.R. 1 create a new category of “coordinated spenders,” based on certain specified relationships, activities or status between candidates and outside spenders. The bill then provides that certain specified categories of campaign-related spending by such “coordinated spenders” will be treated as coordinated. The ACLU questions whether such treatment can be “based solely upon a speaker’s identity.” ACLU Ltr. at 19.

This is, at best, a half-hearted objection because the ACLU also then “agrees that a speaker’s identity coupled with the contents of the communications can be factors in determining whether a particular communication was coordinated with a candidate such that it should be considered a campaign contribution.” Id. The ACLU nonetheless questions whether spending can be treated as coordinated “absent any additional information indicating the speaker acted pursuant to a common plan.” Id.

But the Court has never limited the definition of coordinated spending only to spending pursuant to an explicit discussion about,

or a “common plan” for, a particular expenditure. The Court has instead cast a wide net in demanding that independent spending be “totally independent,” *Buckley*, 424 U.S. at 29, and “not pursuant to any general or particular understanding with a candidate,” *Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee v. FEC*, 518 U.S. 604, 614 (1996), and “truly independent” or “without any candidate’s approval (or wink or nod).” *FEC v. Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee*, 533 U.S. 431, 442 (2001).

The standards set forth in H.R. 1 look both to certain relationships between the outside spender and the candidate, and certain activities between the outside spender and the candidate, to determine whether the spending meets the standard set by the Court of being “totally” and “truly” independent. If the relationship between the candidate and spender, or the activities of the candidate on behalf of the spender (such as helping to fundraise for the spender), indicate that they do not meet this high standard for true independence, then the proposed rule would appropriately deem spending by that person to be coordinated.

Conclusion

The reforms contained in H.R. 1 will make essential improvements in the transparency of the money spent to influence federal elections and in shutting down avenues that are currently being exploited to evade and eviscerate candidate contribution limits. The bill is carefully drafted to conform to the Supreme Court’s campaign finance rulings, and to appropriately balance constitutionally protected privacy and speech interests with the government’s compelling interests in deterring corruption and the appearance of corruption through disclosure and the restoration of effective contribution limits.

Democracy 21 urges you to vote for H.R. 1. Sincerely,

FRED WERTHEIMER,
President.
DONALD J. SIMON,
Counsel.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I would note, also, that we have just received a letter from The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights expressing their strong support for H.R. 1. This is an organization that no one can fault for their firm leadership on human, civil, and constitutional rights for many decades.

I include in the RECORD a letter from The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE
ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2019.

Support H.R. 1, the For The People Act.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, a coalition of more than 200 national organizations committed to promoting and protecting the civil and human rights of all persons in the United States, and the 50 undersigned organizations, we write in strong support of H.R. 1, the For The People Act.

H.R. 1 represents a transformative vision for American democracy. It would create a democracy that welcomes every eligible voter’s chance to participate in civic life, and a democracy that demands integrity, fairness, and transparency in our nation’s elections. For far too long, voter suppression has been a shameful reality in our country—undercutting the power and representation of African Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, Native Americans, and other groups historically excluded from our

political process. The ability to meaningfully participate in our democracy is a racial justice issue. It is a civil rights issue. And the need for legislative action is urgent. We commend the 235 House co-sponsors of this critical legislation.

Our nation will soon mark the 54th anniversary of the Bloody Sunday march, where John Lewis and 600 voting rights activists were viciously beaten and attacked on March 7, 1965 on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama. History was made in August 1965 with the passage of the landmark Voting Rights Act (“VRA”), which sought to end racial discrimination at the ballot box. Nearly five decades later, in 2013, five justices of the Supreme Court gutted the VRA’s most powerful tool—the preclearance system. That system had enabled the Justice Department and federal courts to block proposed discriminatory voting restrictions in states with well-documented histories of discrimination.

In the aftermath of the *Shelby County v. Holder* decision, North Carolina, Texas, and other jurisdictions previously covered in whole or part by the VRA preclearance requirement began to implement voter suppression laws. In striking down the North Carolina law in 2016, the Fourth Circuit described the law as “the most restrictive voting law North Carolina has seen since the era of Jim Crow” with provisions that “target African Americans with almost surgical precision.” There have been findings of intentional discrimination in at least 10 voting rights decisions since *Shelby County*.

The Trump administration has only made matters worse by damaging our democracy and institutions—from elections to the census to the free press. The administration’s assault on voting rights can be seen in the creation of the sham Pence-Kobach commission, a political ploy that was ultimately discredited and disbanded. We also saw it in its defense of Texas’s discriminatory photo ID law and Ohio’s voter purge efforts. The Trump administration has not filed a single VRA case, despite numerous recent state and local efforts to block access to the ballot in communities of color. Yet the Trump administration cited its need to enforce the VRA as its justification for adding an untested citizenship question to the 2020 Census—a justification that a federal judge recently found to be pretextual and unlawful.

People turned out in record numbers during the 2018 election to reject this assault on voting rights and cast their votes for democracy reform. Not only is this reflected in the most diverse Congress in our nation’s history, but voters also cast their ballot to end gerrymandering and make voting more accessible in red and blue states across the country. However, many states continue to create barriers to voting, and that is why H.R. 1 is so critical.

H.R. 1 would enhance and ensure democracy in America by:

Committing to restoring the Voting Rights Act: H.R. 1 contains a commitment to restoring the landmark VRA and updating its preclearance provision, which is crucial to ensuring that our political process functions fairly and equitably. VRA restoration is being pursued on a separate legislative track that will involve investigatory and evidentiary hearings, thus enabling Congress to update the preclearance coverage formula and develop a full record on the continuing problem of racial discrimination in voting. In 2006, the VRA was reauthorized on a unanimous vote in the Senate and a near-unanimous vote in the House. We need the same type of broad and bipartisan support for restoring the VRA today. Safeguarding democracy should not be a partisan issue.

Restoring voting rights for formerly incarcerated people: H.R. 1 would restore voting

rights for people with felony convictions, a necessary repudiation of our nation’s discriminatory and racially violent past. This would re-enfranchise approximately 4.7 million voters nationwide. Reforming felony disenfranchisement has bipartisan support; last November, 65 percent of Florida voters cast their ballots to restore the right to vote for over 1.4 million people.

Reforming voter registration: In the November 2016 election, nearly 20 percent of people who were eligible but did not vote cited registration hurdles as the main reason for not voting. H.R. 1 would modernize America’s voter registration system and improve access to the ballot box by establishing automatic voter registration (“AVR”), same day registration (“SDR”), and online voter registration for voters across the country, and by ensuring that all voter registration systems are inclusive and accessible for people with disabilities. AVR alone could add an estimated 50 million people to the voter rolls and SDR increases voter turnout by roughly 10 percent.

Combating voter purging: H.R. 1 would overturn the Supreme Court’s troubling 2018 decision in *Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Institute* that allowed Ohio to conduct massive purges from its voter rolls based on non-voting in past elections. Such practices disproportionately target and remove traditionally marginalized people from registration rolls. Voting should not be a “use it or lose it” right.

Prohibiting deceptive practices and voter intimidation: H.R. 1 would ban the distribution of false information about elections to hinder or discourage voting. This provision is particularly important in an era in which Facebook and other digital platforms have been readily manipulated to spread misinformation about the time, place, and manner of voting to vulnerable communities. The bill would also increase the criminal penalties for intimidating a voter for the purpose of interfering with their right to vote, or causing them to vote for or against a candidate.

Banning voter caging: H.R. 1 would ban voter caging and prevent challenges to voters’ eligibility to vote by individuals who are not election officials, unless the challenge is accompanied by an oath under penalty of perjury that the challenger has a good faith factual basis to believe the person is ineligible to vote or register to vote.

Creating a federal holiday and ensuring early voting and polling place notice: H.R. 1 would make Election Day a federal holiday. It would also require at least 15 consecutive days of early voting, including weekends, in federal elections and ensure that early voting polling places are accessible by public transportation. The bill would also require that voters be given a minimum of seven days’ notice if the state decides to change their polling place location.

Reforming redistricting: H.R. 1 would be a milestone in the battle against the extreme partisan gerrymandering our country has witnessed in recent years, by requiring states to draw congressional districts using independent redistricting commissions that are bipartisan and reflect the demographic diversity of the region. The bill would establish fair redistricting criteria and ensure compliance with the VRA to safeguard voting rights for communities of color.

Modernizing election administration: H.R. 1 would reauthorize the Election Assistance Commission—an independent, bipartisan commission that plays a vital role in ensuring the reliability and security of voting equipment used in our nation’s elections. It would also promote election reliability and

security by requiring voter-verified permanent paper ballots and enhanced poll worker recruitment and training. And H.R. 1 would prohibit state election administrators from taking an active part in a political campaign over which they have supervisory authority.

H.R. 1 would also make significant advances in the areas of campaign finance and ethics reform. It would correct the rampant corruption flowing from the corrosive power of money in our elections. It would replace the current campaign finance system that empowers the super-rich and big corporations with one that relies on small donors and public matching funds. It would end secret election spending and force disclosure of all election-related spending. And it would call for a constitutional amendment to overturn the disturbing Citizens United decision that made it impossible to restrict outside spending by corporations or billionaires. In addition, H.R. 1 addresses our government ethics crisis by, among other things, requiring the development of a code of conduct for Supreme Court Justices to enhance accountability on ethics and recusal issues; overhauling the Office of Government Ethics to strengthen federal ethics oversight; establishing more robust conflict of interest requirements for government officials; prohibiting members of Congress from using taxpayer dollars to settle allegations of employment discrimination; and requiring presidents to disclose their tax returns.

H.R. 1—the For the People Act—provides a North Star for the democracy reform agenda. It is a bold, comprehensive reform package that offers solutions to a broken democracy. Repairing and modernizing our voting system goes hand in hand with reforms that address the rampant corruption flowing from the corrosive power of money in our elections, and reforms that address the myriad ethical problems that plague all three branches of the federal government. The reforms in H.R. 1 are necessary to advance racial justice and ensure that our government works for all people, not just a powerful few. The civil and human rights coalition is strongly committed to expanding the franchise and fixing our democracy, and we urge Congress to pass this historic legislation.

Sincerely,

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; AFL-CIO; African American Ministers In Action; American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees; American Federation of Teachers; Asian Americans Advancing Justice; Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL-CIO; Brennan Center for Justice; Center for Community Self-Help; Center for Constitutional Rights; Center for Responsible Lending; CLASP; Clearinghouse on Women's Issues; Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA); Common Cause.

Council on American-Islamic Relations; Demos; Fair Elections Center; Faith in Public Life; Feminist Majority Foundation; Franciscan Action Network; Hispanic Federation; Human Rights Campaign; Justice for Migrant Women; Juvenile Law Center; Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; League of Conservation Voters; League of Women Voters; U.S. MALDEF; Matthew Shepard Foundation.

Muslim Public Affairs Council; NAACP; NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.; NARAL Pro-Choice America; National Action Network; National Association of Social Workers; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Coalition for the Homeless; National Council of Jewish Women; National Education Association; National Employment Law Project.

National Employment Lawyers Association; National Immigration Law Center; National Organization for Women; NETWORK

Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; People For the American Way; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Prison Policy Initiative; Service Employees International Union (SEIU); Sierra Club; UFCW Minority Coalition.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chairwoman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chairwoman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I just want to make a few specific comments in regard to the amendment and how it impacts H.R. 1 in general.

First, there are no special interest protections in this amendment, none whatsoever. I remind my colleagues of what the ACLU actually said about H.R. 1. It places a chill on "speech essential to our public discourse."

Further, I would like to stress that the Court has long affirmed the rights of individuals and organizations to have free speech.

With those comments and clarifications, Madam Chairwoman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, we have no additional speakers at this point.

I would just note that—and I understand the gentleman's points one through four. I completely agree. It is number five in your amendment that causes me concern about whether there is actually an undercutting of H.R. 1's disclosure requirements, and that is the concern we have and why I am so sorry that I cannot support the amendment.

I do think that we have a disagreement over disclosure. I don't understand why, because the Supreme Court, including Justice Scalia, recommended that to us, and we never followed up with Justice Scalia's admonition that we should have disclosure as a remedy for concern over unlimited money.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chairwoman, I would just like to read that point five. This is what it actually says: "Political speech, including the financial contributions to political or issue advocacy campaigns, is a vital part of our Nation's free exchange of ideas and avenues of free expression must be preserved and protected."

That is all it says, let the American people decide. That is essentially what it says, that free speech should be protected.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I understand, but the concern that has been expressed to me by a number of people who have read this, probably lawyers who spent more time on constitutional cases than I have, is that the concern is that this, as a part of the bill, would undercut the disclosure requirements that are established

within it, and that is the reason we cannot come to an agreement.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. In conclusion, Madam Chairwoman, again, as I look at that point five, or paragraph five, supporting the free exchange of ideas and avenues of free expression, I struggle to see where disclosure issues are raised in that paragraph.

But as my colleagues, I have no one else to comment on the bill. I am ready to have the amendment considered, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of subtitle A of title I the following:

PART 8—PROVIDING VOTER REGISTRATION INFORMATION TO SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

SEC. 1081. PILOT PROGRAM FOR PROVIDING VOTER REGISTRATION INFORMATION TO SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS PRIOR TO GRADUATION.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—The Election Assistance Commission (hereafter in this part referred to as the "Commission") shall carry out a pilot program under which the Commission shall provide funds during the one-year period beginning after the date of the enactment of this part to eligible local educational agencies for initiatives to provide information on registering to vote in elections for public office to secondary school students in the 12th grade.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—A local educational agency is eligible to receive funds under the pilot program under this part if the agency submits to the Commission, at such time and in such form as the Commission may require, an application containing—

(1) a description of the initiatives the agency intends to carry out with the funds;

(2) an estimate of the costs associated with such initiatives; and

(3) such other information and assurances as the Commission may require.

(c) CONSULTATION WITH ELECTION OFFICIALS.—A local educational agency receiving funds under the pilot program shall consult with the State and local election officials who are responsible for administering elections for public office in the area served by the agency in developing the initiatives the agency will carry out with the funds.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this part, the terms "local educational agency" and "secondary

school” have the meanings given such terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).
SEC. 1082. REPORTS.

(a) **REPORTS BY RECIPIENTS OF FUNDS.**—Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period which begins on the date of the receipt of the funds, each local educational agency receiving funds under the pilot program under this part shall submit a report to the Commission describing the initiatives carried out with the funds and analyzing their effectiveness.

(b) **REPORT BY COMMISSION.**—Not later than the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date the Commission receives the final report submitted by a local educational agency under subsection (a), the Commission shall submit a report to Congress on the pilot program under this part.

SEC. 1083. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this part.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I thank the gentle, yet courageous, lady from California for leading this floor discussion debate, if you will. I thank the Rules Committee for allowing this rule, this amendment to be in order, and I also would like to thank my staff for the stellar, outstanding job they have done to help bring this amendment to the floor.

Madam Chairwoman, on November 19, 1863, the 16th President of the United States of America standing near the battlefield at Gettysburg proclaimed that “government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the Earth.” That is what our bill, H.R. 1, is all about, government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Madam Chairwoman, you cannot have government of the people, by the people, for the people without the precious right to vote. The right to vote is something that people have fought for in this country. Dr. King marched for it; JOHN LEWIS went to jail for it, the Honorable JOHN LEWIS, a Member of this House; Schwerner, Goodman, Chaney died for it.

The right to vote, H.R. 1, is about protecting the right to vote. This amendment is one that will help us to inculcate new, young people into the voting process. The amendment simply allows those who are in high school to receive voter registration information while they are in school on the school campus.

□ 1315

It does not change the laws related to registration and qualification to vote. It merely allows the principal at a school to go to the young people and provide them with voter registration information so that they may decide. It does not impose upon them a duty to register, but it does give them the opportunity to. This is a good thing in a country where we believe that govern-

ment of the people and by the people shall not perish from the Earth.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the basis of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I am not opposed to what this amendment does, although I would point out, once again, this is another unfunded mandate. This is another cost that the CBO has already said, from what they can score, this bill is going to cost taxpayers \$2.8 billion with a potential for billions more for what they couldn't even offer a congressional budget score for. So I have some issues with that, although I appreciate the direction my colleague is going with this.

I think providing voter registration materials at schools is something that is probably being done now. I would hope that local county clerks—I know mine are—are already doing that. But I am not opposed to that language.

However, I disagree with my colleague from Texas that H.R. 1 is a bill by the people and for the people. Frankly, I believe every single American who is eligible to vote should have their vote counted and they should have their vote protected.

We all, as Americans—Republicans and Democrats—want every vote to count. We want to make sure everyone can get registered to vote. At a time in our country when registration turnout is exceedingly high compared to previous generations, we are doing that.

Make no mistake about it. This bill is not by the people. H.R. 1 is not for the people. H.R. 1 is for the Members of Congress who sit in this institution who are going to eventually get tax dollars to pay for their own campaign ads. That is why this bill is a bad bill. I appreciate the amendment that my colleague is offering, but by no means is H.R. 1 going to ensure that we have the protection to ensure that every eligible American voter has their vote counted and protected.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. This is a splendid amendment. It will do a lot to allow young people to channel their excitement and to understand they are important and they are going to be participating as voters when they turn 18. It works well with the amendment that will be offered by Mr. NEGUSE later that allows for preregistration of 16- and 17-year-olds so that when they turn 18 they will automatically be registered to vote.

I know that there is some concern on both sides of the aisle about the idea of

a 16-year-old preregistering, that change in the voting eligibility. We don't know how that amendment will turn out, but certainly these amendments would do much to make sure that young people are thoroughly connected to our government and understand that the government belongs to them and their families.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I close with these words. This is a participatory democracy. If it is to function efficaciously, then the right to vote must be protected.

I join my colleague on the other side in his position that all votes should be counted and that every person who has the right to vote should be in a position to vote. This amendment helps to assure that young people will start to participate in the participatory democracy.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I would like to thank my colleague and friend from Texas (Mr. GREEN). Again, I agree with what Chairperson LOFGREN said about the excitement of students in high schools being able to understand what it means to be able to register to vote and participate in the political process. That is why I visit high schools throughout my district on a regular basis each time we are back from Washington, off this floor and in our districts for our district work period.

I am going to, again, extend the olive branch of bipartisanship to ensure that I am not going to oppose this amendment. I want this amendment to pass through, but I will note to many of my colleagues on the floor, Madam Chairman, we just had two Republican amendments offered, and not one passed. The olive branch of bipartisanship has to work both ways. I am, again, reaching out, and I will continue to do so throughout the day, but it is not without frustration that that olive branch has not yet been returned.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 142, insert after line 3 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

“(g) **PERMITTING VOTERS TO RETURN BALLOT TO POLLING PLACE ON DATE OF ELECTION.**—The State shall permit an individual to whom a ballot in an election was provided under this section to cast the ballot on the

date of election by delivering the ballot on that date to a polling place.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chairman, I urge support for the underlying legislation, H.R. 1, which in my mind reaffirms the right to vote and empowers the individual citizens in our democracy and empowers their role in our democracy over the wealthy special interests that has been the trend as of late.

My amendment asks that in the spirit of this bill, which is to protect voting rights, that we protect Americans who opt to vote by mail from unnecessary impediments to voting. Specifically, this amendment requires States to provide voters with an opportunity to return ballots at a polling place on election day.

At its face value, this might not seem like a drastic ask, but it merits consideration, granted efforts by States to shortchange eligible voters from casting their ballot by denying them the right to return the ballot on election day. In Arizona, about 228,000 people dropped off their ballots at the polling places on election day in November of this general election, a majority of which, I should add, were Republican voters.

The reason why I believe that my amendment should be supported is to protect the vote-by-mail process. In 2016, 16 States showed a combined percentage of greater than 50 percent of votes cast early, by mail, or via absentee ballots, including my State of Arizona. As more Americans chose to vote by mail, lawmakers in this Chamber should facilitate rather than hinder the right to vote by mail.

Voting by mail allows voters to take their time examining and researching the candidates and issues that align with their values, thus making that very important informed decision on election day. That only strengthens our democracy and empowers that individual voter.

Voting by mail also allows voters not to be constrained by work, school, family, or other sensitive matters that would hinder their ability to wait at polling places for long periods of time. As you well know, other portions of this legislation outline and address the issue of forcing voters to wait hours to cast their ballots, which is unacceptable. Voting by mail can help reduce these incidents and provide more options that are considerate of a person's lifestyle or their particular needs.

Vote by mail helps alleviate under-resourced, consolidated, or distant polling places from having an influx of voters on election day. By ensuring that all polling sites accept vote-by-mail ballots on election day, voters' confidence in the electoral process, I

believe, is upheld. Vote by mail is intended to increase voter participation during non-Presidential election years which tend to have overall lower voter turnout rates.

The scope of this legislation is to promote and protect the right to vote that every American citizen is entitled to. For many constituents, voting by mail is the most practical and convenient method to exercise that right. With ongoing efforts at all levels of governance to restrict voting, now more than ever it is important to ensure that regardless of voting in person or by mail that that vote is cast, processed, tabulated, and accepted as valid.

Madam Chair, I would hope that you would join me in ensuring States are not able to place harmful restrictions on voters. States should continue to do their due diligence and protect voters by allowing them to return their ballots on election day. Anything less would be a direct attack on voters' rights and would disenfranchise a growing percentage of nontraditional voters across this Nation.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I have a couple of questions. One question, in particular, is: If the gentleman from Arizona, Chairman GRIJALVA, has this information, I would like to know. This is already the process that we follow in my home State of Illinois.

Are there any States that don't allow this already that the gentleman is aware of?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I think there have been efforts in my home State to begin to restrict the use of election day dropping off of vote-by-mail forms and other discussions, and this is both a preventive and encouraging amendment that prevents any of those actions, and more importantly, to encourage States to apply that fairly.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I will reclaim my time, but let the RECORD show it is not a process, it is illegal in the State, my colleague's home State.

I am not against this process happening because it happens in my home State right now. The problem we have is we don't want somebody who is eligible to cast a ballot, who got that vote-by-mail ballot, and they decided on election day to fill it out. We want them to be able to go to their polling place and not have to wait in line, and we want them to be able to turn it in.

The problem we have on our side of the aisle is it is ballot harvesting. It is the process in North Carolina where a Republican is likely going to jail, if

convicted. But that same process that will likely send that person to jail, if convicted, is legal in California. We have a problem with somebody besides that voter taking absentee ballots unwatched, not a bipartisan effort, not any control mechanisms, bringing it to the polling place or to the county clerk on election day or after election day. Those are issues that we are concerned about in the bill.

I don't oppose this amendment because, again, it is already the process we follow in my home State.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), who is the author and leader of the legislation, H.R. 1.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to support this amendment. Again, what we are talking about here with H.R. 1 is increasing confidence, engagement, and participation on behalf of the voters. This opportunity to be able to return mail-in ballots at polling places is a way to further that.

I also want to say that with respect to this idea we have to distinguish between election fraud and voter fraud; what we saw in North Carolina was election fraud by a political operative taking advantage of voters, not voters engaged in fraud. So there is a very important distinction there.

I also really wanted to quickly correct the RECORD for my colleague from the other side of the aisle who mentioned a moment ago that somehow under H.R. 1 taxpayer money would be used to fund candidates' campaigns. Nothing could be further from the truth. The bill provides explicitly that there will be no taxpayer funds going to any kind of candidate committees or candidate campaigns. I just wanted to correct the RECORD. I am happy to continue doing that over the course of the debate.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself the remainder of my time, Madam Chair.

I would remind everybody that this amendment provides the States with flexibility. It is providing convenience, as my colleague mentioned, and as a preventive tool, and no prohibition on voters returning mail ballots would actually occur or slow down the process.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chairman, again, I don't oppose the process. It is already in existence in my home State to ensure that every eligible American voter has their vote counted and protected.

There are legitimate concerns about the ballot harvesting process; otherwise somebody might not have to face a trial in North Carolina.

I certainly appreciate the author coming to the floor to, once again, talk

about the bill and some of the changes that were made since it was introduced on January 3, the first day of Congress, cosponsored by every Member of the other side of the aisle, a 571-page bill. I certainly hope everybody had a chance to take a look at that bill before signing their name on the dotted line, because the provision that the author put in place, if he would have reached out to any of the three Republicans on the House Administration Committee, we would have gladly discussed some of our priorities, but there was no olive branch of bipartisanship whatsoever.

□ 1330

The sheer fact that somehow the bill has been changed to now create this fine that is going to be corporate malfeasance dollars, it is never going to be able to get the amount of money in that candidates are going to expect when running for Congress. Candidates, even like the neo-Nazi who ran against my good friend DAN LIPINSKI in the last race, will now be eligible for this corporate malfeasance money.

Everybody on that side of the aisle knows, when candidates for Congress, including Members of Congress on the other side of the aisle, aren't going to get what they expect into their campaigns from this corporate malfeasance fund—which is corporate dollars that we weren't supposed to be able to take as Members of Congress in our campaigns anyway but now somehow it is a good idea to do—you know what is going to happen? They are going to say, "I don't have the money in my campaign to run a race," and they are going to ask the taxpayers to bail it out.

Everybody on that side of the aisle knows that is going to happen, and the shell game they are playing right now is very frustrating.

The CBO couldn't even score this new provision. We don't even know how much this is going to cost beyond the possible \$3-plus billion.

This is a bill designed to keep a Democratic majority in this Congress so that we don't have a chance to pre-empt over these hearings anymore.

That is not the way to run elections. That is not what our Constitution wants. That is not what anybody should support.

Madam Chair, again, I am not opposed to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. RODNEY DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH), I have an amendment at the desk, amendment No. 28.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 529, line 12, strike "Not later than" and insert "(a) IN GENERAL—Not later than".

Page 530, after line 3, insert the following:

"(b) CONTENTS.—The code of conduct issued under subsection (a) shall contain requirements that are at least as stringent as the requirements placed on Members of Congress under Rule XXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives (known as the Code of Official Conduct)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, it is great to have many conversations with you today. This is what is great about the institution: Our forefathers set up a legislative branch to debate, to cast votes, and then to legislate.

We won't always agree on every issue. There are times we will vehemently disagree with each other. But, Madam Chair, after the debate is over, we all move on and look forward to working with each other.

Madam Chair, today, I rise in support of amendment 28 because Members of Congress, all of us in the legislative branch, are, appropriately, held to stringent ethical standards that are designed to prevent financial or material gain for actions taken while we are legislating in this institution. We should ensure all branches of government are held to high ethical standards, too.

This commonsense amendment would require the Judicial Conference of the United States to implement a judicial code that is at least as stringent as the requirements placed on Members of Congress. This amendment would be a step in the right direction for providing transparency in government, which the American people expect and deserve.

Again, I gave the olive branch to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle on the last two amendments, and I certainly hope that that olive branch can be returned on this Republican amendment, and I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, this amendment is well intentioned but riddled with inconsistencies that render it ineffective and unnecessary.

Although judges should be held to high ethical standards, it is a false equivalence to claim that Members of Congress and judges face the same dilemmas. Judges do not accept campaign funds, do not represent constituents, and have no term limits.

Every person who has the privilege to serve in our government should be held to a code of conduct, yet it is a misstep to assume that all branches of govern-

ment have the same prerogatives and ethical pitfalls.

H.R. 1 already contains a reasonable approach to expanding ethics for the United States Supreme Court, and this amendment would confuse the clarity and enforcement of these standards.

The Judicial Conference of the United States is best suited to issue a code of conduct for the courts of the United States. Judges know best what predicaments judges face and how best to protect the integrity of our courts from corruption and improper conduct.

We should pass H.R. 1 without this amendment so that we can create effective, enforceable ethical standards for our courts.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Georgia for debating this amendment with me.

There are a lot of what I believe are constitutional issues with H.R. 1, legislative overreach that defies the equal branches of government. This one does not. All we are simply doing with this amendment is asking the Judicial Conference of the United States to implement a judicial code up and down the judicial spectrum.

Maybe it will actually help ensure that, as judges go through the confirmation process in the Senate for whatever level of Federal judgeship he or she may be nominated, it might help us understand who these judges are.

This is a very commonsense amendment. We are not saying Congress is going to legislate judicial conduct. We are just saying that we are the lawmakers. Why don't we ask the Judicial Conference to do it for the judges, just like our standards are set by Congress and the executive branch standards should be set by the executive branch.

These are small things that make a big difference in a big bill. Again, I have extended the olive branch of bipartisanship this entire day, yesterday, and I would certainly hope that that would be extended back to us because we have yet, in this entire process of H.R. 1—being a 622-page bill yesterday and added pages upon pages yesterday and today—not one single Republican amendment has been accepted. Not one. Maybe this is it.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 111, line 21, after “such election”, insert the following: “and provide such individual with any materials that are necessary to register to vote in any such election”.

Page 112, line 23, after “such election”, insert the following: “and provide such individual with any materials that are necessary to register to vote in any such election”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 1, the For the People Act, which would, among other provisions, require Federal and State governments to physically provide voting registration materials at the same time they provide notification of a restoration of voting rights under the bill. Voting is the most powerful voice that we have in our democracy.

As a Wisconsinite, I am proud to stand today to fight for everyone's right to vote. Wisconsin has been the petri dish for some of the most pernicious voting suppression efforts, including partisan gerrymandering, all designed to marginalize some votes.

Where our votes are counted, our voices are heard. I am here to say no more—no more—to suppression.

Anyone who works to suppress the vote does not support democracy, Madam Chair. Anyone who limits the ability of all people to express their voice through the ballot does not support democracy.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise this time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I was a strong supporter of the First Step Act, and I continue to support criminal justice reform efforts.

As a matter of fact, just last week, a former czar in the Obama administration, Van Jones, said that, “The conservative movement in this country, unfortunately,” from his point of view, “. . . is now the leader on this issue of reform,” talking about criminal justice reform.

We need to make sure that we don't have petty drug users spending more time in Federal prison than Jared the Subway guy who was a pedophile, but we have to review this amendment very carefully.

We still haven't figured out the processes and procedures of an amendment that passed, part of H.R. 1 that is in the underlying bill that would allow felons to vote without any determination of whether that felon may be like Jared the Subway guy.

Who is to say he doesn't live near a polling place where his polling place is a school? How in the world can we move forward on getting voter registration materials to felons without

understanding who is eligible to go to the exact polling place they are supposed to vote at or not?

I don't want pedophiles, sex offenders, going into a polling place in many rural areas that the only place they have is a school with children.

The provision in the bill needs to be changed, needs to be vetted very carefully. We need to have some certainty here.

I certainly do not support this amendment because I still am not sure that a felon who is not allowed around children won't be forced to cast his or her vote around children.

That is why this bill needs to be put back into our committees of jurisdiction, where almost 40 percent of the jurisdiction was never marked up in the first place.

This is a rush. I don't blame my colleagues who are here today. I think Chairperson LOFGREN and the members of the House Administration Committee have done an excellent job putting a bill that is terrible forward, but the only reason we are here on the floor this week is because Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership team are forcing this issue.

The American people and the American taxpayers aren't going to stand for the provisions that are in this bill.

I don't know why we are rushing it, and I certainly wish there was more bipartisanship. I certainly wish there was clarification on whether or not a former convicted felon who is a sex offender is going to be allowed in a polling place that happens to be a school, where they can't go into or can't get within a certain amount of yardage to, outside of election day.

Madam Chair, I can't support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, may I inquire of the Chair how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, let me commend the gentleman for his active participation in the First Step Act, the criminal justice reform. Let me commend him on his efforts to restore freedom to felons and, as he indicated, murderers and drug dealers and other kinds of criminals who he worked so hard to restore their right to freedom.

This amendment deals with really low-hanging fruit in terms of criminal justice reform. It just says that, when the department has decided that someone has finished their term, when they have finished their sentence, when they are released, they would simply receive those instructions as to how to register to vote.

If there is a pedophile—and I would have welcomed the gentleman's amendment—perhaps it can be part of the rules to say that you must vote by absentee ballot.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), chairwoman of the committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Chair, nothing in H.R. 1 impacts any State law that requires an individual who has been convicted of an offense against a child staying away from a school. Luckily, we have vote-by-mail and early voting at county facilities in the bill, so that is really not a real issue.

□ 1345

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for that clarification.

Democracy demands hard work, and, again, I commend the gentleman for his hard work to put criminals back onto the street.

This is very low-hanging fruit. There have been studies that have indicated that restoring the voting rights of felons really means that they will be more likely to not re-offend because we are bringing them back into the civil discourse of our communities.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I certainly wish that the underlying piece of legislation actually addressed our concerns, which is why I would urge both sides of the aisle to send this back to committee to ensure that, while it doesn't specifically say that State laws can't be followed when it comes to allowing sex offenders into polling places, it also doesn't prevent it. That is the problem with this top-down overreach.

There is nothing in this bill, H.R. 1, that would prevent a sex offender from walking in and demanding his or her right to vote while surrounded by children that he or she is not allowed around because of a previous conviction or a sex offender registration status.

I appreciate my colleague from Wisconsin's work on the First Step Act, also; and I also have to offer a correction.

The First Step Act was actually to get nonviolent offenders out of our prisons, petty drug users who have been put away because maybe they didn't have the information that the assistant U.S. attorney wanted and then, all of a sudden, they are ratcheted into a long jail sentence because of mandatory minimums. These are the issues that have bipartisanship.

By no means does the First Step Act, or any act of criminal justice reform that I support or that anybody else I know would support, want murderers out of prison. That is not the case.

If that is the case, we have some more questions about this amendment and we have some more questions about this bill. We want to make sure those jail cells are reserved for the people who are the most hardened criminals.

We have got to work together on criminal justice reform to take the next step in the First Step Act. We need to make it better, but it is all for nonviolent offenders.

I have some serious concerns when sex offenders get out of prison or maybe they don't even go to prison for that long, like Jared, the Subway guy, because he may have had a lot of money, may have had the ability to hire a good lawyer; but so many petty drug offenders who are going to be the beneficiary of the First Step Act didn't.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, just in closing, I hope that my colleague will support this amendment. It doesn't deal with murderers or pedophiles. It deals with people who are coming out of prison and being notified of their rights and responsibilities with regard to voting.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 90, insert after line 11 the following new section:

SEC. 1103. GAO ANALYSIS AND REPORT ON VOTING ACCESS FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) ANALYSIS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an analysis after each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office with respect to the following:

(1) In relation to polling places located in houses of worship or other facilities that may be exempt from accessibility requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act—

(A) efforts to overcome accessibility challenges posed by such facilities; and

(B) the extent to which such facilities are used as polling places in elections for Federal office.

(2) Assistance provided by the Election Assistance Commission, Department of Justice, or other Federal agencies to help State and local officials improve voting access for individuals with disabilities during elections for Federal office.

(3) When accessible voting machines are available at a polling place, the extent to which such machines—

(A) are located in places that are difficult to access;

(B) malfunction; or

(C) fail to provide sufficient privacy to ensure that the ballot of the individual cannot be seen by another individual.

(4) The process by which Federal, State, and local governments track compliance with accessibility requirements related to voting access, including methods to receive and address complaints.

(5) The extent to which poll workers receive training on how to assist individuals with disabilities, including the receipt by such poll workers of information on legal requirements related to voting rights for individuals with disabilities.

(6) The extent and effectiveness of training provided to poll workers on the operation of accessible voting machines.

(7) The extent to which individuals with a developmental or psychiatric disability experience greater barriers to voting, and whether poll worker training adequately addresses the needs of such individuals.

(8) The extent to which State or local governments employ, or attempt to employ, individuals with disabilities to work at polling sites.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 9 months after the date of a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report with respect to the most recent regularly scheduled general election for Federal office that contains the following:

(A) The analysis required by subsection (a).

(B) Recommendations, as appropriate, to promote the use of best practices used by State and local officials to address barriers to accessibility and privacy concerns for individuals with disabilities in elections for Federal office.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, my amendment simply requires an ongoing evaluation after every Federal election of the efforts to ensure that those with disabilities have successfully been able to exercise their right to vote.

The Government Accountability Office would be charged with assessing polling place accessibility, privacy issues, and the extent of poll worker training on the rights of individuals with disabilities, as well as on accessible voting machines, among other identified barriers. They would provide their recommendations, if any, to Congress.

I recently had a constituent come into my office and speak about the continued challenges faced by those with disabilities when it comes to exercising this fundamental right, such as inaccessible voting machines that were located and situated as to not provide privacy for the voter.

And this is not just an anecdotal evidence of the problem. According to the National Council on Independent Living, over 2 million people with disabilities didn't vote in 2016, and this isn't just an issue of voter apathy. Study after study shows that our voting system is still inaccessible.

What we know is that, even with laws in place, not all polling places are accessible because of physical barriers,

unprepared and untrained staff, or accessible equipment that is either not functional or turned off.

Let me be clear: This bill takes steps forward to address those barriers, and I appreciate the addition of those measures.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I am not opposed to this amendment. I think we should work together to ensure that all those who have disabilities have access to be able to cast their vote, and I know my home State of Illinois is doing yeoman's work, our local county clerks are doing yeoman's work to ensure that all those who need reasonable accommodations get them. So I thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin for offering it.

Before I reserve, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Chair, we all agree that Americans should vote and participate in our Republic. We all agree that every American's vote deserves to be counted and protected. But the bill, the underlying bill we consider today, is riddled with problems.

My friends across the aisle call this bill the For the People Act, but it should really be called the “Protect Professional Politicians Act.”

One of the most egregious parts of this bill is the creation of Federal funding for elections. Taxpayers will pay for politicians' campaigns whether they agree with them or not. Under this bill, if someone gives a politician \$200, the Federal Government will send \$1,200 of money to that politician.

Those mailers that fill your mailbox, well, under the “Protect the Professional Politicians Act,” you will pay for them.

Those attack ads that flood your TV, well, you will pay for them.

Those high-priced political consultants in Washington, D.C., well, you will pay for them, too.

Since when is it a good idea to have taxpayers' hard-earned money shoveled into a trough for a politician's campaign?

Montanans don't want that. At a recent townhall, 97 percent of Montanans told me they oppose taxpayer funding for political campaigns.

Imagine Republicans and Democrats working together on a bipartisan bill that addresses voting and election reforms. We could have done that. We did that with election security in the last Congress.

But that is not what happened with H.R. 1, the “Protect Professional Politicians Act.” Maybe that is one of the reasons why diverse groups like the

Montana Chamber of Commerce and the ACLU have opposed this bill.

I join those groups, and I strongly urge a “no” vote on H.R. 1, the Protect Professional Politicians Act.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Can the Chair inform me about the time available to both of us?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chair, I just want to support the amendment. Obviously, we want to make voting as accessible as we can to everybody, and this is a very, very important step in terms of supporting that with respect to people with disabilities. I want to thank my colleague for introducing the amendment.

I did, also, just want to correct the RECORD. The last speaker, who may not have been here a few minutes ago, was suggesting that, under H.R. 1, taxpayer money would go to fund political campaigns, candidates’ campaigns, and I just want to reiterate that the bill is explicit that that would not happen.

There will be no taxpayer funds used to support candidates’ campaigns. We have provided for that. We have come up with another way to support the matching fund that we want to see, to lift up small donors out there and give them a voice in their own democracy.

I know the gentleman who spoke a moment ago might not have been here previously, so I just wanted to make sure I got that on the RECORD.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, again, thank you to my colleague from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE). I support this amendment, and I am going to ensure that we have no opposition over here.

But I do have a problem with the bill, and I appreciate the author of the bill being here. If I had that much time dedicated to authoring a 571-page bill with the help of outside special interest groups that were commended at the opening press conference, I would be here to defend it, too. But there are so many problems, so many unanswered questions.

The sheer fact that the shell game of corporate fines is supposed to fund upwards of billions of dollars to congressional campaigns—my district alone would have been eligible for \$6 million-plus just by using the last campaign. Multiply that times 435 and add some extra candidates in there, like the neo-Nazi candidate who would be eligible for this funding who ran against Democrat DAN LIPINSKI. These are issues that we don’t have questions answered because the CBO hasn’t scored.

CBO has already said \$2 billion-plus for sure, possibly another \$1 billion to the taxpayers under this fund, but how much is going to be raised from this corporate malfeasance?

And until this day, until this week, I had no idea that the Democratic majority is okay with putting more corporate money into their own campaign coffers. Corporate dollars are not allowed in our campaigns now, as you know, Madam Chair, but we are going to use corporate fines at a level we don’t know what it amounts to? We are going to use those to fill campaign coffers of Members of Congress? Seriously? That is why the bill needs to go back to committee.

I would love to work with the author. I am one of the most bipartisan Members of Congress, according to The Lugar Center, but I never got a call. I would love to help write this bill.

We tried to make that bill better. This is another olive branch to the other side on an amendment. I am going to continue to show bipartisanship that has yet to be reciprocated from the author and from the committee.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I just want to thank the gentleman, again, for his support of this amendment.

I think that America’s motto, E Pluribus Unum—out of many, one—will really be honored by this reporting requirement which I believe will provide information that will move us closer to an election process that is truly inclusive and accessible for all Americans. That is what makes democracy work.

Madam Chair, I urge a “yes” vote on my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 63, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 64, line 7 and insert the following:

(3) The term “exempt State” means any of the following States:

(A) A State which, under law which is in effect continuously on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, operates an automatic voter registration program under which an individual is automatically registered to vote in elections for Federal office in the State if the individual provides the motor vehicle authority of the State (or, in the case of a State in which an individual is automatically registered to vote at the time the individual applies for benefits or services with a Permanent Dividend Fund of the State, provides the appropriate official of such Fund) with such identifying information as the State may require.

(B) A State in which the percentage of the aggregate number of individuals who were eligible to vote in the regularly scheduled

general elections for Federal office held in the State in November 2018 and who voted in such elections was more than 5 percentage points greater than the percentage of the aggregate number of individuals who were eligible to vote in the regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office held in the State in November 2014 and who voted in such elections.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

□ 1400

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, all too often in Washington, we mistake activity for progress, and in many cases we apply that misguided framework onto the States.

There are few better examples of this than Washington’s dabbling in our election laws over the last 2 or 3 decades.

The National Voter Registration Act, our last big partisan bill, aimed at increasing turnout, did not actually achieve that aim. It increased voter registration, but as the Congressional Research Service has said:

Its effect on turnout remains unclear. Its cost and mandates on the States, however, were very clear.

That is exactly what I am talking about in terms of mistaking activity for progress.

The centerpiece of division A’s voting section is automatic registration. According to my colleagues on the other side, it covers all sorts of problems: updating the voter rolls, lack of participation, et cetera.

No excuse vote by mail, same-day registration can be important, but is the automatic voter registration section that is hoped for the driver of participation?

This is an aggressive mandate in a bill full of aggressive mandates.

Fifteen States and Washington, D.C., have automatic registration. Only five States do it at every welfare and government agency. Three States require registrants to decline by postcard.

This bill would more or less include all three of these provisions.

This bill would also require the automatic preregistration of 16-year-olds.

If it went into law, it would amount to, at the very least, a top three most aggressive automatic registration program all across the country, but the bill says that if you are in a State where you have already got an automatic registration program on the books, you don’t have to comply with all the mandates in the bill.

My amendment would do the same thing, but for outcomes instead of for registration.

The outcome that this bill looks for is turnout.

States that have seen massive increases in turnout should get rewarded, and that is what this amendment does.

It lets States who have achieved increased turnout be rewarded by exemption from the mandates in this bill to continue the success that they have been able to achieve with their own programs.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. HAALAND). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment aims to exempt States that have taken measures to increase voter turnout that are not subject to additional Federal voter registration mandates, and I think what it really does is undermine the progress that would be made under H.R. 1.

In November of 2016, the general election, nearly one in five people who were eligible to vote but who did not vote cited registration issues as their main reason for not casting a ballot.

H.R. 1 sets a national standard for voter registration and access to the ballot in Federal elections.

Now, an improvement in participation rates is fine, but it doesn't mean that proven programs, such as the automatic voter registration program, aren't necessary.

You know, automatic voter registration is not simply to increase turnout. It serves a more fundamental purpose: to protect the right to vote by removing bureaucracy and obstacles from the process of registering to vote.

Now, nearly every State that has implemented automatic voter registration has seen dramatically increased registration rates. High rates of voter registration are inherently healthy for a democracy.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter that I received just yesterday from Kate Brown, the Governor of Oregon.

STATE OF OREGON,

March 6, 2019.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: I write in strong support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2019, which includes bold and necessary reforms to strengthen our democracy, protect and expand voting rights for all Americans, and improve campaign finance laws. As the Governor of Oregon and former Secretary of State, this is an issue that I—like many Americans—care deeply about, and I urge you to vote in support of this legislation.

Voting is our country's greatest collective responsibility, and we must work continuously to safeguard the sanctity of our elections. Across the country, the fundamental right of voting itself is increasingly at risk. More states are moving to obstruct voting rights than are increasing access to the ballot. It's imperative that Congress take action to bolster our democracy and fight every effort to undermine it by ensuring that, as a country, we are making it easier, not harder, for people to have their voices heard.

Several key provisions in H.R. 1 reflect the work that Oregon has done to lead the way on expanding voter access, including cre-

ating a national automatic voter registration system, allowing citizens to register to vote online, and expanding vote-by-mail.

As you know, Oregon was the first state to pass automatic voter registration (AVR) in 2015. This law, combined with our vote-by-mail election system, makes Oregon the most modern, efficient, and secure state to vote in the country. Oregon's AVR program has added nearly 400,000 voters to the state rolls, already significantly increased voter turnout, and has ensured 90 percent of eligible voters in our state are registered.

Across the country, this success is being recognized and replicated. Seventeen states and the District of Columbia have since adopted some form of automatic voter registration. These reforms have been successful in creating a stronger and more inclusive democracy. And here in Oregon, it's supported by both Democrats and Republicans.

Every eligible voter in the U.S. should have equal, easy access to the ballot box, and I commend Congress for their focus on this critical issue. This week, I urge you to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

GOVERNOR KATE BROWN.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, Governor Brown notes that Oregon was the first State to have automatic voter registration. It went into effect in 2015 and has added nearly 400,000 voters to the State rolls. Nearly 90 percent of eligible voters are, in fact, registered to vote. What that means is they can participate in our elections, which I think is very important.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, the amendment that I have offered is in keeping with the spirit of the bill. States are balancing the right of everyone to have access to the polls.

Automatic voter registration has allowed so much access to the polls, that it has created challenges for States to be able to comply, even with people who are only supposed to vote legally. They have access to voter registration through Motor Voter and other ways when they are not even residents of the United States, and it puts burdens on States to comply with that.

This would be a one-size-fits-all mandate from the Federal Government that may be needed in some States where access has been challenging and where voter turnout has been low, but in States that have had high voter turnout, that do have effective regimes where you have not just access, but you have participation at levels that have increased by 5 percent or more, to continue on the path of success that they have had without disruption from Federal mandates that would potentially do that.

The Brennan Center says:

Automatic voter registration is gaining momentum across the country.

Currently, 15 States and D.C. have approved the policy, meaning that over a third of Americans live in a jurisdiction that has either passed or implemented automatic voter registration. This policy is winning at the State level and overall push for turnout is also winning.

My amendment is complementary to this bill's enterprise and it would do nothing to undermine the pushes that are already going on at the State level.

It was Madison who said that States are:

... best acquainted with the situation of their people.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I appreciate the spirit with which this amendment is offered, but I disagree.

This is about Federal elections. The Constitution says that the Congress has the ability to promulgate laws about Federal elections.

The reason why we are looking at it is there have been States who have gone into AVR, they are grandfathered into the bill, but the problematic States are those States that are trying to suppress the vote, trying to keep people from voting, and we need to do something about that.

Madam Chair, while we are here, I do want to say something about, not the gentleman's comments, but the prior comments of the ranking member about the costs of the bill.

We have a score from CBO, and almost all the money that CBO has scored goes to grants to the States to upgrade their computer systems: \$1.5 billion from 2019 to 2024; 750 for other computer assistance; and the other big amount is for making polling places accessible to disabled voters. So it is not about the other provisions in the bill.

I would also like to note, and I put this into the RECORD yesterday, the Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated that the fine and forfeiture fund that will go into the Freedom From Influence Fund is estimated to raise \$1.948 billion between 2019 and 2029. They also estimate that it will reduce the deficit by \$83 million, which is interesting, because it will deter people from cheating on their taxes. So the comments made about the money were simply incorrect.

I know that the Joint Committee on Taxation material is in the RECORD under general leave. I will make sure that the CBO report is also included.

Madam Chair, I would just end with this: I appreciate the tone of the gentleman's arguments and the intent of his amendment, but I do think it severely undercuts the advances that H.R. 1 would make.

Madam Chair, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike subtitle F of title IV.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, I want to quote from a speech delivered by a former SEC, Securities and Exchange Commission, chair:

Certain mandates, which invoke the Securities and Exchange Commission's mandatory disclosure powers, seem more directed at exerting societal pressure on companies to change behavior, rather than to disclose financial information that primarily informs investment decisions.

That is not to say that the goals of such mandates are not laudable. Indeed, most are. Seeking to improve safety in mines for workers or to end horrible human rights atrocities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo are compelling objectives, which, as a citizen, I wholeheartedly share.

But, as Chair of the SEC, I must question, as a policy matter, using the Federal securities laws and the SEC's powers of mandatory disclosure to accomplish these goals.

Those are the words of Mary Jo White, President Obama's SEC Chair. She understood what this body understood when it adopted the rider in the appropriations bill my amendment seeks to protect.

The SEC cannot and should not be used as a tool for social engineering. The disclosure laws cannot be used as a method to compel noneconomic behaviors. The SEC has known this since the 1970s, when it received hundreds of different petitions to add dozens of different disclosure requirements. It stated at the time, "The Commission's experience over the years in proposing and framing disclosure requirements has not led it to question the basic decision of the Congress that, insofar as investing is concerned, the primary interest of investors is economic. After all, the principal if not the only reason, why people invest their money in securities is to obtain a return. A variety of other motives are probably present in the investment decisions of numerous investors; but the only common thread is the hope for a satisfactory return, and it is to this that a disclosure scheme intended to be useful to all must be primarily addressed."

Madam Chair, we don't know what each individual investor wants, disclosure requirements have proven very costly, and I urge my colleagues to support the position of the Obama SEC Chair and the SEC since the 1970s, which my amendment seeks to preserve.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to amendment No. 32, which represents an unfortunate attempt to protect the influence of dark corporate money in politics.

I am so proud of the package of bills included in H.R. 1, because I believe that the work we are doing here will transform our democracy.

One of the bills included in H.R. 1 is my Transparency in Corporate Political Spending Act, which will reverse a law that prevents the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, or SEC, from requiring corporations to disclose political spending to their shareholders.

The only reason that the law my measure will reverse is even on the books is that for years, conservatives in Congress have misused the appropriations process to enact anti-transparency measures, contrary to our most fundamental democratic values.

This amendment would keep that anti-transparency law in place.

I cannot for the life of me understand why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem so keen on helping corporations keep their political spending a secret. How is that good for our democracy?

Indeed, Justice Scalia, in another case after Citizens United, wrote: "Requiring people to stand up in public for their political acts fosters civic courage, without which democracy is doomed."

The situation could not be simpler. Americans deserve to know which corporate interests are donating money to influence our elected officials.

□ 1415

Corporations should play by the same rules as Michiganders in my district in Macomb and Oakland Counties and that the rest of Americans play by and disclose their political contributions because secret corporate spending poses a threat to our democracy and to investor confidence.

Since the disastrous decision in the Citizens United v. FEC case allowed corporations to make unlimited political contributions, investors and citizens concerned about the future of American democracy have looked to the SEC to require corporate disclosure of political spending. We need to untie the hands of the SEC so that it can move forward with finalizing a crucial rule requiring corporations simply to disclose their political spending.

Requiring public corporations to be honest with their shareholders, customers, and the public about the political donations they make is essential to taking our democracy back from the hands of special interests.

This is why I rise in vehement opposition to this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

Madam Chair, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, companies are already going ahead and disclosing political donations. 196 of the Fortune 500 companies have disclosure policies in place, up from 174 in 2015. More companies are deciding this is the right way to approach their political giving.

But I don't have anything to say against their voluntary decision. I do think it is a mistake to force compliance through disclosure laws at a time when public markets are less attractive than ever for going public.

Capital formation in the United States of America could easily be improved and has, in fact, suffered by a heavyhanded regulatory approach.

Corporations are not treated differently than individuals are. There is nothing that compels an individual to disclose every single dollar they donate and to whom. This would go in the other way.

If you decide to go public in the United States, you are treated differently under the law than a private company or a private individual. The reality is, under the law, you should be treated the same way. In some cases, you are allowed to give a donation privately, and in other cases, you are not. Corporations have to comply with that law. The Federal Election Commission administers that law, not the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chairwoman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chairwoman, I am glad to hear that some corporations are good citizens. However, we cannot leave our basic functioning of our democracy to the whims of individuals.

Some corporations protected the safety of their workers before we had the OSHA laws. Some corporations didn't use child labor before we had our child labor laws. We need fundamental rules to make sure there is sunshine in this area.

Now, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), my friend.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just really wanted to echo what was just said, a couple of things that were said.

First of all to note that, clearly, best practices have emerged with respect to public companies making this kind of information available, but if that best practice has merit, then it ought to be applied across the board, which is the argument that we are making. I thank you for your work and interest in this issue.

The SEC is there to protect shareholders. It is there to protect the public. That is the purpose of that agency. Within the basket of things and measures that it can do to protect the public is to promote this kind of disclosure.

The rider that we are trying to get rid of in this bill that you would strike, that rider is preventing that kind of inquiry and disclosure and protection of the public to occur, and that is why it is so important that that rider be struck. I agree with the gentleman in his opposition to this amendment.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I think there has been a lot of talk about transparency today. We have had a transparent process in the committees, 15 hours of hearings, but this repeals a rider that was privately put on an appropriations bill by Republicans to prevent the SEC from doing something that they want to do.

Let's get real. I mean, this actually just undoes a secret rider on an appropriations bill. This is the way bad law gets made.

We are here in the middle of the day, in public, debating amendments, not secretly putting little riders on appropriations bills that hamstring the SEC for making sure that there is sunlight on what corporations are doing.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. I wonder, Madam Chairwoman, whether folks opposed to my amendment would be in favor of requiring every single person and corporation to disclose every dollar that they give. That is essentially what you are saying here: We want to treat publicly traded companies differently than we want to treat every other company and every other individual. And we realize that the FEC isn't competent or qualified to do that job, so we want to add another agency to do this.

President Obama's own Chair of the SEC stated: When disclosure gets too complicated or strays from its core purposes, it can lead to information overload, a phenomenon in which ever-increasing amounts of disclosure make it difficult for investors to focus on the information that is material and most relevant to the decisionmaking of investors in the financial markets.

As has been stated, the fiduciary responsibility of the directors of the company, of the shareholders, and of the people making investments is a common denominator. There may be disparate political views in these days—there surely are—and unpopular positions may be at odds with the fiduciary responsibilities of companies.

This should have been debated in a Financial Services Committee—one of the other flaws of this path that we are on today—subrogating all of the authority of the other committees with only a handful of the amount of participation.

Lastly, I would say that a majority of Democrats actually voted for the appropriations bill with the riders that are at the heart of the opposition's objection to my amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike subtitle E of title IV.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, my amendment would uphold an appropriations policy rider included in the FY 2019 appropriations package that this body, on a bipartisan basis, just voted on last month. That provision prevents the IRS from the collection of donor information for 501(c)(4) social welfare organizations.

In 2013, when the IRS attempted to issue rules that would clamp down on these organizations, there was bipartisan pushback from groups as disparate as the ACLU and Tea Party Patriots.

The IRS has a poor track record on the handling of donor information of these organizations. The 2013 IRS scandal of targeting conservative groups is the perfect example of this. The IRS asked groups excruciatingly detailed questions, even as far as for the details of the prayer meetings of pro-life organizations. Government agencies investigating the intimate details of an organization's efforts to participate in issue advocacy creates an unconstitutional chilling effect on free speech.

The IRS is a tax collection agency, not an arbiter of the fitness of an organization's political viewpoint. My amendment is about the fundamental First Amendment rights for citizens and groups to participate in public discourse.

Finally, H.R. 1's needless removal of a bipartisan policy rider does not make sense in the context of this bill's inclu-

sion of the DISCLOSE Act. I oppose the First Amendment privacy issues raised by the DISCLOSE Act provisions, like the ACLU opposes the DISCLOSE Act, but duplicative collection of information, especially through a scandal-ridden agency like the IRS, which has scandalously overstepped its bounds and authority and jurisdiction, highlight what this amendment is all about. It is inappropriate for the IRS to collect this sort of information.

It is my hope that we can maintain the well-considered appropriations rider already included in the package passed just last month.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today in opposition to the amendment.

This amendment would strike a critical provision of H.R. 1 that cracks down on organizations that are flooding our elections with dark money. In the 2018 cycle, \$150 million was spent by groups that did not have to disclose their donors. Voters had no idea who was spending this money to influence their vote.

What it does is create a system in Washington that leaves elected officials beholden to mega-donors, rather than the needs of their constituents. This is a direct threat to our democracy, and it is coming from within this Chamber.

This is a problem that is only getting worse. Since Citizens United, dark money spending has gone up by more than 8,000 percent. Part of the problem is the law isn't being enforced. Some so-called social welfare organizations are devoting too much of their time to political activity, yet they are allowed a tax-exempt status and don't have to disclose their donors. And the IRS can't do anything about it.

We must allow the IRS to move forward on the 2013 rule to define acceptable levels of political activity by these organizations. This will create a clear standard. If a group violates this standard, and it fails to adhere to its social welfare mission, then it should lose its tax-exempt status, and it should register as a PAC.

If you are going to spend millions of dollars to influence someone's vote, then you better have the courage to stand behind your words. Instead, mega-donors have taken advantage of a loophole that allows them to donate to a tax-exempt welfare organization while hiding their identity.

All Americans should care about the abuse of social welfare organizations. It undermines the sanctity of so many other valuable and necessary organizations.

Let's be clear about what is happening here. This amendment serves one purpose: to hide mega-donor support for campaigns. Let's pull back the

curtain and let Americans see who is really behind those negative ads.

Madam Chairwoman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, may I inquire of the amount of time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, even the scandal-ridden, 2013-era IRS that targeted conservative groups, overstepping its jurisdiction by trying to shape the speech and conduct of organizations rather than collect their taxes, withdrew the rulemaking process at the heart of what is sought in this H.R. 1 bill. It is a chilling effect.

As we talk about one of our rights, access to the ballot box at the Federal level, and we consider that, I think it is important to remember the founding principles that led to the creation of this country, and they are enshrined in the Federalist Papers.

I include in the RECORD a copy of Federalist Paper No. 59, wherein Madison makes the case that Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution is about the Federal Government's right to defend itself. It is not about Congress being the prime driver of elections.

CONGRESS GETS TO REGULATE ELECTIONS

Federalist No. 59:

It is absolute not the first province of the federal government. This is what Hamilton said in Federalist 59:

They have submitted the regulation of elections for the federal government, in the first instance, to the local administrations; which, in ordinary cases, and when no improper views prevail, may be both more convenient and more satisfactory; but they have reserved to the national authority a right to interpose, whenever extraordinary circumstances might render that interposition necessary to its safety.

Article 1 section 4 is about the federal government's right to defend itself. It is not about Congress being the prime driver of elections.

□ 1430

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. As we look at this, we have the Federal Election Commission. We have bodies of law that require disclosure, and we have organizations that sometimes violate those disclosure laws, and those companies are prosecuted when they do that.

Here, we want to take and add the IRS responsibility of shaping that disclosure, and only for these types of groups and these types of donations. It is intended to have a chilling effect on the speech, and that is at the core of the objection for groups that don't agree on much.

Between the ACLU and the NRA they don't often agree, but they agree that H.R. 1 is bad, and this goes to the heart of their objection.

Madam Chair, I ask unanimous support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, just to note, Congress never intended for

501(c), for social welfare organizations to just be conduits for dark campaign spending.

In exchange for nonprofit status and tax exempt status, the law requires them to engage exclusively in the promotion of social welfare.

Now, how is that defined? The IRS was trying to get a bright line on that, but they were stopped by a secret rider put in an appropriations bill.

Obviously, the appropriation at large got votes from both sides of the aisle because you need to keep the government down. But that is not the way you legislate. That is a sneaky way to change the law.

To repeal this provision of H.R. 1 would be a huge mistake, because what we are doing is setting things right so that people know what they can do and what they can't do.

Yes, you can speak, but don't expect to get a tax break because you are speaking about politics. You get a tax break because you are doing charitable work.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his work in introducing the bill that would repeal this rider that prevents the IRS from the kind of inquiry that should be done.

This is about figuring out who is leaning into the big money game. So it goes with a number of other riders that we have seen that have been put in place over the last few years.

We want to know if Federal contractors are leaning into the big money game. That is why we want the executive branch to have rules of disclosure with respect to what is happening with money and Federal contractors. That is why we wanted to get rid of the rider that would stop that from happening.

We want to know if public companies are leaning into the big money game. That is why we want to get rid of that rider that would stop the SEC, since they are supposed to protect the public from following that disclosure and looking into whether money is coming into that space.

And in this instance, we want to make sure that these entities that are supposed to be tax exempt aren't leaning into the big money game, and the IRS is there as the agency to do that.

Madam Chair, we need to make sure we protect that ability.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, this is more than one simple issue. This is about rule of law; it is about transparency; and it is about the democracy that we must become if we are to return power back to our communities.

This is already the law.

What my colleagues on the other side want to do is prevent the government from enforcing the law.

This is about rule of law and making sure we are enforcing what is already on the books, and we are prohibiting the abuse of social welfare organizations and we are bringing to light dark money.

The voters of this country deserve to know who is spending money, millions of dollars, to influence their vote. It should not be hidden. The people of our communities deserve to know who is spending that money to influence our vote, and that is why I ask folks in this Chamber, my colleagues, to oppose this amendment and let's restore our democracy and return power back to our communities.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, in *Alabama v. the NAACP*, the courts upheld the right to protect the privacy of donor information.

The right to privacy is fundamental to our Bill of Rights, and it is threatened. It has a chilling effect, as has been enumerated from any number of groups. My colleagues know this.

Just recently, social welfare groups, as defined by 501(c)(4), engaged in social welfare to support infanticide, a bill that could not get a vote to cloture in the Senate.

It would require the IRS, instead of the body of jurisdiction, the Election Commission, to deal with donors.

The IRS should be narrowly focused on collecting tax revenue, not on elections law, and we have seen abuses of their already-limited jurisdiction.

This is the right thing to do. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, and I ask for everyone who can find a way to see through the distortion of information that is being presented here to support our Bill of Rights, protect the right to privacy, and vote for this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. LUJÁN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 285, line 1, insert "and the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology" after "National Science Foundation".

Page 285, line 7, insert “, and increase voter participation” after “infrastructure”.

Page 285, line 17, insert “, and on voter participation” after “infrastructure”.

Page 285, line 20, strike “\$6,250,000” and insert “\$20,000,000”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Chair, our democracy is at its best when all voices are heard. Unfortunately, whether due to an antiquated voting system or restrictive voter laws, too many Americans face too many obstacles to participating in our elections.

There is also an immediate need to protect election security. Russia attacked our democracy in 2016 and could do so again. That is why, last Congress, I introduced a Voting Innovation Prize Act, to tap into America’s innovative spirit to strengthen our democracy. These are competitive grants.

Today, I am proud to offer an amendment based on that legislation. My amendment will expand the election infrastructure grants to promote voter participation, secure our elections, and increase funding.

Madam Chair, I thank Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON for working with me on this amendment, and I urge adoption of this amendment and the For the People Act.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Chair, although I strongly oppose H.R. 1, I appreciate the intent of Mr. LUJÁN’s amendment.

This amendment would improve the election infrastructure innovation grant program established in H.R. 1 by requiring consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

NIST is already working with the Election Assistance Commission to develop voluntary standards and guidelines for voting systems and is well-positioned to support the Department of Homeland Security, the National Science Foundation, and the Commission’s election security research efforts.

I would like to note that the amendment does not add the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology as a recipient of the report required by section 321(b).

I am the ranking member of the Research and Technology Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over the DHS

Science and Technology Directorate, the NSF, and the NIST, all of which are implicated by section 321.

Although I do not expect H.R. 1 to ever become law, I hope election security is something that we can do on a bipartisan basis in the future. This process has been rushed, and appropriate due diligence to create strong and effective bipartisan election and security reforms has not been done.

Once again, I support the intent of this amendment, but I oppose H.R. 1.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Chair, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the chair of the Committee on House Administration.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I think this amendment improves the bill. It revises the election infrastructure grant program and includes an emphasis on increasing voter participation, in addition to the emphasis on improving election infrastructure that is currently included in H.R. 1.

I am especially pleased that it engages the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, which is really the premier agency to help us on technical issues. So I think it is a very good amendment.

And while I have the floor, I would like to note that I will include in the RECORD a letter from the AFL-CIO and a letter from the American Federation of Teachers urging support of H.R. 1.

AFL-CIO,

Washington, DC, March 5, 2019.

UNITED STATES HOUSE,

Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL-CIO, I am writing to express our strong support for H.R. 1, the “For the People Act of 2019.” By expanding access to the ballot box, reducing the influence of big money in politics and strengthening ethics rules for public servants, this legislation includes many of the most important reforms necessary to restore the promise of our democracy.

For years, right-wing groups backed by wealthy donors have been working aggressively to suppress the right of every American citizen to cast a ballot. They have supported laws to make it harder to register and to vote and they have used the corrosive power of money to drown out the voices of working people.

H.R. 1 would expand the franchise by promoting early voting, same day and online registration. It would create a system of public financing powered by small donations and require super PACS and dark money political organizations to make their donors public. It would restore voting rights for formerly incarcerated individuals and commit Congress to restore the Voting Rights Act to end racial discrimination in voting.

Record wealth inequality, mass incarceration and low voter turnout are all symptoms of a broken political system. AFL-CIO proudly supports H.R. 1 as we continue the fight to fix our democracy and restore the balance of power to working people.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,

Director, Government Affairs Department.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,

Washington, DC, March 6, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.7 million members of the American Federation of Teachers, I urge you to vote YES on H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2019.

There is no question that we have seen an erosion of voting rights, a loosening or ignoring of ethics rules and conduct, and an ever-increasing presence of big money in elections. All of this undermines America’s democracy. That is why passage of H.R. 1 is so important. It represents a historic effort to restore both the rights of working people and the promise of our nation’s democracy. It will give power back to the people by limiting the influence of the corrupt and by expanding voting rights for all Americans.

The For the People Act will strengthen the government’s ethics laws while imposing much-needed restrictions on campaign finance regulations. For far too long, the influence of money in politics—especially unaccountable “dark money” funneled into our system by wealthy individuals and large companies—has been a negative force in elections across our nation. The bill will put an end to anonymous election spending and force disclosure of all election-related spending.

The AFT also strongly supports H.R. 1’s call for a constitutional amendment to overturn the disturbing Citizens United decision. This case has had a corrosive effect on our democracy, giving powerful corporations a disproportionate amount of influence in our elections. Since this case was decided, big corporations have been using their record profits to try to silence the voices of hard-working Americans. No donor should be able to hide its identity as it floods the system with hundreds of millions of dollars in an effort to pass an extreme agenda that will gut the salary, healthcare and pensions of workers.

It’s time to restore balance and guarantee that a teacher in Cleveland has the same voice in our democracy as a CEO on Wall Street. H.R. 1 moves us in that direction.

The bill’s promise to focus on voting is absolutely essential as a civil rights matter and as a democracy issue. It commits to restoring the Voting Rights Act; restoring voting rights for formerly incarcerated people; reforming voter registration; combating voter purging; prohibiting deceptive practices and voter intimidation; creating a federal holiday for Election Day; ensuring early voting and polling place notice; reforming redistricting; and modernizing election administration.

Expanding voting rights in 2019 is vital to our democracy. It’s hard to understand how any members of the House of Representatives would vote against it, yet we have seen all too frequently an allegiance to partisan politics rather than to the basic values of civic participation.

Passage of H.R. 1 will help confront the many real threats facing our democracy today. I hope you will vote YES when it comes up for a vote this week in the House.

Sincerely,

RANDI WEINGARTEN,

President.

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment, I urge adoption of H.R. 1, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

After subtitle G of title II, insert the following (and redesignate subtitle H as subtitle I):

Subtitle H—Residence of Incarcerated Individuals

SEC. 2701. RESIDENCE OF INCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS.

Section 141 of title 13, United States Code, is amended

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g)(1) Effective beginning with the 2020 decennial census of population, in taking any tabulation of total population by States under subsection (a) for purposes of the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States, the Secretary shall, with respect to an individual incarcerated in a State, Federal, county, or municipal correctional center as of the date on which such census is taken, attribute such individual to such individual’s last place of residence before incarceration.

“(2) In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall consult with each State department of corrections to collect the information necessary to make the determination required under paragraph (1).”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chair, first off, let me thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for this bill and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for all her work on this bill.

This is an important promise that we made to the American people that we would clean up Washington, and I think H.R. 1 is going to go very far in doing that.

This amendment specifically addresses an important aspect of continuing to make the process for democracy stronger in this country. This amendment would end the practice of prison gerrymandering.

Starting this decennial Census, this amendment would require persons who are incarcerated in correctional facilities to be counted as a resident of their last place of residence before incarceration.

There is only one constitutional mandate as it pertains to the Census: The Federal Government must count all persons present in the country at the time of the Census.

We know we will get an accurate count of incarcerated individuals. The only question, then, is: Where do we count them?

If we count incarcerated persons as being present at their last known resi-

dence, we know that the right community will receive the appropriate amount of population-based funding it needs to take care of all of their citizens, because the odds are that an incarcerated person will return home after release to the community in which they most recently lived.

If we count incarcerated persons as residents of correctional facilities, more often than not we are simply swelling the population count of communities in which incarcerated individuals do not actually live, participate in civil society, or utilize government services outside prison walls.

Let’s stop this charade. Let’s stop the dramatic distortion of representation at State and local levels, and let’s end the inaccurate creation of community populations that mislead research and planning efforts.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which is also supported by the Brennan Center for Justice, Common Cause, and the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin’s interest in redistricting and gerrymandering.

Coming from the State of Illinois, I like the independent redistricting provisions of H.R. 1.

I have some concerns as to why one State’s redistricting plan is now part of the bill when it was supposed to be a nationwide approach, but we will get to that later.

□ 1445

Gerrymandering is a process like in my home State of Illinois that can poison the political process. We have Democrat supermajorities in the House of Representatives in Illinois. We have Democrat majorities in the Illinois State Senate, supermajorities. We have a Democrat Governor. I certainly hope we get redistricting reform by the time 2021 rolls around.

But this amendment is about gerrymandering. This amendment is about the census, and my biggest concern goes back to, again, this bill was not even marked up in the Oversight and Reform Committee. This issue was not even brought up during a single hearing that the Oversight and Reform Committee held on H.R. 1.

This amendment also could upend a foundational principle of the census. Since 1790, the census has been counting people at their usual residences on census day. I guess, when Charles Manson was alive out in the 21st District of California, he got counted at the maximum security Federal prison.

All alternatively housed populations are actually counted the same way, or are supposed to be. Who is to say that

somebody who lives at Charles Manson’s old home, a relative, doesn’t write him down on the census form, too. I have some concerns about double counting that this amendment does not address. But prisoners have been counted at their prison, college students have been counted at their dorms. I remember in 1990, I filled out a little census form in Mills Hall at Millikin University in Decatur, Illinois, to be counted as part of the census.

I didn’t check with my mom to see if she counted me at home too. Military servicemembers are counted at their U.S. station base. Counting one population differently than other similarly situated populations only serves to decrease the accuracy of the census. The census count is actually about apportionment that State legislatures use to draw new lines, or independent commissions use to draw new congressional lines, State legislative lines. Hopefully, they don’t gerrymander. This is not about redistricting.

The Census Bureau works with States to provide detailed data about prison populations that would allow the States to redistrict however the State chooses. That is why I am opposed to your amendment. I do respect you being here to participate in the process. I certainly wish that we could have sat down and maybe worked out a better amendment that would have addressed all of our concerns, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chairwoman, I appreciate the thoughtful comments made by the ranking member, but I do think this is a special situation, and it is why the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund is in support of this amendment.

As the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund has noticed, the practice of counting prison inmates as part of the district where the prison is located has a disproportionate impact on African American and Latino communities. That is because members of those communities, for a variety of other bad reasons, are incarcerated at higher rates and housed at prisons farther from their homes than other communities.

The gentleman from Illinois is correct. You may be counted in the census at your university dorm, but you can also vote from your university dorm. The inmates can’t vote.

Actually, they are properly allocated to the communities where they are from. Doing otherwise has the impact of disenfranchising communities of color around the United States, and that is why this amendment is an important one and why the Brennan Center for Justice and the NAACP supports it.

I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chair, I would just like to add, in 2016 when the census in the Federal Register asked for comment on this, 77,000 people did comment. Only four wanted to keep this provision. Everyone else wanted to change this, out of 77,000. That is probably about the percent of people who think Nickelback is their favorite band in this country. It is pretty low.

I think if you look at—if Nickelback is your favorite band, I apologize to the gentleman.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POCAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Why would the gentleman criticize one of the greatest bands of the nineties?

Mr. POCAN. Wow. One more reason why there is a difference between Democrats and Republicans, clearly found on the floor of Congress today.

I would argue, when I look at the small communities in Wisconsin and I would probably argue in Illinois, where there are correctional facilities, those populations really do bloom because of the people who are incarcerated there, but almost no one goes back to that community. So this is a much better and more accurate way to have a census. I hope that it will be supported, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairwoman, I stand here to say that my colleague from Wisconsin, I know he did not mean to offend the many thousands, upon thousands of Nickelback fans in his district in Wisconsin. I will stand here to save you from doing that and having to face the political consequences at the ballot box.

Madam Chair, I enjoyed debating back and forth and it is always good to have some good humor on the floor of the House. And, yes, I actually do have a Nickelback song on my running playlist that I listen to on a regular basis.

I was ridiculed for that when I posted my playlist one time, and I know some in this Chamber—even up at the dais—are still laughing about that.

But this amendment is a bad amendment. I wish we could have worked together on it. I hope we can work together on any gerrymandering in this Nation together as we know it, and I look forward to working with the gentleman in the future.

I do have to recommend a “no” vote on this amendment because it does not address the underlying issues with gerrymandering, and the underlying issues that I have with this bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I will just wrap up by saying I appreciate that very brave admission of your fandom for Nickelback. That is very brave and I do recognize that. I didn't think we were going to talk about Nickelback on the floor today. Somehow it came up.

Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In title III of the bill—

(1) redesignate subtitle G as subtitle H (and conform the succeeding subtitle accordingly); and

(2) insert after subtitle F the following new subtitle:

Subtitle G—Use of Voting Machines Manufactured in the United States

SEC. 3601. USE OF VOTING MACHINES MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES.

Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by section 1504, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) VOTING MACHINE REQUIREMENTS.—By not later than the date of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office occurring in November 2022, each State shall seek to ensure that any voting machine used in such election and in any subsequent election for Federal office is manufactured in the United States.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today to offer an amendment that I think everyone in this Chamber can support. Whenever possible, voting machines used in America should be made in America.

Aside from the obvious that it just makes sense to have the infrastructure of American democracy made in America, this amendment seeks to help safeguard our elections. Manufacturing voting machines in America will ensure that production lines are secure, and that we know without a doubt whether or not our voting machines have been compromised.

Today's amendment simply requires States to seek to ensure that any voting machine used in any election for Federal office is a machine that is made in this country. The deadline for this requirement would be the 2022 election.

Madam Chair, I believe that the intent of this amendment is clear. I anticipate strong support from my colleagues, and for that reason I will stop here, urge the Chamber to vote in favor of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my good friend from Wisconsin. I didn't know if he wanted to mention Creed this time or not, but we can have a great debate on nineties music, if you like. But I do want the gentleman to come over and see my playlist after this is done. We will have some fun.

I am opposed to this amendment because American manufacturing employs more than 12 million men and women, contributes \$2.25 trillion to the U.S. economy annually, has the largest economic impact of any major sector, and accounts for more than three-quarters of all private-sector research and development in the Nation. I support American manufacturing wholeheartedly.

However, my good friend's amendment is not about American manufacturing. It is about the many complaints that I have had regarding H.R. 1—and I have already stated—about Federal overreach in mandating States to comply with a requirement that is within their jurisdiction.

This bill continues to burden the American taxpayer by adding programs that would be footed by everyday Americans and would have to be paid for by county governments, by local governments, and municipalities that already have budgets that are stretched too thin. It is another unfunded mandate. It is another unfunded mandate from the Federal Government.

Unnecessary regulations of election equipment also present an undue burden on the States who administer these elections. This requirement gives State and local officials less options. This is ultimately a federalism issue. We believe that our State and local governments can maintain safe, secure elections that allow every one of their constituents, our constituents, to vote, and also ensure that every single American who is eligible to vote has their vote counted and has their vote protected. That is our goal.

H.R. 1 doesn't accomplish this goal, and much to my chagrin, I say to my friend from Wisconsin, I am opposed to this amendment, although I am not opposed to him.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chairwoman, I support this amendment, given the level of foreign interference in the elections in 2016 and 2018 and efforts to penetrate our voting systems. I think it makes sense that we use American-manufactured systems as well as software. But I would note this: this amendment is not proscriptive. It says that “States shall seek to ensure.” That is not a mandate to do it. Really, this is saying this is a good thing to do. I think it is a good thing to do.

While I have the microphone, I would like to note that we have just received

a letter from 27 religious institutions, including the Alliance of Baptists, African American Ministers In Action, the National Council of Churches, the NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice and the Presbyterian Church in the United States, in favor of H.R. 1, which I include in the RECORD.

MARCH 6, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As national faith-based advocates and congregations we urge passage of H.R. 1—the For the People Act. Our organizations strive for policies and systems that diminish inequality, support the most vulnerable, nurture human potential, and protect the health and well-being of all members of our society and of creation. We look to our government to reflect those ideals and we support a strong democracy:

... where voting is a fundamental right and a civic responsibility.

... that serves the people rather than the private interests of public officials and wealthy political donors.

... where our influence is based on the force of ideas, not the size of our wallets.

... where people know who is trying to gain influence over our representatives, who is trying to influence our votes, and how and why policy is being made.

... that works to respond to the needs of all people and their communities, building trust in governance and equity.

A broken democracy has clear and detrimental impacts on the issues important to us. We are faithful advocates who work within the existing political system, yet that system no longer seems capable of contending with the big problems facing our country, our communities, and our congregations. The faith community offers witness to what is obvious to most Americans: our democracy is out of balance.

The current system allows powerful corporate and wealthy interests to regularly defy the foundational principles of fairness, equity, ethics, accountability, and respect for the rule of law. The unfortunate result is that our government has become more responsive and accountable to wealthy political donors than to the public. Today's broken democratic system subjugates deeply held, age-old values to the profit motive.

People of faith know that Washington is not representing their best interests when millions of Americans who are eligible to vote cannot do so because they are not registered, voter ID laws are used as a tool to suppress the vote, millions of Americans are disenfranchised due to a felony conviction, and a number of states are improperly purging eligible voters from the registration rolls.

People of faith know that Washington is not representing their best interests when congressional districts are drawn to achieve highly partisan results at the expense of fair representation for citizens.

People of faith know that Washington is not representing their best interests when ethics rules governing our highest leaders and decision-makers are deeply flawed and are not subject to proper oversight and enforcement.

People of faith know that Washington is more accountable to corporate interests than to the public when they can spend huge sums of money influencing our elections and our government.

People of faith know that we can't fix the issues that the faith community cares about the most—such as poverty, immigration, climate change, racial justice and health care—until we fix our democracy.

To that end, the undersigned national faith organizations support H.R. 1, The For the People Act.

We recognize the historic opportunity our country faces to repair our political system and, as people of faith, we are hopeful in the possibility of renewal.

We applaud efforts to reform our election processes and our governing politics so that the interests of all are served, not just those with money.

We support attempts to restore ethical norms which inhibit self-interested corruption on the part of lawmakers.

We support provisions that enhance the influence of low-income and middle-income people on policy-making through their vote and their engagement in the civic body.

We support campaign finance reforms that sustain and encourage elected officials to serve their constituents and to legislate on behalf of the common good.

We embrace reforms that favor accountability and transparency in our government and in our lawmakers' decision-making.

We urge Congress to seize this moment to pass the comprehensive democracy reform H.R. 1.

Alliance of Baptists; African American Ministers In Action; American Friends Service Committee; Church World Service; Conference of Major Superiors of Men; Congregation of Our Lady of the Good Shepherd, US Provinces; Disciples Center for Public Witness; Ecumenical Poverty Initiative; Faith in Action; Faith in Public Life; Franciscan Action Network; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Islamic Society of North America; Jewish Council for Public Affairs; Leadership Conference of Women Religious.

National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd; National Campaign for a Peace Tax Fund; National Council of Churches; National Council of Jewish Women; National Religious Campaign Against Torture; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; Pax Christi USA; Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.); South East Asian Faith Initiatives; United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; Unitarian Universalist Association; Unitarian Universalists for Social Justice (UUSJ).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Madam Chairwoman, again, this amendment, I am opposed to because I believe it is Federal overreach, but I do want to address an issue. As we can see, this would require American manufacturers to begin producing even more pieces of equipment that would then have to comply by the standards of this amendment, which is fine.

I am all for creating American jobs, but we also have a problem with the underlying bill. I tried to pass an amendment in the only markup that happened on this now almost-700-page bill. The amendment would have made sure that anyone who helped craft this bill, especially the special interest groups who were recognized on the day this bill was introduced and announced at a press conference, people who helped write this bill should have to sign a document that says that they will not profit from this.

What doesn't happen is, if somebody who helped craft this bill decides to open a manufacturing facility and make money off of the legislation, we need to know that. Because that amendment did not pass during the markup process, we won't know if that happens.

I would love to work with my colleague from Wisconsin to put a provi-

sion in place like that, and at that point in time this may be an amendment I could support.

Before we talk about any more nineties music, I am going to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN, Madam Chairwoman, I can assure my colleague, I do not plan on going into the voting machine business so he doesn't have to worry about me anyway. I don't think anyone in this body will.

I do urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1500

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MS. FRANKEL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. FRANKEL, Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 264, line 14, strike "and".

Page 264, line 19, strike "office." and insert "office; and".

Page 264, insert after line 19 the following: "(3) to implement and model best practices for ballot design, ballot instructions, and the testing of ballots."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. FRANKEL, Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment, which is aimed at ensuring that a voter is not confused or misled by a bad ballot design that could lead to that voter overlooking a race—that is called an undervote—or even voting for the wrong candidate.

I want to explain the problem, Madam Chair, and then what I suggest is the remedy because, unfortunately, I have seen a bad ballot design basically cause chaos in my home State of Florida in two recent past elections.

First, I want to go back to the 2000 Presidential race, Gore v. Bush, where a very—unfortunately, a famous—poorly designed butterfly ballot confused voters in Palm Beach County. Many elderly citizens who thought they were voting for Al Gore actually voted for Pat Buchanan.

Why was this significant? Because we had a Presidential race where 6 million voters voted and it was decided by 500-plus votes, and Pat Buchanan got an unexpected 3,400 votes in a very liberal Palm Beach County.

Then, again, just recently in the 2018 midterms, again, in a very close Senate race, this time a race that was about a 12,000-vote margin, more than 30,000 voters in Broward County did not make

a choice in a U.S. Senate race. It is arguable that this is because the Senate candidates' names were under a set of long instructions, and according to experts, people don't read long instructions, and then they overlooked this Senate race.

So this amendment makes a good attempt to remedy this situation. It would allow States to use the election assistance grants that are now being authorized by H.R. 1 to improve ballot designs. Although our Election Assistance Commission publishes best practices and guidelines how to design a good ballot, these guidelines are voluntary, and local election administrators often face difficulties in trying to translate the best practices into the real world.

So with the funds provided by this amendment, States will be allowed to use their election assistance grants to create programs to train workers, research, model, and implement ballots designed by the best practices. This promises Americans the chance to cast their vote for their intended candidate.

We have seen problems with bad ballots. They are not just theoretical hiccups. They can and will, literally, swing elections.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my friend and colleague from Florida and fellow 2012 election year classmate.

We want to make sure every vote is counted. We want to make sure that every eligible voter in this country is registered, casts their votes, and that their vote is protected.

I have a lot of faith in the American people, and I have a lot of faith in the American voters. I think simple sets of instructions under, above, or below a race may or may not be a consideration in whether or not somebody decides to vote.

I find it ironic that most of the time my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will blame ballot design, but only when they lose. The fact that a Republican won in Florida meant that there is obviously a ballot issue. The fact that a Republican won in the 2000 Presidential race, it has got to be a ballot issue.

Let's address ballot issues throughout the country. Let's make sure that we have the ability to plan ahead, and that is what this bill doesn't do. It doesn't plan ahead and allow us to look at what is the next best, safest voting technology in the future. This bill will require paper marked ballots when we don't know what may or may not be safer in the future, but we are going to limit ourselves now.

Now, my biggest concern with this amendment is it is another example of

this bill being rushed. If this were a well-thought-out piece of legislation, then we wouldn't need amendments clarifying the bill's intent.

This amendment in particular shows how we should have taken more time in the markup, and we should have had more committees that had jurisdiction mark this bill up instead of the vague language that is scattered throughout the bill.

If Members had more than 15 minutes of questioning—which I had in the one hearing as the ranking Republican on the committee, the only committee that marked this bill up—then we could have gotten to the bottom of this vague language.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), my colleague.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I just wanted to come down. I was listening to this debate. Some of it is good-hearted because, frankly, you just don't want to get so frustrated with a bill that was so rushed with 600-and-some pages that was not gone through.

I pointed out on the floor yesterday, Madam Chair, that there is a part of this bill that actually does—go back and read it. The chairwoman of this great committee, whom I have a lot of respect for would not have done this, I believe, if she was allowed to have done this, but it actually criminalizes keeping a 4-year-old from voting.

Now, this amendment is fine, but it goes to this issue: Ten committees had jurisdiction. One of the biggest was the Judiciary Committee on which I am the ranking member. We had a hearing, but no markup—don't want to get close to that; Oversight, hearing, no markup. This is what happens when you rush bills to the floor.

This is what happens when your agenda is bigger than the process. This is what happens when you don't care what is on the floor, you just want a talking point.

If we are going to continue this for 2 years, fine. The American people will see through this. But I think my ranking member from committee is correct. You cannot continue to do this and people not figure out we are not sure what is going on anymore.

This is a frustrating point with this because some of this could have been caught. We probably still wouldn't have agreed on much of this. Some of this bill is actually good, Supreme Court ethics and some other things in here we could have worked on.

But when you come to the floor like this and you don't mark it up and you do it like this, this is what you get: the hope of a lot of amendments to clarify, the hope of a lot of amendments to change.

Just do the work of committee. That is what I don't understand.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, Mr. COLLINS is showing, once again, that in the immortal words of the best-selling band of the 2000s,

Nickelback, if today was your last day, I would always yield to my good friend from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Vote "no."

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Chair, I just want to say that this amendment is very simple.

You do not want elections with asterisks. Voters should be able to vote for the candidate they intend to vote for. There should be no confusion because of the ballot.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

This amendment clarifies that the election administration improvement grants that are in the bill may be used by localities or the States to implement and model best practices for ballot design, ballot instructions, and, I will say, testing of ballots, which is very important.

Most of the grants are really oriented towards computer systems, which is also very important, but I have seen some of these ballots where you could see why you could get confused; and, really, if you look at our friends in the tech world, you can design something so you vote yes or no just by the way the design is done.

Now, I think most of the ballot mistakes—there is no evidence it is by intention; it was just error. But you can create something so that people make a mistake.

The last thing we want for the most precious right that we have is for people to make inadvertent errors. We want people to cast their votes for whom they choose and then to have their vote counted for whomever it is they choose. It is that simple.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for the amendment. I think it is a good one.

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Chair, I thank the chairwoman for her comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In part 5 of subtitle A of title I of division A (page 72, beginning line 3), add at the end the following:

SEC. 1052. GRANTS TO STATES FOR ACTIVITIES TO ENCOURAGE INVOLVEMENT OF MINORS IN ELECTION ACTIVITIES.

(a) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Election Assistance Commission (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Commission") shall make

grants to eligible States to enable such States to carry out a plan to increase the involvement of individuals under 18 years of age in public election activities in the State.

(2) CONTENTS OF PLANS.—A State's plan under this subsection shall include—

(A) methods to promote the use of the pre-registration process implemented under section 8A of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (as added by section 2(a));

(B) modifications to the curriculum of secondary schools in the State to promote civic engagement; and

(C) such other activities to encourage the involvement of young people in the electoral process as the State considers appropriate.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—A State is eligible to receive a grant under this section if the State submits to the Commission, at such time and in such form as the Commission may require, an application containing—

(1) a description of the State's plan under subsection (a);

(2) a description of the performance measures and targets the State will use to determine its success in carrying out the plan; and

(3) such other information and assurances as the Commission may require.

(c) PERIOD OF GRANT; REPORT.—

(1) PERIOD OF GRANT.—A State receiving a grant under this section shall use the funds provided by the grant over a 2-year period agreed to between the State and the Commission.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the end of the 2-year period agreed to under paragraph (1), the State shall submit to the Commission a report on the activities the State carried out with the funds provided by the grant, and shall include in the report an analysis of the extent to which the State met the performance measures and targets included in its application under subsection (b)(2).

(d) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term "State" means each of the several States and the District of Columbia.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under this section \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I am very pleased to be able to offer this amendment with my good friend from the First District of North Carolina, Mr. G. K. BUTTERFIELD.

Madam Chair, I am the father of four, and for the last 40 years I have tried always to take one of my children into the voting booth with me until they got too old, one by one, to come in because I wanted them to see by example how important it was to vote.

I tried to show them that this is a really big deal. Our dinner conversations for these 40 years have been always about the world, the country, inevitably, then about politics and then about government, because nothing is more important to our representative government than this idea of self-determination, that every one of us has the obligation to be part of our political process.

But, sadly, as we all know, way too many young people do not participate in our process. If we get to 10 percent, 11 percent, 12 percent under the age of 29, we are thrilled that they show up. So their voice is lost far too often.

So our amendment simply authorizes \$25 million, over the next 2 years, in grant money to be issued to the Election Assistance Commission, and that is for them to give to eligible States money to be used to carry out plans, policies, and programs to increase youth involvement in elections. It does things like encourage States to implement methods to promote the preregistration of young voters.

I know this is probably already part of the bill itself, the requirement for preregistration, but in the 20 States that have it that you can register at age 15 or 16—not vote until you are 18—but if you do that, then you get a much higher voter participation.

It petitions States to modify the curriculum of secondary schools to promote civic engagement and activities to inspire young people to engage.

Madam Chair, I try to accept every invitation that I get from a high school to come be part of their classes. I came to 84 high school graduations when I was Lieutenant Governor because I get so discouraged when not just kids, but even adults don't know the names of their Governor or their U.S. Senators or certainly not their Congressman, and they have no idea how the Constitution works and how valuable it is.

We have to educate them, and this is a small investment in encouraging States to provide those curricula and others that can make it. They need substantive opportunities to participate in our political process and contributing to practical solutions.

Madam Chair, I feel deeply, if you can give good practice to kids, that will lead to good habits, good habits to good character, and as we all know, character is destiny.

So this small, humble amendment simply authorizes the Appropriations Committee to invest \$25 in the Election Assistance Commission to help get our kids involved in politics at the best and young ages.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I appreciate my colleague from Virginia offering this amendment. I know he misspoke when he said \$25 is being authorized in this amendment. It is actually \$25 million that is being authorized.

That is my biggest hang-up with the bill. We have got a lot of pressing things in this country that \$25 million can be spent on: infrastructure projects, pediatric cancer research, and putting it towards curing Alzheimer's, ALS, what have you, a lot of other priorities. We don't need a Federal pro-

gram that is going to potentially cost \$25 million to do what States, localities, and local organizations are doing right now.

I commend the gentleman for wanting to get more young people involved. I have got 18-year-olds. I sometimes wish they were a little more interested in what was happening at all levels of government, but that comes with time.

It is interesting the gentleman talks about being around the dinner table with family talking about what it means to serve and what it means to enact policy. That is how I got here.

□ 1515

I am the son of a 16-year-old who walked into a fast-food restaurant and then never left and is going to celebrate 60 years with the same company this year. Because he had a dream to own his own restaurant one day, my dad was able to move us to Illinois and achieve the American Dream.

He and my mom, a high school dropout, taught me around the dinner table how decisions in Washington and in Springfield, Illinois, affected their ability to hire people at their local McDonald's in Taylorville, Illinois.

That is what got me interested in politics. That is what got me interested in government. Much to the chagrin of some on the other side of the aisle and some on my own side of the aisle, that is probably why I am here.

We want to encourage young people, but that encouragement happens around the dinner table. It happens already, and it shouldn't cost \$25 million.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I commend Mr. BEYER and Mr. BUTTERFIELD for this amendment providing grants.

Over the period of time that the bill covers, this is actually a pretty small amount of money, and it is subject to appropriations.

I do think it is difficult to put a price on our democracy. We need to make sure that young people are involved from the get-go. We have seen that young people don't necessarily have the tools to become engaged in our democracy.

It is fine if our ranking member gave his instruction to his twins around the dinner table. I commend him for that. But not every person in America has been so fortunate, and we need every American to participate.

I would like to say that this amendment, coupled with Mr. AL GREEN's amendment for the pilot project and Mr. NEGUSE's amendment, which will come later in the proceedings, really does put on the agenda outreach to the young people of America to participate in our democracy.

I know that there are people on both sides of the aisle who have concerns about changing the voting age in this bill and want to study that further. For

those people, these amendments are going to create vigorous outreach to the young people of America so they can be participants, and I commend the gentlemen for offering it.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I appreciate the chairperson offering her support for this amendment. She mentioned it is tough to put a price on democracy. That is exactly what H.R. 1 is doing.

The price of democracy in every single congressional district, for every single candidate running for Congress, is now, according to this bill, \$4.5 million in corporate money and, eventually, taxpayer dollars. That is the price of democracy that my Democratic colleagues have put into every Member of Congress' campaign coffers if this bill goes through.

The price of democracy should be the freedoms that we enjoy on the floor of this great institution to be able to debate back and forth. The price of democracy should not be legislated at \$4.5 million for each and every Member of Congress who is blessed enough to serve in this institution.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), my good friend.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I appreciate the chair here, and I do want to follow up on that.

I think the price of democracy has actually been paid by the blood, sweat, death, and lives of those who have fought for this country for over 200-something years.

That is the price of democracy. Those of us who have seen it in Iraq and other places, while serving there, understand that.

It is not found in a 600-page bill being rushed to the floor, not going through markup. Let's at least be very honest about that.

I appreciate the gentleman wanting to involve others in that. I appreciate wanting to make sure that we have young people's involvement. But we are also, frankly, as Members of this body, given a great opportunity.

There is not a high school, elementary school, or middle school in this country that would turn us away. We can go anytime we are in our district workweeks and encourage those teachers who are trying every day to teach them reading, writing, and civic responsibility. That is what our jobs give us the ultimate privilege of doing.

I appreciate the chairwoman of the committee saying that we are going to have vigorous outreach. She just said: Well, \$25 million spread over the life of this bill is not that much.

It is either a lot of outreach or it is a little bit of money or really, frankly, it is neither. It is just a feel-good to

make sure that we are getting people involved, which we should be doing.

I don't think I want to join in an attack on teachers, who are trying their best to instill civics, by saying we are not doing it well enough, and we are going to give a little bit of money spread out very thinly across the country to do something that our teachers strive every day in classrooms to do.

I respect the work of those teachers who are doing that, and I think Members of Congress ought to be able to go in and do what we do, take our office and go to the very ones who we are encouraging to show them that we are human, that we do understand, that we listen, and we answer all their questions, no matter how small or how large those questions are.

It is one of the greatest joys that I have, going to these schools each and every time I can and listening to them and saying: You can do this.

I was once an intern here, and I share that story. When they come to my office, they can see that.

That is what it takes.

I appreciate the gentleman's intent. I have never questioned his intent. I want to see this happen as well. But it also happens many times in this body. We believe money and a little bit of conversation has it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I want to say that all we are doing is giving the Appropriations Committee the flexibility to do this. We are going to spend over \$700 billion on defense for people fighting for our democracy. We can spend a tiny, tiny fraction of that to make sure that American citizens understand what they are fighting for. This is a really important thing.

By the way, it is never an attack on teachers. Every teacher I have talked to would like more resources so they can do their job more effectively.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 136, beginning line 2, strike “, except that” and all that follows through “Sundays”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman

from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me first start by thanking Mr. CRIST of Florida for cosponsoring this amendment. I also want to recognize the work of my good friend from Maryland, JOHN SARBANES, on the underlying bill and his efforts to make our democracy work for the people.

My amendment would guarantee access to early voting during every day of the week, including Sundays, to every American.

Early voting makes voting more convenient by providing Americans with greater flexibility and opportunity to cast a ballot. More and more Americans are taking advantage of early voting, with more than 40 million citizens casting ballots before election day last year.

But guaranteeing fair and flexible early voting on Sundays is not just a matter of convenience. It is critical for minority voters who disproportionately take advantage of Sunday early voting and often face higher barriers and disparate burdens when deciding to cast a ballot: lost pay, childcare expenses, transit costs.

In my State and in States across the country, churches promote “take your souls to the polls” programs that take church parishioners from Sunday services to the voting booth. So cuts to Sunday early voting, as we have witnessed across this country, have had a negative impact, especially on communities of color.

Six States have cut back on early voting, and even more have tried but were blocked by the courts.

In North Carolina, lawmakers deliberately cut Sunday voting, saying 6 days of voting in one week is enough. But this action was struck down because, as the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals noted, it targeted African Americans with almost surgical precision.

Our democracy doesn't work if we don't give people the fullest opportunity to make their voices heard. We should make it easier for people to vote, not harder, and this amendment does exactly that.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, personally, Sunday mornings are sacred for me and my family and for a lot of other people, too, including those public servants who work the polls on early voting.

But this isn't about Sunday or any other day. It is about my colleagues dictating to States and local officials on how they should run their elections.

State and local election officials know their voters best and what works for them. This amendment is yet another example of the Federal Government trying to push a one-size-fits-all standard on States and localities.

I don't believe the Federal Government should be mandating to States how to run their elections, even to the minute details such as polling hours, especially because, I guess, in my home State, it already happens.

When you look at my district, they have early voting hours on Sundays, so I don't know how widespread the problem is since it already happens in Illinois. It seems like another top-down approach that could adversely affect some communities, especially rural communities, that may not be able to afford to have a polling place open on Sundays.

It is a problem with the entire bill. The costs keep going up and up and up on our local officials without a lot of certainty that funds are going to flow to help them with that.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, in an ideal world, perhaps, we don't mandate from the Federal Government, but when the Fourth Circuit determines that the North Carolina Legislature did it to target African Americans with almost surgical precision in eliminating Sunday voting, it is time for action at the Federal level so we can ensure every American has the right to vote.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST), my friend and a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. CRIST. Madam Chair, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN), for his leadership on this issue.

Souls to the Polls is a bedrock of Florida elections. For my colleagues who may be unfamiliar, minority communities, particularly African American and Latino, use Sunday early voting to energize their communities to make their voices heard. For those without reliable transportation or with unpredictable work schedules, Sunday voting is critical and sacred.

This is how a healthy democracy should work, communities organizing themselves to increase participation, doing their civic duty. Higher turnout and greater participation strengthen our democracy, giving elected leaders a stronger, more representative voice.

Unfortunately, some States have targeted Sunday Souls to the Polls voting. My own State tried to shut it down in 2012.

This amendment would block States from using voter suppression tactics against Souls to the Polls.

I urge my colleagues to support the Brown-Crist amendment and let the underlying bill pass.

Let's refresh our democracy, for the people.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I have kind of said all I

need to say about this amendment, so while I have a few extra minutes, I understand the chairperson has received an estimate from a joint committee regarding how much this new corporate funding program for congressional campaigns will bring into the Federal Government over the next 10 years.

First, I would love to see a copy of that, now that we are only 1 day away from voting on this bill. This is eerily similar to the games that my colleagues across the aisle played with the Congressional Budget Office score. I will remind them once again that we still don't have a figure of how much this section of H.R. 1 will cost American taxpayers.

Second, if we look at the potential cost of the 6-to-1 government match program and the Presidential campaign matching program, these together could represent billions and billions of dollars every election cycle.

Now, what you will hear from the other side is that, if they don't have the funds for these programs, the caps for these programs would uniformly be lowered. What that means is that either the programs will die or my counterparts across the aisle are going to turn to taxpayer dollars to ask us to fulfill what they have claimed as absolutely necessary programs.

What does this sound like to you, a well-thought-out public policy proposal or a shell game with American tax dollars?

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the chairwoman of the Committee on House Administration.

□ 1530

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, first, I would like to thank Congressmen BROWN and CRIST for an excellent amendment that improves the bill considerably.

On the point just raised by the ranking member, the report given by the Joint Committee on Taxation was put into the RECORD yesterday, and it is their estimate of how much will be raised, and their estimate that we will reduce the deficit by \$83 million.

We are waiting; the CBO is crunching numbers, which is hard to do because each amendment has to be crunched as we go along.

But I will say this: During the markup in the House Administration Committee, we did outline the vessel for the Freedom From Influence Fund. We didn't have the jurisdiction to do the assessment on criminal wrongdoing by corporations and tax cheats, but we did create the Freedom From Influence Fund, and we did create the step-down on the program if there is insufficient funding. So this is not a new thing.

I think it is sound policy.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, how much time do I have left, if I may inquire?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, this is another clear example of why this bill needs to be voted down or put back, preferably put back to committee.

I am the ranking member of the House Administration Committee, and I stood across this floor from my colleagues who now use the excuse and say, Well, it was submitted into the RECORD yesterday.

There has been a lack of communication, a lack of bipartisan outreach from the Democratic side of the aisle, and this is another example of the "Keystone-coppish" behavior of the folks that have introduced now an upwards of 700-page bill that has not been marked up, has not been discussed, debated by 40 percent of the committees that have—by nine other committees that have jurisdiction over 40 percent of the bill.

So when I hear the chairperson talk about jurisdictional issues as to why she couldn't discuss this with me in our markup process, I am wondering why she couldn't turn and tap me on the shoulder, since I was about 6 inches away, and say, Hey, we don't have jurisdiction, but here is what we estimate this is going to cost.

It just goes to show that this is a shell game. This is a game that is going to cost taxpayers billions. This is a game that we, and the American taxpayers, are going to have to pay for; and it is offensive that we have zero communication.

I have shown time and time again—we Republicans have offered and supported bipartisan—supported Democrat amendments. We have offered the olive branch of bipartisanship throughout this process to try and make this bill better, and we have been shut down by the Democrats every single time we have and every step of the way.

This bill is not going to guarantee that every single American voter who is eligible to vote has their vote counted and has their vote protected. What this is going to guarantee is that this bill is going to be rammed through on a partisan roll call tomorrow.

This bill is going to cost taxpayers billions, and we are not going to have the price tag because the Democrat majority, who is trying to enrich themselves and their own campaigns, the Democratic majority, who is trying to keep themselves in a permanent majority, are going to obfuscate, put new programs, and plans, and charades, and shell games in place, that are going to end up costing taxpayers, put more corporate money into congressional campaigns and, in turn, break the American taxpayers under the guise of election reforms.

Madam Chair, this process is not what the Democratic majority promised when they took over. This process has been riddled with a lack of bipartisanship, a lack of transparency, and special interests helping write this

mammoth, now 700-page bill that is going to nationalize our election systems and put billions of dollars into the campaign coffers of Congressmen and Congresswomen throughout this Nation.

That is not what the taxpayers of this country want. That is not what we are demanding. And it is an affront. I hope everybody votes “no” on this amendment and this bill.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 168, line 7, strike “before the date of the election;” and insert “before the date of the election or the first day of an early voting period (whichever occurs first);”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified with the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 47 offered by Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

The amendment is modified to read as follows:

Page 168, line 3, strike “before the date of the election;” and insert “before the date of the election or the first day of an early voting period (whichever occurs first);”

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, my amendment would require States to notify voters of polling location changes no later than 7 days prior to the first day of early voting, providing every voter as much time as possible to plan how and when they will vote, and avoiding last minute polling place changes that, more often than not, discourage people from exercising their right to vote.

Research shows that the most important factor that impacts whether someone votes or not is the location of the polling place and the effort it takes to get there.

A 2011 study in the American Political Science Review said changing a location of a polling place can significantly lower voter turnout.

Unfortunately, since 2008, and further accelerated in 2013, when the Supreme Court struck down key parts of the Voting Rights Act, nearly 15,000 polling places have been closed across the country; many of them are located in southern Black communities.

Polling places have been used as political tools to shape the outcome of elections for generations, and it continues to happen today.

Before the 2018 elections, States and local election boards closed polling places at colleges and universities, consolidated polling places in predominantly-minority neighborhoods to save money, and moved polling locations away from public transportation.

These changes discourage participation in our democracy, and make our system of government weaker. That is why Congress must take action to protect the rights of the people, to have a government by the people, for the people.

By providing sufficient notice, every voter can decide whether to cast a vote on Election Day or, as this bill provides, take advantage of early voting or no-excuse absentee voting.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I am proud to be a champion for open and fair elections, and encouraging all American citizens to participate in their fundamental right to cast their vote.

My challenge to this amendment is similar to my larger challenges to the underlying bill. What this amendment seeks to do is already a Federal requirement and is updating its specific requirement.

This is a great example of when the Federal Government steps into legislating something that is outside of its jurisdiction, and is forced to update its own legislation.

State and local election officials are charged with determining how to best administer fair elections and open elections for all of their citizens. This includes notifying them of their polling place, and of any changes. Federally mandating details is unnecessary and, really, not the role of the Federal Government.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Sadly, Madam Chair, in this country there are far too many States and/or local election officials that are not committed to fair and open elections. And as we have seen by decisions in courts at every level, rolling back actions by State legislatures to change polling sites, to take away early voting oppor-

tunities, there are some times in the history of this Nation, and this is one of them, when it comes to protecting voting rights, where it is a Federal responsibility to do so.

In an optimal world, in an optimal situation, where we had truly free and fair and open elections, perhaps this amendment and perhaps even this legislation wouldn't be required. That is not the world we live in today, although it is an aspirational place to be.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I again thank my friend and colleague from the great State of Maryland for offering the amendment. Unfortunately, I have to be opposed to this amendment for the variety of reasons I mentioned.

I believe in the greatness of America. I believe we have a great system where other countries from around this globe only wish they could choose their own leaders, like Americans get the opportunity to do so.

We have a system of federalism. We have a system that, I believe, works best from the bottom up; and I believe a top-down approach, that this 700-page mammoth bill will provide for our local election officials, will hinder them, and cost them, and stop them from being able to administer the best, most open elections they possibly can.

I have a lot of faith in the county election officials that are operating in my district, in central and southwestern Illinois. I believe they run a very fair election process. I want to give them the tools and the flexibility to meet the needs of my constituents and our constituents; and the Federal Government doesn't need to be the voice to do so. Our local officials can do that better.

I am ready to close, so I will just reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the chair of the House Administration Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I just want to say how much I appreciate the amendment offered by Mr. BROWN. It improves the bill by making sure that voters are notified, not just 7 days before the poll is moved, but before early voting begins, maximizing the opportunity to actually get to the poll.

Many Americans, right now, have a single day to vote, and if you are a working person, you may not even have time off, you may not even be able to get to the polling place. That is what H.R. 1 is all about.

And just getting to the federalism issue. Article I, section 4 explicitly says, “Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations” about Federal elections. That is what we are doing here.

We need to do more because there are jurisdictions in our country that are specifically trying to prevent people from voting based on race. That is why we have got the Voting Rights Act that

is going to be coming later. We are compiling the evidentiary record for the Voting Rights Act right now.

But this bill just relates to Federal elections which we have jurisdiction to do. We need to make sure that the efforts to keep people from exercising their right to vote in Federal elections are defeated. That is what H.R. 1 is about. That is what Mr. BROWN's amendment is about, and I am grateful to him for offering it.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I will close by just encouraging all my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 136, line 3, strike "and".
Page 136, line 5, strike the period and insert "; and".
Page 136, insert after line 5 the following:
"(3) allow such voting to be held for some period of time prior to 9:00 a.m. (local time) and some period of time after 5:00 p.m. (local time)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment would require a portion of early voting hours to occur outside of normal business hours. This simple, yet effective amendment would ensure that every working individual has the opportunity to cast their ballot without taking time off from work, having to find child care, or risking being reprimanded by their employer.

□ 1545

While early voting has become increasingly commonplace, States and localities continue to change and restrict hours every election, sometimes closing as early as 4 p.m., making it problematic for those whose workdays may have irregular schedules or are unable to take time away from work.

Despite State laws guaranteeing many workers time off to go vote, too many Americans have neither the luxury of an employer that will give them time off to vote nor the financial freedom to risk losing a few hours' wages in order to participate in our democracy. That is why early voting is so important.

But holding early voting during business hours is just another way citizens have been impeded from exercising their right to vote, particularly middle-class working Americans in the service, manufacturing, and other blue-collar industries. These Americans often rely on a 9 to 5 schedule and don't have the same opportunity to vote.

To ensure everyone's voice can be heard and early voting is convenient for every American, locations should remain open well after the traditional close of business.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I have said the same thing about previous amendments. I think this is an overreach issue. I don't think the Federal Government should be involved in the minute details of early voting hours.

States aren't asking us to set our hours here in Congress; we shouldn't, as the Federal Government, ask our State and local election officials who know better how to run free, fair, and a lot less costly election processes.

We have got a problem in this country, Madam Chair, with a shortage of election day workers. We have got a problem with poll workers.

In my home State of Illinois, every other year it is a holiday. It hasn't helped us get more election workers. It hasn't helped us get more poll workers. What it has done is it has created a holiday and a day off where many people can come vote or they can enjoy the already open early voting processes that States like mine have in place and the opportunities to cast their votes in a wide variety of ways.

This is another example of a Federal top-down approach that obviously shows there is a distinct difference between my Democrat colleagues and me and all of us on this side of the aisle. We believe in a bottom-up approach of governing; they believe in a top-down approach.

The bottom-up approach, I believe, leads to more efficiencies, leads to fairer and better and freer elections, and a top-down approach is nothing but costly to the taxpayers in unfunded mandates.

One thing that really frustrates me is, if you are going to impose Federal mandates, you cannot leave States open to the potential liability because the mandate is so broad. And that is

exactly what this bill does. That is exactly why I am opposed to this amendment.

Madam Chair, I am ready to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, keeping the same terminology of "bottom-up" and "top-down," I think the Founders contemplated both, that when it comes to Federal elections, it would be both a bottom-up and a top-down.

As my friend from Illinois was reminded during the last debate, Article I, Section 4 says, and I will read it in its entirety: "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof"—that sounds like bottom-up to me—"but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."

I think that is what you would refer to as a top-down, contemplated by the Founders, implemented and embraced here in H.R. 1. Why? So that we can protect, expand, promote, and defend the right for every single American to vote and to make sure it is as convenient and accessible to every American regardless of race, color, creed, gender, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Maryland.

You know, like some of the legislation we pass here, it has to go through the rulemaking process later. That is no different than our forefathers and our Founders of the Constitution.

If you read Alexander Hamilton, he responds to the concerns that the power of the national government to determine the time, places, and manner of elections of the Representatives of the House might actually, at that time, result in the elevation of the wealthy over the mass of citizens.

The fear seems to have been that the national government may conspire to hold elections in only parts of the States populated by the wealthy. That would presumably prevent lower income citizens from voting.

Hamilton rejected that fear on several grounds, including the fact that such places do not exist, but that the rich are scattered throughout the States.

Hamilton argued that every member of this country should have the right to vote, but the Federal overreach should not be something we are actually encouraging right now.

Let's look at what our forefathers actually said about the provisions in the Constitution, just not using them to put forth a political agenda.

Madam Chair, I am urging a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 182, line 21, strike the semicolon and insert the following: “, together with a description of any actions taken in response to such instances of voter intimidation or suppression;”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This amendment will require States to include in their biannual report to Congress on the voter information hotline statistics to include a description of any actions taken in response to reports of voter intimidation or suppression.

Discouraging voter participation through intimidation or suppression tactics runs against the very foundation of our democracy, but these tactics continue to play an unfortunate role in our elections today.

When I ran for Lieutenant Governor of Maryland in 2010, my opponent hired a consultant who advised my opponent that “. . . the first and most desired outcome is voter suppression” by having “African American voters stay home.”

To that end, my opponent made thousands of election day robocalls to Democrat voters telling them that Democrats had won; although, in fact, the polls were still open for 2 more hours.

The call told voters: Relax. Everything is fine. The only thing left is to watch it on TV tonight.

It reached 112,000 voters in majority African American areas.

This is just one example of the despicable tactics that have become commonplace in our elections.

We have the responsibility to confront these attempts to target individuals and influence whether or not they vote.

In 2019, too many Americans are still being harassed, threatened, and barred from exercising their right to vote. My amendment will ensure election officials do their job by helping voters who don't know where to vote, why their polling place is closed, or why they are being turned away.

This is an essential element to make our elections more free, more fair, and will help safeguard the integrity of our elections by holding election officials

accountable for protecting every citizen's right to vote.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, this amendment would have the effect of the Federal Government compiling statistics without context and without vetting on very serious criminal matters. Unless there was some sort of follow-up on the reports, it could actually do more harm than good.

I am also afraid that certain partisan organizations could take advantage of this. So bear with me. Let's talk through this and let's see how this would work.

People call into this hotline, submit allegations of serious crimes, and then it is sent to the State and now the Federal Government. Partisan groups who helped author this bill would then use statistics from the hotline to then bring unverified lawsuits under the new third-party actions that are allowed in this bill.

This is a recipe for disaster. The stated purpose of H.R. 1 is to increase transparency in politics, but instead, unfortunately, this provision would only invite corruption.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, turning back to the amendment, what the amendment does is it simply holds local election officials accountable and to be responsive to the claims, the calls, the concerns that are raised to them regarding voter intimidation, voter suppression, ensuring that when they are collecting that information, that they also report on what the response is to the claims that are made.

Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), chair of the House Administration Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I would like to commend the gentleman for this amendment.

When you make a phone call in to complain about harassment or intimidation, that information may or may not ever become known, so this is really a pro-transparency measure.

The amendment says: “together with a description of actions taken in response to such instances of voter intimidation or suppression.”

The State legislatures may not know, we may not know how many efforts are being made. We should know that to see whether what we have done here is sufficient, whether the Voting Rights Act that will be following along this bill later in the spring needs to address this.

Madam Chair, this is an excellent amendment.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I believe the EAC, Elec-

tion Assistance Commission, is supposed to track this information.

The key point, too, that I made earlier is that there is no verification, and that is a problem with this amendment. It is a problem with the bill. There are no protections for bad behavior.

This is why we tried to get rid of ballot harvesting. It was why the amendment was offered in committee. I mean, we have already seen what bad actors can do.

It cost taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars in North Carolina, and they have to run a new special election, but that is okay because that may not have been a crime in California. But that is all right. The Democrats didn't want to accept that because they might like the process somewhere else.

I think what is wrong is wrong and we ought to be able to have protections. I am not convinced that the American people have the protections that they need and that they deserve to stop what happened in North Carolina from happening somewhere else.

This is another example of overreach, another example of something already happening, already existing agencies that should be compiling this information; and there are no safeguards and there will be no verification of allegations, and that is unfortunate.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, the issue raised by the gentleman from Illinois is neither helped nor harmed by this amendment. He raises an issue that we can take up perhaps another day.

But what this bill simply does is it requires that local elected officials be responsive and report on the responses they take to claims of intimidation and suppression.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, we would love to take up ballot harvesting today, too, but, unfortunately, we are not given the chance to. The Democrats voted it down in the only markup that we had, the smallest committee in Congress, 5 hours last week, with 40 percent of the bill not going through regular order, not going through the committee process.

This is not a process that has been open. It is not a process that has been transparent. It is not a process that has been bipartisan.

Clearly, we have accepted many Democrat amendments on our side. Not one single Republican amendment has been accepted by the Democrat side.

Madam Chair, I urge a “no” vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) having assumed the chair, Ms. HAALAND, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1600

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on any postponed question at a later time.

CONDEMNING ANTI-SEMITISM AND ANTI-MUSLIM DISCRIMINATION

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 183) condemning anti-Semitism as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values and aspirations that define the people of the United States and condemning anti-Muslim discrimination and bigotry against minorities as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contrary to the values and aspirations of the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 183

Whereas the first amendment to the Constitution established the United States as a country committed to the principles of tolerance and religious freedom, and the 14th amendment to the Constitution established equal protection of the laws as the heart of justice in the United States;

Whereas adherence to these principles is vital to the progress of the American people and the diverse communities and religious groups of the United States;

Whereas whether from the political right, center, or left, bigotry, discrimination, oppression, racism, and imputations of dual loyalty threaten American democracy and have no place in American political discourse;

Whereas white supremacists in the United States have exploited and continue to exploit bigotry and weaponize hate for political gain, targeting traditionally persecuted peoples, including African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, Asian Americans and Pa-

cific Islanders and other people of color, Jews, Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs, the LGBTQ community, immigrants, and others with verbal attacks, incitement, and violence;

Whereas the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., taught that persecution of any American is an assault on the rights and freedoms of all Americans;

Whereas on August 11 and 12, 2017, self-identified neo-Confederates, white nationalists, neo-Nazis, and Ku Klux Klansmen held white supremacist events in Charlottesville, Virginia, where they marched on a synagogue under the Nazi swastika, engaged in racist and anti-Semitic demonstrations and committed brutal and deadly violence against peaceful Americans;

Whereas a white nationalist murdered nine African American worshippers at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, on the evening of June 17, 2015, in the hopes of igniting a nationwide race war;

Whereas on October 27, 2018, the perpetrator of the deadliest attack on Jewish people in the history of the United States killed 11 worshippers at the Tree of Life Synagogue building in Pittsburgh and reportedly stated that he "wanted all Jews to die";

Whereas anti-Semitism is the centuries-old bigotry and form of racism faced by Jewish people simply because they are Jews;

Whereas in 2017 the Federal Bureau of Investigation reported a 37 percent increase in hate crimes against Jews or Jewish institutions and found that attacks against Jews or Jewish institutions made up 58.1 percent of all religious-based hate crimes;

Whereas there is an urgent need to ensure the safety and security of Jewish communities, including synagogues, schools, cemeteries, and other institutions;

Whereas Jews are the targets of anti-Semitic violence at even higher rates in many other countries than they are in the United States;

Whereas it is a foreign policy priority of the United States to monitor and combat anti-Semitism abroad;

Whereas anti-Semitism includes blaming Jews as Jews when things go wrong; calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or extremist view of religion; or making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotyped allegations about Jews;

Whereas Jewish people are subject in the media and political campaigns to numerous other dangerous anti-Semitic myths as well, including that Jews control the United States Government or seek global, political, and financial domination and that Jews are obsessed with money;

Whereas scapegoating and targeting of Jews in the United States have persisted for many years, including by the Ku Klux Klan, the America First Committee, and by modern neo-Nazis;

Whereas accusing Jews of being more loyal to Israel or to the Jewish community than to the United States constitutes anti-Semitism because it suggests that Jewish citizens cannot be patriotic Americans and trusted neighbors, when Jews have loyally served our Nation every day since its founding, whether in public or community life or military service;

Whereas accusations of dual loyalty generally have an insidious and pernicious history, including—

(1) the discriminatory incarceration of Americans of Japanese descent during World War II on their basis of race and alleged dual loyalty;

(2) the Dreyfus affair, when Alfred Dreyfus, a Jewish French artillery captain, was falsely convicted of passing secrets to Germany based on his Jewish background;

(3) when the loyalty of President John F. Kennedy was questioned because of his Catholic faith; and

(4) the post-9/11 conditions faced by Muslim-Americans in the United States, including Islamophobia and false and vicious attacks on and threats to Muslim-Americans for alleged association with terrorism;

Whereas anti-Muslim bigotry entails prejudicial attitudes towards Muslims and people who are perceived to be Muslim, including the irrational belief that Muslims are inherently violent, disloyal, and foreign;

Whereas Muslims and people perceived to be Muslim are subjected to false and dangerous stereotypes and myths including unfair allegations that they sympathize with individuals who engage in violence or terror or support the oppression of women, Jews, and other vulnerable communities;

Whereas in 2017, mosques were bombed in Bloomington, Minnesota, and burned in Austin, Texas, Victoria, Texas, Bellevue, Washington, and Thonotosassa, Florida, and mass attacks on Muslim communities were planned against communities in Islamburg, New York, in 2019, Jacksonville, Florida, in 2017, and Garden City, Kansas, in 2016;

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation reported that hate crimes against Muslims or Muslim institutions in the United States increased by over 99 percent between 2014 and 2016;

Whereas attacks motivated by bigotry against those who are Muslim or perceived to be Muslim have substantially increased since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks;

Whereas the violation of an individual's civil rights based on his or her actual or perceived membership in a particular religious group clearly violates the Constitution and laws of the United States; and

Whereas all Americans, including Jews, Muslims, and Christians and people of all faiths and no faith, have a stake in fighting anti-Semitism, as all Americans have a stake in fighting every form of bigotry and hatred against people based on religion, race, or place of birth and origin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) rejects the perpetuation of anti-Semitic stereotypes in the United States and around the world, including the pernicious myth of dual loyalty and foreign allegiance, especially in the context of support for the United States-Israel alliance;

(2) condemns anti-Semitic acts and statements as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values that define the people of the United States;

(3) reaffirms its support for the mandate of the United States Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism as part of the broader policy priority of fostering international religious freedom and protecting human rights all over the world;

(4) rejects attempts to justify hatred or violent attacks as an acceptable expression of disapproval or frustration over political events in the Middle East or elsewhere;

(5) acknowledges the harm suffered by Muslims and others from the harassment, discrimination, and violence that result from anti-Muslim bigotry;

(6) condemns anti-Muslim discrimination and bigotry against all minorities as contrary to the values of the United States;

(7) condemns the death threats received by Jewish and Muslim Members of Congress, including in recent weeks;

(8) encourages law enforcement and government officials to avoid conduct that raises the specter of unconstitutional profiling against anyone because of their

race, religion, nationality, political, or particular social group, including the assignment of blame or targeting members of an entire religious group for increased suspicion, based on the conduct of a single individual or small group of individuals; and

(9) encourages all public officials to confront the reality of anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, racism, and other forms of bigotry, as well as historical struggles against them, to ensure that the United States will live up to the transcendent principles of tolerance, religious freedom, and equal protection as embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the first and 14th amendments to the Constitution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 183, which condemns anti-Semitism unambiguously, as well as anti-Muslim bigotry and all forms of prejudice against minorities, as contrary to fundamental American values and principles. This resolution makes clear that we condemn anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, and racism no matter where on the political spectrum they may emanate from, right, left, or center.

This resolution is a statement of our values as a Nation. While it focuses on concerns raised in the last few weeks regarding anti-Semitism and Islamophobia, it addresses those noxious forms of bigotry in the context of our broader concern with all forms of bigotry and hatred in our country.

Bigotry against members of minority groups based on their actual or perceived religion, ethnicity, race, or national origin are among the cardinal sins of our Nation. As the resolution notes, tolerance and religious freedom are among our country's fundamental principles, so much so that they are enshrined in the very First Amendment to the Constitution.

Sadly, without constant vigilance, our Nation has seen darker moments where religious and other forms of hate have reared their ugly heads. Often, our Nation has fallen short of its ideals when they succumbed to the demagoguery of bigots.

Indeed, one of the biggest problems facing our country today, and one that has bedeviled it in the past, is the fact that white supremacists have weaponized bigotry and hatred to achieve political gains. They do so by

stoking hatred and division among Americans based on religion, race, ethnicity, or other characteristics.

To combat this, it is imperative that all of us—but especially those of us in public life—speak out against such hate. Unfortunately, sometimes the perpetrators of religious and other forms of bigotry are themselves public figures and even, distressingly, Members of this House.

Indeed, in the last few weeks, comments have been made by some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that can fairly be characterized as anti-Semitic, and I have condemned these remarks.

Anti-Semitism is among the most ancient of prejudices and is associated with pernicious stereotypes, including the claim that Jews exert control over the government and the global political and financial systems, that they are obsessed with money, and that their loyalty to their home countries is somehow in question.

Assertion of these beliefs does not constitute merely making statements of political or policy positions. Rather, propagation of these beliefs has, throughout history, resulted in harassment, discrimination, violence, and murder against Jews.

While anti-Semitism is an ancient prejudice, its effects are not ancient history. Less than 6 months ago, a gunman murdered 11 worshippers at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, reportedly stating that he “wanted all Jews to die.” Nearly 2 years ago in Charlottesville, Virginia, white supremacists chanted, “Jews will not replace us.”

Despite this ugly history, Members on both sides have questioned the loyalty and patriotism of Members of this House. The trope that support for Israel, particularly among Jewish Americans, is the result of a “dual loyalty” to Israel and the United States is deeply offensive to me.

What I find equally despicable is a somewhat analogous “dual loyalty” trope increasingly deployed against Muslim Americans. This includes the recent implication by one of our colleagues that another colleague is a spy and a State Republican poster in the West Virginia State capitol that implied an association between that same colleague and the September 11, 2001, attacks in New York.

Indeed, statements have repeatedly been made in the recent past by public officials, including the President, which can fairly be characterized as anti-Muslim more generally.

Particularly since the September 11 attacks, Muslim Americans have faced a gauntlet of prejudice alleging that they are inherently violent, disloyal, and foreign, and this has led to hate-motivated violence. In 2017, for example, at least five mosques were bombed or burned in various cities around the country.

Efforts to question the loyalty or patriotism of anyone in this country

based on their religion or on any innate characteristic is completely out of bounds.

It is my fervent hope that this resolution will be a chance for us, both as an institution and also as a Nation, to remind ourselves of what we all believe in, and to come together and heal.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this resolution today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, at Sunday school, Jewish kids learn the imperishable words of Hillel, who said: If I am not for myself, who will be for me? But if I am for myself only, then who am I? And if not now, when?

Today, we must all stand strongly and proudly for ourselves and our communities, but we must also stand in strong solidarity with other people and their communities. We must act now because in America and in nations all over the world, anti-Semitism, anti-Muslim bigotry, and other forms of racism and intolerance are sharply on the rise.

These old and lethal poisons are not only a threat to individual Jews and Muslims and African Americans and Hispanic Americans and Asian Americans and Native Americans walking down the street, and to our children playing at school, they are the common enemy of liberal democracy, which depends upon tolerance and pluralism to survive.

As the world's oldest liberal democracy and a thriving multiracial and multicultural society, America must reject the myths and stereotypes and libels and tropes that make up these ancient hatreds.

Anti-Semitism and racism are the gateway to destruction for everything that we believe in as a society. They are a threat to the values of our constitutional creed: pluralism and tolerance, religious freedom and freedom of association, equal protection for all citizens.

Let us stand up today for our most hard-won American ideals, and let us vote for this resolution condemning racism and anti-Muslim bigotry and other forms of racism and intolerance.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I don't know where to begin. I really don't. As Members of Congress duly elected by a constituency to serve in this body, who come here with the hope and the thought that we exchange ideas and come to this body to actually participate, for the second time in 8 weeks, I am here with my friend from New York debating a resolution that all of us should have learned in kindergarten: Be nice; don't hate.

This resolution doesn't need to be seven pages. It is just wordy. I agree with it. We don't need to hate, no matter where it comes from. But what

bothers me the most, Mr. Speaker, is what I am finding right here.

Just the other day on this floor, we celebrated the institution of this body with the dean of the House. We spoke of Mr. Dingell. We spoke of DON YOUNG. We spoke about the institution of this House. What is becoming more and more concerning for me about this process and what breaks my heart as much as any anti-Semitic thought, any anti-Muslim thought, any anti-anybody thought, is that we have broken down in this House.

Last week, we brought to the floor a bill that was supposed to be about firearms, which my friends across the aisle mistakenly didn't understand the penalty associated with the bill.

Yesterday, I was just on the floor of this House talking about a bill that really, because they rushed it through committee, came to the floor of this House in which, if you keep a 4-year-old from voting, you are a criminal. This is what happens when we rush.

This week, the entire week almost, has been taken up by sentiments of a Member that were anti-Semitic, repeating, as Rahm Emanuel said, some of the ugliest stereotypes that we have had.

But it goes back, again, to my concern here. At 3:20 this afternoon, I was handed, or at least it was printed, one of the resolutions. I have three more of this resolution that has taken all week. How long does it take to figure out "just don't hate"? How many times, how many, you know, pages does it take to cite evil is evil?

My heart breaks, Mr. Speaker. My heart breaks for this institution when we say that we see something that is anti-Semitic, but we say, well, they may not have known it was. It is anti-Semitic. It is anti-Muslim. It is whatever you want to call it. It is just wrong. My heart breaks.

Then I find out that we changed it now lately as to add other groups in here who undoubtedly saw they weren't a part of the group, so we added in new groups to the list. I guess since we are at it, why didn't we add Mormons? Why didn't we add Jehovah's Witnesses? They have been attacked. Mormons have many times been accused of dual allegiance. Ask a former Presidential candidate.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the Chair and I could engage in a colloquy. He is a good gentleman from North Carolina. Explain this to me, why it took a whole week to figure out to say, "Hate is hate." We don't need seven pages.

We need people to understand that words have consequences; that being a Member of Congress matters; that being a Member of Congress says that when you say something, we can debate civilly.

My friends from New York and Maryland, we disagree on most anything. We could probably disagree about how many clouds are in the sky, about policy, but it is not a disagreement that hate is hate.

□ 1615

And we shouldn't overlook it and try and lump it with everything else and give moral equivalency. But here we are again. Here we are again.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we are not here in another 4 weeks, because the first 8 weeks we have been here twice. Please let us get back to being the people that this country needs us to be.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, listening to the gentleman from Georgia, I think I heard him say that he and his colleagues were going to vote for this resolution. I am glad to hear that, especially since I noted that after the march in Charlottesville and the murder in Charlottesville when a censure resolution was brought up, the Republicans, who were then in control of the House, refused to bring it to the floor. So I am glad that they are willing to vote for this resolution today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. LURIA).

Mrs. LURIA. Mr. Speaker, I am a Jewish American woman who served for 20 years in uniform and continue to serve in the United States Congress.

At the age of 17, when I entered the United States Naval Academy, I first took the oath to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. I subsequently repeated that oath six times at every promotion in rank and, most recently, when I had the honor to become a Member of Congress.

Is that not enough to prove my loyalty to our Nation?

I deployed six times, serving in six ships in the Middle East and Western Pacific, working under challenging conditions while operating complex weapons systems, overseeing nuclear reactors, driving ships, and, ultimately, commanding a combat-ready unit of 400 sailors.

Is that not enough to prove my loyalty to our Nation?

In the first 3 years my husband and I were married, we spent almost 2 years apart so that we could both serve at sea and deploy three times.

Is that not enough to prove my loyalty to our Nation?

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Virginia an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. LURIA. Mr. Speaker, am I to look back on my military career and the sacrifices it meant for my family and remain silent in the face of people questioning my loyalty to my country?

I believe that I speak clearly for all fellow Jewish veterans that this echoes of language that has been used to marginalize and persecute the Jewish people for centuries.

The recent accusations of dual loyalty call into question the equal footing of Jewish Members in elected office and, by extension, all Jews living in America.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to vote on this resolution in condemnation of this rhetoric.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I don't think the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) would question my belief that what happened in Charlottesville or anywhere else was bad. I don't think he really meant that, Mr. Speaker, because I do believe it is bad. And I think what is bad is having to write this thing, seven pages, and having to figure this out.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, let's all be honest with each other. We are here today, right now, because of anti-Semitic rhetoric from one Member of this Chamber said again and again and again. We would not be on this floor right now otherwise to discuss this topic.

If that Member were a Republican, that Member's name would be in this resolution, and this resolution would be all about condemning anti-Semitism, and it would be done so forcefully.

That Member in January had to apologize for talking about a hypnosis of Israel that they had over the entire world. That Member had to apologize in February for saying: If you support Israel, it must be because you are bought off by Jews. That Member called it an unequivocal apology even though she filled it with equivocation.

Now we are back again this time by the Member saying that, if you support the U.S.-Israel relationship, that you must have pledged allegiance to a foreign government—except this time that Member is refusing to apologize.

Even if you gave that Member every benefit of the doubt that she had no idea what she was doing, why now wouldn't she be apologizing? Why would she be more emboldened to refuse an apology altogether?

I, apparently, am giving Representative OMAR more credit than the Speaker is because I don't believe she is naive. I believe that she knows exactly what she is doing.

It is an American value, by the way, to have reasonable, legitimate criticism of a government, whether it be the U.S. Government, Israel, or any other government. It is not an American value, though, to be hurling anti-Semitic rhetoric.

Anti-Semitism must be condemned, unequivocally and emphatically.

We have Members of this Chamber who associate with Louis Farrakhan, who says: "Hitler was a very great man." Let's talk about a double standard.

In January, we all came to this Chamber. We condemned white supremacy. We named a Republican Member. We kicked that Member off of his committees; he can't serve on the Small Business Committee. But this Member will continue to serve on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

But, no, now we can't come here and just emphatically, solely, forcefully condemn anti-Semitism and name names. But if it was a Republican, we would.

It is time to call out these statements for what they are: pointed, bigoted, unreasonable, illegitimate, anti-Semitic.

I commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have been speaking out about all this anti-Semitism. A few Members come to mind: Chairman ENGEL, Congressman DEUTCH, Congressman NADLER, Congresswoman LOWEY, Congressman GOTTHEIMER.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I believe, to their core know how very wrong this is.

There are many other Members to name as well, and I would be remiss if I didn't take this opportunity to say thank you to each and every one of them, because support of Israel, support of Jews, standing against anti-Semitism has been bipartisan in the past. It should be bipartisan today, and it should be bipartisan for every moment in the future.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution condemning anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, and bigotry against minorities.

This resolution expresses our rejection of all attempts to weaponize words and sow discord and division.

Make no mistake, our Caucus is unified, but unity does not mean unanimity. We are the most diverse Caucus in the history of Congress. We are a true reflection of who and what America is.

Each of us brings our own familiar backgrounds and personal experiences to this august body. Those experiences help shape our values and our perspectives as we do the work of the American people.

We learn from one another, and we do so following President Lincoln's declaration: "With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in."

This resolution condemns hateful expressions of intolerance, honors the heritages and experiences of all who serve in this body, and commits all of us to the continued search of a more perfect Union.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for yielding me time, and I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for his comments.

We are here today because a Member of this body issued a series of anti-Se-

mitic statements, and I couldn't help but think of what justice means and what mercy means.

Well, we want to temper justice with mercy. So the first time we come to understand that maybe the depth of what was said was maybe accidental; the second time maybe less so; and certainly the third time, we now have a pattern.

We begin to wonder how we extend mercy when justice cries out against one who is anti-Semitic.

It doesn't help that the Democratic leaders have attempted to rationalize and protect this individual, whether it is appearing on the cover of a national magazine, whether it is saying: "She did not understand the full weight of the words." One wonders what more needs to be done to try to eradicate anti-Semitism from this body.

Some have said that to specifically condemn these statements and remove her from her committee assignment would stifle legitimate criticism of Israel. But the problem with that argument is this:

The comments made were not directed at Israel, were not directed to policy, were not directed towards the American-Israel relationship. They were, instead, directed to Americans with the allegation that they have a dual loyalty, which is an ancient anti-Semitic cliché that has been used to target the Jewish community throughout history.

How about this in the future? If a Member of Congress desires to criticize Israel or criticize American policy towards Israel, maybe they can do so without resorting to an anti-Semitic rhetoric that is inflammatory, unnecessary, and, frankly, it is hateful.

So we stand here today and we look at a resolution condemning hatred of any kind. Who can disagree with that? I don't. I don't disagree with that.

But what I will say is you cannot temper justice any longer with mercy, with rationalization. Sooner or later, you have to face what the awful truth is. And if someone is going to persist in making anti-Semitic, hateful statements, to bury that is inexcusable.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me suggest at the outset that no party be too self-righteous on the issue of supporting prejudice and bigotry too often. This is a very serious matter. It is important to call out anti-Semitism in a way that is unmistakable and unambiguous.

We must do so because whenever some people begin to question the allegiance or patriotism of Americans, indeed, whether certain people fully belong as part of our country, it is critical to set the record straight.

Recent statements employing time-worn tropes of dual loyalty have deeply

and correctly unsettled American Jewish communities because their allegation is, simply put, that American Jews who support Israel are not loyal to this country.

I stand as a very strong supporter of Israel and a very loyal American. Such allegations fall into—as has been said—a century-old and dark history of Jews being marginalized and set apart. They recall past evils that occurred in other countries and in our own when, according to the Anti-Defamation League, people accuse Jews of "being disloyal neighbors or citizens" because of their connection to Israel or Jewish communities elsewhere in the world.

That was false, and it was bigoted.

To be clear, the First Amendment protects the right of every American to criticize policies and leaders, whether our own country or others.

That is the glory of our democracy.

□ 1630

However, in these past few weeks, those who say they are only criticizing Israel's leaders or policies have, instead, been making claims about the allegiance and motivation of Israel's defenders.

I do not believe there is anyone in our Caucus, not one, who wishes to silence debate over policy. Rather, what is being called for is an end to the invocation of age-old, anti-Semitic tropes that demonize people instead of criticize policies.

Accusations that Jews bear dual allegiance because of support for Israel or concern for its safety are false and they are also hurtful canards that must be opposed and exposed for what they are: bigotry. They elicit legitimate fear and uncertainty in the individuals and communities they target.

In much the same way, we have also seen vile examples of hatred aimed at painting Muslim Americans as somehow disloyal to our Nation, or not fully belonging, causing similar feelings of insecurity and distress.

No Muslims could come to our country. Those feelings cannot be discounted either. One of our own colleagues was the target of an Islamophobic attack, impugning a Member of this House. That ought to be unacceptable to all of us.

We have seen this same form of exclusion, hatred in recent years whenever acts of bigotry have been directed towards African Americans, and when Latino and Latina citizens have been yelled at to "go back" to their country. This is their country.

This phenomenon is also a reminder of the horrific internment of Japanese Americans during the Second World War. None of us ought to be like Pontius Pilate and think that we have not fallen short of the principles enunciated in our Declaration.

In our multicultural Republic, sometimes it is incumbent upon the American people to speak as one Nation, indivisible, and make a clear affirmation that all Americans have an equal share

in our Republic, that no one's race, or creed, or origin can call into question one's love of country.

I will continue to urge unity in the face of anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, xenophobia, homophobia, transphobia, racism against African American, Latino, Asian Americans, and other forms of prejudice and discrimination.

American Jews, including those who serve our Nation in Congress, need to be reassured that they are equal partners in the diverse coalition for justice, opportunity, tolerance, and equality, and that they have true allies who stand with them as firmly as they have stood with others.

I will continue to make that clear. America is rightfully respected for its Declaration of Independence and its Constitution, as amended and perfected, both of which proclaim the dignity and rights of individuals endowed by our Creator.

But America has also seen, too often, the denial of that dignity and equality to millions of its citizens based upon the color of their skin, the land of their birth, or the faith of their forebearers.

My colleagues, if we are to be better than our past, we must reject all forms of bigotry and prejudice directed at any of our fellow human beings and fellow Americans. Let us all, in solidarity and in union with the principles of our country, support this resolution.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, could you please tell me how much time the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) has remaining, and how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 8¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, according to Proverbs, something that people who are practicing Jews and Christians believe, it says that there are seven things that are detestable to the Lord. They are: "Haughty eyes, a lying tongue, hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that devises wicked schemes, feet that are quick to rush into evil, a false witness who pours out lies, and a person who stirs up conflict in the community."

It goes so far as to say, these are things the Lord hates. So the word hate is not wrong in the Jewish and Christian tradition, but anything beyond this is wrong. And, yes, there has been persecution of Christians. There has been persecution of Muslims, but anybody who is persecuting a people in the name of Christianity is not acting as a Christian. That is not part of the faith.

But what makes this so dangerous—and the reason I will vote against this resolution—is because we came here because of an anti-Semitic remark. We came here to condemn anti-Semitism, but this resolution, as changed up over the last hour, now condemns just about

everything, and the reason that is so dangerous is that anti-Semitism, hatred for the children of Israel, is a very special kind of hatred that should never be watered down.

There has never been a persecution of a people like the Jewish people from 1933 to 1945. Over 6 million were killed. It started with little things, hateful remarks made about the children of Israel that grew and grew, and it was okay because it was made by somebody who had a grudge. It was let go, and it built until it led to the death of 6 million Jews. We have to say no.

We will not let it go on. That is why I will vote against it. It has watered down the sentiment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus condemns all forms of white supremacy, anti-Semitism, and Islamophobia in the strongest terms possible.

This could have been an issue that sowed further division among the country, but, instead, has united everyone around our shared values, condemning all forms of bigotry and hatred. The Congressional Black Caucus stands firmly against all expressions of hate, and is concerned by the recent uptick in hateful rhetoric and crimes targeting minority communities.

For example, a white nationalist murdered nine African American worshippers at Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, on the evening of June 15, 2015, in hopes of igniting a nationwide race war; or the perpetrator of the deadliest attack on Jewish people in the United States' history at the Tree of Life synagogue building in Pittsburgh that killed 11 worshippers.

It is unfortunate that the President of the United States has shown a complete lack of leadership on these issues and has, in fact, fanned the flames.

As chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, the CBC remains committed to building a more perfect union by engaging in constructive dialogue that affirms America as a nation welcoming to all.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to what I was talking about when we first started this, and being saddened to be here, and also how we are continually rushing stuff to the floor. I know it is an oversight, but it goes back to my very first statement here, and, again, I can remind everyone here, if we wanted to write a simple resolution here, hate is hate. It is not good. Don't say it. Think about what you are doing. You could have done this in half of a paragraph.

Not to belittle any of this, this is all wrong, but on page 7, number 7, we have a resolution that says, "condemns death threats received by Jewish and Muslim Members of Congress."

I am a Member who has had someone put in jail for threatening to kill me and my daughter. Why don't we condemn that? We forgot it. We forgot it. Like we had other groups in this bill, that we have written three times, that we had to add because we forgot them. As I mentioned earlier, why didn't we add Mormons? Why didn't we add Jehovah's Witnesses?

It is not that the issue here is the hate and what happened and where it went back to. Our speakers on both sides have gone to the very issue of why we are here. I go back to the issue of what I talked about earlier, that I am saddened for the state of our House that we are so concerned about trying to make talking points and finishing it, that we rush stuff to this floor. This is not what we do or who we are.

Hate is hate. It is bad. It is wrong. Quit saying it, but don't keep rushing stuff to the floor when you don't even really understand what you put in the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote "yes" on this measure today, but I do have concerns about how we are dealing with these issues. Obviously, all forms of hatred and bigotry are intolerable and we should go on the record as saying so.

I am voting for this because when I read the resolution, I agreed with everything it says. But let me say this to the criticism that the Democratic majority won't condemn anti-Semitism. A few weeks back we took the virtually unprecedented step of accepting a Republican motion to recommit, the procedural tool the majority never supports because it condemned anti-Semitism. We were proud to set aside precedent to condemn anti-Semitism then, and in today's resolution, we are doing so again today.

So contrary to what some are saying, that is twice in the course of a month that the Democratic majority is condemning anti-Semitism on the floor of the House.

But I must say, the words spoken by our colleague from Minnesota last week touched a very real, very raw place for me. My desire for the House to go on record again, specifically condemning anti-Semitism, wasn't a desire to single the gentlewoman out or to stifle debate on U.S. policy towards Israel, but it was a desire and need to say that certain words, no matter who utters them, have no place in our public discourse and, indeed, can be very dangerous.

When a Member of our body speaks the way the Representative from Minnesota spoke, then we need to single it out and say we will not tolerate it. In the last week, these problems have been compounded.

Since the comments that sparked this controversy, the gentlewoman from Minnesota has become the target of vile, racist Islamophobic smears and threats. One begets another. And we have got to put a stop to it now. That is horrific. Islamophobia has no place in this body or anywhere in the United States, and anti-Semitism certainly doesn't either.

I wish we had had a separate resolution about anti-Semitism. I think we deserved it. I think it was wrong not to have it. I don't think we should mix everything. But I want to say very clearly and very loudly that anti-Semitism will never be tolerated by me, never be tolerated by this body, and no Member of Congress should be making anti-Semitic statements.

No Member of Congress should be saying hurtful things and then not apologizing for them. So I hope we can put everything together to support this resolution. It condemns all kinds of hatred, whether it is Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, any kind of hatred that is what we need to do. And any time that anti-Semitism rears its ugly head, we need to stop it.

This resolution is a fine resolution, and I will support it. But I am very disappointed that we weren't able to have a separate resolution to specifically condemn anti-Semitism and what our colleague said that really was a very hateful term.

I hope we can put everything together in this House. I know we can. I know people on both sides of the aisle want to work together. We want to stomp out any form of hatred, particularly anti-Semitism.

I will continue to work with anybody who wants to do that.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from New York's statement just then. It is frankly a shame that he had to come say that in this context, but I appreciate what he said because he is right on. He is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I fully associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from New York condemning anti-Semitism, full stop, an entirely appropriate thing to do.

I just think it is curious how we ended up here. We are having this debate right now because Democrats had an objection to something said by a Democrat. So they launch off on this drafting project, and then lo and behold, I hear all of the remarks on the floor, and a lot of the substance in the resolution is about President Trump, and criticizing him and trying to open wounds.

This is, unfortunately, becoming the new mantra of the left in the Congress. When they have got a problem that they can't solve, it must be President Trump's fault.

It is a lot of the sentiment that we see echoed out of the Judiciary Com-

mittee where there is no Russian collusion. The Mueller report is about to drop and Democrats know it is not going to allege Russian collusion, so they have to launch an 81-pronged investigation to harass our President.

They can't get their own House in order, so everything has to be the fault of a President who is creating more economic opportunity, reducing unemployment, ending wars, and doing a heck of a job for the country.

□ 1645

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, as a Jewish Member of Congress who lost family in the Holocaust and whose grandfather fought the Nazis, I need no reminder about our responsibility to confront bigotry, hatred, and intolerance wherever it is found.

No matter how hard one tries, the allegation of dual loyalty simply does not constitute legitimate opinion about foreign policy. It is a slur against Jews. It is indefensible, and it is deserving of condemnation by everyone every time. More than anything, it is offensive to question my loyalty or anyone's loyalty to the United States of America here simply because I am Jewish, the same way it was appalling to question President John Kennedy's loyalty to the United States because he was Catholic.

I am glad that Congress is voicing its opposition to anti-Semitism and made it clear that a dual loyalty smear is unacceptable.

Unfortunately, it was also clear from the discussions this week and the ultimate resolution that anti-Semitism is being treated differently than other forms of bigotry and hatred. There shouldn't be an asterisk next to anti-Semitism, and I will continue to fight it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 4¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 4 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, one thing we are all reminded of this week is that words have power, and divisive words cause pain. Every Jewish person in America, no matter where they are from, could share a story of deeply painful anti-Semitism that they have personally experienced. For me, at its worst, Nazi-obsessed internet trolls mercilessly taunted my children with Holocaust threats too vile for me to describe on this floor.

This pain is frequently felt by all too many Americans. How you look or speak, whom you love, or where you live and pray can still invite unwanted

and potentially dangerous words of hostility.

The conversation today about anti-Semitism, allegiance, and loyalty is necessary because remaining silent against hatred and bigotry is not an option.

I am a second-generation American on both sides of my family. Two generations later, it was possible for me to become a Member of the U.S. Congress—only in America. So, questioning my allegiance is painful and personal.

Unfortunately, this dual loyalty question is not isolated to Jews. Words have power. We must carefully choose our words and make sure that we use them to unite us and not to divide us.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who is the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for bringing this important resolution to the floor of the House.

I commend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) and the very distinguished gentleman from Louisiana for his participation in writing this important resolution.

It is in the spirit of unity and solidarity with my colleagues as we come together in this Chamber of our American democracy to condemn all forms of hatred, racism, prejudice, and discrimination with a hopefully single and strong voice.

It is a profoundly disturbing reality that anti-Semitism is on the rise in America today, and anti-Semitic attacks increasingly are at the highest rate on record. Appalling acts of hatred and bigotry are being inflicted on all elements of our society, be they African American, Latino, people from Asia, and attacks in terms of people being Muslim or other religious faiths. This isn't who we are as a country.

We all believe that there is a spark of divinity in every person who exists, that we are all God's children, and that we come to meet with each other in a way that commands respect for that provenance of our being all God's children. Then we see people making attacks on each other throughout the country, whether it is in Charlottesville or whether it is anti-immigrant attitudes that have reared their ugly heads in our country. It is in that spirit that I come to the floor almost emotionally to speak about this.

In the Congress and across the country, we must accept debate on any subject in a legitimate way, whether it is on our U.S.-Israel policies and the rest. That is protected by the value of free speech and democratic debate in the United States and in Israel.

Israel is our friend in that region. We support Israel out of friendship and out of shared values, but also because it is in our national interests to do so. But not every one of us in this body agrees

on every provision or any consideration in that relationship. That is a separate and complete issue from anti-Semitism.

Anti-Semitism, whether it is in the form of attacks on Jewish people, anti-Semitic tropes, prejudicial accusations, or any other form of hatred, is deeply and unequivocally offensive and must be condemned wherever it is heard. All of us must remember, as Members of Congress and as the President of the United States, that our words are weightier once we cross the threshold into Congress, and, indeed, they weigh a ton when someone becomes the President of the United States.

It is also disturbing that Islamophobia and white supremacism remain a sinister and shameful presence in America today. Too often that goes undernoticed or unchecked. Such attacks have even targeted some of us in this body.

We must condemn these attacks and confront them. As Members of Congress and Americans, we have a solemn and urgent responsibility to fight to end the scourge of bigotry, racism, and hatred in our country.

I do want to again salute our colleague, CEDRIC RICHMOND, our distinguished former chair of the Congressional Black Caucus and now distinguished leader in the whip's operation, for his leadership in shaping this legislation, and, again, Congressman JAMIE RASKIN of Maryland for his leadership role in all of this.

I salute all of our Members for demonstrating the courage to have this difficult conversation and for doing so in a spirit of great respect, disagreeing sometimes, but never questioning the patriotism or motivation of anyone with whom we serve.

I thank Chairman NADLER of the Judiciary Committee for the work that he has done to give us this important moment on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will have a unanimous vote in support of this resolution.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I do again want to go back to something.

I appreciate the words that have been said here. Again, I cannot emphasize this enough. It took seven pages to describe what simply can be said is: Don't hate; watch what you say; you are a Member of Congress; we deserve better; the House deserves better. When we understand this, then we can begin to understand.

Also, I want to go back to something that I will hit again. It goes back to this is again something put together because we couldn't come to agreement on the very nature of what started this, which was anti-Semitic comments. And having to have some of our Jewish legislators come down here and condemn

that is sad, wanting to have to vote for something that, at the very heart, tore them apart. You can hear it in their voices, but yet they have to vote for this.

We also put it together getting it at 3:20 this afternoon. We left out the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. We left out Wiccans. We left out Jehovah's Witnesses. We left out disabled people who are often discriminated against and have hateful things said about them.

We also, in the thing, found out that the only ones we are going to condemn getting death threats are Jewish Members and Muslim Members. We are not condemning anything else. This is just another attempt to rush to do something, to fix something.

I said last week, and I will say it again: What makes you feel good doesn't always heal you. This is another example of a rush project.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), who is the minority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking a Member from the other side of the aisle, Chairman ELIOT ENGEL. I thank the gentleman, for when he heard the language, he stood up. I thank the gentleman for his work.

To all the Members who are here, this shouldn't be this hard. We should not have to go through the number of versions that we had to. We shouldn't have to be on this floor even speaking about this. I hope we won't be back.

Of all the things that have happened this Congress, this is what we have talked about the most. This is the action that this Congress has taken the most. Twice we have to make a statement that we are opposed to anti-Semitism.

The first time it took the minority. It doesn't have very many abilities to bring something to the floor, but we did, and we spoke with one voice. But now we are back in a few weeks stating the same thing, but without apologies, without apologies from that voice.

It did not have to be this hard. Mr. Speaker, we didn't have to break the 72-hour rule that you put in this year to make it less than an hour because of fear of what would happen tomorrow on a motion to recommit.

I will pledge to you this from this side of the aisle, and I hope you understand this clearly: Any hatred, we take action.

I hope you have seen from the action on this side of the aisle where we stand, Mr. Speaker. We didn't have to have a resolution, but when it came to the floor, we voted for it. We took action before it came to the floor, and it wasn't simply: Please apologize.

It didn't have to be this hard.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, our Madam Speaker was right. America is better than this. But to my Members, Congress is better than this.

Please do not make history write about our time with these 2 years that

the most we have ever done is that we had to keep bringing resolutions to the floor to tell people that anti-Semitism is wrong if that is the only action we are going to take. I know we are better than this.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we come to the conclusion of our second time doing this, I will echo the sentiments of our leader who just spoke, and I will echo the sentiments of most everyone who has spoken here that this is wrong.

One time, we should learn; two times, we are getting nothing out of this anymore because, undoubtedly, we are getting no input because we are just putting everything we can imagine that we could think of in a short amount of time unless somebody brought it up into a resolution and saying: This is hate. We don't need to do this.

We don't need a manual to tell us who we can't hate.

How is it so hard?

Why do we blow process?

Why do we disrespect this institution by bringing together things that are thrown together at the last minute that leave out death threats to any other Member besides two groups of Members, that leave out others who have been hated upon?

□ 1700

It breaks my heart. After just a day or so ago speaking of the institutional spirit and hearing the dean of this House talking about working together, it breaks my heart that we are 8, 9 weeks into the session and this is our largest accomplishment, telling the world: Don't hate.

That is our largest accomplishment?

Mr. Speaker, my fear is, with this today, I don't want to be here again. But with the way this was handled, I fear we may be.

We are better than this. This should not be where we are at.

Why do we keep coming back? Because many times, Members forget the awesome responsibility that they have been given as Members of Congress.

Our mouths and our tongues can be our greatest enemy. Let us remember that as we seek guidance each day.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Let me just say that we are better than this, and we have seen in this body where we have had Members attacked. We came together right here in this body, where we all held hands. We said that words have consequences, and we were going to do better. We were going to set an example. Before we could walk off the floor, there was a commercial running to attack the

character of our then-leader, NANCY PELOSI.

So hollow words mean nothing to me. Booker T. Washington once said that we are as separate as the fingers, but we are as whole as the hand. We come together today, hopefully as whole as the hand, to condemn anti-Semitism, bigotry, racism, all of the phobias, Islamophobia, homophobia. What we do is push love, like Dr. King said.

But in the eulogy for Dr. King, Dr. Benjamin E. Mays blamed, in part, the American people for the assassination. He pointed out that the assassin heard enough condemnation of Dr. King and of Negroes to feel that he had public support.

When Dylann Roof murdered nine worshippers in Charleston, he thought he had public support.

The shooter at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh thought he had public support.

The neo-Nazis and the white nationalists who marched in Charlottesville thought they had public support.

The shooter of Gabby Giffords thought he had public support.

The shooter of STEVE SCALISE thought he had public support.

What we are doing here today is making it unequivocally clear to the public that no one has the support to engage in discrimination and racism and anti-Semitism.

Dr. Mays went on to challenge us as Americans to do better. He said: “We, and not the assassin, represent America at its best.” He said we have the power—not the prejudiced, not the bigoted, not the anti-Semite, not the assassin—to make things better.

We, too, in Congress have the power and the obligation to make things right. Though we come from dramatically diverse backgrounds and though we have lived very different lives, we must all, right now, stand together against bigotry.

We must make clear to those who traffic in all forms of hatred—neo-Nazis, white nationalists, racists of all kinds, anti-Semites, Islamophobes, homophobes, transphobes, and those who demonize and demean immigrants from Latin America and throughout the world—that they have no place in the public discourse.

For the record, this will be our third time on anti-Semitic measures. We voted against both of them. You all voted for one and then voted against the other.

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, as one of the first Muslim woman elected ever in the history of the United States to Congress, I rise in support of opposing all forms of hate. No one should ever experience feeling less than, live in fear, or be exposed to oppression, discrimination or violence because of their sexual orientation, their immigration status, their faith, the color of their skin, their ethnicity, their income status or any other form of identifiers. I rise in support of our United States Constitution where all beings are created equal and

will fight every day to oppose racism in our country.

I urge my colleagues to have an open heart, to be present, to serve with compassion, and to hear one another. My colleagues have a rare opportunity to serve with me, an American Muslim woman, who can offer a different understanding of what it is to be a country that is truly equal and inclusive.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 183, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. NADLER. 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 407, nays 23, answered “present” 1, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]
YEAS—407

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burchett
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Ciilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud

Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crenshaw
Granger
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Poster
Foyx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz

Gallagher
Gallego
Lucas
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko

Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O’Halloran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin

NAYS—23

Biggs
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Budd
Burgess
Cheney
Collins (NY)
Conaway

Crawford
Duncan
Gohmert
Gosar
Graves (GA)
King (NY)
LaMalfa
Massie

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

King (IA)

NOT VOTING—1

Clay

□ 1732

Messrs. BROOKS of Alabama, STEUBE, WALKER, and BURGESS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill

Palazzo
Rogers (AL)
Roy
Steube
Walker
Yoho
Zeldin

Messrs. SWALWELL of California, BRADY, MEUSER, WEBER of Texas, BABIN, and GROTHMAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 172 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

Will the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1735

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans’ access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes, with Mr. PETERS (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 49 printed in part B of House Report 116–16 offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116–16 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. RASKIN of Maryland.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 24 by Ms. PRESSLEY of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 25 by Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

Amendment No. 33 by Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. RASKIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 215, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

AYES—219

- | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Adams | Gomez | Ocasio-Cortez |
| Aguilar | Gonzalez (TX) | Omar |
| Allred | Green (TX) | Pallone |
| Axne | Grijalva | Panetta |
| Barragan | Haaland | Pappas |
| Bass | Harder (CA) | Pascrell |
| Beatty | Hastings | Payne |
| Bera | Hayes | Perlmutter |
| Beyer | Heck | Peters |
| Blumenauer | Higgins (NY) | Phillips |
| Blunt Rochester | Hill (CA) | Pingree |
| Bonamici | Himes | Plaskett |
| Boyle, Brendan F. | Horn, Kendra S. | Pocan |
| Brown (MD) | Horsford | Porter |
| Brownley (CA) | Houlahan | Pressley |
| Bustos | Howler | Price (NC) |
| Butterfield | Huffman | Quigley |
| Carbajal | Jackson Lee | Raskin |
| Cárdenas | Jayapal | Rice (NY) |
| Carson (IN) | Jeffries | Richmond |
| Cartwright | Johnson (GA) | Rose (NY) |
| Case | Johnson (TX) | Rouda |
| Castor (FL) | Kaptur | Roybal-Allard |
| Castro (TX) | Keating | Ruiz |
| Chu, Judy | Kelly (IL) | Ruppersberger |
| Cicilline | Kennedy | Rush |
| Cisneros | Khanna | Ryan |
| Clark (MA) | Kildee | Sablan |
| Clarke (NY) | Kilmer | Sánchez |
| Cleaver | Kim | Sarbanes |
| Clyburn | Kind | Scanlon |
| Cohen | Kirkpatrick | Schakowsky |
| Connolly | Krishnamoorthi | Schiff |
| Cooper | Kuster (NH) | Schrier |
| Correa | Lamb | Scott (VA) |
| Costa | Langevin | Scott, David |
| Courtney | Larsen (WA) | Serrano |
| Cox (CA) | Larson (CT) | Sewell (AL) |
| Craig | Lawrence | Shalala |
| Crist | Lawson (FL) | Sherman |
| Crow | Lee (CA) | Sherman |
| Cummings | Levin (CA) | Sherrill |
| Cunningham | Levin (MI) | Sires |
| Davis (CA) | Lewis | Smith (WA) |
| Davis, Danny K. | Lieu, Ted | Soto |
| Dean | Lipinski | Spanberger |
| DeFazio | Loeb sack | Speier |
| DeGette | Lofgren | Stanton |
| DeLauro | Lowenthal | Stevens |
| DelBene | Lowe y | Swalwell (CA) |
| Delgado | Luján | Takano |
| Demings | Luria | Thompson (CA) |
| DeSaulnier | Lynch | Thompson (MS) |
| Deutch | Malinowski | Titus |
| Dingell | Maloney, | Tlaib |
| Doggett | Carolyn B. | Tonko |
| Doyle, Michael F. | Maloney, Sean | Torres (CA) |
| Engel | Matsui | Trahan |
| Escobar | McCollum | Underwood |
| Eshoo | McEachin | Van Drew |
| Espallat | McGovern | Vargas |
| Evans | McNerney | Veasey |
| Finkenaue r | Meeks | Vela |
| Fletcher | Meng | Velázquez |
| Foster | Moore | Visclosky |
| Frankel | Morelle | Wasserman |
| Fudge | Moulton | Schultz |
| Gabbard | Mucarsel-Powell | Waters |
| Gallego | Nadler | Watson Coleman |
| Garamendi | Napolitano | Neal |
| Garcia (IL) | Neguse | Wexton |
| Garcia (TX) | Norcross | Wild |
| Golden | Norton | Wilson (FL) |
| | O’Halleran | Yarmuth |

NOES—215

- | | | |
|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Abraham | Banks | Brooks (IN) |
| Aderholt | Barr | Buchanan |
| Allen | Bergman | Buck |
| Amash | Biggs | Bucshon |
| Amodei | Bilirakis | Budd |
| Armstrong | Bishop (GA) | Burchett |
| Arrington | Bishop (UT) | Burgess |
| Babin | Bost | Byrne |
| Bacon | Brady | Calvert |
| Baird | Brindisi | Carter (GA) |
| Balderson | Brooks (AL) | Carter (TX) |

- | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Casten (IL) | Hudson | Roby |
| Chabot | Huizenga | Rodgers (WA) |
| Cheney | Hunter | Roe, David P. |
| Cline | Hurd (TX) | Rogers (KY) |
| Cloud | Johnson (LA) | Rooney (FL) |
| Cole | Johnson (OH) | Rose, John W. |
| Collins (GA) | Johnson (SD) | Rouzer |
| Collins (NY) | Jordan | Roy |
| Comer | Joyce (OH) | Rutherford |
| Conaway | Joyce (PA) | Scalise |
| Cook | Katko | Schneider |
| Crawford | Kelly (MS) | Schrader |
| Crenshaw | Kelly (PA) | Schweikert |
| Cuellar | King (IA) | Scott, Austin |
| Curtis | King (NY) | Sensenbrenner |
| David (KS) | Kinzinger | Shimkus |
| Davidson (OH) | Kustoff (TN) | Simpson |
| Davis, Rodney | LaHood | Slotkin |
| DesJarlais | LaMalfa | Smith (MO) |
| Diaz-Balart | Lamborn | Smith (NE) |
| Duffy | Latta | Smith (NJ) |
| Duncan | Lee (NV) | Smucker |
| Dunn | Lesko | Spano |
| Emmer | Long | Stauber |
| Estes | Loudermilk | Stefanik |
| Ferguson | Lucas | Stell |
| Fitzpatrick | Luetkemeyer | Steube |
| Fleischmann | Marchant | Stewart |
| Flores | Marshall | Stivers |
| Fortenberry | Massie | Mast |
| Fox (NC) | Fox (NC) | McAdams |
| Fulcher | Fulcher | McBath |
| Gaetz | Gaetz | McCarthy |
| Gallagher | Gallagher | McCaul |
| Gianforte | Gianforte | McClintock |
| Gibbs | Gibbs | McHenry |
| Gohmert | Gohmert | McKinley |
| Gonzalez (OH) | Gonzalez (OH) | Meadows |
| González-Colón (PR) | González-Colón (PR) | Meuser |
| Gooden | Gooden | Miller |
| Gosar | Gosar | Mitchell |
| Gottheimer | Gottheimer | Moelenaar |
| Granger | Granger | Mooney (WV) |
| Graves (GA) | Graves (GA) | Mullin |
| Graves (LA) | Graves (LA) | Murphy |
| Graves (MO) | Graves (MO) | Newhouse |
| Green (TN) | Green (TN) | Norman |
| Griffith | Griffith | Nunes |
| Grothman | Grothman | Olson |
| Guest | Guest | Palazzo |
| Guthrie | Guthrie | Palmer |
| Hagedorn | Hagedorn | Pence |
| Harris | Harris | Perry |
| Hartzler | Hartzler | Peterson |
| Hern, Kevin | Hern, Kevin | Posey |
| Herrera Beutler | Herrera Beutler | Radewagen |
| Hice (GA) | Hice (GA) | Ratcliffe |
| Higgins (LA) | Higgins (LA) | Reed |
| Hill (AR) | Hill (AR) | Reschenthaler |
| Holding | Holding | Rice (SC) |
| Hollingsworth | Hollingsworth | Riggleman |

NOT VOTING—3

- | | | |
|------|-------------|-------------|
| Clay | Rogers (AL) | San Nicolas |
|------|-------------|-------------|

□ 1742

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 235, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

AYES—199

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)

González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Graves (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman

Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Radewagen
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rigglesman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—235

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Dávila (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro

DeBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)

Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan
Luria
Lynch

Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan

Sablan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Traib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—3

Clay
Rogers (AL)
San Nicolas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1747

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

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms.
PRESSLEY) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 126, noes 305,
answered “present” 2, not voting 4, as
follows:

[Roll No. 111]

AYES—126

Adams
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Burgess
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Correa
Crist
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
DeFazio
DeBene
Delgado
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Crist
Evans
Finkenauer
Foster
Fudge

Gabbard
Gallego
Gonzalez (TX)
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan
Malinowski
Maloney, Sean
McGovern
Meng
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Neal
Neguse
Norton
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)

Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
Demings
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)

Pallone
Payne
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Pressley
Price (NC)
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
Schakowsky
Schiff
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Traib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—305

Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
Demings
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Case
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)

González-Colón (PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Houlihan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jeffries
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Garamendi
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger

Krishnamoorthi Norman
Kuster (NH) Nunes
Kustoff (TN) O'Halleran
LaHood Olson
LaMalfa Palazzo
Lamb Palmer
Lamborn Panetta
Larsen (WA) Pappas
Larson (CT) Pascrell
Latta Pence
Lawrence Perlmutter
Lawson (FL) Perry
Lesko Peters
Lipinski Peterson
Loeb sack Phillips
Lofgren Posey
Long Quigley
Loudermilk Radewagen
Lucas Ratcliffe
Luetkemeyer Reed
Luria Reschenthaler
Lynch Rice (SC)
Maloney, Riggleman
Carolyn B. Roby
Marchant Rodgers (WA)
Marshall Roe, David P.
Massie Rogers (KY)
Mast Rooney (FL)
Matsui Rose, John W.
McAdams Rouzer
McBath Roy
McCarthy Rutherford
McCaul Sánchez
McClintock Sarbanes
McCollum Scalise
McEachin Scanlon
McHenry Schneider
McKinley Schrader
McNerney Schrier
Meadows Schweikert
Meeks Scott (VA)
Meuser Scott, Austin
Miller Scott, David
Mitchell Sensenbrenner
Moolenaar Sherman
Mooney (WV) Sherrill
Moore Shimkus
Morelle Simpson
Mullin Sires
Nadler Slotkin
Napolitano Smith (MO)
Newhouse Smith (NE)
Norcross Smith (NJ)

RECORDED VOTE
The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.
A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 233, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]
AYES—200
Abraham González-Colón
Aderholt (PR)
Allen Gooden
Amash Gosar
Amodei Granger
Armstrong Graves (GA)
Arrington Graves (LA)
Babin Graves (MO)
Bacon Green (TN)
Baird Griffith
Balderson Grothman
Banks Guest
Guthrie Guthrie
Hagedorn Hagedorn
Harris Riggie
Hartzler Hartzler
Hern, Kevin Hern, Kevin
Bost Herrera Beutler
Brady Hice (GA)
Brooks (AL) Higgins (LA)
Brooks (IN) Hill (AR)
Buchanan Holding
Buck Hollingsworth
Bucshon Hudson
Budd Huizenga
Burchett Hunter
Burgess Hild (TX)
Byrne Johnson (LA)
Calvert Johnson (OH)
Carter (GA) Johnson (SD)
Carter (TX) Jordan
Chabot Joyce (OH)
Cheney Joyce (PA)
Cline Katko
Cloud Kelly (MS)
Cole Kelly (PA)
Collins (GA) King (IA)
Collins (NY) King (NY)
Comer Kinzinger
Conaway Kustoff (TN)
Cook LaHood
Crawford LaMalfa
Crenshaw Lamborn
Curtis Latta
Davidson (OH) Lesko
Davis, Rodney Long
DesJarlais Loudermilk
Diaz-Balart Lucas
Duffy Luetkemeyer
Duncan Marchant
Dunn Marshall
Emmer Mast
Estes McCauly
Ferguson McCaul
Fitzpatrick McClintock
Fleischmann McHenry
Flores McKinley
Fortenberry Meadows
Foxy (NC) Meuser
Fulcher Miller
Gaetz Mitchell
Gallagher Moolenaar
Gianforte Mooney (WV)
Gibbs Mullin
Gohmert Yoho
Gonzalez (OH) Young
Gonzalez (TX) Zeldin

Cuellar Kind
Cummings Kirkpatrick
Cunningham Krishnamoorthi
Davids (KS) Kuster (NH)
Davis (CA) Lamb
Davis, Danny K. Langevin
Dean Larsen (WA)
DeFazio Larson (CT)
DeGette Lawrence
DeLauro Lawson (FL)
DelBene Lee (CA)
Delgado Lee (NV)
Demings Levin (CA)
DeSaulnier Levin (MI)
Deutch Lewis
Dingell Lieu, Ted
Doggett Lipinski
Doyle, Michael Loeb sack
F. Lofgren
Engel Lowenthal
Escobar Lowey
Eshoo Lujan
Espallat Luria
Evans Lynch
Finkenauer Malinowski
Fletcher Maloney,
Foster Carolyn B.
Frankel Maloney, Sean
Fudge Matsui
Gabbard McAdams
Gallego McBath
Garamendi McCollum
Garcia (IL) McEachin
Garcia (TX) McGovern
Golden McNeerney
Gomez Meeks
Gottheimer Meng
Green (TX) Moore
Grijalva Morelle
Haaland Moulton
Harder (CA) Mucarsel-Powell
Hastings Murphy
Hayes Nadler
Heck Napolitano
Higgins (NY) Neal
Hill (CA) Neguse
Himes Norcross
Horn, Kendra S. Norton
Horsford O'Halleran
Houlahan Ocasio-Cortez
Hoyer Omar
Huffman Pallone
Jackson Lee Panetta
Jayapal Pappas
Jeffries Pascrell
Johnson (GA) Payne
Johnson (TX) Perlmutter
Kaptur Phillips
Keating Pingree
Kelly (IL) Plaskett
Kennedy Pocan
Khanna Porter
Kildee Pressley
Kilmer Price (NC)
Kim Quigley

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2
Himes Porter
NOT VOTING—4
Clay Rogers (AL)
Gomez San Nicolas

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1754
Mmes. PLASKETT, SPEIER, WATERS, and Mr. CICILLINE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."
So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
Stated against:
Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote Number 111 on H.R. 1, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "yes" when I should have voted "no" on amendment No. 24 from Ms. PRESSLEY.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TENNESSEE
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.
The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.
The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

NOES—233
Adams Brindisi
Aguilar Brown (MD)
Allred Brownley (CA)
Axne Bustos
Barragán Butterfield
Bass Carabajal
Beatty Cárdenas
Bera Carson (IN)
Beyer Cartwright
Bishop (GA) Case
Blumenauer Casten (IL)
Blunt Rochester Castor (FL)
Bonamici Castro (TX)
Boyle, Brendan Chu, Judy
F. Cicilline

NOT VOTING—4
Clay San Nicolas
Rogers (AL) Watkins

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1759
Mr. MARSHALL changed his vote from "no" to "aye."
So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON OF OHIO
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.
The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.
The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 238, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

AYES—194

Abraham	Gooden	Olson
Aderholt	Gosar	Palazzo
Allen	Granger	Palmer
Amash	Graves (GA)	Pence
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Perry
Armstrong	Graves (MO)	Posey
Arrington	Green (TN)	Radewagen
Babin	Griffith	Ratcliffe
Bacon	Grothman	Reed
Baird	Guest	Reschenthaler
Balderson	Guthrie	Rice (SC)
Banks	Hagedorn	Riggleman
Barr	Harris	Roby
Bergman	Hartzler	Rodgers (WA)
Biggs	Hern, Kevin	Roe, David P.
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (KY)
Bishop (UT)	Hice (GA)	Rooney (FL)
Bost	Higgins (LA)	Rose, John W.
Brady	Hill (AR)	Rouzer
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Roy
Brooks (IN)	Hollingsworth	Rutherford
Buck	Hudson	Scalise
Bucshon	Huizenga	Schweikert
Budd	Hunter	Scott, Austin
Burchett	Hurd (TX)	Sensenbrenner
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Shimkus
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Simpson
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Smith (MO)
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Smith (NE)
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Chabot	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Spano
Cline	Kelly (PA)	Stauber
Cloud	King (IA)	Stefanik
Cole	King (NY)	Steil
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger	Steube
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Stewart
Comer	LaHood	Stivers
Conaway	LaMalfa	Taylor
Cook	Lamborn	Thompson (PA)
Crawford	Latta	Thornberry
Crenshaw	Lesko	Timmons
Curtis	Long	Tipton
Davidson (OH)	Loudermilk	Turner
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Upton
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Wagner
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Walberg
Duffy	Marshall	Walden
Duncan	Massie	Walker
Dunn	Mast	Walorski
Emmer	McCarthy	Waltz
Estes	McCaul	Watkins
Ferguson	McClintock	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	McHenry	Webster (FL)
Flores	McKinley	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Meadows	Westerman
Foxx (NC)	Meuser	Williams
Fulcher	Miller	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Mitchell	Wittman
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Womack
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Gibbs	Mullin	Wright
Gonzalez (OH)	Newhouse	Yoho
González-Colón (PR)	Norman	Young
	Nunes	Zeldin

NOES—238

Adams	Brownley (CA)	Cleaver
Aguilar	Buchanan	Clyburn
Allred	Bustos	Cohen
Axne	Butterfield	Connolly
Barragán	Carbajal	Cooper
Bass	Cárdenas	Cooper
Beatty	Carson (IN)	Costa
Bera	Cartwright	Courtney
Beyer	Case	Cox (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Casten (IL)	Craig
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Crist
Blunt Rochester	Castro (TX)	Crow
Bonamici	Chu, Judy	Cuellar
Boyle, Brendan	Cicilline	Cummings
F.	Cisneros	Cunningham
Brindisi	Clark (MA)	Davids (KS)
Brown (MD)	Clarke (NY)	Davis (CA)

Davis, Danny K.	Kind	Quigley
Dean	Kirkpatrick	Raskin
DeFazio	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
DeGette	Kuster (NH)	Richmond
DeLauro	Lamb	Rose (NY)
DelBene	Langevin	Rouda
Delgado	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Demings	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Ruppersberger
Deutch	Lawson (FL)	Rush
Dingell	Lee (CA)	Ryan
Doggett	Lee (NV)	Sablan
Doyle, Michael	Levin (CA)	Sánchez
F.	Levin (MI)	Sarbanes
Engel	Lewis	Scanlon
Escobar	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky
Eshoo	Lipinski	Schiff
Espallat	Loeb	Schneider
Evan	Loeb	Schroder
Finkenauer	Lofgren	Schrier
Fitzpatrick	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)
Fletcher	Lujan	Scott, David
Foster	Luria	Serrano
Frankel	Lynch	Sewell (AL)
Fudge	Malinowski	Shalala
Gabard	Maloney,	Sherman
Gallego	Carolyne B.	Sherrill
Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Sires
García (IL)	Matsui	Slotkin
García (TX)	McAdams	Smith (WA)
Gohmert	McBath	Soto
Golden	McCollum	Spanberger
Gomez	McEachin	Speier
Gonzalez (TX)	McGovern	Stanton
Gottheimer	McNerney	Stevens
Green (TX)	Meeks	Suozzi
Grijalva	Meng	Swalwell (CA)
Haaland	Moore	Takano
Harder (CA)	Morelle	Thompson (CA)
Hastings	Moulton	Thompson (MS)
Hayes	Mucarsel-Powell	Titus
Heck	Murphy	Tlaib
Higgins (NY)	Nadler	Tonko
Hill (CA)	Napolitano	Torres (CA)
Himes	Neal	Torres Small
Horn, Kendra S.	Neguse	(NM)
Horsford	Norcross	Trahan
Houlihan	Norton	Trone
Hoyer	Ocasio-Cortez	Underwood
Huffman	Pallone	Van Drew
Jackson Lee	Panetta	Vargas
Jayapal	Pappas	Veasey
Jeffries	Pascrell	Vela
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Velázquez
Johnson (TX)	Perlmutter	Visclosky
Kaptur	Peters	Wasserman
Katko	Peterson	Schultz
Keating	Phillips	Waters
Kelly (IL)	Pingree	Watson Coleman
Kennedy	Plaskett	Welch
Khanna	Pocan	Wexton
Kildee	Porter	Wild
Kilmer	Pressley	Wilson (FL)
Kim	Price (NC)	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Clay	Omar	San Nicolas
O'Halleran	Rogers (AL)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1804

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 237, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

AYES—195

Abraham	Gooden	Olson
Aderholt	Gosar	Palazzo
Allen	Granger	Palmer
Amash	Graves (GA)	Pence
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Perry
Armstrong	Graves (MO)	Posey
Arrington	Green (TN)	Radewagen
Babin	Griffith	Ratcliffe
Bacon	Grothman	Reed
Baird	Guest	Reschenthaler
Balderson	Guthrie	Rice (SC)
Banks	Hagedorn	Riggleman
Barr	Harris	Roby
Bergman	Hartzler	Roe, David P.
Biggs	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (KY)
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Rooney (FL)
Bishop (UT)	Hice (GA)	Rose, John W.
Bost	Higgins (LA)	Rouzer
Brady	Hill (AR)	Roy
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Rutherford
Brooks (IN)	Hollingsworth	Scalise
Buchanan	Hudson	Schweikert
Buck	Huizenga	Scott, Austin
Bucshon	Hunter	Sensenbrenner
Budd	Hurd (TX)	Shimkus
Burchett	Johnson (LA)	Simpson
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Smith (MO)
Byrne	Johnson (SD)	Smith (NE)
Calvert	Jordan	Smith (NJ)
Carter (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Smucker
Carter (TX)	Joyce (PA)	Spano
Chabot	Katko	Stauber
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Stefanik
Cline	Kelly (PA)	Steil
Cloud	King (IA)	Steube
Cole	King (NY)	Stewart
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Stivers
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger	Taylor
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Thompson (PA)
Conaway	LaHood	Thornberry
Cook	LaMalfa	Timmons
Crawford	Lamborn	Tipton
Crenshaw	Latta	Turner
Curtis	Lesko	Upton
Davidson (OH)	Long	Wagner
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Walberg
DesJarlais	Lucas	Walden
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Walker
Duffy	Marchant	Walorski
Duncan	Marshall	Waltz
Dunn	Massie	Watkins
Emmer	Mast	Weber (TX)
Estes	McCarthy	Webster (FL)
Ferguson	McCaul	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	McClintock	Westerman
Flores	McHenry	Williams
Fortenberry	McKinley	Wilson (SC)
Foxx (NC)	Meadows	Wittman
Fulcher	Meuser	Womack
Gaetz	Miller	Woodall
Gallagher	Mitchell	Wright
Gianforte	Moolenaar	Yoho
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Young
Gohmert	Mullin	Zeldin
Gonzalez (OH)	Newhouse	
González-Colón (PR)	Norman	
	Nunes	

NOES—237

Adams	Brown (MD)	Clarke (NY)
Aguilar	Brownley (CA)	Cleaver
Allred	Bustos	Clyburn
Axne	Butterfield	Cohen
Barragán	Carbajal	Connolly
Bass	Cárdenas	Cooper
Beatty	Carson (IN)	Correa
Bera	Cartwright	Costa
Beyer	Case	Courtney
Bishop (GA)	Casten (IL)	Cox (CA)
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Craig
Blunt Rochester	Castro (TX)	Crist
Bonamici	Chu, Judy	Crow
Boyle, Brendan	Cicilline	Cuellar
F.	Cisneros	Cummings
Brindisi	Clark (MA)	Cunningham

Davids (KS)	Kirkpatrick	Quigley
Davis (CA)	Krishnamoorthi	Raskin
Davis, Danny K.	Kuster (NH)	Rice (NY)
Dean	Lamb	Richmond
DeFazio	Langevin	Rose (NY)
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Rouda
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
DelBene	Lawrence	Ruiz
Delgado	Lawson (FL)	Ruppersberger
Demings	Lee (CA)	Rush
DeSaulnier	Lee (NV)	Ryan
Deutch	Levin (CA)	Sablan
Dingell	Levin (MI)	Sánchez
Doggett	Lewis	Sarbanes
Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted	Scanlon
F.	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Engel	Loeb	Schiff
Escobar	Loftgren	Schneider
Eshoo	Lowenthal	Schrader
Espallat	Lowe	Schrier
Evans	Luján	Scott (VA)
Finkenauer	Luria	Scott, David
Fitzpatrick	Lynch	Serrano
Fletcher	Malinowski	Sewell (AL)
Foster	Maloney	Shalala
Frankel	Carolyn B.	Sherman
Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Sherrill
Gabbard	Matsui	Sires
Gallego	McAdams	Slotkin
Garamendi	McBath	Smith (WA)
Garcia (IL)	McCollum	Soto
Garcia (TX)	McEachin	Spanberger
Golden	McGovern	Speier
Gomez	McNerney	Stanton
Gonzalez (TX)	Meeke	Stevens
Gottheimer	Meng	Suzuki
Green (TX)	Moore	Swalwell (CA)
Grijalva	Morelle	Takano
Haaland	Moulton	Thompson (CA)
Harder (CA)	Mucarsel-Powell	Thompson (MS)
Hastings	Murphy	Titus
Hayes	Nadler	Tlaib
Heck	Napolitano	Tonko
Higgins (NY)	Neal	Torres (CA)
Hill (CA)	Neguse	Torres Small
Himes	Norcross	(NM)
Horn, Kendra S.	Norton	Trahan
Horsford	O'Halleran	Trone
Houlahan	Ocasio-Cortez	Underwood
Hoyer	Omar	Van Drew
Huffman	Pallone	Vargas
Jackson Lee	Panetta	Veasey
Jayapal	Pappas	Vela
Jeffries	Pascrell	Velázquez
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Visclosky
Johnson (TX)	Perlmutter	Wasserman
Kaptur	Peters	Schultz
Keating	Peterson	Waters
Kelly (IL)	Phillips	Watson Coleman
Kennedy	Pingree	Welch
Khanna	Plaskett	Wexton
Kildee	Pocan	Wild
Kilmer	Porter	Wilson (FL)
Kim	Pressley	Yarmuth
Kind	Price (NC)	

NOT VOTING—5

Clay	Rodgers (WA)	San Nicolas
Cole	Rogers (AL)	

□ 1809

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. BRINDISI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 54 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 184, insert after line 2 the following:
SEC. 1908. LIMITING VARIATIONS ON NUMBER OF HOURS OF OPERATION FOR POLLING PLACES WITHIN A STATE.

(a) LIMITING VARIATIONS.—Subtitle A of title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.), as amended by section 1031(a), section 1101(a), section 1611(a), and section 1621(a), is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 308 and 309 as sections 309 and 310; and

(2) by inserting after section 307 the following new section:

“SEC. 308. LIMITING VARIATIONS ON NUMBER OF HOURS OF OPERATION OF POLLING PLACES WITH A STATE.

“(a) LIMITATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (b), each State shall establish hours of operation for all polling places in the State on the date of any election for Federal office held in the State such that the polling place with the greatest number of hours of operation on such date is not in operation for more than 2 hours longer than the polling place with the fewest number of hours of operation on such date.

“(2) PERMITTING VARIANCE ON BASIS OF POPULATION.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to the extent that the State establishes variations in the hours of operation of polling places on the basis of the overall population or the voting age population (as the State may select) of the unit of local government in which such polling places are located.

“(b) EXCEPTIONS FOR POLLING PLACES WITH HOURS ESTABLISHED BY UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—Subsection (a) does not apply in the case of a polling place—

“(1) whose hours of operation are established, in accordance with State law, by the unit of local government in which the polling place is located; or

“(2) which is required pursuant to an order by a court to extend its hours of operation beyond the hours otherwise established.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act, as amended by section 1031(c), section 1101(d), section 1611(c), and section 1621(c), is amended—

(1) by redesignating the items relating to sections 308 and 309 as relating to sections 309 and 310; and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 307 the following new item:

“Sec. 308. Limiting variations on number of hours of operation of polling places with a State.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRINDISI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank the gentleman from Maryland for his work on this important topic, and I also want to thank him for his willingness to work with Members of this body to address our concerns regarding the finance of this bill.

Thanks to the changes that I supported and pushed for, we have ensured that no taxpayer dollars will go towards financing political campaigns. It is a testament to what we can accomplish when we work together and compromise.

This bill has many important provisions which will make it easier for working families to have their voices heard. My amendment would extend these wins to the people of upstate New York who have been treated unfairly for years by arbitrary restrictions on polling hours.

In New York State, voters in New York City and neighboring downstate counties have 6 more hours to vote in Federal primary elections compared to voters in my district. A voter in New York City can vote on their way to

work when the polls open at 6 a.m. A voter in Binghamton, on the other hand, can't vote in that very same election until their polls open at noon.

My amendment would fix this situation and institute some basic rules to prevent States from reducing polling hours for people based solely on where they live. This is an important step to ensure that all voters across the State are treated fairly.

I urge adoption of my amendment, and I again thank the gentleman from Maryland for his leadership on this bill, and I urge our colleagues to pass the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, as we look at H.R. 1, at least the limited amount of time that we have had to actually consider H.R. 1 as it has been rushed through the committee process and it has been rushed to the House floor—it grew from 571 pages when we had the opportunity to briefly review it on one day for 5 hours when it was before the House Administration Committee. It has significantly grown since then before it even came to the floor.

But as those who do take a look at it realize, yes, there may be some good ideas in H.R. 1. And what is interesting, those good ideas that are in H.R. 1 are things that are already in States. They are ideas that States have implemented.

This amendment, when you look at it, it sounds like a good idea. Well, let's put all of the polling places on the same timeframe.

I submit to my good colleague from New York, if there is an issue in New York, then the gentleman ought to lobby his State legislature to make that change because the Constitution gives that power to the State legislatures.

Mr. Chairman, as I was coming to Washington again this week, I left my home early on Tuesday morning, and I went to the State capitol in Georgia where I had the opportunity to address both the statehouse and the State legislature, which I served in both of those bodies.

What was amazing, as I talked about this bill, there was bipartisan opposition to this bill. Why? Because this bill strips away the authority of States to actually set their own laws regarding elections.

Some may think it is a good idea to centralize that power here in Washington, D.C., but the problem is the landscape of America is diverse. The geography of America is diverse, and the States are more well-suited to actually meet the constituencies' needs of that State.

Some would say that the Federal Government is more powerful; we can actually enforce this across the board.

Well, the one-size-fits-all doesn't work, and besides that, we don't do very much very efficiently.

As I was looking at the State legislature, there is one thing that I know: Their session in Georgia is going to end in a few days, and by the end of that session, they will have passed a budget and appropriations to fund the State of Georgia for the next year, and it will balance.

Mr. Chairman, do you know the last time that we did that by our deadline? Newt Gingrich was Speaker of the House. We can't even pass our own appropriations here. We are not even following our own laws, but we want to take on more laws and force the States to follow what we think is a good idea?

Early voting, we established that in Georgia years ago, and it has worked well, and we have worked to perfect that.

Mr. Chairman, while this amendment may sound good and it may be well-needed in New York, I would submit to my colleague that this is something that the New York Legislature should take up. This is not something that should be under the purview of Congress.

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

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chairman, I again urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, again, I love this country. I love what this country has stood for. I love the idea of our Founding Fathers, who made this Nation the greatest Nation in the history of the entire world. It is unique because our Founders understood that a government that is closest to the people is the most effective and the most efficient. This bill will undo 220-plus years of States setting their own voting requirements, running their own voter laws.

As I have stated, there is little that we do efficiently here, and we have already uncovered that there are a lot of unintended consequences in this bill. If the States make mistakes, they are much faster, much quicker, and more responsive to correct those mistakes than we would be here.

I encourage my colleagues to vote against this amendment and vote against the underlying measure.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRINDISI).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. CASE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 56 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 453, line 16, strike "(5)" and insert "(6)".

Page 453, line 19, strike "(5)" and insert "(6)".

Page 493, insert after line 8 the following new subtitle (and redesignate the succeeding subtitle accordingly):

Subtitle E—Empowering Small Dollar Donations

SEC. 5401. PERMITTING POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES TO PROVIDE ENHANCED SUPPORT FOR CANDIDATES THROUGH USE OF SEPARATE SMALL DOLLAR ACCOUNTS.

(a) INCREASE IN LIMIT ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES.—Section 315(a)(2)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30116(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking "exceed \$5,000" and inserting "exceed \$5,000 or, in the case of a contribution made by a national committee of a political party from an account described in paragraph (1), exceed \$10,000".

(b) ELIMINATION OF LIMIT ON COORDINATED EXPENDITURES.—Section 315(d)(5) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30116(d)(5)) is amended by striking "subsection (a)(9)" and inserting "subsection (a)(9) or subsection (a)(11)".

(c) ACCOUNTS DESCRIBED.—Section 315(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30116(a)), as amended by section 5112(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(11) An account described in this paragraph is a separate, segregated account of a national committee of a political party (including a national congressional campaign committee of a political party) consisting exclusively of contributions made during a calendar year by individuals whose aggregate contributions to the committee during the year do not exceed \$200."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to elections held on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in favor of my proposed amendment.

This amendment will empower small dollar donors to participate in our elections process and focus the attention of candidates and political parties on earning financial support from a broader base of voters.

All across our political spectrum, we decry the historically low esteem in which Congress is now held, as well as the utter absence of many, if not most, of our fellow citizens from their government, as if the two were unrelated. For, of course, low esteem breeds absence, and absence breeds low esteem. Most Americans simply feel left out, without a voice, unvested, unwanted, and, thus, the downward cycle.

Nor is this just about low esteem and absence. For the vast majority of Americans are not vested in our government, and if our government is only supported and is only representative of

the very few, mostly moneyed and influential, interests of our country, then that does not lead to representative decisions and erodes the consent of the governed, the political and social consensus on which our democracy is based.

As just one manifestation of this dangerous and worsening syndrome, the Center for Responsive Politics reviewed 2018 election-cycle contributions and found that, still again: "Only a tiny fraction of Americans actually give campaign contributions to political candidates, parties, or PACs. The ones who give contributions large enough to be itemized, over \$200, is even smaller. The impact of these donations, however, is huge."

In fact, according to the center, while less than a half percent of the population contributed \$200 or more, their contributions totaled 71 percent of all individual contributions in 2018 to candidates, PACs, parties, and outside groups.

The clear corollary is that the vast majority of Americans do not participate in our elections with their financial support and that, of those who do contribute, their voices are drowned out in a sea of larger contributions from a precariously narrow interest base.

This is why leading reform groups such as Issue One and its ReFormers Caucus, a fully bipartisan group of now over 200 former Members of Congress, Governors, and Cabinet members committed to nonpartisan solutions to fixing our broken system, cites increased and broadened voter participation in the election process through means such as amplifying the voices of small donors as key to returning our government to the people.

My amendment would take one small but meaningful step in that direction by authorizing national political party committees of any party to contribute up to \$10,000 to a candidate, twice the amount currently authorized, if the amount consists solely of individual contributions of less than \$200, and by making corresponding changes in the limit on coordinated expenses.

By permitting such committees to provide enhanced support to their candidates through use of separate, small dollar amounts, this change would incentivize greater attention by committees of all parties to small dollar donors, greater participation by such donors in the political process, and representation of a broader and more representative America by those elected.

I urge support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER), my good friend, one of our newest Members, and a great guy.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1.

The people have a right to know what this bill truly is: a Big Government, central command takeover of our elections by the new House majority. This bill should be called the Democratic Politician Protection Act.

This legislation is virtually a complete takeover by the Federal Government of State and local voting jurisdictions. It imposes new mandates, including more than 2 weeks of mandatory early voting and same-day registration, and diminishes the process of election day voting by expanding absentee voting and allowing both current and newly registered voters to cast their ballot by mail, with no additional safeguards to that process.

The bill also allows felons to vote, violating our Constitution by usurping the 14th Amendment ability of States to determine whether felons may vote or not.

An example of its impracticality can be seen in Lenhartsville Borough, Berks County, in my district, a small borough with a polling place that averages 60 voters each election. This bill would mandate that Lenhartsville open and operate a polling place for 15 days of early voting. That is absurd.

Astonishingly, this bill also includes a 6-to-1 match of public funds to the campaign of a candidate that individual taxpayers may not even support on contributions up to \$200. That is a possible \$1,200 match of public funds going to fund political campaigns for each contribution.

□ 1830

This legislation is not for the people. It is for partisan power. H.R. 1 isn't just terrible policy, it is an attempt to rewrite the rules of the political process itself and change the rules to favor one side.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose it, and I hope they will stand with me in defending the Constitution and the sanctity of our elections. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the comments of my colleague, but I did not detect in his comments any objection to the amendment, and I hope that that means that he would agree that a much broader and more representative group of Americans should, in fact, be incentivized to participate in the political process.

I hope he would agree that one of the basic problems we have in this country today is the disincentivization and the disenfranchisement of too many people who just simply don't feel a heart and zone of participation. I hope he would agree that this amendment, at least, is one way to accomplish that.

Speaking also to the broader purpose, he made reference to the fact that this was a partisan bill, and I would refer him to Issue One, which I referenced in my comments, and to the ReFormers

Caucus, which is about 100 each, Republicans and Democrats, Members that he would recognize, leaders of both parties, now retired, who have looked back on their service in this Congress and have concluded that many of the provisions in this bill are the right way to go, not just this amendment, but many, many of those provisions, and I hope he would reference those leaders of the party for guidance going forward with respect to the intent of this bill.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for participating in the process, and I would like to ask the gentleman a question about the amendment.

I know you have been here before. We haven't had the chance to really meet, but congratulations. I look forward to working with you.

Is this just raising the limit that political parties can give from \$5,000 to \$10,000?

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. CASE. No, that is not correct. It provides that if contributions are received from donors of \$200 or less, those may effectively be pooled into a segregated account by either political party and then contributed to candidates in an amount over and above the amount allowed for contributions of over \$200. So, therefore, you will see that that would incentivize both parties to start to think a little more seriously about getting contributions from donors at less than \$200.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the clarification. I appreciate that.

I am still opposed to the amendment because, unfortunately, these incentivization programs that are code word incentivized are part of H.R. 1, and instead I think they are going to be gamed by many of the same people who are gaming the system right now.

Many of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle said they want to get money out of politics, and we are talking about putting more in. The amendment here is just a small part of a big problem of what this bill is about.

Mr. MEUSER talked about how bad this bill is going to be about getting money back into politics. If the goal is to take money out of politics, then H.R. 1 clearly is not the answer. This amendment, while great intentions to my colleague from Hawaii trying to do what we can, I would love to sit down with the gentleman in a bipartisan way to talk about how we can make campaign finance reforms work.

But the clear fact is we have been shown zero consideration as Republicans over here to try and work out solutions in this bill. We weren't asked to even be considered to help write provisions in this bill. No one was even

called, none of us, no one on our side. As a matter of fact, I guess we didn't know the special interest groups who helped write this bill and who were touted in the press conference when this bill was announced.

We got zero Republican amendments passed during our markup in only one committee, which left 40 percent of the bill out from being marked up. That is not the regular order that the Democrats promised when you took the majority. That is what we get.

Today, the olive branch has been extended numerous times. I have accepted Democrat amendments, and do you know what? Not a single Republican amendment has passed, even one during the last round of votes that all it did was give a sense of Congress that we like free speech.

Seriously? You have got to be kidding me. You couldn't even accept that amendment? How partisan can this new Democrat majority be?

This is why this bill is terrible. It is the biggest terrible bill I have ever seen in my time here in Congress.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, first of all, to my colleague, I accept the gentleman's offer to work in a bipartisan way to fix some of these major problems. I look forward to it, number one.

Number two, the gentleman referenced that special interest groups had drafted this amendment. If there is a special interest group, it is the ReFormers Caucus, on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Real quick, I was not referring to the amendment. It was the bill itself.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MS. HOULAHAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 57 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 136, line 1, strike "4 hours" and insert "10 hours".

Page 136, line 3, strike "4 hours" and insert "10 hours".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I was sent to Congress by the Sixth District of Pennsylvania

to fix the broken culture in Washington. H.R. 1 will help to reduce the role of money in politics and address the culture of corruption in Congress. I rise today to support my amendment, No. 57.

This bill also takes key steps to expand voting access to eligible voters. Currently, my constituents in Pennsylvania have no access to early voting and have severe absentee restrictions on voting by mail. This bill will introduce early voting and vote by mail to all 50 States, which will greatly help working families who may have trouble voting around their working schedules on election day.

I am introducing an amendment to further expand this early voting provision to mandate at least 10 hours of early voting each day for the final 15 days before election.

Expanding access to early voting, especially in Pennsylvania, is a key component to bringing the government back to the people by helping people with inflexible hours or people who work shift work to exercise their right to vote. This ensures that their voice is heard and that they are represented in our government.

This week, with H.R. 1, we are taking a big step to returning us to government of, by, and for the people.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is great to have you in the chair again tonight.

I rise to oppose this amendment; although, again, I want to compliment my new colleague, Ms. HOULAHAN, for coming down here and being a participant in the legislative process. It has been great to get to know the gentlewoman and work with her, and I look forward to working together on a bipartisan basis as we move forward during this term.

I have got to oppose this amendment because I have opposed others that are just like it.

We want every American to be able to cast their vote, to be registered to vote, and to be able to have their vote counted and their vote protected. My issue is with a top-down approach from the Federal Government versus the State and local governments. This amendment, though well-intentioned, just, again, infringes on our State and local officials' ability to determine how best to run their elections.

Additionally, this mandate increases the cost of all election offices, as it is tasked to recruit, train, and deploy additional poll workers, where we already know we have a shortage.

I would love to work with my colleague, Ms. HOULAHAN, moving forward to address many issues involving elec-

tion reform. Unfortunately, I just don't think H.R. 1 is the answer, and I don't think it is going to be passed into law, so there are going to be opportunities for us to work together. Again, my bipartisan olive branch is reaching out, once again, to the gentlewoman's side, and I certainly hope we can do so.

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

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the bipartisan spirit and the olive branch that the gentleman has reached out to me.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding her time, and I want to commend her on this amendment.

I want to respond to this idea of this kind of top-down federalization of our voting. That is not what is happening here. The States are going to continue to have the authority to put together how elections operate. What we are doing is we are collecting best practices and then making a policy decision at the Federal level that those best practices ought to extend across the country.

If you think about it, Mr. Chairman, that is our role as Federal legislators. Our purpose here is to gather up wisdom from all parts of the country, figure out what things work and what things don't work, and if it rises to a level of being a good policy suggestion, then putting that into legislation. That is what we are doing, and that is what this particular change would do, and it would make it much easier for people to access the ballot box.

So, again, I want to thank Congresswoman HOULAHAN for this amendment, and I support it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from the author of this bill. He and I have had some spirited discussions over the last day and a half, but I appreciate his willingness to want to address issues. I just don't think this bill is the answer.

To respond to the author of the bill, there is a big difference between offering best practices to our State and local officials about how best to run their elections, there is a big difference between best practices and suggestions versus mandates, and that is clearly what H.R. 1 is. It is going to be a mandate.

It is so nebulous. We get answers one day that change the next. There is zero bipartisanship. We haven't been included. All of a sudden, we get a new shell game: Move over; we are going to fund it by doing this and put corporate money now into congressional campaigns, which is illegal now, but I guess it is a solution for getting money out of politics to the majority.

I don't understand this. This has got to be one of the most discombobulated

processes that I have ever been a part of. I can't help myself to think there is no way that every Democrat who co-sponsored this bill on day one thinking they were going to talk about election reform had any idea of so many of the terrible, terrible provisions for taxpayers that are in this bill.

Again, Mr. Chairman, if you vote for this bill, you are putting corporate cash into congressional campaigns. There is no way the billions upon billions of promises that are made to congressional candidates and incumbents are going to be able to be fulfilled with this new, nebulous corporate malfeasance fund that we haven't even had scored by the CBO.

Billions of dollars of taxpayer money are going to fund a revamp of how public money goes into congressional campaigns. This is the worst of the worst of the worst of what the D.C. swamp is all about.

I am going to lightly oppose this amendment because I really respect Ms. HOULAHAN and her efforts. I just have a big problem with the bill, as I think you can tell.

Mr. Chairman, I will give Ms. HOULAHAN, likely, the last word. I reserve my right to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, again, I urge the adoption of my amendment and also the adoption of H.R. 1 so that we can once again restore the faith of the people and focus on the working Americans of today.

Mr. Chairman, if you do a shift or even if you have a 9 to 5 job, it is very, very hard to get to the polls, particularly in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I think every American who is eligible to vote deserves to have the right to vote, to have their vote counted, and to have their vote be protected.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1845

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. PHILLIPS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 58 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 514, insert after line 17 the following new section (and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly):

SECTION 6008. CLARIFYING AUTHORITY OF FEC ATTORNEYS TO REPRESENT FEC IN SUPREME COURT.

(a) CLARIFYING AUTHORITY.—Section 306(f)(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30106(f)(4)) is amended

by striking “any action instituted under this Act, either (A) by attorneys” and inserting “any action instituted under this Act, including an action before the Supreme Court of the United States, either (A) by the General Counsel of the Commission and other attorneys”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to actions instituted before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer my amendment that would allow the Federal Election Commission to represent itself in actions before the United States Supreme Court so that it may fulfill its role as the people’s top election watchdog.

Under current law, the FEC is almost always represented by the solicitor general when it has business before the U.S. Supreme Court, effectively removing the FEC attorneys from the process and centralizing litigation within the Department of Justice.

It is a revelation that troubles me and many and should worry us all.

Unfortunately, we have seen the President use the Department of Justice and its appointees not to promote truth and accountability, but as a political tool with which to suppress those who challenge his unilateral approach to campaigning and governing.

The identity, priorities, skills, and role of lawyers representing the government play a significant role in determining the nature and outcome of litigation.

These cases are often charged with partisan politics, and the American people need an advocate who operates with a degree of separation from a particular party or administration and can faithfully execute the unique mandate bestowed upon the FEC.

As the people’s last line of election oversight, the FEC must have the power to act independently in its business before the courts so that it may hold this administration, and all administrations to come, accountable to the people, the law, and the Constitution.

My amendment would ensure that it can.

At a time when campaign finance law has become increasingly complex and dangers of direct conflicts of interest have become more prevalent, my amendment will strengthen the FEC’s enforcement powers and help the court navigate the increasingly blurry boundaries of what is and what is not legal during Federal elections by having a subject matter expert empowered to present arguments.

Mr. Chair, I respectfully urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, once again, I claim time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, the language of the amendment is pretty innocuous. The problem I have is the portion of the bill that it is amending, the sheer fact that, in this now almost 700-page, mammoth bill that anyone thinks it is a good idea to weaponize the FEC by making it partisan. It is the furthest thing from where we should be as an institution.

This amendment is going to do nothing to address this partisan FEC that the bill establishes.

The biggest threat to our elections is actually partisanship, and a partisan FEC will undermine the neutrality that voters expect of an agency that oversees Federal elections, especially when the billions upon billions upon billions of new dollars come in from the programs that are created in this bill.

A partisan FEC is going to give enhanced powers to the chairman to make decisions on behalf of the commission that have been reserved for years for the full commission.

I fully expect a lower standard of protection of free speech to be embraced by a partisan FEC.

As a former chairman of our own Franking Commission here in the House of Representatives, I think bipartisan agencies can work together, bipartisan commissions can work together.

Heck, we are not even allowed to send a bulk mail piece out of this institution without Republicans and Democrats signing off on it. If we can’t send bulk mail out without it being bipartisan, why in the world would we want to make the FEC partisan?

Do the Democrats really want the Trump administration to have a partisan FEC? I don’t want any party to have a partisan FEC. I want it to remain an institution where it takes bipartisanism to get results.

I would urge my good friend, Mr. PHILLIPS, if he hasn’t, to sit down with some of the FEC commissioners and talk to them about their opinion of why the FEC is bipartisan, and I would urge the gentleman to work with them.

This bill is not going to pass. The amendment, likely, will get ruled by the chairman to be a part of this bill. The bill is not going to become law. It is going to go die in the Senate. But I would urge the gentleman to work with the FEC, talk with them on the reason why, why it is bipartisan.

We don’t want our Ethics Committee here in the House to have a partisan edge. We don’t want our Franking Commission to have a partisan edge.

Why in the world do we want the FEC to have a partisan edge?

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Illinois.

However, to say that this weaponizes the FEC I do take exception to because, indeed, it is just the opposite.

It empowers the FEC to actually do its job, which is to look out for voters. That is quite simple and quite apparent to me.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, it is a good amendment because it allows the FEC to be represented in an effective way.

As to the underlying bill, I can’t think of another agency of the Federal Government, commission, where you have an even number. Most have an uneven number so you don’t have deadlocks.

We are deadlocked at the FEC. They are dead in the water.

Is it because of bipartisanship? Right now there are two Republican commissioners, one Democratic commissioner, one independent commissioner, and two vacancies. They can’t make a decision.

There are backlogged cases that go on for years. This is really a disservice to America to not be able to play that cop on the beat, because it is a completely dysfunctional agency.

We need to change that. And that is what the underlying bill does. It allows a nonpartisan career staff to make initial fundings. It provides that there can be no more than two commissioners in the same party, so we are not going to have a partisan takeover. And then it allows the commission to overrule the nonpartisan staff, if necessary.

We need reform at the FEC. This amendment is part of it, and I credit the gentleman for offering it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Representative SARBANES for his tireless work in bringing this important legislation to the floor and Chairman MCGOVERN for making my amendment in order.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, again, I have a problem with the underlying bill and the FEC issue.

It is not that hard to be bipartisan when we send bulk mail in the House. It may take a little longer. It may be a little more difficult. But, you know what, bipartisanship works. There is a reason for it here.

Frankly, if the FEC isn’t working, if the FEC is such an agency that has zero credibility in the mind of the majority right now, then why in the world are we spending time marking up a 700-page, mammoth bill in the House Administration Committee when we ought to just reauthorize the FEC?

I certainly hope that our committee can work toward making that happen. And that is something that has not been done that we should be able to get bipartisanship on. I look forward to working with Chairperson LOFGREN when that day comes over the next 2 years.

Mr. Chair, I am going to oppose the amendment because of the underlying language regarding the FEC.

I commend Mr. PHILLIPS for being here to legislate. I welcome the gentleman to Congress, and I look forward to working with him and appreciate his opportunity to be a part of the process. I thank the gentleman for letting me be a part of it with him.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 61 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 220, insert after line 16 the following:

(E) The individual or (in the case of the covered periods described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3)) an immediate family member of the individual paid a civil money penalty or criminal fine, or was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, for violating any provision of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

This historic package of democracy and anticorruption reforms will put power back in the hands of the people and restore the American people's faith that government works for the public interest, not the special interests.

I am pleased that my bill, the Transparency in Corporate Political Spending Act, is included in H.R. 1. I am also proud today to present an amendment to prohibit violators of our Federal election campaign laws from serving on critically important redistricting commissions in the States.

Our democracy has been under attack from foreign interference, gerrymandering, hidden corporate money, and voter suppression. Today, the time has come to reform our system and restore faith in our political process.

I believe we have a duty to transform our democracy from a spectator sport into a true dialogue in which we all participate to debate the issues, defend our interests, and demand our rights.

By passing H.R. 1, we will move one step closer to that transformation by breaking the grip of special interests and ensuring that the American people come first in our democracy.

Among its many important provisions, this historic democracy reform package includes my Transparency in Corporate Political Spending Act, which will eliminate the policy rider that lets corporations keep their unlimited political spending secret.

In addition, I look forward to this Chamber's consideration of my amendment to H.R. 1. This amendment would protect our democracy by prohibiting campaign finance law violators and their immediate family members from serving on redistricting commissions.

Congress needs to ensure that we set out commonsense minimum criteria for people who will serve on redistricting commissions in States across the country. My amendment will ensure that redistricting commissions nationwide are free of individuals and immediate relatives of individuals who have knowingly and willfully committed a violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act.

In November 2018, the people of Michigan overwhelmingly passed Voters Not Politicians, a ballot initiative that sets up a nonpartisan redistricting commission to create State legislative and congressional districts after the 2020 census. About seven or eight States have already done this, and more are considering it.

If we are going to transform our democracy, we need to do it right. I could not be more proud to vote to end the dominance of big money in our political system, to guarantee free and fair elections that are open to all, and to ensure public officials work for the public interest.

I would like to thank Congressman SARBANES and the members of the Democracy Reform Task Force for their unrelenting efforts to reclaim our democracy as one for and by the people.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the For the People Act and to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am going to rise in opposition to this amendment, although I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes. There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am not opposed to this amendment.

I just want to take the time to welcome our new colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), and I would like the gentleman to give my utmost thanks to his dad, who we stood on this floor, with these same microphones, and I was able to work in a bipartisan way with him to pass the EACH Act that allowed for a religious exemption from the individual mandates of ObamaCare, of the Affordable Care Act.

That is now law, and that is a sign of bipartisanship that I hope to be able to continue while we work together.

Give him my best. The Christian Scientists that are in my district at Principia College, one of the largest Christian Science institutions in the Nation, are very thankful that they are not now being penalized by the Tax Code for a religious exemption from seeking medical care from doctors and medical professionals.

So my thanks to the gentleman's father, and I thank the gentleman for being here.

Mr. Chair, I am not going to oppose this amendment. I will reserve just in case somebody wants to come up and talk about something else and I can rebut them, but I am ready to close if the gentleman is.

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I deeply appreciate the gentleman from Illinois' kind remarks. I will absolutely give my dad his regards. I will call him tonight and tell him, seriously, that the gentleman said that.

I really appreciate the incredible honor and opportunity to be here working with the gentleman to do the people's business.

I really hope we will get a chance to work together on any number of bills to perfect and expand our democracy.

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

□ 1900

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am going to be bipartisan once again. I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MRS. TRAHAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 62 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 220, insert after line 16 the following:

(E) The individual or (in the case of the covered periods described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3)) an immediate family member of the individual is an agent of a foreign principal under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend my friend, the Congressman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for offering one of the most significant reforms to our election system in a generation. I am particularly pleased that H.R. 1 puts redistricting in the hands of independent commissions, where it belongs.

Under the bill, each State will create 15-person independent redistricting commissions that represent the public's interests first and foremost, without consideration of political party advantage.

However, to prevent the real or perceived risk of bias, H.R. 1 excludes several categories of people from serving

on these commissions, including political candidates or officeholders, campaign officials, big donors, and lobbyists.

My amendment would simply add to this list those individuals who are registered agents under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, FARA.

FARA has been in law since the 1930s. It requires disclosure when an individual is acting as a political representative of foreign governments.

As with H.R. 1's current exclusions, adding foreign agents will help ensure that those serving on the independent redistricting commissions are not at risk of actual or perceived conflicts of interest.

Coming from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which gave our Nation the term "gerrymander," I am pleased that H.R. 1 will put an end to this device by allowing voters to choose their representatives rather than the other way around.

My amendment aims to close a loophole by ensuring that registered foreign agents, like lobbyists and big donors, may not serve on redistricting commissions.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes. There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts. It is great to see her, and I thank her for putting this amendment forward.

I have a problem with the underlying provisions of the bill. I actually support redistricting reforms.

I am from Illinois. I am a Republican. We are not going to have a single say in how the Democrats in the supermajority Illinois House and the supermajority Illinois Senate, and our newly elected Democratic Governor, we are not going to have a say in how these maps are drawn.

I certainly hope we can get an independent redistricting commission because, since this bill is not going to pass the Senate, it is not going to become law. I certainly hope that we could come together and work on some independent redistricting issues.

Mr. Chair, I will, again, not oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for simply an excellent amendment. This strengthens the provisions in the underlying bill to make sure that agents of foreign principals would have no role in these commissions.

I think it is important that we understand that the citizens who serve on

these commissions have no agenda, not for one party or the other, and certainly not for some foreign country.

It is really a very good amendment. I am so glad that she offered it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am highly concerned with the redistricting provisions in this bill now. It seems that now, as part of the bill, that one State is going to be exempted out.

At what point, then, do we not question why everyone doesn't have the same ability to opt out of provisions of this bill, just like the State of Iowa has done in an amendment that was accepted.

The sheer fact that if Iowa's independent redistricting commission is better and, thus, we shouldn't have to apply the same standards as the other 49 States in this great Nation, then why don't we use Iowa's independent redistricting commission standards for everyone? Why don't we make the whole bill about Iowa?

I mean, I have been talking about federalism and States having to follow top-down Federal mandates, in most cases, that are going to be unfunded or nebulously funded because we really don't know how they are going to get those funds to our States and localities. But the sheer fact that we are debating a bill that has a provision about independent redistricting that could have been very, very bipartisan, now we have exempted one State out, it basically tells all of us that is a better commission.

I hope that when we come back, after this bill passes the House, unfortunately for many of my colleagues who are going to vote for it on the other side of the aisle, I hope we can come together and have the debate on whether Iowa's commission is better than what was proposed in this bill.

You cannot have a 700-page bill that talks about how gloriously good for the people it is, for all of the provisions that are this top-down approach, and then, all of a sudden, you exempt one State out of what could have been one of the most bipartisan provisions, and that is independent redistricting.

If you are serious about governing, the majority ought to offer an amendment, ought to offer a change, to make Iowa's independent commission the language of this bill. Make it work in States, even where they have independent commissions.

I would sure like it to work in Illinois. Maybe California would want to use Iowa's commission because clearly it is better than what you have in the bill, or we wouldn't have had to take an amendment on it.

Well, I think I got my point across.

I say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN), your amendment is a good amendment. I apologize I had to use this time to address an issue that is very frustrating, but the gentlewoman is talking about redistricting.

I appreciate what she has done. I welcome her to the floor of the House, and I look forward to working with her.

Again, my offer to the gentlewoman is the same as others. When this bill fails in the Senate, let's come together on some provisions. I will continue to throw the bipartisan olive branch out toward that side of the aisle, and I look forward to working with the gentlewoman. Congratulations. I won't oppose the amendment.

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

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I also look forward to working in a bipartisan way to restore our government to the people.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment. I urge a "yes" on H.R. 1. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MRS. TRAHAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 63 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In subtitle J of title I, insert after section 1704 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provision accordingly):

SEC. 1705. EXTENDING GUARANTEE OF RESIDENCY FOR VOTING PURPOSES TO FAMILY MEMBERS OF ABSENT MILITARY PERSONNEL.

Section 102 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20302) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(j) GUARANTEE OF RESIDENCY FOR SPOUSES AND DEPENDENTS OF ABSENT MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICE.—For the purposes of voting for in any election for any Federal office or any State or local office, a spouse or dependent of an individual who is an absent uniformed services voter described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 107(1) shall not, solely by reason of that individual's absence and without regard to whether or not such spouse or dependent is accompanying that individual—

"(1) be deemed to have lost a residence or domicile in that State, without regard to whether or not that individual intends to return to that State;

"(2) be deemed to have acquired a residence or domicile in any other State; or

"(3) be deemed to have become a resident in or a resident of any other State."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, under current law, our brave men and women serving our country in uniform are able to maintain their residency status for the purposes of voting during deployment. Current law also protects voting residency status if a spouse of a servicemember is absent from their State in order to accompany the servicemember on a deployment.

However, current law does not protect the residency status of a spouse if he or she is absent but without accompanying the deployed servicemember.

My amendment fixes this loophole. It will ensure that these spouses may maintain their voting residency status, regardless of whether they accompany their spouse. Moreover, my amendment would extend the same protection to voting-age dependents.

The absence of a servicemember who is deployed can be an enormous hardship on a family. It means a caregiver is no longer at home to share in parenting duties. In these cases, it is natural to rely upon friends and family, even those in another State, for support. However, these families should not lose the right to vote in their home district if they are absent while their spouse is deployed. Furthermore, my amendment extends those same protections to voting-age children.

This is an amendment about ensuring those who sacrifice the most for the defense of our Nation are treated fairly and that they have a voice and a vote in our elections.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although, once again, I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes. There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is a great amendment. I commend Mrs. TRAHAN because it is vitally important that we protect the families of our Nation's military. It is very important we remember those who sacrifice everything to serve us, and we should ensure that they are able to weigh in to whomever represents them in government.

I am going to vote "yes" on this amendment, again, an olive branch to the other side of the aisle.

I appreciate the gentlewoman's willingness to legislate. It is great to work with her, and I will be supporting this amendment.

Since I see the chair up, in case she says something I have to rebut, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say what a smart amendment this is, and I am so grateful that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has taken the time to put this together.

We all care about our men and women in the armed services, to make sure they are treated fairly. But over the years we have been here, none of us came up with this amendment before this evening.

I really thank the gentlewoman. Great kudos to her. We are lucky that she is a Member of our House of Representatives.

Like the ranking member, I will be happy to vote "aye" on this amend-

ment. I think it is very important, and I am grateful to the gentlewoman for offering it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let the RECORD show that I liked the amendment first. I liked it before the chairperson.

Listen, it is a great amendment, and I look forward to voting for it.

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

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Illinois once again. I thank the gentlewoman from California. She made this easy on me, and I appreciate that.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1915

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. KIM

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 64 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In subtitle F of title I of the bill—
(1) redesignate section 1505 as section 1506; and

(2) insert after section 1504 the following new section:

SEC. 1505. PAPER BALLOT PRINTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by section 1504, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(8) PRINTING REQUIREMENTS FOR BALLOTS.—All paper ballots used in an election for Federal office shall be printed in the United States on paper manufactured in the United States."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer my amendment to H.R. 1.

Mr. Chair, our democracy isn't working for the majority of Americans. This is a simple message I hear from the people in my district every single day: there are too many barriers to participate in our democracy; there is too much dark money influencing our politics; there are too many loopholes for bad actors to skirt our ethics laws and use the revolving door of politics to enrich themselves instead of empowering the American people.

H.R. 1 isn't just a step in the right direction, it is a massive shift that takes power and puts it back in the hands of our constituents. It is legislation that reminds us that our government must be for the people, but just as importantly, our democracy must be by the people.

That is why I rise today to offer this amendment to H.R. 1, which will require Federal election ballots to be made in America.

In short, this is a win-win for the American people. It will help protect and create American jobs by ensuring that manufacturing stays right here in America. It will help protect the integrity of our Federal elections, which are increasingly under attack by foreign powers.

We have an opportunity today to not only help clean up our government, but create jobs and secure our elections.

I hope that my colleagues from both sides of the aisle will come together to make the democracy we swore to protect truly of, by, and for the people.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense made-in-America amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I don't know if I have had a chance to formally meet Mr. KIM. I welcome him and thank him for being here to participate in the process.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I would like to have some details on what percentage of ballots that are used in the United States right now are not printed in the U.S.

The issue I have is not with United-States-made printing materials, it is with the sheer fact that we are having a top-down approach once again.

I mean, there is always going to be extenuating circumstances. Some of our territories may raise the cost of importing paper to be able to now live up to the paper ballot marking whatever requirements that are in this 700-page bill.

We can work together on these provisions, but we also might want to work together as this bill fails in the Senate.

Mr. Chair, if this is something Mr. KIM wants to work on together, I am willing to work on it with him, but let's have some room in there for some exceptions.

I mean, let's say it is almost election day, you have got wildfires roaring all over California and there is a paper shortage in the country. We can't stop the election, so maybe we need some exceptions. We can't stop the election, maybe we need an exception.

So let's work together, let's do something like that so that nobody loses a chance to be able to cast their vote on election day, to have their vote counted, and even just as importantly, to have their vote protected.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his amendment. I have got to oppose this, because there are no exceptions in here, but I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to work together after this is done.

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

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chair, I just want to start by saying that I am very much looking forward to being able to continue to work with the gentleman from Illinois throughout my time here. I appreciate his welcome to me here on the House floor.

Mr. Chair, for me, as we go about this, it is essential that we understand that our ballots are the most fundamental form of our democracy that citizens here are engaged in, that we understand them as a tangible manifestation of that participation that each and every voter plays.

So this is a manifestation of our value, our collective value that with this most important symbol of our democracy, this tangible form that our voters take, that this should be something of, by, and for the American people.

That is something that I think would be an important signal from the United States Congress across this country that we recognize the importance of that and we want to hold and commit to making sure that this tangible piece of our democracy is something that is made in America.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Look, I am all for increasing American manufacturing, I am all for building new paper plants, but I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to remember they are probably going to burn more fossil fuels. You know, if we are going to have to cut down more trees, maybe we will get some bipartisanship when it comes to deforestation, which could help cut down on forest fires that may cause the problems that would need the exceptions that we talked about earlier.

So I certainly hope this fits into the New Green Deal provisions that are going to be voted on in the Senate.

There is a lot of talk about paper in this bill. And in this bill, actually the paper keeps growing. It is upwards of 700 pages now.

Mr. Chair, I just got a very important piece of paper with the new CBO score, so I assume we are going to be talking about that soon.

Ms. LOFGREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I would remind the gentleman of the recycled ballot amendment that had passed earlier today relative to the issue of cutting down trees.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am all for more paper production. Those paper plants that exist in my district, you know, they use recycled materials, too. I am more than happy to have more trees be deforested out of areas that are caught up in wildfires on an annual basis.

If we could have the paper that is going to work, if the other side is okay

with burning more fossil fuels to make this happen, hey, maybe we won't need those exceptions I talked about, maybe we will have enough American manufacturing and paper jobs. Some of the best paying jobs in my district are at the paper mills.

Mr. Chair, I am certainly looking forward to working with the gentleman when this bill fails. Especially after seeing some of the preliminary numbers out of this new CBO score. I don't know how many cosponsors of this bill are going to actually be able to cast a vote for it, but I will reserve judgment until I see the board tomorrow.

Mr. Chair, I am ready to close, but since I have the right to close, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the perspective on the other end, and I understand our common value that, of course, we would want to see things made in America, and I want to make sure that I constantly, as I will every time on this House floor, seek bipartisanship as we move forward.

I reiterate that this is a common-sense amendment that is simply good policy. My amendment would give a leg up to domestic supply chains and ensure that taxpayer dollars are used to support local middle-class jobs and boost our economy.

Amendments like mine also ensure that when Federal agencies buy products to carry out their responsibilities, that they put American manufacturers first.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KIM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MS. SPANBERGER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 291, insert after line 20 the following:
SEC. 3106. PRE-ELECTION THREAT ASSESSMENTS.

(a) SUBMISSION OF ASSESSMENT BY DNI.—Not later than 180 days before the date of each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit an assessment of the full scope of threats to election infrastructure, including cybersecurity threats posed by state actors and terrorist groups, and recommendations to address or mitigate the threats, as developed by the Secretary and Chairman, to—

(1) the chief State election official of each State;

(2) the Committees on Homeland Security and House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and Rules and Administration of the Senate; and

(3) any other appropriate congressional committees.

(b) UPDATES TO INITIAL ASSESSMENTS.—If, at any time after submitting an assessment with respect to an election under subsection (a), the Director of National Intelligence determines that the assessment should be updated to reflect new information regarding the threats involved, the Director shall submit a revised assessment under such subsection.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) The term “Chairman” means the chair of the Election Assistance Commission.

(2) The term “chief State election official” means, with respect to a State, the individual designated by the State under section 10 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20509) to be responsible for coordination of the State’s responsibilities under such Act.

(3) The term “election infrastructure” means storage facilities, polling places, and centralized vote tabulation locations used to support the administration of elections for public office, as well as related information and communications technology, including voter registration databases, voting machines, electronic mail and other communications systems (including electronic mail and other systems of vendors who have entered into contracts with election agencies to support the administration of elections, manage the election process, and report and display election results), and other systems used to manage the election process and to report and display election results on behalf of an election agency.

(4) The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(5) The term “State” has the meaning given such term in section 901 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21141).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall apply with respect to the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2020 and each succeeding regularly scheduled general election for Federal office.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1.

This week, we are focused on fighting for the public interest, fighting for transparency, and fighting for accountability. We have a rare opportunity to restore faith and trust in our system of government.

Mr. Chair, I thank all those who have fought to bring us to this point and for our upcoming major historic vote on H.R. 1.

As we speak, I am working under a mandate from the people of central Virginia. They expect me to fight back against a broken Washington and to work to protect our democracy, whether from special interests, barriers to voting, or foreign influence.

Right now, we are seeing an uptick in hostile attacks against election systems across the globe, with the rise of the internet, anonymous hackers, non-state actors, and foreign intelligence operatives, as they rise as formidable and dangerous adversaries.

Our elections are the bedrock of our democracy.

If our voting infrastructure is compromised or attacked, the entire integrity of our electoral system could come into question.

This was especially clear following Russia's interference in the 2016 election, and it is almost certain that nefarious actors will continue their deliberate attempts to attack our elections or put in doubt the outcome of those elections.

During this time, it is critical that the U.S. election officials have accurate and up-to-date information about where our election security systems are most vulnerable.

This amendment pushes back against foreign attempts to interfere in our electoral process and helps identify any potential threats that may exist.

This amendment would use the invaluable expertise of public servants in the intelligence community and Department of Homeland Security to strengthen the security of Federal and State election systems.

My amendment would require a Federal assessment of the scope of potential threats to the security of America's election system, including cyber, terror, and state actor threats.

This assessment would happen 180 days prior to every general election to allow the States the opportunity to respond and strengthen their voting system.

Additionally, this legislation would direct the Director of National Intelligence and DHS to update Federal and State officials on possible vulnerabilities and to provide assessments on how best to stop these threats.

As a former CIA case officer, I greatly appreciate the objective and non-partisan work of the national security and intelligence communities. With their help, we can fight back against foreign interference, we can safeguard our elections.

The dedicated men and women of our national security agencies and of our intelligence agencies have demonstrated their ability to collect information on foreign actors' intentions and provide election security assessments that are intellectually rigorous, objective, timely, and useful to the States they would provide them to.

As we are having an important discussion about safeguarding the integrity of the vote, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to H.R. 1.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it. I think this is a darn good amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am going to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, it is great to work with Ms. SPANBERGER, and I thank her for her service as an intelligence officer

for our great Nation. This is an issue that she knows better than me and she knows better than most of us here in this institution. I look forward to supporting this amendment, and I welcome the gentlewoman to the U.S. House of Representatives and look forward to working with her.

Mr. Chair, I would love to work with the gentlewoman on issues like this when this bill does not pass the Senate and is signed into law and we can work together in a bipartisan way. I will continue to show bipartisanship. I congratulate and welcome the gentlewoman.

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for his comments and for his support of this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my colleague.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, this just goes to show how lucky we are that someone with the background of Congresswoman SPANBERGER has been elected to the House. With her background in the CIA, we gain a special expertise on issues of national security.

You know, States don't have a CIA, they don't have an NSA, and if foreign actors are attacking us, they are not in a position to find that out.

I think that the gentlewoman from Virginia understands the workings of our national security agencies and the importance of giving them metrics on what to do and with whom so that we are completely safe.

Mr. Chair, I am so delighted that she has offered this very smart amendment, and I look forward to approving it, and I thank her so much for the wisdom that she brings to the House.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1930

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, again, let the RECORD show I was for the amendment once again before the chairperson. I should get kudos.

Listen, this is a good amendment. I congratulate the gentlewoman on her election, being a Member of Congress, and helping to legislate and participate.

I also want to use a few seconds to really highlight the work of our intelligence officials in the administration and our Department of Homeland Security, especially Secretary Nielsen and her team, working with our local officials in Illinois before the last election to ensure that there was no nefarious activity that could have come about in our home State.

Our home State election officials got a lot of accolades from the Department of Homeland Security, and I think the Department of Homeland Security and their team, especially Secretary Nielsen, deserve the accolades, also.

So, with that, I am ready to close. I congratulate Ms. SPANBERGER.

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I am ready to close, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman yields back.

Ms. SPANBERGER. May I reclaim my time, Mr. Chair?

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. May I reclaim my time?

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois and the gentlewoman from Virginia both reclaim their time.

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Virginia is recognized.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Actually, I want to echo the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois and the remarks of the gentlewoman from California in congratulating Congresswoman SPANBERGER on this excellent amendment and emphasizing, as they did, how lucky we are to have the benefit of the expertise that is brought to this Chamber by Congresswoman SPANBERGER, based on her national security experience. We need to maximize what people can offer here, and this amendment is a perfect example of that.

There is increasing anxiety out there among the populace about these attempts to hack into our election infrastructure. This measure will make sure that we are all on alert to that. I thank the gentlewoman for the amendment.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I am ready to close, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have left?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am having a lot of fun down here, but I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MS. SLOTKIN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 69 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 323, insert after line 6 the following:
SEC. 4103. DISBURSEMENTS AND ACTIVITIES SUBJECT TO FOREIGN MONEY BAN.

(a) DISBURSEMENTS DESCRIBED.—Section 319(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign

Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(2) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) an expenditure;

“(D) an independent expenditure;

“(E) a disbursement for an electioneering communication (within the meaning of section 304(f)(3));

“(F) a disbursement for a paid internet or paid digital communication that refers to a clearly identified candidate for election for Federal office and is disseminated within 60 days before a general, special or runoff election for the office sought by the candidate or 30 days before a primary or preference election, or a convention or caucus of a political party that has authority to nominate a candidate for the office sought by the candidate;

“(G) a disbursement for a broadcast, cable or satellite communication, or for a paid internet or paid digital communication, that promotes, supports, attacks or opposes the election of a clearly identified candidate for Federal, State, or local office (regardless of whether the communication contains express advocacy or the functional equivalent of express advocacy); or

“(H) a disbursement for a broadcast, cable, or satellite communication, or for a paid internet or paid digital communication, that discusses a national legislative issue of public importance in year in which a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office is held and is made for the purpose of influencing an election held during that year, but only if the disbursement is made by a foreign principal who is a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party or an agent of such a foreign principal under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to disbursements made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, the legislation before us today, the For the People Act of 2019, represents a major step forward toward improving government transparency and accountability, expanding voting rights, and draining the corrosive influence of money in our politics.

These are the very issues I hear about over and over again as I travel across my district in mid-Michigan, and these are the issues that my constituents sent me to Washington to address.

Simply put, people in Michigan and across the country know in their bones that the current system isn't working and want a return to honesty and decency in our politics. Passing H.R. 1 is a huge step forward in increasing confidence in our system.

Mr. Chair, my amendment today would add important provisions to close a loophole in our current campaign finance laws that allows foreign governments and foreign nationals to influence American elections through campaign ads. Right now, a foreign entity can legally buy an ad through so-

cial media that supports or attacks a candidate. Right now, a foreign entity can legally purchase an ad that focuses on an issue of legislative importance.

My amendment would close this loophole by implementing new requirements to ensure that foreign governments don't influence our elections.

The amendment specifically would prohibit a foreign entity from buying a campaign ad, on digital media or on TV, that supports or attacks a candidate or an ad that focuses on an issue that is meant to divide us rather than unite us.

Mr. Chair, I am a former CIA officer, a former Pentagon official. I have spent my life preventing homeland attacks and preserving the democratic system that we all love. I am introducing this amendment because the attempts by Russia to interfere in the 2016 elections targeted vulnerable voters and took advantage of the lack of disclosure in our laws. During the 2016 election in my home State of Michigan, we were specifically targeted and witnessed disturbing evidence of Russian interference in our elections.

It is important to remember what we are talking about. These ads, which I have a bunch printed out over here, purposely divide us. They sow discord. They target ethnic groups. And they generally attempt to influence American elections.

Some may say that these ads were a relatively small number of the ads in our elections and that it is a relatively meager investment. As defenders of American interests and our national security, we must ensure that our laws do not allow this to happen at any level.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing: Support preservation of the American democracy. Reject foreign influence in our elections.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition, although I am going to do the right thing and not oppose this amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I know our time together tonight is winding down. This, I think, is the last amendment we are going to debate tonight.

I thank Ms. SLOTKIN for her amendment and thank her for her service to our country. It is a pleasure to be able to serve in this great institution with the gentlewoman.

As I said, I am not going to oppose the gentlewoman's amendment. Congratulations. I certainly wish this would be part of something that could go into law, because this bill is not going to go into law. I certainly look forward to working with her to address these issues as we move forward.

Congratulations, and I thank the gentlewoman again for her service here now.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding her time, and I also congratulate her on this amendment and her service here in the House and contributing her expertise, again, as I said a moment ago with respect to our other colleague. Providing her insight and her experience here in shaping these amendments and making our legislation stronger is absolutely valuable. We need to make our democracy more resilient.

The gentlewoman made the point that too often now these foreign adversaries can get into our politics and sow discord. The way we push back at that is by putting our antenna out, our radar, making sure we are keeping that kind of spending out of our politics. That is exactly what the gentlewoman's amendment does. I thank her for it. I support it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Well, I would be remiss to not thank my colleague from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for being a cosponsor of this amendment. We have had some lively discussions back and forth. My apologies. I thank the gentleman for his efforts on this amendment, too.

I am ready to close, but congratulations once again to Ms. SLOTKIN.

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

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I look forward to working across the aisle on this important amendment. I think it is not a partisan issue. It is an American issue. I look forward to talking with my Republican colleagues about how we can break this thing off and turn it into law.

Ms. LOFGREN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLOTKIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I join in the celebration of the new Members of this House of Representatives. The gentlewoman from Michigan has experience in preserving our national security. Not everyone who is here serving has done what she has done, and the gentlewoman who preceded her.

Our body is richer because of the experience that they have brought to this Congress, and I think this excellent amendment really is a product of the expertise that she brings to this institution.

I am grateful for her amendment. I look forward to joining the ranking member in approving it and in celebrating her service to our country here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a list of groups such as the Hispanic Leadership Fund, The LIBRE Initiative, Americans for Tax Reform, Coalition to Reduce Spending, the National Right to Life, Heritage Action for America, and the Chamber of Commerce and several

letters in opposition to H.R. 1, obviously, or I don't think I would be entering them into the RECORD.

The following organizations oppose H.R. 1: ACLU

U.S. Chamber of Commerce along with over 300 Chamber's of Commerce and industry groups

Freedom Works
National Right to Life
Heritage Action for America
Republican National Lawyers Association
March for Life Action
Conservative Action Project
Club for Growth
Americans for Tax Reform
National Taxpayers Union
Coalition to Reduce Spending
Americans for Prosperity
The LIBRE Initiative
Concerned Veterans for America
Faith and Freedom Coalition
Hispanic Leadership Fund
National Association for Gun Rights
Goldwater Institute
American Bankers Association
Agricultural Retailers Association
American Petroleum Institute
National Grocers Association
Associated Builders and Contractors
National Association of Manufacturers
Insurance Associates, Inc.
Airlines for America

NATIONAL RIGHT TO LIFE
COMMITTEE, INC.

Washington, DC, March 5, 2019.

Re H.R. 1, the so-called "For the People Act of 2019".

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The National Right to Life Committee (NRLC), representing state right-to-life organizations nationwide, urges you to oppose the so-called "For the People Act of 2019" (H.R. 1), introduced by Rep. John Sarbanes.

This legislation has been carefully crafted to maximize short-term political benefits for the dominant faction of one political party, while running roughshod over the First Amendment protections for political speech that have been clearly and forcefully articulated by the U.S. Supreme Court in a series of landmark First Amendment rulings, culminating in *FEC v. Wisconsin Right to Life*, 551 U.S. 449 (2007) and *Citizens United v. Federal Election Com'n*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010).

Because this legislation would severely impede the exercise of our organization's constitutional rights, and the rights and privacy of our donors and supporters, NRLC intends to include any roll call that occurs on H.R. 1 in our scorecard of key roll calls of the 116th Congress:

Enactment of H.R. 1 would not be a curb on corruption, but is itself a type of corruption—an abuse of the lawmaking power, by which incumbent lawmakers employ the threat of criminal sanctions, among other deterrents, to reduce the amount of private speech regarding the actions of the lawmakers themselves. Further, this legislation would add a commissioner to the Federal Election Commission (FEC), causing a partisan takeover by significantly increasing the likelihood that the agency could make decisions benefiting the political party in power.

THE TRUE PURPOSES OF H.R. 1

Our organization's name and contact information always appear on our public communications, and we openly proclaim the public policies that we advocate. But there is very little in this bill, despite the pretenses, that is actually intended to provide useful or necessary information to the public. The overriding purpose is precisely the opposite: To

discourage, as much as possible, disfavored groups (such as National Right to Life) from communicating about officeholders, by exposing citizens who support such efforts to harassment and intimidation, and by smothering organizations in layer on layer of record keeping and reporting requirements, all backed by the threat of civil and criminal sanctions.

SPEECH-RESTRICTIVE PROVISIONS OF H.R. 1

The bill would codify, in Section 324, a vague and expansive definition of "the functional equivalent of express advocacy," that applies to communications that "when taken as a whole, it can be interpreted by a reasonable person only as advocating the election or defeat of a candidate for election for Federal office." There is little that an organization could say by way of commentary on the votes or positions taken by an incumbent member of Congress that would not fall within this expansive definition, in the eyes of some "reasonable person"—most often, an annoyed incumbent lawmaker or his operatives.

The time periods over which the government would have authority to regulate speech about those who hold or seek federal office—so-called "electioneering communications"—would be dramatically expanded under H.R. 1.

H.R. 1 also contains additional provisions that would place an unacceptable burden on the exercise of First Amendment rights. H.R. 1 mandates burdensome disclaimers on television, radio, and online advertisements that are likely to bury the substantive message and make some advertising, especially online, functionally impossible.

PARTISAN TAKEOVER OF THE FEC

In title VI, H.R. 1 would destroy the FEC's long-standing bipartisan structure. Proponents claim that the provision is aimed at ending "frequent deadlocks," but this is a sham argument leading down a dangerous road.

In the excellent piece by the Institute for Free Speech (IFS), titled "Establishing a Campaign Speech Czar and Enabling Partisan Enforcement: An Altered FEC Structure Poses Risks to First Amendment Speech Rights" issued on January 31, Brad Smith comments,

But, in fact, tie votes have always been a small percentage of FEC votes. Historically, they have totaled approximately one percent to four percent of Commission votes on enforcement matters. . . . Although critics claim that tie-votes sap the FEC's ability to enforce campaign finance laws, in fact, it is assuredly the opposite. The only reason that the FEC has any legitimacy is its bipartisan makeup. Particularly in the current environment, it is inconceivable that an agency empowered to make prosecutorial decisions about the legality of campaign tactics, communications, funding, and activities on a straight party-line vote would have any legitimacy.

DISCLOSURE OF DONORS

Our members and supporters have a right to support our public advocacy about important and controversial issues without having their identifying information posted online, exposing them to harassment or retribution by those who may disagree with their beliefs.

In an additional piece from the IFS, titled "For the People Act" Replete with Provisions for the Politicians, by Eric Wang, issued on January 23 he writes,

The right to associate oneself with a non-profit group's mission and to support the group financially in private is a bedrock principle of the First Amendment that the government may not abridge casually. This is particularly true when the cause is con-

tentious, such as abortion, gun control, LGBTQ rights, or civil rights, and association with either side on any of these issues may subject a member or donor to retaliation, harassment, threats, and even physical attack, as recent events have tragically reminded us. The potential divisiveness of these issues does not diminish their social importance and the need to hash out these debates in public while preserving donors' privacy.

It should be self-evident that the real purpose of such burdensome requirements is not to inform the public, but to deter potential donors from financially supporting the work of groups such as National Right to Life in the first place.

We strongly urge you to oppose this pernicious, unprincipled, and constitutionally defective legislation. In our scorecard and advocacy materials, the legislation will be accurately characterized as a blatant political attack on the First Amendment rights of National Right to Life, our state affiliates, and our members and donors.

Sincerely,

CAROL TOBIAS,

President.

DAVID N. O'STEEN, PH.D.,

Executive Director.

JENNIFER POPIK, J.D.,

Legislative Director.

MARCH 5, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of March for Life Action and the millions of pro-life Americans who march to end abortion, I am writing to voice our opposition to H.R. 1, the misnamed "For the People Act of 2019." Many aspects of the bill seek to put an undue burden on organizations and individuals who speak out for the unborn—discouraging these people from participating in the political process. When H.R. 1 reaches the House floor March for Life Action will score a "yes" vote negatively in our scorecard for the First Session of the 116th Congress.

H.R. 1 would regulate a new category of speech—communications that "promote," "attack," "support," or "oppose" ("PASO") federal candidates and elected officials. Under this broad and vague standard, groups that merely speak about federal legislation or policy issues could be forced to file FEC reports that they did not have to file before. This is conflicting to Supreme Court precedent limiting the regulation of speech to communications that could have no reasonable meaning other than to advocate the election or defeat of a candidate.

The main beneficiaries of H.R. 1 would be incumbent politicians and campaign finance attorneys while those who would suffer most would be grassroots activists. The legislation would greatly increase the already onerous legal and administrative compliance costs, liability risk, and costs to donor and associational privacy for public groups that help inform citizens speak about policy issues and politicians. Instead of being able to inform the public organizations will have to divert resources away from their advocacy activities to pay for compliance staff and lawyers. Some groups will not be able to afford these costs or will violate the law unwittingly. Less speech by private citizens and organizations means politicians will be able to act with less accountability to public opinion and criticism.

When our great nation's founders articulated the rights of Americans, they not only included the right to life but also the right to free speech. As those who speak up for the unborn, we uniquely combine those two rights. H.R. 1 would take away one of those rights, the freedom of speech, making it almost impossible for us to speak up for those

who cannot speak for themselves. For these reasons, March for Life Action will score against the legislation our annual scorecard for the First Session of the 116th Congress.

Sincerely,

THOMAS MCCLUSKY,
President, March for Life Action.

HERITAGE ACTION FOR AMERICA,
March 6, 2019.

KEY VOTE: "NO" ON THE "FOR THE PEOPLE
ACT" (H.R. 1)

Heritage Action opposes the For The People Act (H.R. 1) and will include it as a key vote on our legislative scorecard.

This week, the House will vote on H.R. 1, the "For The People Act." Lawmakers should not let this legislation's misleading name fool them—it is comprised of unconstitutional and ill-advised policy mandates that the Democratic Party would use to hijack America's election processes. H.R. 1 is a very long, complex bill that is a liberal wish list of "reforms" ranging from voter registration and elections to campaign finance, lobbying, and judicial ethics.

Free and fair elections are the bedrock of American government. They are fundamental to our way of life and confidence in our representative system. H.R. 1 cloaks itself in the guise of transparency and fairness but in reality is a partisan scheme to choke off dissent and squelch Republican candidates and conservative political voices. This bill is aptly "renamed" by Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell as the "Democrat Politician Protection Act." It is an unprecedented attempt to seize control of elections through federal government power.

This fundamentally flawed legislation establishes a new taxpayer-funded bailout of political campaigns, weaponizes the Federal Elections Commission by destroying the current bipartisan makeup, and creates a new, subjective category of "campaign-related" speech that is regulated by Washington bureaucrats who are empowered to enforce these regulations with penalties and censorship.

According to The Heritage Foundation, H.R. 1 would implement the following changes:

1. Makes it easier to commit fraud and promotes chaos at the polls through same-day registration, as election officials have no time to verify the accuracy of voter registration information and cannot anticipate the number of voters, ballots, and precinct workers that will be needed to ensure a safe and secure election process.

2. Degrades the accuracy of registration lists by automatically registering individuals from state databases, such as DMV and welfare offices, which provides an opportunity to register large numbers of ineligible voters, including aliens as well as multiple or duplicate registrations of the same individuals.

3. Constitutes a recipe for massive voter registration fraud by hackers and cyber criminals through online voter registration not tied to an existing state record, such as a driver's license.

4. Requires states to count ballots cast by voters outside of their assigned precinct, overriding the precinct system used by almost all states that allows election officials to monitor votes, staff polling places, provide enough ballots, and prevent election fraud.

5. Prevents election officials from checking the eligibility and qualifications of voters and from removing ineligible voters. This includes restrictions on using the U.S. Postal Service's national change-of-address system to verify the address of registered voters; participating in state programs that com-

pare voter registration lists to detect individuals registered in multiple states; or ever removing registrants due to a failure to vote.

6. Cripples the effectiveness of state voter ID laws by allowing individuals to vote without an ID and to merely sign a statement in which they claim they are who they say they are.

7. Expands regulation and government censorship of campaigns and political activity and speech, including online and policy-related speech. H.R. 1 imposes onerous legal and administrative compliance burdens and costs on candidates, citizens, civic groups, unions, corporations, and nonprofit organizations.

8. Requires states to unconstitutionally restore the ability of felons to vote the moment they are out of prison. Section 2 of the 14th Amendment gives states the constitutional authority to decide when felons who committed crimes against their fellow citizens may vote again. Congress cannot override a constitutional amendment with a statute.

9. Transfers the right to draw congressional districts from state legislatures to "independent" commissions whose members are unaccountable to voters. H.R. 1 makes it a violation of federal law to engage in "partisan" redistricting and mandates inclusion of alien population, both legal and illegal, in all redistricting. This is an anti-democratic, unconstitutional measure that takes away the ability of the citizens of a state to make their own decision about redistricting.

10. Violates separation of powers and directly interfere with the President's constitutional duties. H.R. 1 bans his political appointees, such as the Attorney General, from participating in, directing the defense of, or assisting in any matter (including lawsuits against a President's policies, programs, executive orders, or his enforcement of the law) in which the President is named as a party."

Although Democrats are promoting H.R. 1 as a bill that would "strengthen our democracy and return political power to the people", it is an anti-democratic bill that would wreak havoc on our election system by manipulating election rules in favor of Democrats. It is nothing but a progressive power grab and Heritage Action urges all House Members to vote against it.

Heritage Action opposes the For the People Act (H.R. 1) and will include it as a key vote on our legislative scorecard.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I am not going to oppose this amendment, and it has been great debating with the other side tonight. I look forward to a livelier debate tomorrow.

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

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the spirit of the gentleman from Illinois and look forward to working with everyone.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. HILL of California) having assumed the chair, Mr. CUELLAR, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state

of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, for the sake of innocent lives, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT DIRECTOR, THE HONORABLE JACKIE SPEIER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Brian Perkins, District Director, the Honorable JACKIE SPEIER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 4, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of San Mateo, in a criminal proceeding involving an alleged threat of violence against our office personnel.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

BRIAN PERKINS,
District Director.

□ 1945

COMMUNICATION FROM CASEWORKER AND FIELD REPRESENTATIVE, THE HONORABLE JACKIE SPEIER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Sera Alptekin, Case-worker and Field Representative, the

Honorable JACKIE SPEIER, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Washington, DC, March 4, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of San Mateo, in a criminal proceeding involving an alleged threat of violence against our office personnel.

After Consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

SERA ALPTEKIN,
Caseworker & Field Representative.

NEVER FORGET THE HEROES ACT

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today alongside Mr. ROSE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KING of New York, and others, to urge the immediate passage of the Never Forget the Heroes Act, introduced by Representatives CAROLYN MALONEY, NADLER, and KING, which would fully fund and extend the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund authorization through 2090.

Representatives MALONEY, NADLER, and PETER KING have been stalwart advocates of this effort fighting on behalf of 9/11 victims and their families since the beginning, and it is thanks to their leadership that we passed the Zadroga Act, creating the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund and why we are still here fighting today.

I can't thank enough and praise enough the leadership of Representatives MALONEY, NADLER, and KING on this very important issue on behalf of the victims of September 11.

James Zadroga was one of those fearless leaders who rose up on 9/11. He was also the first NYPD officer whose death in 2006 was connected to toxic exposure at the World Trade Center site. The James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act was later signed into law in 2011 to help our 9/11 first responders.

Madam Speaker, 5 years later, the Zadroga Act was permanently reauthorized and included \$4.6 billion for the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund

over 5 years, which was established to provide compensation for the victims of 9/11 and their families, and it continues to provide compensation for those suffering from 9/11-related illnesses decades later and their loved ones.

First responders who worked on the pile day and night aiding in the search, rescue, and cleanup efforts were breathing toxic debris and ash that are now known to have caused over 50 different types of cancer. However, last month, the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund issued an alarming report, which stated its funding was insufficient to compensate all claims, and the fund would have to make severe cuts to awards across the board.

This is unacceptable. And regardless of party affiliation, regardless of which district or State you come from, it is imperative that this legislation is passed and sent to the President immediately to become law so we can ensure these victims receive the compensation they deserve.

This isn't a one-off issue. This isn't just a New York issue. This isn't a Democratic or Republican Party platform or political football. This is a responsibility we all shoulder as Americans, first and foremost. It is the spirit of our Nation, and it is who we are as a people.

It is important to remember that 9/11 first responders live not only in New York, but in 433 out of 435 congressional districts across this country.

These were the very men and women who, in the face of evil, were willing to put it all on the line to help save their fellow Americans, who ran into the towers as everyone else ran out. It is unconscionable that time and again they have been forced to plead their case as to why they are worthy of our support.

People who came down when the Zadroga Act was first getting authorized—sick—weren't there to fight in 2015 when it was permanently reauthorized because they had passed away due to their injuries.

People who were here in 2015 when that fight was made for the Zadroga Act to be permanently reauthorized are not here today to fight for the Victim Compensation Fund because they passed away and succumbed to their injuries.

We should not make them take dozens of trips down here to Washington, D.C., begging for support. Let them stay where they are and take care of their health. That is most important.

It is so important that we immediately passed the Never Forget the Heroes Act, which will ensure these heroes receive the support they have more than earned.

This past September 11, 17 years since the attacks, we came together, as we always do, to remember those who were taken from us that day. But this year marked an especially harrowing occasion. By the end of 2018, more people had died from 9/11-related illnesses than were killed on September 11.

Tonight, we are going to hear from the authors of the Never Forget the Heroes Act, Representatives CAROLYN MALONEY, PETER KING, and JERRY NADLER, and so many others from both sides of the aisle, on why this legislation is important for the victims of 9/11, for their communities, and for our Nation.

In addition to those who are joining us this evening, there are also so many activists and outside organizations fighting on behalf of 9/11 victims and working to ensure they receive full compensation: Jon Stewart, who has traveled to Washington countless times to fight for them and was just here last week; John Feal, from my district, and the FealGood Foundation; and so many more, including the great advocates from organized labor, especially law enforcement and first responders in New York and nationwide.

From everyday men and women in my district to us on the floor of the House of Representatives, it is up to each and every one of us to never forget the men and women whom we lost that day, those whom we have lost since, those suffering from 9/11-related illnesses, and their families.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), a fellow New Yorker who has been a stalwart champion of this legislation going all the way back to the passage of the Zadroga Act.

I know our 9/11 first responders, their families, those suffering from 9/11-related illnesses, and all those affected by this dark moment in our Nation's history are so grateful to Mrs. MALONEY for her tireless work on behalf of them.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), my friend and colleague, for initiating this Special Order and for bringing us together to speak out in support for the bipartisan Never Forget the Heroes Act, which we must pass in this Congress.

On September 11, 2011, we lost 2,997 people. But the death tolls from 9/11 may be far higher. It seems like every week I hear about the passing of another first responder and survivor. Soon the deaths from 9/11-related illnesses may outnumber those lost on that horrific day.

Thousands more are living with the effects of 9/11, with chronic diseases, with cancer, with a whole host of other 9/11-related illnesses.

Over 10,000 responders and survivors have been certified as having 9/11-related cancers. These are the men and women who rushed in and spent months combing through the wreckage. They are the residents and the workers who were told by the Federal Government, they were told that the air they were breathing was safe when, in fact, it was filled with toxic pollutants.

They are firefighters, police officers, Federal and local law enforcement,

medical workers, construction workers, and other heroes. All of them are victims of 9/11 as well.

The 9/11 attacks caused one of the biggest public health crises our country has ever faced. And those aren't just my constituents. They aren't just from New York or New Jersey. They are Americans.

We were attacked because we were a site of economic strength in America. Then they attacked our Pentagon, a symbol of the strength of our military. And then they were coming to the Capitol, a symbol of strength of our democracy.

These people live in every single State. We documented, and the GAO documented, 434 of the 435 congressional districts had someone who was harmed by 9/11.

Our whole country owes them a debt. On 9/11 we counted on them, and in return, we made a promise never to forget.

This needs to be more than a slogan and more than a bumper sticker. It is our sacred duty to make sure that they get the support they so justly deserve.

In 2010, after years of tireless effort, Congress reaffirmed its commitment to never forget the sacrifices made on September 11 by passing the bipartisan James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act.

We established the World Trade Center Health Program and the Nationwide Provider Network and reopened the Victim Compensation Fund to provide the thousands of injured and ill 9/11 responders and survivors with medical treatment for 9/11 health-related conditions and economic compensation for losses resulting from the attack.

In 2015, we permanently authorized the World Trade Center Health Program and reauthorized the Victim Compensation Fund until 2020.

So now we need to get to work again. The problem is bigger than expected. The number of cancer cases has jumped.

Cancer claims now account for one-third of claims—up from one-fifth just a few years ago. Death rates have gone up.

This January saw a 235 percent surge in death claims to the Victim Compensation Fund compared to the end of 2015, most of which are the result of cancers.

More and more 9/11 first responders and survivors are in need of the Victim Compensation Fund. Increased enrollment has led to a need for more funding. And in February, the special master of the September 11 Victim Compensation Fund announced that the fund was running out of money and would have to cut compensation awards by 50 percent to 70 percent because of budget shortfalls. These cuts went into effect on February 25, and have already devastated first responders, survivors, and their families.

This is unacceptable. We cannot let this stand, and we won't.

Last week, with my colleagues, Representatives NADLER, KING, and I intro-

duced the Never Forget the Heroes Act. Already, we have an unprecedented 150 cosponsors in 1 week. This was a joint effort, along with Congressman ZELDIN, Congressman ROSE, Congressman GOTTHEIMER, and many others.

Our bill will restore any cuts to awards, ensure that future eligible recipients are fully compensated, and make the Victim Compensation Fund a permanent program for the lives of the recipients.

We promised sick and injured 9/11 first responders and survivors that we would fully compensate them for the losses they have suffered. They shouldn't have to come begging for us to do our job, come begging back over and over again to Congress.

For some, 9/11 is a distant memory. For them, they remember this and 9/11 with every breath, with every cough, with every doctor's appointment, and with every death in their families.

They are counting on us. They are counting on Congress, just like we counted on them on that terrible day and in the weeks afterwards.

Never Forget is a promise. I urge my colleagues to join us in ensuring that we honor it.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), my distinguished colleague, for organizing this important remembrance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to maintain proper decorum in the Chamber.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mrs. MALONEY really inspires us all. And when she said that these 9/11 victims, their families are counting on us, they certainly know that they can count on her.

So I thank Congresswoman MALONEY for leading this effort for so many years. She has been a great champion in this cause, and it is great to assist her however I can. That is why Congressman ROSE and I wanted to be here coleading this Special Order on a bipartisan basis to support Congresswoman MALONEY, Congressman NADLER, and Congressman KING, who have been the champions of this effort.

□ 2000

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman ZELDIN, Congressman ROSE, and Congressman GOTTHEIMER for really helping to achieve the 150 cosponsors that we have.

I have asked, and the gentleman has joined me in asking, Chairman NADLER to schedule hearings as quickly as possible. We hope to continue getting cosponsors. Hopefully, we will get everyone in this body to make a firm statement in support of the survivors and the heroes.

I thank the gentleman and others so much for all that they have been doing.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

Madam Speaker, next, I am going to yield to my friend from New Jersey (JOSH GOTTHEIMER), who is really a leader in so many different forms. He co-chairs the Problem Solvers Caucus. If I had to make a pitch for the bill that should be at the top of the list for every caucus—there are many caucuses here in this Chamber—this should be an important priority, if not number one on the list, but I would put a pitch in for number one. He is a great Member, and I have a lot of respect for him.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I am thankful to be able to speak on behalf of this important bipartisan legislation.

Madam Speaker, I ask that Mrs. MALONEY keep that jacket on, so we can remember the importance of our firefighters who ran into those buildings. That is excellent. I thank Mr. ZELDIN for his leadership and his friendship, and I am really grateful. I thank Mr. ROSE for his leadership as well.

On 9/11, as we all know, our first responders ran directly into danger when others ran out. Just like we should always stand by our veterans and Active Duty, we are here today because we must continue to get the backs of all first responders and others who get our backs every day, especially those who stood up to the terrorists that morning and ran into the burning buildings on 9/11 and in the weeks that followed.

They are heroes and need our help. On 9/11, our world changed in an instant. Hundreds of Jersey cops and New York law enforcement, firefighters, EMTs, and others from around the country answered the call of duty and rushed toward the pile, some staying there for weeks.

If you ask how they were able to summon the courage that day, they will tell you that they were simply doing their job. Our Nation has an obligation to do everything in our power to take care of our first responders and survivors of those horrific attacks by terrorists on American soil.

Now, too many first responders are suffering from serious illnesses and cancers from exposure to harmful toxins, smoke, and debris from the pile. We lost thousands that day and have lost thousands since because of those effects. In fact, during those first few days, many didn't even wear a mask or an appropriate mask. They were told that they would be fine.

Congress set up the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund to help cover and compensate for 9/11 injuries, lost earnings, benefits, and out-of-pocket medical expenses. Many of those who were exposed back in 2001 are, sadly, first developing symptoms now, and still are. There just aren't enough allocated resources to cover all those who have suffered.

As a result, the special master of the fund recently announced that injured

and ill 9/11 first responders and survivors would receive cuts of 50 or 70 percent of their benefits that they were promised, that their families could count on, that their children could count on.

That is absolutely unacceptable. We can't leave law enforcement and first responders with brain tumors and end-stage lung disease by the wayside.

It is heartbreaking to hear their stories, and I heard so many earlier this week in New Jersey when we got together. They talked about how there are hundreds of first responders and volunteers still going through the Mount Sinai monitoring program, hoping for the best, but expecting the worst. It is in the back of the minds of all those who were there that day: When will I be diagnosed? Will it be too late? What will happen to my children and my family?

As of earlier this year, more than 47,000 claims have been filed with the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund and more than 11,000 additional claims are expected by 2020 when the fund is set to expire unless Congress acts. We must do the right thing by our first responders once and for all. No excuses.

That is why I am very proud to be an original cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation, the Never Forget the Heroes Act, to fully fund the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund so that no 9/11 survivor has to ever worry.

As Mr. ZELDIN said, there is nothing partisan about this. The bipartisan Problem Solvers Caucus just talked about it this morning, how important it is, including Mr. ROSE.

This is a fight where we have had many champions, from Jon Stewart to Congresswoman MALONEY to Congressman KING, and I am grateful to all of them. Representatives NADLER, ZELDIN, ROSE, FITZPATRICK, SHERRILL, and SMITH, I thank all these Members for coming together in this bipartisan fight. Again, this was an attack on American soil by terrorists.

I thank all the families and all our first responders for their incredible service to our great country.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman GOTTHEIMER for his words and his leadership with what is a bipartisan caucus here in the House of Representatives where people from all across the entire country come together. As the name of the caucus says, you just want to solve problems. You want to make your time here in Congress worthwhile. You want to be able to go back to the voters 2 years later and say this is what I did during my term, and have something positive, productive, and constructive to show for it.

The fact that the gentleman dedicates so much of his energy toward solving problems, building bridges, and bipartisanship is to be commended. I thank the gentleman for who he is, and for his efforts here on the floor tonight.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, next, I get to introduce an amazing colleague

who was here in the Chamber, a Member of Congress, during the attacks on September 11. He was here in the days afterward, the years when the Zadroga Act was still getting passed and reauthorized, and here now during this fight for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund.

He has been there every single step of the way since day one, and he is really an amazing Member of Congress and leader, really on the global stage. I just got back from the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, and he is leaving his mark on human trafficking and other issues around the globe.

At this time, on this really important issue tonight, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. ZELDIN for his leadership, not just tonight, but it has been ongoing and very effective. I thank CAROLYN MALONEY for her prime sponsorship of this important legislation.

I am very proud to be a Never Forget the Heroes cosponsor, along with another very strong group of bipartisan Members who will not let this opportunity to enact this legislation pass. We will get this done.

Madam Speaker, everyone remembers where they were and what they were doing. I was actually chairing a Veterans' Affairs Committee hearing when a group of cowards hijacked four airliners in order to perpetrate the worst act of terrorism in American history.

Nearly 3,000 innocent people lost their lives that day, including 700 from my State. Who can forget the courageous first responders running up the stairs of the burning buildings with total disregard for their own safety, saving others at the expense of their own lives.

No one remembers the shock, horror, and numbing sorrow of this day, however, more than the families and the close friends of the victims. I have worked with and befriended many family members of 9/11 victims, and I can state unequivocally that there would not have been a 9/11 Commission and other historic policy initiatives without their extraordinary tenacity, commitment, and courage. That includes what was known as the four Jersey girls, widows who simply would not take "no" for an answer. They were a driving force behind the establishment of that very important historic commission.

I got to know a lot of the others. I actually hired a school principal who lost her husband, Alan, in 9/11, and I am reminded every time I am in the district office, and other days as well, what she has lost and how painful and how sorrowful that was on that day.

For more than 17 years, the families and the friends of those who died have had to endure their loss and a broken heart. Now we know the carnage, the consequences, the ongoing loss of life, and the health crisis attributable to 9/

11 are even worse than anyone could have imagined. New cases of 9/11-caused conditions are being diagnosed by the doctors at the World Trade Center Health Program every day, with close to 12,000 cases of 9/11-caused cancers diagnosed so far, including 600 cases with breast cancer, 2,400 with prostate cancer, 600 with thyroid cancer, 500 with lung cancer, and 500 with kidney cancer.

There have also been other kinds of catastrophic consequences, with people who are suffering from PTSD, some 9,000 so far and counting.

Congress enacted the World Trade Center Health Program Fund and September 11th Victim Compensation Fund to provide health services for responders at the three crash sites, and others in the vicinity of the World Trade Center site for health conditions related to toxic exposures from the attacks.

There are over 6,800 New Jerseyans receiving healthcare services from the World Trade Center Health Program, 1,200 of whom are from my district, constituents of mine.

Just last month—and this was shocking, frankly—the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund special master announced that, due to a lack of funding, the Justice Department will have to cut awards on pending cases by 50 percent and any new claims that are filed by 70 percent.

These cuts will devastate the first responders, our firemen, police, and emergency personnel. They will also represent a gross injustice for survivors and their families who spent countless hours and days in search of their loved ones.

I remember going to the site a couple of days after. I went with Tony Principi, who was then the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Unfortunately, there was a sense, a falsely conveyed sense, that maybe you didn't have to wear the mask, so many of those guys and those ladies on the ground were breathing in a toxic mix of chemicals that now have manifested into very serious disease.

This is an important bill. It is bipartisan, and again, I thank the gentleman (Mr. ZELDIN) for bringing us all together tonight, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle; Congresswoman MALONEY for her leadership; and of course, all the others who are cosponsors of this bill.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman SMITH for his words tonight and pointing out that special master's report that just came out, which really stresses the urgency to get this done immediately. That is tough and unacceptable news for all those victims to read that report, and for the advocates, so I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Congressman SMITH from New Jersey is fighting hard on behalf of his constituents on this issue and for all 9/11 families.

Tonight's Special Order, I just asked Kevin from my team here to see—it

might be a fun fact as to when was the last time that there was a bipartisan Special Order in the Chamber. I don't know, is this even a first?

I am leading tonight's event with Congressman MAX ROSE of Staten Island, who is our next speaker. Congressman ROSE is a freshman who was elected to represent a great congressional district in New York. I represent the greatest congressional district in New York.

Staten Island, I know, is a pretty special place as well, and Congressman MAX ROSE is a military veteran. I have a tremendous amount of respect for him, for his military service.

Right after World War II, almost 100 percent of the House was made up of military veterans. Right after Vietnam, it was a little over 75 percent. I think it was about 77 percent right after Vietnam. Now the number is less than 1 in 5. We have to get that number up. Republicans, Democrats, conservatives, liberals, anywhere you are in the 50 States, it is good to have more vets here in Congress. I thank the gentleman for running, for serving, and for co-leading tonight's Special Order.

The gentleman contacted me as soon as he was elected after the November election to talk about different ways that we can work together, and it is great that our bipartisan Special Order here tonight is for this particular cause. It is an honor to lead tonight with him.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE), the freshman Congressman from Staten Island.

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. ZELDIN for his kind words. The honor is all mine, from one post-9/11 veteran to another post-9/11 veteran, from Staten Island or Long Island. I truly respect your service as well to our great country and applaud the gentleman for putting the country first ahead of any other political considerations as we try to do what is right here.

I would also like to, of course, thank the other original cosponsors of this bill, people who have fought for this incredibly important project and initiative for more than a decade, CAROLYN MALONEY, JERRY NADLER, and PETE KING.

I wanted to start off by telling a story of one of my constituents, Rob Serra. Rob graduated from the academy on September 10, 2001. His first day on the job with the New York City Fire Department was 9/11. When he saw the burning towers from the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge, he did exactly what first responders across the city and across the country did without hesitation, and that is, he raced to the scene. He raced right to danger.

For weeks, he joined so many in digging through the rubble, looking for survivors, looking for their friends, looking for those who were not as fortunate. Dust loaded with cement, asbestos, lead, glass fibers, and other

chemicals caked to his face. He knew this would probably kill him, but he served without question because it was the right thing to do.

Rob is a young man, but he is now in a wheelchair, retired from the FDNY before he could even truly begin his career. He is not looking for handouts. He is looking for respect, for acknowledgment, and for his government to just do the right damn thing, not just for him and for his family, because he is already covered, but he knows there are thousands of heroic Americans just like him across the country who are getting sick but facing drastic cuts to their benefits.

Just about every Member in this body has a constituent like Rob and his family. They all deserve more than our tweets and statements. They need action. They deserve nothing less because we need to do more than just say, "Never forget." We need to do more than just shake somebody's hand and say that we have a picture of the Twin Towers in our office or that we decided to serve in this body because of 9/11.

We need to make sure that these heroes are never forgotten and are always taken care of. That means making sure every victim and their families get the benefits and care they deserve, because this wasn't an attack on New York. This was an attack on the United States of America.

Keeping our promise to these heroes is not a New York problem. It is an American issue that we have to address and fix as a country. There are VCF claims from all 50 States and 99 percent of congressional districts. In a few years, we may face the tragic fact that more people will have died from 9/11-related injuries and diseases than were lost on the day of the attacks.

Each and every person that dies is yet another victim of al-Qaida's attack. Unless Congress acts to fully and permanently fund the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund, benefits will be cut and promises will be broken. This isn't due to mismanagement or fraud or any other fact than that more people are getting sick.

I applaud this administration for doing the right thing and effectively managing this program. I applaud the President for that. But it is unacceptable that we will not adequately fund it, and I won't stand for it. I am hopeful we can get this done, because we truly have no other choice.

□ 2015

Mr. ZELDIN. I didn't realize Congressman ROSE is a Purple Heart too.

Mr. ROSE of New York. I was in the wrong place at the wrong time for that one.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his service in the military and for his new service he just started here in the House. I had to throw in the Army, too, knowing that we do have another speaker here who is a Navy helicopter pilot, if I understand correctly. We have got a couple of

Army folks in the House. I thank the gentleman for his service to our country going back many years, even though he just started here in the House 2 years ago.

Mr. ROSE of New York. Absolutely, I thank the gentleman. Go Army.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, our next speaker tonight also had a distinguished career serving in government before joining Congress. He rose up the ranks at the FBI. He is a very well-respected member of the FBI who believes in law enforcement and the rule of law. He also loves our military so much that over the course of years, every single year for Christmas we have been able to travel to Iraq or Afghanistan, going to the Middle East, to visit the troops as we did this past Christmas, all over Kuwait on Christmas Day.

The FBI was impacted greatly on 9/11. They went into the towers as well while many people were running out. So I thank Brian, not only for his service with the FBI, but for his continued fight for all of those first responders, as we should remember those FDNY and the NYPD who went in to the towers. There were many other types of law enforcement who ran in as well, including many FBI agents.

On behalf of all those FBI agents, I thank the gentleman for continuing the fight. It is great to have another State Representative from Pennsylvania.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues from New York, LEE ZELDIN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. KING, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. NADLER, for holding this Special Order tonight. I am proud to join my colleagues in this fight to reauthorize the September 11 Victim Compensation Fund to ensure that our 9/11 survivors and their families have the resources and the support to which they are owed.

As my colleagues can attest, we lost some amazing human beings on that day: firefighters, police officers, EMTs, medics, mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters.

Victor Saracini, a resident of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, a constituent in my district, was the captain and pilot of United Airlines Flight 175 which our entire country and the entire world witnessed fly into the south tower.

While 9/11 shattered many preconceived notions we have had, it strengthened our collective American identity. Our Nation emerged from that day stronger because of the bravery and selflessness of the heroes who risked and, in many cases, lost their lives to save people they didn't know and had never met.

Their sacrifice has come at a tremendous cost. In over 17 years since that fateful day, nearly 10,000 people have suffered from cancers induced by breathing in toxic dust at Ground Zero, dust that included thousands of contaminants, including lead and mercury.

Madam Speaker, in just one statistic on how this problem is still prevalent, the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial reported that 15 police officers died in 2018 from 9/11-related illnesses, 15 just last year alone. This problem is pervasive, and this problem is persistent. It is incumbent upon the Federal Government to stand up and defend those who defended us. The September 11 Victim Compensation Fund must be reauthorized immediately. It is a moral obligation of this body. It simply cannot wait.

Again, I want to thank the members of the New York delegation for holding this Special Order and for giving me the opportunity to express my gratitude for the heroes and their families and the need to reauthorize this fund. I second my colleagues' sentiment tonight. This is a moral obligation of this House. We must get this done, and we must get it done immediately.

I want to thank Mr. ZELDIN for representing the Problem Solvers Caucus tonight. In recognizing JOSH GOTTHEIMER, I wanted to say to my colleague, MAX ROSE and I are going to be testing a new rule that we put into place, and we are going to get to 290 cosponsors come hell or high water. We will get there which will force that matter on to this floor. It will pass. It will pass overwhelmingly, and we will get this done for the 9/11 victims and their families.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman FITZPATRICK for setting his goals with cosponsorship not just high but also appropriately. Every Member of this Chamber should be cosponsoring this bill so, hopefully, we will get those numbers up a lot, but much credit to Congresswoman MALONEY, to Congressman NADLER, and to Congressman KING, for the advocates from the outside, especially across the New York City metropolitan area, we are already starting strong with 150 cosponsors.

The next speaker is a United States Naval Academy graduate. She was a helicopter pilot. She is a new Representative from New Jersey's 11th District, and she is hitting the ground running with important leadership on this issue fighting for her constituents. There is a story to be told to Members of Congress who maybe weren't here in 2015 or even 5 years before that when Congressman NADLER, whom we will be hearing from next, was getting the Zadroga Act first passed, a lot of Members were new in 2015 when we were permanently reauthorizing the Zadroga Act. Now, if you look back to 2015, we have a lot of new Members who weren't here in 2015. The education, as we talk to people who live far away from where we live in New York and New Jersey, they might not even know what the Zadroga Act is. They might not know what the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund is. That is why it is great to see Congressman ROSE and Congresswoman SHERRILL leading the fight to educate their fellow freshman and others to

make sure that they cosponsor this effort.

I thank the gentlewoman for her service. I kind of apologize for my Go Army joke before. I won't mention the three-game winning streak that MAX and I have going. Hopefully that didn't bring the gentlewoman down too much before we hear her great remarks tonight.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York, as I like to call it the suburbs of northern Jersey.

But as my colleagues before me have made clear, this Congress must honor the first responders and survivors of 9/11 and make the September 11 Victim Compensation Fund permanent.

For 8 months and 19 days after September 11, police officers, firefighters, first responders, FBI agents, and Federal officers from across the country came together in New York. In a gesture of national unity that we have not forgotten, they stayed, sometimes far away from home, to help.

Firefighters like Gerry Lynch from the Bloomfield Fire Department in my district. Gerry and the Bloomfield firefighters were assigned to help Ladder 105 Engine 219 in Brooklyn because they were at Ground Zero looking for their brothers. After being told that they could go home to Jersey, Gerry didn't think twice about what he would do next. He went down to help on the bucket brigades at Ground Zero working with men and women on the line.

Madam Speaker, we now know that first responders, as well as students, residents, workers, and business owners of Lower Manhattan were exposed to toxic fumes in the aftermath of the attack. What some have called a toxic soup of mercury, dust, silica, lead, fiberglass, benzene, and many other substances, were pulverized and released into the air. These victims have developed cancers, pulmonary disease, respiratory disease, and sleep apnea, among many other ailments.

Those suffering from 9/11-related illnesses include Mike, a firefighter from New Jersey, who lugged, by hand, the equipment that his firefighters brought from New Jersey into Ground Zero. Mike worked from 7 a.m. through the next morning, and by the time he was finished, he was so exhausted that a human chain had to carry him off the pile. His feet never hit the ground.

Mike told me that a lot of firefighters, including himself, didn't want to come forward. They didn't want to admit that they might need help. But luckily for him, his captain made sure that they went forward for monitoring, and so he started that in 2004. Since 9/11, Mike has developed breathing problems, sleep apnea, and precancerous cells. He asked me to let people know how hard the firefighters worked for us and that we need to do whatever we can for those who have fallen sick.

Madam Speaker, we are here tonight to let Mike and all those suffering know that we consider it our responsibility and our duty to get this done. We established the victim compensation fund in 2011 to provide care for Mike and all those suffering from health issues after 9/11.

There are 8,614 New Jerseyans who have registered for the victim compensation fund, and nearly 4,000 have submitted claim forms. That is 500 residents in my district alone. If anyone thinks this is just a New York-New Jersey issue, consider that the victim compensation fund helps Americans from 434 out of 435 congressional districts.

The fund is running out, Madam Speaker. As my colleagues said, benefits are being slashed by 70 percent and thousands of claims go unpaid. To let the fund go broke or give another temporary extension and force our heroes and their families to worry about the rug being pulled out from under them is simply unacceptable. It is embarrassing that we would have to fight for this, that people who are ill cannot concentrate solely on getting the treatment they need or seeing the right doctors.

Firefighters like Mike and Gerry were the ones who didn't run away from the crisis, but ran right into it. People who have displayed this bravery and courage need to be taken care of. They should not be made to feel guilty that they are asking for help when they have medical issues related to their service.

Madam Speaker, I believe in this country. I believe in our values and that as a Nation we know that when we step up and when we take care of our own, we are helping those people to whom we owe the most to. We need to give these first responders and survivors the peace of mind that their sacrifice for this country is recognized and valued by the rest of America. I call upon each and every Member of this Congress to join us and to make the September 11 Victim Compensation Fund permanent.

Go Navy.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I will get back to the gentlewoman in December on that one. We will see if we keep the winning streak going.

I thank the gentlewoman again for her service, for her remarks tonight, and for running for office. I look forward to working with the gentlewoman on this.

The next speaker certainly needs no introduction. He is last but certainly not least, someone who has been a rock solid presence, a voice, a leader, a fierce advocate for all 9/11 victims and their families, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and someone who is not just one of the main three who have been leading this effort with Congresswoman MALONEY and Congressman KING, but really right back to the very beginning, since September 11, 2001, so personally on behalf

of my constituents back home on the east end of Long Island, for all 9/11 victims, their families, thank you to Chairman NADLER for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), who is the chair of the House Judiciary Committee.

□ 2030

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. ROSE for holding this Special Order hour on the importance of reauthorizing the Victim Compensation Fund and ensuring that every responder and survivor is made whole, as Congress intended.

As my colleagues have also discussed, we have been pushing for more than 15 years to finally address the moral obligations we have to those made ill by exposure to toxins on September 11 and in the weeks and months after the attack. It is a two-part moral obligation.

First, the attacks on September 11 were not just attacks on New York or on Washington, D.C. They were attacks on America.

In the last few weeks, we have heard an objection raised to this bill that New York should handle this issue because it is a "New York problem."

The World Trade Center stood in my district. Many of the people who ran into those towers were my fellow New Yorkers. The people who fled their homes and offices to find safety were my constituents.

But they were Americans, and those towers fell on that Tuesday morning not because they stood in New York, but because they stood in the United States of America.

While it may have been the brave men and women of the Fire Department of New York and the New York Police Department and the Port Authority who first rushed to those towers, to say that the responders and survivors who are sick today are just in New York is factually untrue.

There are sick responders and survivors in every State and in 434 of the 435 congressional districts. This is not a New York or a D.C. issue; it is a national issue and deserves a national response.

The second moral obligation directly ties the Victim Compensation Fund to the Federal Government.

The reason so many survivors and responders were exposed to the toxins that made them sick was that they were told by the Federal Government—specifically, by Christine Todd Whitman, then the Administrator of the Federal EPA, and then by Mayor Rudy Giuliani—that the air at Ground Zero and in Lower Manhattan was safe to breathe, that they should work for months to clean up the pile, that they should go back to work in Lower Manhattan, that the air was safe to breathe.

But it was not safe; it was toxic.

In the rush to get Wall Street up and running, tens of thousands of people were sent directly into harm's way by the Federal Government.

I went to Ground Zero days after the attack. We knew even then that the air was not safe, that the air was thick with dust and debris, and we had no idea what was swirling in those clouds around us as we struggled to breathe. But the Federal Government said it was safe.

I think of those responders, first on the rescue mission. And I don't begrudge anybody who worked on the pile in the first 3 days when people may have still been alive who worked without proper respiratory protection to save lives. But after the first 3 days, it was a recovery mission; and people worked, breathing that air, for hours and days without adequate protection.

I think of the families sent back to their apartments in Lower Manhattan and told to wipe away the layers of asbestos from their furniture and their windows with a damp cloth.

I think of the students sitting in their classrooms at Stuyvesant High School, blocks from Ground Zero, and the barges removing debris as trucks full of asbestos idled below the high school's open windows.

The Federal Government bears the burden to care for and support all those who went back to Ground Zero because the Federal Government told them it was safe when it was not safe.

And since the day the EPA and others told people it was safe to go back to work, to school, and to their homes, since the day the EPA told those responders at Ground Zero that it was safe to work with minimal protection, I have been fighting alongside my colleagues Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. KING to secure healthcare and support for the people who became sick because of that exposure.

We fought for nearly 10 years to get the first Zadroga Act passed in 2010. That bill created the World Trade Center Health Program and reopened the Victim Compensation Fund.

But we only authorized the VCF for 5 years. We knew we needed more than 5 years, and we came back in 2015 and passed the reauthorization bill.

That bill made the health program permanent—or, at least, until 2090—which gave much-needed certainty to those suffering from 9/11 illnesses and their families. But, again, we authorized the Victim Compensation Fund, the VCF, for just another 5 years.

As those 5 years have gone on, people have become sicker. More and more responders and survivors have been diagnosed with various cancers, particularly cancers with long latency periods, and, tragically, more and more have died from those illnesses.

As people become sicker and pass away, the VCF has functioned exactly as Congress directed. It has provided those individuals, those first responders, those survivors, and their families with compensation and resources they need to get through these difficult times.

But, just as people are getting sicker, the VCF is running out of money. Last

month, the Justice Department announced that, because of the high demand for claims, because the cancers are more numerous than anticipated, because more people of the heroes of 9/11 than anticipated are getting sick, the Department would be forced to cut awards by 50 percent if they were filed by February 1 and 70 percent if they were filed after February 1.

Can you imagine that? You are dying of stomach cancer, unable to work, unable to leave your house for more than your doctor's appointments, and waiting for compensation so you can pay off your house and protect your family before you die, and the award you anticipated is cut in half or by 70 percent.

Your wife dies after a long struggle with breast cancer, and you are waiting for your claim to pay her funeral expenses, and your compensation is cut in half or by 70 percent.

You have such severe gastrointestinal issues that you can only work part-time. You are waiting for your award to pay for your child's college tuition, and your claim is cut by 70 percent.

That is not the promise we made to those first responders and survivors. That is not fulfilling the moral obligation that pushed us to create the VCF in the first place.

That is failing Lincoln's statement of our duty "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan."

That is failing our promise to never forget 9/11 and failing the brave men and women who helped us on that day and who struggle and fight to this day.

But that doesn't have to happen. If we pass the Never Forget the Heroes Act, we can stop these cuts and make the Victim Compensation Fund permanent, providing responders and survivors the certainty that, no matter how sick they get, they will have us at their backs and the resources they need.

I thank my colleagues who have been with us in this fight from the start, and I thank the 142 bipartisan cosponsors who have already signed on to this bill.

We will get this done. We must get this done. We will meet our moral obligations.

We will never forget these heroes.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for his remarks tonight and for his leadership through the years. It is a very important voice from New York City, from Ground Zero, and something that couldn't have possibly impacted the heart of his district any more than what was the largest attack on our soil on September 11, 2001.

Yet the silver lining of that attack was seeing the spirit, the fight, the grit of his constituents, of my constituents, of constituents from 433 out of 435 districts in our entire country who responded after September 11, 2001.

A lot of Members of this Chamber don't realize that 9/11 first responders came from almost every single congressional district represented here.

But it was all throughout Chairman NADLER's district on September 11, 2001, that we saw people going into danger while everyone else was running out, and it reminded us of the strength of New Yorkers, the pride and strength and courage of Americans.

There has certainly been great sacrifice since but, most importantly, sacrifice from those who have been victims because of September 11, 2001, either due to the attack that day or service in our military.

As we are here tonight, there are 9/11 first responders who are very sick, and I just want to, right before we close, share one quick story.

This is a constituent of mine from East Hampton. This is a single mother, a sole provider of her 12-year-old son, who lived and worked within blocks of the World Trade Center on 9/11 and during the aftermath.

She said: "My colleagues and I saw it as our patriotic duty to show the terrorists that they could not destroy our neighborhood and way of life."

I think, many times, people forget that, in the aftermath of 9/11, we were not only tending to Ground Zero, but we were rebuilding the spirit of our Nation.

It is thanks to Americans like this constituent of mine and her coworkers and all those who faced the unconscionable horror, who did not cower in fear, that our Nation rose stronger than ever.

In late 2017, she was diagnosed with stage III ovarian cancer, which has never occurred on either side of her family.

Her coworker at the time of 9/11 developed prostate cancer, and three of her coworkers now have an extremely rare skin condition.

In response to learning that the fund is running out of money and would cut claims by 70 percent, she said: "I don't think I can properly express in writing how devastated I feel. Even worse, I feel extremely distraught over the others who are in the same situation as me or who are about to find they are . . . as they will, too, receive a devastating diagnosis like mine."

The one other story is Kevin from Smithtown. I represent a district that is just over 50 miles from Ground Zero, and fighting for my constituents who were affected by September 11 is my job, but it is also very personal.

Kevin is a former NYPD officer who said he "picked up human remains for 2 days, without any hesitation, because at the time that is what had to be done."

He continued to work on and around the pile for close to 12 months.

In January of 2018, Kevin was diagnosed with non-Hodgkin's diffuse large B-cell lymphoma and underwent 6 months of chemotherapy, which left him with devastating symptoms that will stay with him the rest of his life.

He wrote to me about how he missed many important moments and family functions with his children and loved

ones. He said: "To give out awards reduced by 70 percent is a slap in my face and all others that are now suffering," and he is right.

When he was working the pile day and night for months on end, he wasn't thinking about himself or what this might mean for his future. He was thinking about our Nation. He was committed to getting the remains of victims of 9/11 home to those who survived them.

Kevin was there for us, and it is important for all of us to step up to the plate for him.

Lastly, I thank Congresswoman MALONEY, Congressman KING, and Chairman NADLER for taking the lead on this legislation yet again. I thank Congressman ROSE for coleading tonight's Special Order. Hopefully, it is the start of something new and that we will see more often: bipartisan Special Orders on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I think our constituents back home all across America want to see more of us working together to get good things done. It makes them feel good that their government is working for them.

But I will tell you, with regards to the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund, it is not until this Chamber, the Senate, and the President signs it that this is done, fully funded, that we are going to be able to take credit for anything good and right, because this needs to actually get over the finish line.

Tonight is just another positive step. Everyone signing on as cosponsors is a positive step. And I hope that everyone who is watching, whether you are a Member of this Chamber, you are a staffer of a Member of this Chamber, or you are an advocate, that you get involved, cosponsor, to get our numbers up.

I thank Madam Speaker for her leadership tonight with this effort, for presiding over the Chamber during this very important hour, and I yield back the balance of my time.

STATUS OF ABORTION IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, today I would like to address the status of abortion in America.

In the past 2 months, there have been two stories that show a significant shift, I believe, in America regarding the status of abortion.

In New York, one of our original 13 Colonies, they recently expanded the right to have abortions up to 9 months and, as a practical matter, left it to be okay for a baby born alive not to receive protection. The Governor of New York was so proud of this situation that he lit up the World Trade Center and people applauded in the Senate chamber.

In Virginia, another one of our original 13 States, the Governor came out for a bill that also allows 9-month abortions. The morally bereft Governor said that, if a baby was born alive, that baby would only be resuscitated if the mother wanted.

By the way, I want to point out here there is this myth out there that late-term abortions are only for babies who may not survive.

I once heard a speech from a woman who quit a late-term abortion clinic in Ohio. She was there only one day. At that time, there were six babies delivered. Five had no health problems whatsoever, and the other had either spina bifida—I think it was spina bifida. And, of course, many people live productive lives with that disease.

Only 10 years ago, Kermit Gosnell of Philadelphia was convicted of delivering babies alive and killing them after they were born—perhaps hundreds, perhaps thousands.

□ 2045

You can read about them in a book by that name, "Gosnell." There is a movie out as well; kind of very interesting to see the mindset of the abortion industry.

But Gosnell was defiant. When they talked to him after he was convicted, as a practical matter, put in prison for life, he said, in the end, he would be vindicated. And I think when he said vindicated, he meant in 10 years that he felt America would come around to the position that it would be okay to kill a baby born alive.

Who would dream that less than 10 years later, Gosnell may be on the verge of being proven right, and that the moral compass of America had shifted so much that it would be okay to allow a born-alive baby to die.

How did we get here? There are a variety of culprits to blame. Part of it, of course, is the thinly disguised racism of our old friend, Margaret Sanger, founder of Planned Parenthood. And I should point out that even Margaret Sanger, feminist hero, was opposed to abortion because as recently as 60 years ago, even among people of that ilk, that would have been considered something that you could never be for.

But she did want her organization to reduce people from races she considered inferior, and this was typical of the views of the early progressives.

We also have people viewing it also as a way to hold down the people that we consider undesirable.

Justice Ginsberg was quoted in the New York Times that she thought Roe was decided, in part, because of a concern about population growth in populations we don't want too many of. Now, she was subsequently allowed to say that that quote was taken out of context, but that was the quote that was listed. They kind of gave her a chance to try to walk that thing back; a chance that wasn't given STEVE KING.

Later, the same point was made by an article in the Harvard Journal crediting abortion with the reduction in crime rates.

Part of the problem is the usual weight of promiscuous politicians who would obviously be for abortion; people like the Ted Kennedys or Bill Clintons or Bob Packwoods of the world; and, obviously, there are a given number of men who have a vested interest in making sure abortion is always available.

Part of the problem is the pernicious influence of Hollywood. The “Me Too Movement” has opened up eyes as to the mindset of powerful people in Hollywood and that, perhaps, is one of the reasons why the popular culture would be all largely pro-choice to the extreme or pro-abortion to the extreme.

But still, why is it in America that we are such an outlier? John Adams said that this country—that the Constitution was put together for a morally and religious people. The Pilgrims came from Europe to found a more devout country. Yet, in Europe, a much less religious country than ours, the norm is no abortions after 12 weeks. You look around. Germany, 12 weeks; France, 12 weeks; Italy, 90 days; Portugal, 10 weeks.

How did America wind up, in States like New York saying, okay for 9 months?

And you look south of the border. Mexico, most of their states don't allow abortion to this day; and it is 12 weeks in the area of Mexico City.

So, we will have to look further why did this happen.

I had originally felt, with the advent of the ultrasound, America would become overwhelmingly pro-life. I had toured abortion clinics when the ultrasound was a little bit rare, and I could see the language that was used to mislead America as to what was going on.

In the abortion industry, they don't use the word “abortion.” They talk about “procedures.” They don't even use the word “fetus,” much less “baby.” They use the word “tissue.”

But I felt the ultrasound would overcome that language that I felt was one of the reasons abortion was still so common.

So who else can we blame?

Obviously, politicians have dropped the ball. Obviously, we have horrible judges who can look at the Constitution, a document founded for a moral and religious people, and claim that when our forefathers put together that Constitution, they apparently expected abortion to be legal, and abortion being illegal for so much of this country's history.

To a certain extent, when you look at the judges, I think we have to blame the law schools, you know. Americans, whatever polls you look at, bounce back and forth between what people would say is 50 percent pro-abortion, 50 percent pro-life.

I wonder, in the law schools, the law school students, the law school faculty, what those numbers are, which is maybe one of the reasons why so few of the judges seem to be able to get the appropriate answer here.

But where I would like to put the attention is, where are the churches?

You know, it must be kind of difficult to be a minister or a priest. You have got to come up with 50 or 52 different topics a year to talk about.

Now, we have a situation going on in this country where we peaked out at over a million abortions a year, and we are still over 600,000. You look what is going on in Virginia, and you look at what is going on in New York; and it seems to me there is fertile ground for the priest or minister looking for something to say.

Nevertheless, I have taken to spending the last few weeks kind of talking to people at random as to how often in the past year, when the priests and ministers are looking for 50 different topics to talk about, how often they have addressed the abortion issue.

It is not unusual, as a matter of fact, I would say the majority of people I talked to who go to a church, it is not brought up at all. I mean, I will tell you, it would be very difficult to come up with 50 different topics a year. But how you can come up with 50 different topics a year, and with 600,000 abortions in this country every year, and not deal with that?

But I think a lot of the blame has to lie there. Whenever there are great tragedies in human history, I think people expect the clergy to step up and provide some moral guidance.

So I end this speech by saying three things:

First of all, I ask the pro-life groups not to give up.

Secondly, I ask the politicians to bring forth bills like the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which, by the way, in itself, shows some weakness, and we have a relatively weak bill. And that is, I guess, what our pro-life position is today, or the bill we can bring to the floor.

It is kind of sad that we didn't even get a final vote on that in the Senate, but the bill should be brought up to educate America on the state of abortion in America right now.

And finally, and most importantly, I ask the churches to finally step up.

You know, I look on a calendar, and this June there will be five weekends. Okay. So your average priest, your average minister out there is going to have to think of five topics to talk about.

So I would like to ask the people of this country, and any clergy who happen to hear this speech, to devote at least one of those 5 weeks in June to this stain of over 600,000 abortions in this country every year, and ask yourself, what is the right or wrong thing to do?

And if you are one of those clergymen who, over the last year has not addressed this issue—see, I am making your life easier for you, you only have to think of four other things to talk about, rather than the five weekends in June—I ask you to spend one week in June addressing this issue and encour-

aging people to finally say no more of this scourge in the United States.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 8, 2019, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

329. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subpart Nomenclature Change [Docket No.: APHIS-2018-0070] received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

330. A letter from the Director, Issuances Staff, OPD/FSIS/USDA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Eliminating Unnecessary Requirements for Hog Carcass Cleaning [Docket No.: FSIS-2018-0005] (RIN: 0583-AD68) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

331. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Rates of Subsistence Allowance and Commutation Instead of Uniforms for Members of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps [Docket ID: DOD-2018-OS-0046] (RIN: 0790-AK32) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

332. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Productivity Enhancing Capital Investment (PECI) [Docket ID: DOD-2018-OS-0084] (RIN: 0790-AK46) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

333. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan (RSFPP) [Docket ID: DOD-2018-OS-0058] (RIN: 0790-AK31) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

334. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Availability of DoD Directives, DoD Instructions, DoD Publications, and Changes [Docket ID: DOD-2019-OS-0004] (RIN: 0790-AK48) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

335. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Division of Investment Management, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's interim final rule — Amendments To The Timing Requirements

For Filing Reports On Form N-Port [Release No.: IC-33384; File No.: S7-02-19] (RIN: 3235-AL42) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

336. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Mobility Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Service Rules for the 698-746,747-762, and 777-792 Bands [WT Docket No.: 06-150; DA 19-77] received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

337. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-19, "Sports Wagering Lottery Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2019", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

338. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-20, "Bryant Street Tax Increment Financing Temporary Amendment Act of 2019", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

339. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-8, "Rental Housing Registration Extension Temporary Amendment Act of 2019", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

340. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-9, "Federal Worker Housing Relief Temporary Act of 2019", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

341. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-7, "Sports Wagering Procurement Practices Reform Exemption Act of 2019", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

342. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2018 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Bluefin Tuna [Docket No.: 140501394-5279-02] (RIN: 0648-XG424) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

343. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 180117042-8884-02] (RIN: 0648-XG695) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

344. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 170816769-8162-02] (RIN: 0648-XG675) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

345. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oce-

anic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 161020985-7181-02] (RIN: 0648-XF948) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

346. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; 2018 Management Area 1B Directed Fishery Closure [Docket No.: 151215999-6960-02] (RIN: 0648-XG512) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

347. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Closure of Purse Seine Fishery on the High Seas in 2018 [Docket No.: 180209155-8589-02] (RIN: 0648-XG458) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

348. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fishery; 2018 Illex Squid Quota Harvested [Docket No.: 140902739-5224-02] (RIN: 0648-XG349) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

349. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Closure of the Mid-Atlantic Scallop Access Area to General Category Individual Fishing Quota Scallop Vessels [Docket No.: 180202111-8353-02] (RIN: 0648-XG690) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

350. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; 2018 Commercial Quota Harvested for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts [Docket No.: 170828822-70999-02] (RIN: 0648-XG392) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

351. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 170816769-8162-02] (RIN: 0648-XG402) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

352. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, trans-

mitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 170816769-8162-02] (RIN: 0648-XG502) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

353. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; 2019 Specifications [Docket No.: 180906820-8999-02] (RIN: 0648-BI48) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

354. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XG115) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

355. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 170816769-8162-02] (RIN: 0648-XG400) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

356. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Shrimp Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Closure of the Penaeid Shrimp Fishery Off South Carolina [Docket No.: 120919470-3513-02] (RIN: 0648-XF955) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

357. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Pacific Island Pelagic Fisheries; False Killer Whale Take Reduction Plan; Closure of Southern Exclusion Zone [Docket No.: 110131070-2626-02] (RIN: 0648-XG781) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

358. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the U.S. Navy Training and Testing Activities in the Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Study Area [Docket No.: 170918908-8999-02] (RIN: 0648-BH29) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

359. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the

Administration's temporary rule — Reel Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2018 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for Gulf of Mexico Gray Triggerfish [Docket No.: 121004518-3398-01] (RIN: 0648-XG421) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

360. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation [Docket ID: ED-2019-OGC-0004] (RIN: 1801-AA18) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself and Mr. BERGMAN):

H.R. 1579. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to require that the POW/MIA flag be displayed on all days that the flag of the United States is displayed on certain Federal property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 1580. A bill to enhance stabilization of conflict-affected areas and prevent violence and fragility globally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. BASS, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASE, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COX of California, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. CROW, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. HIMES, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOV-

ERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SIREs, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHRULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 1581. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to include in the Annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices a section on reproductive rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1582. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require preservation of certain electronic records by Federal agencies, to require a certification and reports relating to Presidential records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORELLE (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 1583. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to establish an initiative, carried out by the Assistant Secretary for Aging, to coordinate Federal efforts and programs for home modifications enabling older individuals and individuals with disabilities to live independently and safely in a home environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 1584. A bill to repeal section 115 of the Clean Air Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BASS (for herself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1585. A bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, Natural Resources, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 1586. A bill to amend the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act to establish a digital network technology program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CRIST, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. MCCOL-

LUM, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CORREA, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 1587. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to enter into a 10-year arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct and update biennially a study on the effects of State legalized marijuana programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. AMASH, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1588. A bill to limit the application of Federal laws to the distribution and consumption of marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1589. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GUEST:

H.R. 1590. A bill to require an exercise related to terrorist and foreign fighter travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 1591. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to local educational agencies to encourage girls and underrepresented minorities to pursue studies and careers in STEM fields; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1592. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish a pilot program to award competitive grants for the integration of cybersecurity education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1593. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a school security coordinating council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1594. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a process to review applications for certain grants to purchase equipment or systems that do not meet or exceed any applicable national voluntary consensus standards, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. HECK, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROW, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PORTER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILD, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 1595. A bill to create protections for depository institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers for such businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. EVANS, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. MCBATH, and Mrs. DEMINGS):

H.R. 1596. A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to obtain a statue of Shirley Chisholm for placement in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GRJALVA, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KILMER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. COSTA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MENG, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1597. A bill to designate the same individual serving as the Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service as the National Nurse for Public Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico (for herself and Mr. HURD of Texas):

H.R. 1598. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue a strategy to improve hiring and retention of U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel in rural or remote areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD (for himself, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 1599. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to eligible organizations for the provision of transition assistance to members of the Armed Forces recently separated from active duty service and spouses of such members; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOK, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 1600. A bill to require that certain funds provided by the Department of Transportation for high-speed rail development in the State of California that are rescinded or otherwise reimbursed be made available to the Secretary of the Interior for water storage projects, and to the Secretary of Agriculture for nitrate contamination reduction grants and new well construction grants; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 1601. A bill to allow States to elect to observe daylight savings time for the duration of the year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 1602. A bill to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MCNER-

NEY, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 1603. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to prohibit the manufacture, processing, and distribution in commerce of asbestos and asbestos-containing mixtures and articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H.R. 1604. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to deny security clearances to any employee of the Executive Office of the President who is under investigation by a Federal law enforcement agency for aiding a foreign government or who fails to disclose contacts with foreign nationals on Standard Form 86, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Mr. YOHO, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BUDD, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. LATTI, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. LONG, and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee):

H.R. 1605. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to allow parents of eligible military dependent children to establish Military Education Savings Accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1606. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit oil-, gas-, and methane hydrate-related seismic activities in the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, and Straits of Florida planning areas of the outer Continental Shelf, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 1607. A bill to promote competition and help consumers save money by giving them the freedom to choose where they buy prescription pet medications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 1608. A bill to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency of Federal advisory committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for

consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana):

H.R. 1609. A bill to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CRIST (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 1610. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to allow the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide capitalization grants to States to establish revolving funds to provide funding assistance to reduce flood risks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. WALTZ):

H.R. 1611. A bill to provide assistance for United States citizens and nationals taken hostage or unlawfully or wrongfully detained abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 1612. A bill to ensure election security, enhance Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics through transparency, establish accountability and integrity measures for Congress, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, the Judiciary, Homeland Security, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Ways and Means, Financial Services, Oversight and Reform, and Ethics, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 1613. A bill to direct the Federal Election Commission to carry out a voucher pilot program under which individuals may use vouchers to make small dollar contributions to qualified candidates for election for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 1614. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to establish additional registration requirements for prescribers of opioids, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. STAUBER, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BERGMAN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. WATKINS, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DUNN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. CROW, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1615. A bill to transfer the responsibility of verifying small business concerns

owned and controlled by veterans or service-disabled veterans to the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 1616. A bill to prioritize the efforts of and enhance coordination among United States agencies to encourage countries in Central and Eastern Europe to diversify their energy sources and supply routes, increase Europe's energy security, and help the United States reach its global energy security goals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (for himself and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 1617. A bill to direct the Director of National Intelligence to submit intelligence assessments of the intentions of the political leadership of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 1618. A bill to encourage States to require the installation of residential carbon monoxide detectors in homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LEE of Nevada (for herself, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 1619. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from taking any action relating to the licensing, planning, development, or construction of a nuclear waste repository until the Director of the Office of Management and Budget submits to Congress a study on the economic viability and job-creating benefits of alternative uses of the Yucca Mountain site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LURIA (for herself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 1620. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BIGGS, Mrs. LESKO, Ms. CHENEY, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 1621. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. MAST, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. HURD of Texas):

H.R. 1622. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to limit experimentation on cats; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 1623. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for the treatment of payments for child care and other personal use services as an authorized campaign expenditure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. PORTER (for herself and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 1624. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit contributions and donations by foreign nationals in connection with State or local ballot initiatives or referenda; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 1625. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a safe harbor for determinations of worker classification, to require increased reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 1626. A bill to prevent the enrichment of certain Government officers and employees or their families through Federal funds or contracting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PALLONE, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KILMER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H.R. 1627. A bill to direct the Attorney General to submit to Congress investigative materials in the event of certain pardons granted by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself and Mrs. LURIA):

H.R. 1628. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to seek to enter into an agreement with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to conduct a study on radiation exposure relating to the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. STAUBER, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 1629. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to review and make certain revisions to the Standard Occupational Classification System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. OMAR, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1630. A bill to impose sanctions under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act to combat corruption, money laundering, and impunity in Guatemala, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 1631. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that any absentee ballot may be mailed free of postage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 1632. A bill to require a strategy for engagement with Southeast Asia and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 1633. A bill to improve the productivity and energy efficiency of the manufacturing sector by directing the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the National Academies and other appropriate Federal agencies, to develop a national smart manufacturing plan and to provide assistance to small- and medium-sized manufacturers in implementing smart manufacturing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1634. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide for the establishment of Youth Corps programs and provide for wider dissemination of the Youth Corps model; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1635. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to create a pilot program to award grants to units of general local government and community-based organizations to create jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1636. A bill to establish the Commission on the Social Status of Black Men and Boys, to study and make recommendations to address social problems affecting Black men and boys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1637. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require States to designate public high schools as voter registration agencies, to direct such schools to conduct voter registration drives for students attending such schools, to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to reimburse such schools for the costs of conducting such voter registration drives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. NEAL):

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEAL (for himself and Mr. BRADY):

H. Res. 182. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself and Mr. RICHMOND):

H. Res. 183. A resolution condemning anti-Semitism as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values and aspirations that define the people of the United States and condemning anti-Muslim discrimination and bigotry against minorities as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contrary to the values and aspirations of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H. Res. 184. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Natural Resources in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H. Res. 185. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Rules in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BYRNE (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NOR-TON, Ms. WILD, Mr. TRONE, Mr. CUM-MINGS, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H. Res. 186. A resolution commemorating the 75th anniversary of the United Negro College Fund, Inc; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. CHABOT):

H. Res. 187. A resolution calling for the unconditional release of United States citizens and legal permanent resident aliens being held for political purposes by the Government of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H. Res. 188. A resolution expressing support for designation of July as National Sarcoma Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Res. 189. A resolution recognizing the importance of sustained United States leadership to accelerating global progress against maternal and child malnutrition and supporting United States Agency for Inter-

national Development's commitment to global nutrition through its multi-sectoral nutrition strategy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H. Res. 190. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives supporting visits and communication between the United States and the Republic of Artsakh at all levels of civil society and government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BABIN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Mr. HUDSON):

H. Res. 191. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives relating to protecting freedom of speech, thought, and expression at institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H. Res. 192. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Homeland Security in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H. Res. 193. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on the Budget in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 1579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution states that "Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." [Page H473]

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:
H.R. 1581.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, US Constitution
By Mr. CUMMINGS:
H.R. 1582.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.
By Mr. MORELLE:
H.R. 1583.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution
By Mr. PERRY:
H.R. 1584.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article One, Section Eight
By Ms. BASS:
H.R. 1585.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:
H.R. 1586.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.
By Ms. GABBARD:
H.R. 1587.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The United State Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.
By Ms. GABBARD:
H.R. 1588.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The United State Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.
By Mr. WALKER:
H.R. 1589.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, section 8, clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
By Mr. GUEST:
H.R. 1590.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department of Officer thereof.
By Mrs. BEATTY:
H.R. 1591.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States
By Mr. LANGEVIN:
H.R. 1592.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. PAYNE:
H.R. 1593.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
By Mr. PAYNE:
H.R. 1594.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
By Mr. PERLMUTTER:
H.R. 1595.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Ms. CLARKE of New York:
H.R. 1596.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.
By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:
H.R. 1597.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws “which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution” any of Congress’s enumerated powers.
By Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico:
H.R. 1598.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. RUTHERFORD:
H.R. 1599.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. MCCARTHY:
H.R. 1600.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 14 of Section 8 of Article I
Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I
Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV
By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:
H.R. 1601.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which states that Congress has the power “to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.”
By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:
H.R. 1602.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.
By Ms. BONAMICI:
H.R. 1603.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:
H.R. 1604.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I of the Constitution
By Mr. BANKS:
H.R. 1605.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitu-

tion, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).
By Mr. BEYER:
H.R. 1606.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution. [Page H2897]
By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:
H.R. 1607.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)
By Mr. CLAY:
H.R. 1608.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.
By Mr. CRENSHAW:
H.R. 1609.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States. Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof
By Mr. CRIST:
H.R. 1610.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Mr. DEUTCH:
H.R. 1611.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.
By Mr. FITZPATRICK:
H.R. 1612.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
By Ms. JAYAPAL:
H.R. 1613.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.
By Mr. KATKO:
H.R. 1614.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to “lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises,” and to provide for the “general Welfare of the United States.”
By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi:
H.R. 1615.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 1616.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution
By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 1617.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 1618.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. LEE of Nevada:

H.R. 1619.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution—regulating commerce with foreign nations, and among the Several States, and with the Indian.

By Mrs. LURIA:

H.R. 1620.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. McCLINTOCK:

H.R. 1621.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, which confers on Congress the power to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 1622.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 1623.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 4 and Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 1624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 4 and Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 1625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

SECTION 8. Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 1626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 1627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Abuse of Pardon Prevention Act is constitutionally authorized under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 1628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Ex-

cises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

2: To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

4: To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

5: To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

6: To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

7: To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

8: To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

9: To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

10: To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations;

11: To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

13: To provide and maintain a Navy;

14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

15: To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

16: To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

17: To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 1629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 1630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen

below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 1631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 1632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section I, Article 8.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section I, Article 8.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1636.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 83: Mr. ROY.

H.R. 96: Mr. COX of California and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 127: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 141: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 142: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 145: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 151: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 154: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 180: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 197: Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 218: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CLINE, and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 219: Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 230: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MOULTON, and Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 273: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 295: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 303: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana,

Mr. CASE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 305: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 307: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.

- H.R. 344: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
- H.R. 345: Mrs. HARTZLER.
- H.R. 350: Ms. TLAIB.
- H.R. 375: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 397: Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 451: Mr. ROSE of New York.
- H.R. 485: Ms. HILL of California.
- H.R. 584: Mr. GOLDEN.
- H.R. 587: Mr. CROW and Mr. GAETZ.
- H.R. 613: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 621: Mr. MITCHELL.
- H.R. 639: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
- H.R. 643: Ms. TLAIB.
- H.R. 647: Miss RICE of New York.
- H.R. 649: Mr. SCHIFF.
- H.R. 663: Mr. SMUCKER, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. KING of New York.
- H.R. 668: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. BASS, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. FOSTER.
- H.R. 693: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SIRES, and Mrs. CRAIG.
- H.R. 712: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. HASTINGS.
- H.R. 732: Mr. LANGEVIN.
- H.R. 739: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. KINZINGER.
- H.R. 748: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MCADAMS, and Mr. PAPPAS.
- H.R. 763: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 808: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
- H.R. 824: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. DEFazio.
- H.R. 832: Mr. DUFFY and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
- H.R. 833: Mr. BIGGS.
- H.R. 837: Mr. GIBBS.
- H.R. 847: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
- H.R. 849: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
- H.R. 854: Ms. TLAIB.
- H.R. 868: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
- H.R. 888: Mr. JORDAN and Mr. BIGGS.
- H.R. 934: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 935: Mr. PAYNE.
- H.R. 943: Mr. NORCROSS.
- H.R. 945: Mr. KIND, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Mrs. AXNE.
- H.R. 946: Mr. KIM.
- H.R. 956: Mr. SMUCKER.
- H.R. 962: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 973: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
- H.R. 989: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
- H.R. 1002: Mr. FOSTER.
- H.R. 1007: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. TURNER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. DEFazio.
- H.R. 1019: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
- H.R. 1042: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
- H.R. 1046: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
- H.R. 1094: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
- H.R. 1109: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
- H.R. 1126: Mr. LATTA.
- H.R. 1131: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
- H.R. 1140: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 1146: Mr. NEAL.
- H.R. 1155: Mr. KIM and Mr. DELGADO.
- H.R. 1156: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
- H.R. 1162: Ms. WATERS.
- H.R. 1163: Ms. STEFANIK.
- H.R. 1171: Mr. ALLRED, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
- H.R. 1184: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
- H.R. 1220: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 1224: Ms. MOORE, Mr. KIND, Mr. KILMER, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
- H.R. 1226: Mr. KINZINGER.
- H.R. 1232: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 1236: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. SERRANO.
- H.R. 1237: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
- H.R. 1249: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
- H.R. 1279: Mr. KING of New York.
- H.R. 1309: Ms. FUDGE and Ms. DEAN.
- H.R. 1327: Mr. MAST, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. TRONE.
- H.R. 1342: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. CARBAJAL.
- H.R. 1345: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
- H.R. 1351: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
- H.R. 1360: Mr. KING of Iowa.
- H.R. 1374: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. PENCE.
- H.R. 1377: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1380: Ms. TITUS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. TIPTON, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
- H.R. 1393: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
- H.R. 1400: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
- H.R. 1407: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. BERA.
- H.R. 1411: Mr. SHIMKUS.
- H.R. 1415: Mr. MAST.
- H.R. 1423: Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. DEFazio.
- H.R. 1425: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. CARBAJAL.
- H.R. 1434: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
- H.R. 1435: Mr. HARDER of California.
- H.R. 1452: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 1469: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. BIGGS.
- H.R. 1495: Mr. GIBBS.
- H.R. 1519: Mr. RASKIN.
- H.R. 1534: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
- H.R. 1543: Mr. HAGEDORN.
- H.R. 1560: Ms. SCANLON.
- H.R. 1570: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Ms. MENG.
- H.R. 1572: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. DEAN, and Mr. MAST.
- H.R. 1576: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
- H.R. 1578: Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.J. Res. 2: Mr. NORCROSS.
- H.J. Res. 20: Mr. BYRNE.
- H.J. Res. 38: Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. GOLDEN.
- H. Con. Res. 15: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
- H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. LUCAS, Ms. DEAN, and Mr. PENCE.
- H. Res. 23: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
- H. Res. 33: Ms. PORTER, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. NORCROSS.
- H. Res. 45: Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. GUEST, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DUNN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. BOST.
- H. Res. 60: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. TIPTON.
- H. Res. 107: Mr. BYRNE.
- H. Res. 110: Mr. DUNN.
- H. Res. 114: Ms. HILL of California.
- H. Res. 138: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SIRES.
- H. Res. 141: Mr. BARR, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HECK, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MAST, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
- H. Res. 149: Mr. HUDSON.
- H. Res. 156: Mr. KINZINGER.
- H. Res. 164: Mr. WOODALL.
- H. Res. 171: Mrs. AXNE.
- H. Res. 174: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOK, Mr. GALLEGRO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
- H. Res. 177: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. MCADAMS.