

there are only 219 female chiefs in the more than 14,000 police departments nationwide.

Chief Ziman's compassionate leadership and barrier-breaking approach to law enforcement inspires us all across the Fox Valley region. We truly are Aurora strong.

Her strength and her service to our community makes us so proud, and I look forward to watching all the little girls in our community grow up knowing they can be anything they want to be, from a police chief to a Congresswoman, because they grew up seeing it firsthand.

There are women like Chief Ziman lifting all of our communities all over the 14th District and all over our country, and I am so glad to celebrate them today.

#### FLORIDA STRAWBERRY FESTIVAL

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a tradition that has come to define a small town in rural Florida.

Every winter, Plant City transforms for the Strawberry Festival, an event to celebrate the annual strawberry harvest.

When the festival was founded in 1930, it was a way for the residents of Plant City to not only mark a new crop of strawberries, but also was one of the few times a year locals could eat strawberries, due to their short shelf life.

Today, the 11-day event attracts guests far beyond Plant City, and the strawberry growers in the community now supply virtually all winter strawberries grown in the United States. This success comes at the hard work of growers in Plant City.

These entrepreneurial men and women work tirelessly to bring us the strawberries many of us enjoy, and I want to take this opportunity to thank them for all that they do for us. Strawberries have become the lifeblood of Plant City, and our community wouldn't be what it is today without them.

I also want to take this time to congratulate Kendall Gaudens, who was crowned this year's Strawberry Festival Queen. Kendall joins the illustrious ranks of many great women before her, including Florida's current attorney general, my friend Ashley Moody.

I also want to congratulate Madilyn Conrad, who was named first maid, and Kennedy Cullins, Jada Brown, and Olivia Frazier, who were selected for the court.

□ 0915

#### CONGRATULATING THE MCFARLAND HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS BASKETBALL TEAM

(Mr. COX of California asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COX of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the McFarland High School girls basketball team. Undefeated in regular season Division IV play, our girls were moved up to Division III for State. Undaunted, the team's motto is "relentless," and that is what they have been.

On Tuesday night, our girls brought home the school's first Southern California Regional Championship. They are a textbook example of what can be accomplished through hard work, practice, and teamwork.

Led by coaches Johnny Samaniego and Gino Barajas, the girls: Lucia Barajas, Heiry Bojorquez, Neli Diaz, Angelica Gonzalez, Emily Gonzalez, Julie Hernandez, Adilene Lopez, Shania Perry, Lucia Rocha, Kathy Rodriguez, and Pilar Samaniego are now playing Oakland High School, represented by my friend and colleague, BARBARA LEE, in tonight's State Championship game.

I ask my colleagues to join me in sending them the best of luck. We are so proud of our girls and their families. Go Cougars.

#### FUND THE POLITICIANS ACT

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, today I raise my objection to H.R. 1, the so-called For the People Act. This act should really be called the Fund the Politicians Act. It is a Federal takeover of our election system. It opens up our precious election system to fraud, and it violates free speech rights.

This bill would allow for the funding of politicians' campaigns. They would be given a 6-to-1 match with government money for their campaigns. I don't believe Americans want their money going to help pay for more robocalls from politicians that they don't even support.

It also will give \$25 to citizens to give to a campaign of their choice. What a terrible use of our tax dollars.

It also opens up our system to fraud by requiring that they have to allow for online registration, same-day registration, and it nullifies all the State protections. No Secretary of State was even consulted about this bill.

And finally, it violates our free speech rights by requiring the publishing of the names and addresses of donors to organizations who may speak about a candidate.

This bill is terrible. Every vote should count, and no government money should go to line politicians' campaigns.

#### FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. UNDERWOOD). 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 Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) kindly take the chair.

□ 0917

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. DEGETTE (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, March 7, 2019, amendment No. 69 printed in part B of House Report 116-16 offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. NEGUSE. 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:

At the end of subtitle A of title I of the bill, insert the following:

#### PART 8—VOTER REGISTRATION OF MINORS

##### SEC. 1081. ACCEPTANCE OF VOTER REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS FROM INDIVIDUALS UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE.

(a) ACCEPTANCE OF APPLICATIONS.—Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20507) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (k), as redesignated by section 1004, as subsection (l); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (j), as inserted by such section 1004, the following new subsection:

“(k) ACCEPTANCE OF APPLICATIONS FROM INDIVIDUALS UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State may not refuse to accept or process an individual's application to register to vote in elections for Federal office on the grounds that the individual is under 18 years of age at the time the individual submits the application, so long as the individual is at least 16 years of age at such time.

“(2) NO EFFECT ON STATE VOTING AGE REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in paragraph (1) may be construed to require a State to permit an individual who is under 18 years of age at the time of an election for Federal office to vote in the election.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to elections occurring on or after January 1, 2020.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I am proud to offer an amendment today to ensure early registration, or pre-registration, for all 16- and 17-year-olds

across the country ahead of their 18th birthday.

To be clear, my amendment does not lower the voting age; it simply allows individuals to pre-register so they are registered and ready to vote when they turn 18.

Today, 14 States, including my home State, the great State of Colorado, as well as the District of Columbia, permit pre-registration beginning at 16 years old. Four States permit pre-registration beginning at 17 years old, and five other States allow for pre-registration a few months ahead of voters' 18th birthday.

States across the Nation are taking up pre-registration to integrate young people in the democratic process early, and I think it is time for us to take up these reforms at the Federal level.

We see young people interacting with the government agencies most frequently when they are 16 and getting their driver's license or learner's permit. This is common sense to allow our young folks to register early when they are already at the Department of Motor Vehicles in their respective State, where voter registration services are typically offered, to ensure that when they turn 18, they have no barriers to casting their ballot on election day.

Madam Chair, the foundation of our democracy is built on the ability of our citizens to vote. We must hold this right precious and sacred, and we must encourage, in my view, our citizens of every age, from every background and every locality and every local party to engage in our political process. Pre-registration helps us do that by investing in our next generation and by encouraging democratic participation from an early age.

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 thank my new colleague, Mr. NEGUSE, and welcome him. I am glad he is participating in the process.

I am going to oppose the gentleman's amendment; not because of the process, just because it adds another layer of burden to our States and our localities.

Many States already accept pre-registration forms, and that is within their State's jurisdiction to do so. I just don't like this top-down approach which this now upwards of 700-page mammoth bill called H.R. 1 is putting on to our States and our local election officials.

Our county offices, our local officials, they are bleeding from unfunded mandates from State and Federal Governments, and this is one more of those.

I agree, we ought to get more 16- and 17-year-olds interested in government. I have got twin boys who are 18; I try

and get them interested. Sometimes they are not even interested in me and what we do.

But the key is we, as Members of Congress, ought to go take our message to the high schools. And I just recently was in Boston with a bipartisan group in and around our colleague, JOE KENNEDY's district.

JOE, MARKWAYNE MULLIN, and LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER and I, we visited numerous high schools. And I hope all four of us standing there in a bipartisan way actually inspired some young people in the Boston area to get engaged.

My colleague, JIMMY PANETTA and I visited schools in my district last fall to do the exact same thing, to show people that we can work together in a bipartisan way.

Unfortunately, this process in H.R. 1 has been nothing but partisan; and that is not the message that we need to send to 16- and 17-year-olds.

I have put my hand out with an olive branch. I have accepted many Democratic amendments throughout the last few days, and not one single amendment, either in the markup of the only committee that marked this bill up, House Administration, where we offered 28, not one Republican amendment to this bill that is now 700 pages has been accepted. Every amendment has been a Democrat-led amendment.

I thought the new Democratic majority was going to be bipartisan. I thought the new Democratic majority was going to be transparent. I thought the new Democratic majority was going to not work with special interests to write mammoth 700-page bills. But I guess, Madam Chair, I was mistaken.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from the other side of the aisle for his thoughtful comments. I would say that I think this amendment is a bipartisan amendment in the sense that it will apply equally to every 16- and 17-year-old across the country, irrespective of their political affiliation.

In Colorado actually, in some months we have had more Republican 16- and 17-year-olds pre-register than Democrat 16- and 17-year-olds. So really what this is all about is just ensuring that young folks in our country are able to integrate into the political process and engage in their civic duties at an earlier age.

From my perspective—I appreciate the gentleman's comments with respect to visiting high schools. I certainly do that quite a bit in my district, to meet with young folks, to talk to them about how to become better citizens and engaged in their community. And often the question I get is, How? And I think this is a great answer.

The ability to say to them that if they go, when they get their driver's license, and pre-register to vote so that, ultimately, when they turn 18 they are automatically registered and ready to

participate in our elections; I think that, at the end of the day, it will do a great service to our country and get more young people involved in our political process.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a distinguished colleague and the chair of our Immigration Subcommittee and, of course, the chair of the House Administration Committee. Ms. LOFGREN.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I just want to express my thanks to the gentleman from Colorado for offering this refining amendment. I think he is exactly right. In order to fully engage the American people, we need to make every effort for them to participate.

And for young people who feel that they really don't have a say, allowing them to pre-register helps them buy in to our American system of government.

You know, somebody on the other side of the building said, well, this is a power grab, to make sure that—H.R. 1 is a power grab. It is. It is a power grab for the American people, to take the power away from the special interests and give it to the American people. The gentleman's amendment helps further that worthy goal, and I thank him for offering it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague, Mr. NEGUSE, again. I admire his tenacity, and admire his willingness to come down and legislate. I stand ready to come to his district and talk to high schoolers with him, and I would hope he would reciprocate, come to mine. If the gentleman will have his team call mine, we will figure out a way to work something out. I think that is the best way for us to send a message to high schoolers to get them engaged, get them involved.

This is just an administrative burden that is going to affect our State and local officials. To process—I mean, there are provisions in this 700-page mammoth bill that don't allow our local election officials to clean voters off the rolls that they know no longer may live in their jurisdiction. So we are hindering local officials' ability to clean up their rolls; and then decide, you know, later on, that we are going to be ahead and pre-register people that we don't know, may or may not want to vote in their college town of residence.

So it just is a burden that I think is unnecessary. Although, again, I respect the gentleman's willingness to come down here and debate; this is an issue that goes further than Mr. NEGUSE's amendment.

I am going to oppose the amendment. I urge folks to vote "no" on it. But more importantly, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill that is going to eventually cost taxpayers billions of dollars and add billions upon billions to the campaign coffers of Members of Congress. That is not what the taxpayers in my district are asking

for. It is not what the taxpayers of America are asking for. It is only what the Democratic majority is asking for.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I certainly will take my colleague up on his invitation, and look forward to visiting his district and having him come to Boulder and Fort Collins, where I know there are plenty of 16- and 17-year-olds who are very eager to be able to advocate for other young folks to be able to pre-register in other States, as they have been able to in Colorado, thanks to the incredible election reforms that we have enacted in our State.

I understand that we have a respectful disagreement with respect to the merits of the underlying bill, but I would hope that, on this particular amendment that is not particularly controversial and that, as I said, is really a nonpartisan approach to just getting young folks of all political affiliations involved in our political process.

I would hope and trust that colleagues in both parties here in this Chamber would think about this amendment thoughtfully, and I would certainly urge them to support it.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, we know this bill is not going to be signed into law. I look forward to working with the gentleman on other amendments that we might be able to come up with some good plans to engage our 16- and 17-year-olds, engage the next generation of leaders.

I hope maybe a visit that we can do together could inspire somebody to do what we do one day, and that would be that we would manage to call ourselves successful in legislating to inspire the next generation.

This bill, H.R. 1, is not going to inspire the next generation. I appreciate Mr. NEGUSE; I appreciate his willingness to serve.

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

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

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

Mr. NEGUSE. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MRS. KIRKPATRICK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 71 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. 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 365, strike lines 15 through 24 and insert the following:

“(6) SAFE HARBOR FOR PLATFORMS MAKING BEST EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY REQUESTS WHICH ARE SUBJECT TO RECORD MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) AVAILABILITY OF SAFE HARBOR.—In accordance with rules established by the Commission, if an online platform shows that the platform used best efforts to determine whether or not a request to purchase a qualified political advertisement was subject to the requirements of this subsection, the online platform shall not be considered to be in violation of such requirements.

“(B) SPECIAL RULES FOR DISBURSEMENT PAID WITH CREDIT CARD.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), an online platform shall be considered to have used best efforts in the case of a purchase of a qualified political advertisement which is made with a credit card if—

“(i) the individual or entity making such purchase is required, at the time of making such purchase, to disclose the credit verification value of such credit card; and

“(ii) the billing address associated with such credit card is located in the United States or, in the case of a purchase made by an individual who is a United States citizen living outside of the United States, the individual provides the online platform with the United States mailing address the individual uses for voter registration purposes.”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Chair, I strongly support H.R. 1, and I commend Congressman JOHN SARBANES for his persistent work on this legislation. We have an opportunity here to reduce the role of dark money in politics and make it easier for Americans to participate in our democracy.

This is not a partisan issue. This is an American democracy issue, and H.R. 1 is the best solution to cleaning up corruption in Washington.

I am proud of my colleagues for working on this historic and necessary package.

□ 0930

You see, Madam Chair, I ran as a publicly funded candidate in Arizona under our public financing law called Clean Elections when I first ran for the legislature. This meant I had to go out and get a certain number of \$5 contributions from constituents in my district, which I then turned in to get my public financing.

It was the same for everyone who was running as a Clean Election candidate, regardless of party. It equalized everything.

One of my favorite stories is that I was walking from my law office down to the post office to check my mail, and this cowboy pulled up in his pickup truck at a stoplight and rolled down the window, and he said, “Hey, ANN. You don’t know me, but I gave you \$5.”

So he felt empowered in my election. I walked over, and we had a conversation in the middle of the street.

That is the way it should be. This puts power in the pocket of the people,

not special interests, and that is the way it should be.

It is the For the People Act, and that empowers people, and that makes our democracy work.

I offer my amendment because it creates transparency in the process. This amendment was actually suggested by a Republican colleague. It requires the disclosure of credit card verification value and billing address information for purchases of online advertising. The credit card verification value is an antifraud security technology designed to protect us and to reduce fraudulent activity.

We know that there are bad actors and foreign nationals out there that have an interest in influencing our American elections through online advertising. Haven’t we seen that very, very well in the last couple of years. We have loopholes that allow them to do so, but we can fix that. Not only can we fix it, we must fix it.

This amendment is a commonsense solution to help protect the integrity of our elections and prevent bad players from compromising our outcomes. This amendment is focused on protecting our democracy through transparency in the digital age.

Madam Chair, I urge you and all my colleagues to support my amendment and the entire H.R. 1 package to clean up Washington and put the American people first.

Remember that cowboy who stopped me in the middle of the road who felt like he was empowered in his election and in his selection of his representative. That is the way it should be.

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, even though 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 welcome back my colleague, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. It is great to have her back in this institution.

The gentlewoman’s amendment is an amendment that I support. However, the underlying bill, H.R. 1, is the furthest thing that can be considered “for the people.” This bill is nothing but a bill that is for loading billions upon billions of dollars into the coffers of Members of Congress.

I don’t think anybody in my district who stops me in the street is saying, “Hey, we want you to take taxpayer dollars away from investing in infrastructure, take taxpayer dollars away from investing in pediatric cancer research, and you know what, load up your campaign coffers with that so you can go enrich some political operatives and maybe buy some more TV commercials and radio ads, send some more mail pieces that get thrown away immediately when they come into your house.”

This has to be one of the worst examples of self-preservation that I have ever witnessed in my 22 years working for the U.S. House of Representatives and serving in the U.S. House of Representatives.

I can't think of one person in my district who has come up and said, "I want you to take tax dollars away from building bridges and roads, finding cures for deadly diseases, and put it in your campaign fund."

That is why this bill is terrible.

This bill has not been open; it has not been a bipartisan process; it has not been regular order, all the things that the Democratic majority promised us that they would do when they took over.

This bill was introduced on January 3. I certainly hope every Democratic Member actually read the bill before they signed on as a cosponsor, but I think they are reading it now. And there are a lot of problems, which is why we have so many amendments.

Let me go through some of the process. We requested a CBO score—it was delivered last Friday; it was updated yesterday—which actually agrees with me that taxpayer dollars are going to be taken away from other priorities that we can spend here in Congress, like roads and bridges, cancer research, Alzheimer's research, and others, and go toward Members of Congress' campaigns.

Hours before the only committee markup that we saw with the majority, an amendment in the nature of a substitute with new text, including a magical, new freedom from influence fund that would supposedly support the enrichment of Members of Congress' campaigns, it had no details on how that fund would be filled.

We went through the markup. Only one committee, the smallest committee in Congress, House Administration, it was the only committee that marked this up. That is not regular order. Forty percent of the bill has never gone through regular order.

Yet we see now 72 amendments over the last few days. Twenty-eight of them that we offered to try to make the bill better in committee were all turned down on a partisan roll call.

Then we went to Rules. I actually had a good time in Rules. I have to thank my colleague, Chairperson LOFGREN, for that debate during the Rules Committee.

We again received new text of the bill 10 minutes before I walked in, 10 minutes before, including 51 new pages. Where was this in the markup process?

After the Rules hearing and before consideration on the floor, we learned through leaks to the press that the new freedom from influence fund would be filled with some magical surcharges of corporate fines, but we had no details.

I had no idea that the Democrats' solution to campaign finance reform and their goal to take corporate money out of politics was to use corporate money to now fund our campaigns, which we now legally cannot accept.

That is the height of hypocrisy. No one is asking for more corporate dollars to line the campaign coffers of Members of Congress.

This bill and the process are just a sham. Look, a joint committee report with revenue stream projections for this new magical freedom from influence fund was not shown to us. It was just submitted for the RECORD. We found it. We saw it.

The new CBO report clearly says this fund will be out of money in just a few years after it becomes activated, because the costs are going to exponentially rise, and clearly, taxpayer dollars will have to bail it out.

The corporate fund, even the CBO and The Washington Post realize that that corporate tax fund, the tax rate of corporate dollars now being funneled into our campaigns that we can't take right now, those corporate dollars and fines will take away from being able to be spent on the priorities of my constituents who stop me in the streets. They say, "We want to build new bridges. We want new roadways. We want to make sure that this bill goes down, because it is a travesty on the American people and the American taxpayer."

Madam Chair, vote "no" on H.R. 1.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Chair, while I have the utmost respect and admiration for my colleague across the aisle—in fact, he is one of my favorite Members of Congress—I strongly disagree with his characterization of H.R. 1.

No one knows more than I about dark money, secret money being spent in elections. I have had tens of millions of dollars spent to defeat me, yet I prevail because I have the power of the people.

That is what this bill does. It empowers people just like that cowboy who stopped me with his pickup and contributed \$5 to my legislative election.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this election. There is nothing more important than elections in our democracy and empowering the people to participate, nothing. That is the cornerstone of our democracy.

Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my esteemed colleague.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I congratulate the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) on this very smart amendment. I am not surprised. It is typical that she would make this a bipartisan amendment. It is very helpful. It is very smart. I am glad that she is back here in Congress to show this leadership.

Just one word on the CBO: It shows that there is indeed no tax money involved in the freedom from influence fund.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. GOLDEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 72 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. GOLDEN. Madam Chair, I rise today to introduce my amendment to H.R. 1.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 449, strike lines 14 through 20 and insert the following:

“(C) PROHIBITING CERTAIN CANDIDATES FROM QUALIFYING AS PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.—

“(1) CANDIDATES WITH MULTIPLE CIVIL PENALTIES.—If the Commission assesses 3 or more civil penalties under subsection (a) against a candidate (with respect to either a single election or multiple elections), the Commission may refuse to certify the candidate as a participating candidate under this title with respect to any subsequent election, except that if each of the penalties were assessed as the result of a knowing and willful violation of any provision of this Act, the candidate is not eligible to be certified as a participating candidate under this title with respect to any subsequent election.

“(2) CANDIDATES SUBJECT TO CRIMINAL PENALTY.—A candidate is not eligible to be certified as a participating candidate under this title with respect to an election if a penalty has been assessed against the candidate under section 309(d) with respect to any previous election.

“(d) IMPOSITION OF CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—For criminal penalties for the failure of a participating candidate to comply with the requirements of this title, see section 309(d).”

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. GOLDEN. Madam Chair, before I talk about my amendment, I would first like to thank Congressman SARBANES for his work on this bill.

H.R. 1 is a comprehensive, good government bill that goes a long way in wresting power away from elites who abuse our political system for narrow self-interests. This legislation would return power where it belongs: in the hands of working people.

As long as corporations and mega-donors finance campaigns, well-connected insiders will continue to call the shots.

Mainers have seen firsthand what can happen when the power is returned to the people. In 1996, our State's voters passed a referendum establishing the Maine Clean Elections Act.

By collecting small donations from people in their communities, Maine candidates refuse the donations of lobbyists and the well-heeled, and concentrate instead on face-to-face conversations with their neighbors. This empowers a community to choose a representative in a battle of ideas instead of a battle of bank accounts.

Maine's clean election reforms have been supported and used by candidates of all parties in my State. Republican,

Democratic, Green Party, and independent candidates have used our clean election system.

In fact, in 2018, a Republican candidate for Governor used the system because he understood that it was going to free him up to spend his time going door to door and talking to the very people who he wanted to represent as Governor of the State of Maine.

Today, we have the opportunity to follow Maine's lead and bring needed reform to the rest of the country.

H.R. 1 allows candidates to refuse donations from mega-donors by implementing a matching system for small-dollar donations from everyday people.

As we have seen in Maine, candidates who use this system are good stewards of the funds they receive. But as with any system, there is potential for bad actors, and it is important that they be held accountable.

My amendment to H.R. 1 ensures that any bad actors are cut off from the matching system and sets high standards for participation. The legislation bars a candidate from using matching funds if the FEC assesses three or more civil penalties against a candidate for violating election laws.

More importantly, if a candidate willfully, knowingly violates the law, my amendment permanently bars them from the program.

Finally, my provision reaffirms that egregious violations of campaign finance laws should result in imprisonment of up to 1 to 5 years.

With H.R. 1 and my amendment, we are creating an accountable election system.

The funds for the matching program, as was just discussed, come from bad corporate actors. These are fines, penalties, and settlements from corporate malfeasance, tax crimes, and other breaches of the public trust. That money can be used to ensure that everyday people who don't have a network of deep money around them, just everyday, working people, will be given the opportunity to compete in a campaign, to go out and represent their people, to go out and spend their time talking to them face-to-face instead of spending their time dialing for dollars and talking to just the very wealthy.

It is time that the people take the power back. By passing my amendment and H.R. 1, we will take that first step. Americans aren't going to let our democracy be taken out from under us any longer.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment and "yes" on final passage.

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 don't have the best Nickelback lyrics to introduce my next speaker, but I yield 1 minute to the

gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our Republican leader.

□ 0945

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his work and his love of music.

This new Democrat socialist majority wants the Federal Government to interfere in our free and fair elections. This bill today, the majority's most important bill, is a massive Federal Government takeover that would undermine the integrity of our elections. But before I explain why, I want to highlight how the majority has gone to great steps to actually hide their prize legislation from the American people.

Madam Speaker, the American public need to understand, when you become the majority, you reserve 1 through 10 of the numbering of bills, and you want to make your number one bill the most important thing you do for America today.

Two years ago we were in the majority, Madam Chair, and we made the most important bill to make sure the people's money went back to them. We wanted to cut your taxes.

The most important bill that the Democrat socialist majority has is to take more of your money and give it to the politicians who want to vote for this bill. How ironic.

Now, because H.R. 1 has had such a broad spectrum of where to go, it was referred to 10 committees. Imagine that, 10 committees.

But 40 percent of this bill has not even been marked up because, what did they do? They only went to one committee.

What committee did they go to? They went to the very special committee, House Administration.

This House Administration, the Members who sit on House Administration, I am sure they are probably selected from the conference committee that goes forward to select individuals for it.

Oh, no, no, no. That is not the committee we went to. House Administration is selected just by two people: the Speaker and the leader. The Speaker and the leader.

And do you know what? It is one of the smallest committees we have. Because if H.R. 1 is so important to the American public, I am sure we would want everybody to see it. But, no, it is just nine people of this House.

And in their jurisdiction, they didn't get to mark up the whole bill. They only had about 60 percent of the bill to mark up.

But I want to thank our Republican colleagues on this committee: first of all, Ranking Member RODNEY DAVIS, MARK WALKER, and BARRY LOUDERMILK. They were very thoughtful.

They realized, even though the chair of the House Administration, when asked during the markup, would the other committees mark up this bill, she promised—she promised—that the

other nine committees would see it, that the other nine committees could mark up that other 40 percent that House Administration didn't get to mark up.

But lo and behold, that is not true. Just as this new Democrat socialist majority said there will be 72 hours before things come to the floor, no. Yesterday we learned that can mean an hour; those other 71 don't matter.

But what the Republicans on the other side of the aisle did, they wanted there to be a thoughtful approach on the issue. They provided 28 amendments to improve H.R. 1.

Do you know how many the Democrats on the other side that the Speaker selected, those six Members—they didn't vote for one of them. They could not find a way that, of those 28 amendments, one of them could be accepted.

I guess the Speaker selected the right people for the House Administration.

Now, they call this bill the For the People Act, but I want to explain why I actually think it is for the politicians, because everyone who votes for this bill today, they are all going to go home a little more excited. Do you know why? They just got the taxpayers to actually fund their elections, and they picked it in a manner where you don't even know, and the multiplying effect of the 6 to 1, who provided it.

So let's talk about "For the Politicians Act."

First, H.R. 1 wants to give American taxpayer dollars to political candidates and campaigns, regardless of whether you support it. We are not talking just Republicans or Democrats running. Any view they want with any impression they want to say.

We just had a bill on the floor yesterday about hate. I imagine there are going to be quite a few people who run for office who get taxpayers' money who talk a lot of hate. I don't think America wants their money spent on that.

This bill will give candidates a government match of 6 to 1, not a dollar for dollar. No, no, no, no. The "For the Politicians Act" multiplies it. So, if a citizen gives \$200, the government gives \$1,200.

That is why the new Democrat socialist party is so excited by this bill. That is why they made it their number one priority. Hard-earned taxpayer money should go toward building roads, bridges, or giving a boost to struggling Americans, not just to political campaigns.

I am not sure about these other districts, but when I campaigned, no one came to me and said: "Let's make sure you take more of my taxpayer money to give to you to run." I can't remember one time anybody on any side of the aisle asked for that.

Worse, this bill would allow political candidates to profit off actually running for office on the American taxpayers' dime. The bill expands the use of taxpayer funds to include the childcare, the rent, the mortgage, or even professional development.

We have now just created a new industry. Think of the individual who just wants to run for office, who wants to spew hate, and says: "The taxpayers are going to pay for it. I am just going to keep doing it."

Second, H.R. 1 legalizes the vote for convicted felons, even if that person was convicted of election fraud. Can you imagine that? We are going to vote on a bill today that provides more taxpayer money to politicians, that is going to allow felons to vote, because we don't care what States say. But even if you are convicted of election fraud, come on down; we have got something special for you.

And this wasn't created by one new member of this Democrat socialist party. It is the most important bill that they selected. It is H.R. 1. No other bill matters to them but this. It just doesn't make sense to me.

Third, H.R. 1 would weaken the security of our elections and make it harder to protect against voter fraud. It automatically registers voters from the DMV.

Voting is a right. It is not a mandate. This legislation would also prevent officials from ever removing ineligible voters from the rolls or even verifying the accuracy of voter information.

To that point, H.R. 1 exposes our election system to widespread fraud. Take ballot harvesting, for example. We have one less Member in this body because of the harvesting of ballots, a practice where a third-party activist can collect your absentee ballot from other voters and turn them in for you, or potentially not even turn them in at all.

Can you imagine putting the trust of your vote in the hand of a stranger? If that doesn't scare you, it should.

Sadly, this practice was weaponized in California and North Carolina not so long ago, but now we want to make it everywhere.

You know, The Washington Post highlighted the peril of this practice. Let me read you the headline: "Don't Be Shocked by the North Carolina Fraud Allegations. Absentee Ballots Are Much Less Secure Than Polling Places."

Absentee ballots are less secure than polling places.

The piece goes on to say: "No one oversees voters filling out absentee ballots to ensure that they fill out the ballot and return it without tampering."

"Campaigns and parties have taken advantage of this by turning to campaign and party workers to deliver and return absentee ballot materials for voters—on the honor system."

And, finally, this bill wants to stack the deck in favor of the party in power at the Federal Election Commission.

We talk a lot about bipartisanship. We have talked a lot about it in different ways. The committee that could only mark up 60 percent of this bill, you might say it is bipartisan. But it is not level. It is six to three. That is why not one of the 28 amendments got adopted.

But the Federal Election Commission is an even six Commissioners, a panel of three on one side and three on the other.

So what does this bill do that the new Democrat socialist majority cares most about? Let's stack the deck. Let's stack the deck a little further. Let's not make it three and three. Let's put the party in power to get that one more, to put the thumb on the scale a little further. So they want to make it a five-member panel.

This week, The New York Times wrote:

Republicans, arguably, have spent more time trying to define this bill than Democrat socialists have spent trying to promote it.

I wonder why. If it is your most important bill, the bill that is going to define your Congress, let's look at what it is. They want to take more taxpayer money. They want to give you less freedom.

Those who vote for it today, I guess they walk away with a raise in their campaign. They are asking the taxpayer to give them 6 to 1. Pretty good return, I would say. But it doesn't even matter if the taxpayer supports you or not because you are just going to make government larger and take the money away.

It is going to let people who are convicted felons open the door. Come on and vote, even if you are convicted of election fraud.

It is kind of interesting to me that you would make it your number one priority. It is kind of interesting to me, a structure of Congress, if you referred to a committee, that you wouldn't have it all marked up. It is kind of interesting to me the only committee you would pick to mark it up is the one chosen by the Speaker. It is interesting to me that this is where you spend your time.

We can do better, and I hope today we have a big voice to say taxpayers should not pay for our elections, that politicians should not vote to take more of taxpayers' hard-earned money so they could say things that people disagree with.

The Acting CHAIR. All Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. GOLDEN. Madam Chair, I think I am going to go home this weekend to my district feeling comfortable that I understand what my constituents want.

As I said earlier, in 1996, Maine voters actually voted for a public funding program in the State of Maine. They liked the program so much that they actually upped the ante in 2015 through another voter referendum where Maine voters actually voted that they wanted to continue this program and they wanted to increase the funding to keep regular people competitive against the dark money that was flown into elections in the State of Maine.

In the State of Maine, we actually allow convicted felons to vote. They do it from prison. Because while we be-

lieve in holding people accountable for their crimes, we don't feel the need, in Maine, to take their voice away from them.

So I am going to go home knowing that I understand my district.

I also just want to take a moment—you know, some of the comments from the Republican leader, whom I respect very much, but you want to talk about spewing hate. H.R. 1 is a piece of legislation that Democrats have put forward to show that one of their top priorities is to protect our democracy, and I know a little something about it.

I fought in two wars for this country, in Afghanistan and Iraq, and I reject this socialist rhetoric. I am an American. Democrats are Americans. Republicans are Americans. We need to put this hateful speech behind us and talk about how we can work together.

I understand that there is some frustration being expressed by other side about amendments and whether or not Republicans are involved in this process. Look, I will wrap it up, but let me just say: I have voted for a number of Republican amendments in the last couple of weeks, so I would encourage them to support this amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank Mr. GOLDEN for his service to our country. Our country thanks the gentleman, and everyone in this institution thanks him for that service.

This bill, however, is a very bad idea. Public funding of elections is a very bad idea.

At the last second before we vote on H.R. 1, Democrats have decided they are afraid of the CBO score for their massively expensive bill. We haven't even debated it and want to hide it from consideration in this Chamber.

So they created this gimmick called the freedom from influence fund, which is proposed to add an additional 2.75 percent penalty against law-breaking or malfeasant corporations and officials at corporations. They claimed it would generate enough funds to pay the massive cost of funding political campaigns for Members of Congress.

Late last night, we got that CBO report, and the score for H.R. 1 that projects the impact of this new shell game called the freedom from influence fund and its proposed funding source, corporate fines—again, voting for this bill will allow corporate money to, for the first time, lawfully flow into the campaigns of each and every one of us in this institution.

□ 1000

The CBO score tells a very different story from what Democrats want you to believe. According to the CBO, this new fund will result in a reduction of income and payroll taxes, meaning corporations will have less money to spend on their payrolls, which equates to less jobs.

To quote the CBO report:

The assessment on civil monetary penalties and settlements would reduce the base for income and payroll taxes. Consequently, the revenues from the assessments will be partially offset by lower income and payroll taxes.

Put another way, H.R. 1 takes American jobs away in order to fund the campaign coffers of Members of Congress.

Furthermore, the CBO notes that, as a result of this funding source, less money will be available for other government programs that we want to prioritize in this institution.

I quote again from the CBO report:

CBO and JCT expect the increased assessment of criminal and civil penalties would reduce the amount of penalties and settlements collected under current law.

The CBO report confirms what Republicans have been saying all along: H.R. 1 is a shell game that will, in the end, hurt taxpayers because this proposal to publicly fund campaigns will be funded by the taxpayers.

However, you are going to likely hear Democrats say, instead, that this fund will run at a surplus over the first few years of its existence, which is true because they designed the bill to not make any expenditures for the first 6 years of this program.

But pay very close attention. What the Democrats won't tell you is that, once the fund starts making its expenditures, the fund will be nearly broke in 5 years, and that is assuming that the cost of running campaigns will stay static today and not exponentially increase like it has.

Again, this Democratic funding gimmick was concocted just to result in a more desirable CBO score. I don't see that as a result.

The new fund will collect money for 6 years with no expenditures, resulting in the accumulation of a large balance. Then, once the money starts flowing to every Member of Congress in this institution, it is going to run out in 5 years.

Democrats should be ashamed for making this bill H.R. 1.

When Republicans took over this institution, after 50 years in the minority, our H.R. 1 was the Congressional Accountability Act, to make Congress work better.

H.R. 1 in the last Congress, put more money in the pockets of middle-class taxpayers, families back home.

This H.R. 1 will do nothing but put taxpayer dollars in the campaign funds of every Member of Congress, and that is not acceptable to me, and that is why we should have a "no" vote on H.R. 1.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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. 54 by Mr. BRINDISI of New York.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. NEGUSE of Colorado.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. BRINDISI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRINDISI) 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 188, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

AYES—237

Adams	Deutch	Larsen (WA)
Aguilar	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Allred	Doggett	Lawrence
Axne	Doyle, Michael	Lawson (FL)
Barragán	F.	Lee (CA)
Bass	Engel	Lee (NV)
Beatty	Escobar	Levin (CA)
Bera	Eshoo	Levin (MI)
Beyer	Españillat	Lewis
Bishop (GA)	Evans	Lieu, Ted
Blumenauer	Finkenauer	Lipinski
Blunt Rochester	Fitzpatrick	Loeb sack
Bonamici	Fletcher	Lofgren
Boyle, Brendan	Foster	Lowenthal
F.	Frankel	Lowey
Brindisi	Fudge	Luján
Brown (MD)	Gabbard	Luria
Brownley (CA)	Gallego	Lynch
Bustos	Garamendi	Malinowski
Butterfield	Garcia (IL)	Maloney,
Carbajal	Garcia (TX)	Carolyn B.
Cárdenas	Golden	Maloney, Sean
Cartson (IN)	Gomez	Matsui
Cartwright	Gonzalez (TX)	McAdams
Case	Gottheimer	McBath
Casten (IL)	Green (TX)	McCollum
Castor (FL)	Grijalva	McEachin
Castro (TX)	Haaland	McGovern
Chu, Judy	Harder (CA)	McNerney
Cicilline	Hastings	Meeke
Cisneros	Hayes	Meng
Clark (MA)	Heck	Moore
Clarke (NY)	Higgins (NY)	Morelle
Cleaver	Hill (CA)	Moulton
Clyburn	Himes	Mucarsel-Powell
Cohen	Horn, Kendra S.	Murphy
Connolly	Horsford	Nadler
Cooper	Houlahan	Napolitano
Correa	Hoyer	Neal
Costa	Huffman	Neguse
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Norcross
Cox (CA)	Jayapal	Norton
Craig	Jeffries	O'Halleran
Crist	Johnson (GA)	Ocasio-Cortez
Crow	Johnson (TX)	Omar
Cuellar	Kaptur	Pallone
Cummings	Katko	Panetta
Cunningham	Keating	Pappas
Davids (KS)	Kelly (IL)	Pascrell
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Payne
Davis, Danny K.	Kildee	Perlmutter
Dean	Kilmer	Peters
DeFazio	Kim	Peterson
DeGette	Kind	Phillips
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick	Pingree
DelBene	Krishnamoorthi	Plaskett
Delgado	Kuster (NH)	Pocan
Demings	Lamb	Porter
DeSaulnier	Langevin	Pressley

Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rose (NY)  
Rouda  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan  
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  
Stefanik  
Stevens  
Suoizzi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko

Torres (CA)  
Torres Small  
(NM)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Van Drew  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Weston  
Wild  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NOES—188

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bergman  
Biggs  
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  
Cook  
Crenshaw  
Davidson (OH)  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan  
Emmer  
Estes  
Ferguson  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Fox (NC)  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez (OH)  
González-Colón  
(PR)

Gooden  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (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)  
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  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reschenthaler  
Rice (SC)  
Riggleman  
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  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Timmons  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Waltz  
Watkins  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westernman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Wright  
Young  
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Bilirakis  
Clay  
Crawford  
Curtis

Dunn  
Khanna  
Radewagen  
Rogers (AL)

Sablan  
San Nicolas  
Stivers  
Yoho

□ 1027

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

Stated for:

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, I was late with my kids sick. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 115.

Stated against:

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 115.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 115.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) 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 239, noes 186, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

AYES—239

Adams	Dean	Kaptur
Aguilar	DeFazio	Keating
Allred	DeGette	Kelly (IL)
Axne	DeLauro	Kennedy
Barragán	DelBene	Khanna
Bass	Delgado	Kildee
Beatty	Demings	Kilmer
Bera	DeSaulnier	Kim
Beyer	Deutch	Kind
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Kirkpatrick
Bishop (UT)	Doggett	Krishnamoorthi
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael	Kuster (NH)
Blunt Rochester	F.	Lamb
Bonamici	Engel	Langevin
Bost	Escobar	Larsen (WA)
Boyle, Brendan	Eshoo	Larson (CT)
F.	Españillat	Lawrence
Brady	Evans	Lawson (FL)
Brindisi	Finkenauer	Lee (CA)
Brown (MD)	Fitzpatrick	Lee (NV)
Brownley (CA)	Fletcher	Levin (CA)
Buck	Foster	Levin (MI)
Bustos	Frankel	Lewis
Butterfield	Fudge	Lieu, Ted
Carbajal	Gabbard	Lipinski
Cárdenas	Galleo	Loeb
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Loftis
Cartwright	Garcia (IL)	Lowenthal
Case	Garcia (TX)	Lowe
Casten (IL)	Golden	Lujan
Castor (FL)	Gomez	Luria
Castro (TX)	Gonzalez (TX)	Lynch
Chu, Judy	Gonzalez-Colón	Malinowski
Cisneros	(PR)	Maloney
Clark (MA)	Gottheimer	Carolyn B.
Clarke (NY)	Green (TX)	Matsui
Cleaver	Grijalva	McAdams
Clyburn	Haaland	McBath
Cohen	Harder (CA)	McCollum
Connolly	Hastings	McEachin
Cooper	Hayes	McGovern
Correa	Heck	McNerney
Costa	Higgins (NY)	Meeks
Courtney	Hill (CA)	Meng
Cox (CA)	Himes	Moore
Craig	Horn, Kendra S.	Morelle
Crist	Horsford	Moulton
Crow	Houlihan	Mucarsel-Powell
Cuellar	Hoyer	Murphy
Cummings	Huffman	Nadler
Cunningham	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
Davids (KS)	Jayapal	Neal
Davis (CA)	Jeffries	Neguse
Davis, Danny K.	Johnson (TX)	Norcross

Norton	Rush
O'Halleran	Ryan
Ocasio-Cortez	Sánchez
Omar	Sarbanes
Pallone	Scanlon
Panetta	Schakowsky
Pappas	Schiff
Pascarella	Schneider
Payne	Schrader
Perlmutter	Schrier
Peters	Scott (VA)
Peterson	Scott, David
Phillips	Serrano
Pingree	Sewell (AL)
Plaskett	Shalala
Pocan	Sherman
Porter	Sherrill
Pressley	Sires
Price (NC)	Slotkin
Quigley	Smith (WA)
Raskin	Soto
Rice (NY)	Spanberger
Richmond	Speier
Rose (NY)	Stanton
Rouda	Staubert
Roybal-Allard	Stevens
Ruiz	Suozzi
Ruppersberger	Swalwell (CA)

NOES—186

Abraham	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Aderholt	Graves (LA)	Olson
Allen	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Amash	Green (TN)	Palmer
Amodei	Griffith	Pence
Armstrong	Grothman	Perry
Arrington	Guest	Posey
Babin	Guthrie	Ratcliffe
Bacon	Hagedorn	Reed
Baird	Harris	Reschenthaler
Balderson	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Banks	Hern, Kevin	Riggleman
Barr	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Bergman	Hice (GA)	Rodgers (WA)
Biggs	Higgins (LA)	Roe, David P.
Bilirakis	Hill (AR)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Hollingsworth	Rose, John W.
Buchanan	Hudson	Rouzer
Bucshon	Huizenga	Roy
Budd	Hunter	Rutherford
Burgett	Hurd (TX)	Scalise
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Schweikert
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Scott, Austin
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Sensenbrenner
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Shimkus
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Simpson
Chabot	Joyce (PA)	Smith (MO)
Cheney	Katko	Smith (NE)
Cline	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NJ)
Cloud	Kelly (PA)	Smucker
Cole	King (IA)	Spano
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Stefanik
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger	Steil
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Steube
Conaway	LaHood	Stewart
Cook	LaMalfa	Taylor
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Thompson (PA)
Curtis	Latta	Thornberry
Davidson (OH)	Lesko	Timmons
Davis, Rodney	Long	Tipton
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Wagner
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Walberg
Duncan	Marchant	Walden
Emmer	Marshall	Walker
Estes	Massie	Walorski
Ferguson	Mast	Waltz
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Watkins
Flores	McCaul	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Fox (NC)	McHenry	Wenstrup
Fulcher	McKinley	Westerman
Gaetz	Meadows	Williams
Gallagher	Meuser	Wilson (SC)
Gianforte	Miller	Wittman
Gibbs	Mitchell	Womack
Gohmert	Moolenaar	Woodall
Gonzalez (OH)	Mooney (WV)	Wright
Gooden	Mullin	Yoho
Gosar	Newhouse	Young
Granger	Norman	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Cioccione	Johnson (GA)	Sablan
Clay	Maloney, Sean	San Nicolas
Crawford	Radewagen	Stivers
Dunn	Rogers (AL)	Van Drew

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1033

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

Stated for:  
Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 116.

Stated against:  
Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, on rollcall Number 116, my vote is recorded as “yea.” My intention was to vote “nay.”

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order to consider a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

Madam Chair, for 8 years, this Chamber has been silent, a silence that harms people. We have allowed measures to reduce people's access to vote, measures that caused the Fourth Circuit to find that African American voters were targeted with surgical precision, measures that excluded voters on Indian reservations and that wrongfully tried to remove 95,000 naturalized Texans from the rolls.

Today that silence ends. This bill is not for its own sake. A Member of the U.S. Senate said that H.R. 1 is a power grab. He is right. It grabs power away from the special interests, the elites, and the 1 percent and gives it to the American people.

I tell you plainly what it does: automatic voter registration to allow 50 million eligible citizens to vote, prohibits deceptive practices, increases access to polls for voters with disabilities, helps States replace outdated voting machines, and requires disclosure of dark money donors, not limiting their speech but simply asking them to stand by it. These reforms aren't difficult, but they will require courage to make.

Mr. Frederick Douglass saw what our democracy was and what our democracy could be and said: “Where all is plain there is nothing to be argued.”

For that reason, I do not argue. But I look forward to joining and doing the will of the people and supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. HAALAND). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.



Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, before I get started, I ask for a point of personal privilege to have the Members of this institution and the gallery recognize the Chair as the first Native American woman to ever chair the House proceedings.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair thanks the gentleman from Illinois.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, as my home State President Ronald Reagan once said: 'The most terrifying words in the English language are: "I'm from the government and I'm here to help."'

I am for the American voter. I support every eligible voter having easier ways to register to vote and easier access to the polls. What I am not for is Washington, D.C. taking over our elections.

I have said it before: I agree with my colleagues across the aisle that there is a role for the Federal Government to play in election infrastructure, campaign finance disclosure, ballot access, transparency, and, most importantly, election security. However, H.R. 1, misuses taxpayer dollars, takes power away from the States to administer their own elections, and threatens to limit Americans' constitutional rights. I cannot support this legislation.

This bill, a 700-page mammoth bill, takes power away from States given to them by the U.S. Constitution to designate the time, place, and the manner of their elections. I know the author of this legislation said yesterday that H.R. 1 is simply implementing the best practices of States, but that is federalizing our election system, no matter how nicely you phrase it.

Congress should partner with the States who understand the unique needs of their own residents and provide support to increase voter registration and improve election security instead of federally mandating, what this bill does, which is a one-size-fits-all approach.

There is a limited role for the Federal Government to play in elections when patterns of discrimination have occurred, and when we will continue to address those patterns, we can do it in a bipartisan way through the Voting Rights Act.

I cannot stress enough that Congress should absolutely be in favor of increasing access to the polls, but we cannot do that without adding the necessary checks and balances to ensure that these accesses are protected.

We should allow States to maintain their own voter rolls to help them process voters in a timely manner, avoid unfunded mandates, and manage voter lists to avoid registration and voting irregularities. A few voting irregularities can change the outcome of a single election.

Just look at what happened recently in North Carolina. A political operative working for a Republican candidate illegally harvested ballots which led to

the North Carolina State Board of Elections calling for a new special election. Ballot harvesting is the practice when a political operative or volunteer can come to your home, pick up your ballot, and deliver it to the polling precinct. This process, while illegal in most States like North Carolina, is a perfectly legal practice in places like California.

Republicans, both at the House Administration Committee markup and at Rules Committee, offered amendments to prohibit ballot harvesting, and both attempts were rejected by Democrats. We can no longer be naive to think that this is a practice that will simply help your elderly neighbor who can no longer get to the polls. Just ask my former colleagues from California. Ballot harvesting is an unguarded instrument that is occurring on a large scale as a practice used by political operatives to manipulate the outcome of elections.

If we want to improve election security, we must eliminate ballot harvesting and its risks to taking away the choice of the American people. Every American deserves their vote to be counted and protected.

H.R. 1 limits free speech and imposes vague standards that disadvantage American citizens who want to advocate on behalf of what they believe in. Organizations like the National Right to Life, the Chamber of Commerce, and even the ACLU have spoken out against this bill for that very reason. Every American should be able to speak on an issue that they are passionate about.

We also recently received the revised CBO score of H.R. 1 which egregiously underestimated H.R. 1's cost to the taxpayers because the Congressional Budget Office said they needed more time to develop a comprehensive score. Instead of giving them more time, we are preparing right now to vote on this 700-page bill.

My colleagues across the aisle are all about transparency—at least that is what I keep hearing. But I have yet to see it in action, especially when it comes to funding their own campaigns. H.R. 1 is creating public subsidies through the new government match program. For every \$200, \$1,200 will be going to a politician's campaign. The majority has changed this provision so many times throughout the last couple weeks. This money will come from the U.S. Treasury through corporate fines and go into this nebulous Freedom From Influence Fund, but the bottom line is it is going into Members of Congress' own campaigns.

Why are we allocating money to go to politicians when there are so many other causes like transportation, infrastructure, and cancer research that our tax dollars, your tax dollars, and the Americans' tax dollars should be funding?

□ 1045

The Democratic majority claims they want to take money out of poli-

tics but have created a scheme that will, for the first time ever, make it legal for Members of Congress to take corporate money into their own campaigns.

This is exactly why we need to vote "no" on H.R. 1. It is a travesty.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), leader of H.R. 1, the author of the bill.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chair, my colleagues, somewhere in America there is a family in their living room looking at the television, hearing another report about how billionaires and super-PACs and insiders and lobbyists are running Washington and calling the shots on what happens in their lives.

And they are asking themselves: Do we matter anymore? Do we count? Will our voice be heard?

H.R. 1 says to that family and millions of families across the country who feel the same way: We get it. We hear you. We want to change this place and give you your voice back by restoring ethics and integrity, by pushing back on the influence of big money in our politics and by making sure that, when you go to vote, you don't have to run an obstacle course to the ballot box in America.

That is what we stand for.

Our colleague JOHN LEWIS reminds us all the time that we have to keep our eyes on the prize. Well, on this day, at this moment, in this House, the prize is H.R. 1. Let's pass H.R. 1.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable JOHN LEWIS, hero of the voting rights and civil rights movement.

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support on H.R. 1, and I urge each and every one of our colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Chair, you have heard me say on occasion that the right to vote is precious—almost sacred. In a democratic society, it the most powerful nonviolent instrument or tool that we have.

In my heart of hearts, I believe we have a moral responsibility to restore access for all of our citizens who desire to participate in the democratic process.

Many people marched and protested for the right to vote. Some gave a little blood. Others gave their very lives.

This weekend, many of our colleagues traveled with us to Alabama—to Birmingham, to Montgomery, and to Selma. They saw the signs in the museums that said, "White only." "Colored only."

They visited the First Baptist Church in downtown Montgomery

where we feared for our lives as a mob waited outside to attack and kill us.

They stood on the Edmund Pettus Bridge—crossing the Alabama River—where we were beaten, trampled, and tear-gassed for attempting to march from Selma to Montgomery to dramatize the need for voting rights.

Madam Chair, you have heard me tell this story before, and you know our work is not finished. It makes me sad. It makes me feel like crying when people are denied the right to vote.

We all know that this is not a Democratic or a Republican issue. It is an American one.

For the past few days, I listened to the debate on this bill. I spent some time having what I call an executive session with myself.

The words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., came to mind. He would often say that the “arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice.”

This vote is an opportunity to be on the right side of history. It is a chance to cast a vote by the people, of the people, and for the people.

So I ask you: If not us, then who? If not now, then when?

The time has arrived to tear down the barriers to the ballot box. Today, we are able to do our part in this long fight for the very soul of our Nation. Let’s save our Nation and redeem the soul of America.

Ms. LOFGREN. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) 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, and, pursuant to House Resolution 172, she reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CRENSHAW. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Crenshaw moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

#### DIVISION D—UPHOLDING SUFFRAGE IN AMERICA

#### TITLE XI—UPHOLDING SUFFRAGE IN AMERICA

#### SEC. 11001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Upholding Suffrage in America Act” or the “USA Act”.

#### SEC. 11002. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) Voting is fundamental to a functioning democracy.

(2) The Constitution prohibits discrimination in voting based on race, sex, poll taxes, and age.

(3) It is of paramount importance that the United States maintains the legitimacy of its elections and protects them from interference, including interference from foreign threats and illegal voting.

(4) The city of San Francisco, California, is allowing non-citizens, including illegal immigrants, to register to vote in school board elections.

(5) Federal law prohibits non-citizens from voting in elections for Federal office.

#### SEC. 11003. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that allowing illegal immigrants the right to vote devalues the franchise and diminishes the voting power of United States citizens.

Ms. LOFGREN (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Much has been made of election security as of late, much of it for good reason. In the end, these concerns, the concerns that many Americans rightfully share, are built around the fundamental notion that our vote should count, our vote should mean something; and we should know that, when we cast it, it is sacred and unchanging.

Our vote is a signal of what direction we want our country to move toward, and that vote is an element of trust that we place in the men or women elected to take it in that direction.

We vote because this country is governed by the people, by the citizens of

this country. We in this body humbly serve at their pleasure.

The quickest way to erode a democracy, erode faith in our institutions, is to erode that trust, erode the notion that your vote truly counts.

The truth is this is already happening. In places like San Francisco, Democrats have fought hard to ensure that U.S. citizens must share their civic duty, their vote, with illegal immigrants. The city of San Francisco has effectively canceled out the votes of its citizens and replaced it with illegals.

When I say it out loud, it sounds like I am making it up, because what kind of government would cancel out the votes of its own citizens and replace them with noncitizens—but not just any noncitizens, ones who entered our country illegally.

It is with this in mind, this sacred duty to protect our citizens, protect their vote, protect their voice, that I propose this motion to recommit.

This motion to recommit would show the American people that, despite the deep and growing differences between us, we can at least agree that the people who vote for us are citizens of this country.

Madam Speaker, this is a simple affirmation. It is an affirmation of the fact that the elected representatives of this body answer to the citizens of this country who voted for us. We will not stand by and let their voices be muted. We will not let their trust be eroded. We will not let our democracy be questioned.

Last year, Congress voted on this very idea. Forty-nine Democrats crossed the aisle to vote with us.

It should not be a partisan idea that the people who do not legally live in our country cannot legally vote in our elections. If you are not legally here, if you entered our country against the laws and wishes of our citizens, then you should not vote for representation in our government, diluting the voices of Americans.

I am proposing this MTR not because it feels good, not because we want to attack anyone, but because it is clear to all of us that voter integrity actually needs to be defended.

It has become clear because San Francisco is not the only municipality that has fallen into this radicalism. Other cities have done or attempted to do the same.

The men and women in this body are here because we were duly elected as such.

Our citizens expect much of us. They expect us to protect their most fundamental rights: the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They expect us to respect their voice. Often, the only way they have to express that voice is through their vote.

If we no longer agree to protect that voice, as we did last Congress—if we don’t, in this moment, agree that their voice should not be canceled out but protected, then I worry a great deal

about our democracy. I worry that radicalism has made its way into this sacred body, as it already has in so many other places across our great country.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit. Vote to protect the voices of your constituents. Vote to preserve the notion that our Nation's government is elected by—and only by—the citizens of this country. Anything less is a disservice to the very people who put us here.

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

□ 1100

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, H.R. 1 already prevents noncitizens from voting in Federal elections, whether they are here lawfully or undocumented. In fact, the motion to recommit notices that. They say: "Federal law prohibits noncitizens from voting in Federal elections."

H.R. 1 utilizes the authority in Article I, Section 4 to extend in Federal elections the opportunity for every American to vote.

This motion to recommit is an effort to divert us from the mission that we are on to expand voting rights to every American citizen in Federal elections. I urge its defeat.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this motion. I rise today as a new Member who ran for office on cleaning up our system. And admittedly, I rise today as someone who has voted for Republican MTRs in the past.

In fact, I was eager to hear how my colleagues and friends across the aisle would propose a solution today for how they are going to finally drain the swamp. I was eager to hear how they would protect and enshrine the rights and freedoms and liberties that we all are endowed in the Constitution.

But what they have given us today does nothing to drain the swamp, nothing to uphold our freedoms. Only in Washington would we see a group of people actively trying to sabotage anticorruption measures.

This is a political stunt meant to divide us, meant to sow hatred. It is a game, nothing less. Nothing less.

This right here is why the American people hate politics. Honestly, if this is your strategy to win future elections, we wish you Godspeed because it will never work. It will never work because the question before us today, and the thing that this joke of an MTR that is seeking to distract us from is, whose side are you on?

Let's show the American people that this is the people's House, not the House of corporate interests and lobbyists and dark money.

Again, I stand in opposition to this motion.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. At this point, Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), the hero of the voting rights movement.

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Speaker, I believe in the way of peace, in the way of love. I believe in the philosophy and the discipline of nonviolence.

Can we come together and support a simple piece of legislation to open up the political process and let all of our people come in?

I ask you to remember what I said a few moments ago. With this vote, we have an opportunity to be a headlight and not a taillight.

Some of our colleagues are complaining that we didn't have enough time. We have the time. This piece of legislation was introduced more than 7 years ago, and the other party didn't do anything.

We are prepared to act. We are prepared to open up the political process and let all of the people come in. It is the right thing to do. It is a good thing to do, to set our country on a path, a path that can be a model for the rest of the world.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of the bill, if ordered; and Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 228, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—197

Abraham	Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)
Aderholt	Bost	Chabot
Allen	Brady	Cheney
Amodei	Brindisi	Cline
Armstrong	Brooks (AL)	Cloud
Arrington	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Babin	Buchanan	Collins (GA)
Bacon	Buck	Collins (NY)
Baird	Bucshon	Comer
Balderson	Budd	Conaway
Banks	Burchett	Cook
Barr	Burgess	Crenshaw
Bergman	Byrne	Cunningham
Biggs	Calvert	Curtis
Bilirakis	Carter (GA)	Davidson (OH)

Davis, Rodney	Joyce (PA)	Rooney (FL)
DesJarlais	Katko	Rose, John W.
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer
Duffy	Kelly (PA)	Roy
Duncan	King (IA)	Rutherford
Emmer	King (NY)	Scalise
Estes	Kinzinger	Schrader
Ferguson	Kustoff (TN)	Schweikert
Fitzpatrick	LaHood	Scott, Austin
Fleischmann	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Flores	Lamborn	Shimkus
Fortenberry	Latta	Simpson
Foxx (NC)	Lesko	Smith (MO)
Fulcher	Long	Smith (NE)
Gaetz	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Gallagher	Lucas	Smucker
Gianforte	Luetkemeyer	Spano
Gibbs	Marchant	Stauber
Gohmert	Marshall	Stefanik
Gonzalez (OH)	Massie	Steil
Gooden	Mast	Steube
Gosar	McBath	Stewart
Granger	McCarthy	Taylor
Graves (GA)	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Graves (LA)	McClintock	Thornberry
Graves (MO)	McHenry	Timmons
Green (TN)	McKinley	Tipton
Griffith	Meadows	Turner
Grothman	Meuser	Upton
Guest	Miller	Van Drew
Guthrie	Mitchell	Wagner
Hagedorn	Moolenaar	Walberg
Harris	Mooney (WV)	Walden
Hartzler	Mullin	Walker
Hern, Kevin	Newhouse	Walorski
Herrera Beutler	Norman	Waltz
Hice (GA)	Nunes	Watkins
Higgins (LA)	Olson	Weber (TX)
Hill (AR)	Palazzo	Webster (FL)
Holding	Palmer	Wenstrup
Hollingsworth	Pence	Westerman
Horn, Kendra S.	Perry	Williams
Hudson	Posey	Wilson (SC)
Huizenga	Ratchliffe	Wittman
Hunter	Reed	Womack
Hurd (TX)	Reschenthaler	Woodall
Johnson (LA)	Rice (SC)	Wright
Johnson (OH)	Riggleman	Yoho
Johnson (SD)	Roby	Young
Jordan	Roe, David P.	Zeldin
Joyce (OH)	Rogers (KY)	

NAYS—228

Adams	Cummings	Horsford
Aguilar	Davids (KS)	Houlahan
Allred	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Amash	Davis, Danny K.	Huffman
Axne	Dean	Jackson Lee
Barragán	DeFazio	Jayapal
Bass	DeGette	Jeffries
Beatty	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Bera	DelBene	Johnson (TX)
Beyer	Delgado	Kaptur
Bishop (GA)	Demings	Keating
Blumenauer	DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)
Blunt Rochester	Deutch	Kennedy
Bonamici	Dingell	Khanna
Boyle, Brendan	Doggett	Kildee
F.	Doyle, Michael	Kilmer
Brown (MD)	F.	Kim
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Kind
Bustos	Escobar	Kirkpatrick
Butterfield	Eshoo	Krishnamoorthi
Carbajal	Espallat	Kuster (NH)
Cárdenas	Evans	Lamb
Carson (IN)	Finkenauer	Langevin
Cartwright	Fletcher	Larsen (WA)
Case	Foster	Larson (CT)
Casten (IL)	Frankel	Lawrence
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Lawson (FL)
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Lee (CA)
Chu, Judy	Gallego	Lee (NV)
Cicilline	Garamendi	Levin (CA)
Cisneros	Garcia (IL)	Levin (MI)
Clark (MA)	Garcia (TX)	Lewis
Clarke (NY)	Golden	Lieu, Ted
Cleaver	Gomez	Lipinski
Clyburn	Gonzalez (TX)	Loebsack
Cohen	Gottheimer	Lofgren
Connolly	Green (TX)	Lowenthal
Cooper	Grijalva	Lowe
Correa	Haaland	Lujan
Costa	Harder (CA)	Luria
Courtney	Hastings	Lynch
Cox (CA)	Hayes	Malinowski
Craig	Heck	Maloney
Crist	Higgins (NY)	Carolyn B.
Crow	Hill (CA)	Matsui
Cuellar	Himes	McAdams

McCollum	Pressley	Speier	Eshoo	Levin (MI)	Roybal-Allard	McClintock	Roe, David P.	Timmons
McEachin	Price (NC)	Stanton	Espallat	Lewis	Ruiz	McHenry	Rogers (KY)	Tipton
McGovern	Quigley	Stevens	Evans	Lieu, Ted	Ruppersberger	McKinley	Rooney (FL)	Turner
McNerney	Raskin	Suozi	Finkenauer	Lipinski	Rush	Meadows	Rose, John W.	Upton
Meeks	Rice (NY)	Swalwell (CA)	Fletcher	Loeb	Ryan	Meuser	Rouzer	Wagner
Meng	Richmond	Takano	Foster	Lofgren	Sánchez	Miller	Roy	Walberg
Moore	Rose (NY)	Thompson (CA)	Frankel	Lowenthal	Sarbanes	Mitchell	Rutherford	Walden
Morelle	Rouda	Thompson (MS)	Fudge	Lowe	Scanlon	Moolenaar	Scalise	Walker
Moulton	Roybal-Allard	Titus	Gabard	Luján	Schakowsky	Mooney (WV)	Schweikert	Walorski
Mucarsel-Powell	Ruiz	Tlaib	Gallego	Luria	Schiff	Mullin	Scott, Austin	Waltz
Murphy	Ruppersberger	Tonko	Garamendi	Lynch	Schneider	Newhouse	Sensenbrenner	Watkins
Nadler	Rush	Torres (CA)	García (IL)	Malinowski	Schrader	Norman	Shimkus	Weber (TX)
Napolitano	Ryan	Torres Small	García (TX)	Maloney,	Schrier	Nunes	Simpson	Webster (FL)
Neal	Sánchez	(NM)	Golden	Carolyn B.	Scott (VA)	Olson	Smith (MO)	Wenstrup
Neguse	Sarbanes	Trahan	Gomez	Maloney, Sean	Scott, David	Palazzo	Smith (NE)	Westerman
Norcross	Scanlon	Trone	Gonzalez (TX)	Matsui	Serrano	Palmer	Smith (NJ)	Williams
O'Halleran	Schakowsky	Underwood	Gottheimer	McAdams	Sewell (AL)	Pence	Smucker	Wilson (SC)
Ocasio-Cortez	Schiff	Vargas	Green (TX)	McBath	Shalala	Perry	Spano	Wittman
Omar	Schneider	Veasey	Grijalva	McCollum	Sherman	Posey	Stauber	Womack
Pallone	Schrier	Vela	Haaland	McEachin	Sherrill	Ratcliffe	Stefanik	Woodall
Panetta	Scott (VA)	Velázquez	Harder (CA)	McGovern	Sires	Reed	Stell	Wright
Pappas	Scott, David	Visclosky	Hastings	McNerney	Slotkin	Reschenthaler	Steube	Yoho
Pascrell	Serrano	Wasserman	Hayes	Meeks	Smith (WA)	Rice (SC)	Stewart	Young
Payne	Sewell (AL)	Schultz	Heck	Meng	Soto	Riggleman	Taylor	Zeldin
Pelosi	Shalala	Waters	Higgins (NY)	Moore	Spanberger	Roby	Thompson (PA)	
Perlmutter	Sherman	Watson Coleman	Hill (CA)	Morelle	Speier	Rodgers (WA)	Thornberry	
Peters	Sherrill	Welch	Himes	Moulton	Stanton			
Peterson	Sires	Wexton	Horn, Kendra S.	Mucarsel-Powell	Stevens			
Phillips	Slotkin	Wild	Horsford	Murphy	Suozi			
Pingree	Smith (WA)	Wilson (FL)	Houlihan	Nadler	Swalwell (CA)			
Pocan	Soto	Yarmuth	Hoyer	Napolitano	Takano			
Porter	Spanberger		Huffman	Neal	Thompson (CA)			
			Jackson Lee	Neguse	Thompson (MS)			
			Jayapal	Norcross	Titus			
			Jeffries	O'Halleran	Tlaib			
			Johnson (GA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Tonko			
			Johnson (TX)	Omar	Torres (CA)			
			Kaptur	Pallone	Torres Small			
			Keating	Panetta	(NM)			
			Kelly (IL)	Pappas	Trahan			
			Kennedy	Pascrell	Trone			
			Khanna	Payne	Underwood			
			Kildee	Pelosi	Van Drew			
			Kilmer	Perlmutter	Vargas			
			Kim	Peters	Veasey			
			Kind	Peterson	Vela			
			Kirkpatrick	Phillips	Velázquez			
			Krishnamoorthi	Pingree	Visclosky			
			Kuster (NH)	Pocan	Wasserman			
			Lamb	Porter	Schultz			
			Langevin	Pressley	Waters			
			Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Watson Coleman			
			Larson (CT)	Quigley	Welch			
			Lawrence	Raskin	Wexton			
			Lawson (FL)	Rice (NY)	Wild			
			Lee (CA)	Richmond	Wilson (FL)			
			Lee (NV)	Rose (NY)	Yarmuth			
			Levin (CA)	Rouda				

## NOT VOTING—7

Clay	Maloney, Sean	Stivers
Crawford	Rodgers (WA)	
Dunn	Rogers (AL)	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1111

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 117.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 193, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—234

Adams	Carson (IN)	Crow
Aguilar	Cartwright	Cuellar
Allred	Case	Cummings
Axne	Casten (IL)	Cunningham
Barragán	Castor (FL)	David (KS)
Bass	Castro (TX)	Davis (CA)
Beatty	Chu, Judy	Davis, Danny K.
Bera	Cicilline	Dean
Beyer	Cisneros	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Clark (MA)	DeGette
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Blunt Rochester	Cleaver	DeBene
Bonamici	Clyburn	Delgado
Boyle, Brendan	Cohen	Demings
F.	Connolly	DeSaulnier
Brindisi	Cooper	Deutch
Brown (MD)	Correa	Dingell
Brownley (CA)	Costa	Doggett
Bustos	Courtney	Doyle, Michael
Butterfield	Cox (CA)	F.
Carbajal	Craig	Engel
Cárdenas	Crist	Escobar

Abraham	Conaway	Hern, Kevin
Aderholt	Cook	Herrera Beutler
Allen	Crenshaw	Hice (GA)
Amash	Curtis	Higgins (LA)
Amodei	Davidson (OH)	Hill (AR)
Armstrong	Davis, Rodney	Holding
Arrington	DesJarlais	Hollingsworth
Babin	Diaz-Balart	Hudson
Bacon	Duffy	Huizenga
Baird	Duncan	Hunter
Balderson	Emmer	Hurd (TX)
Banks	Estes	Johnson (LA)
Barr	Ferguson	Johnson (OH)
Bergman	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (SD)
Biggs	Fleischmann	Jordan
Bilirakis	Flores	Joyce (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Fortenberry	Joyce (PA)
Bost	Foxx (NC)	Katko
Brady	Fulcher	Kelly (MS)
Brooks (AL)	Gaetz	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (IN)	Gallagher	King (IA)
Buchanan	Gianforte	King (NY)
Buck	Gibbs	Kinzinger
Bucshon	Gohmert	Kustoff (TN)
Budd	Gonzalez (OH)	LaHood
Burchett	Gooden	LaMalfa
Burgess	Gosar	Lamborn
Byrne	Granger	Latta
Calvert	Graves (GA)	Lesko
Carter (GA)	Graves (LA)	Long
Carter (TX)	Graves (MO)	Loudermilk
Chabot	Green (TN)	Lucas
Cheney	Griffith	Luetkemeyer
Cline	Grothman	Marchant
Cloud	Guest	Marshall
Cole	Guthrie	Massie
Collins (GA)	Hagedorn	Mast
Collins (NY)	Harris	McCarthy
Comer	Hartzler	McCaul

## NAYS—193

## NOT VOTING—5

Clay	Dunn	Stivers
Crawford	Rogers (AL)	

□ 1121

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

Mrs. MILLER. 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 this request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and