is reckless and dangerous for our police.

Mr. Speaker, because of H.R. 1, which is a federalization of our elections, I also, today, will make a motion to adjourn so that Democrats can think a little bit harder.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

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

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 222, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—182

Aderholt
Allen
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brooks
Buchanan
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (WV)
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Mullin
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Zeldin

NAYS—222

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Banks
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Craig
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Granger
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller-Meeks
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walberg
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Womack

NOT VOTING—27

Barragán
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Buck
Bucshon
Cawthorn
Costa
Crist
DeFazio
Fudge
Green (TN)
Johnson (TX)
Kelly (IL)
Larsen (WA)
Lynch
McCaul
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Mooney
Ruppersberger
Smith (NJ)
Titus
Trone
Waters
Wittman
Yarmuth
Young

□ 1032

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. WOMACK, Mrs. AXNE, Messrs. SCHNEIDER, SHERMAN, GARAMENDI, O'HALLERAN, and MORELLE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. BOEBERT and Mr. LAMALFA changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, due to an unforeseen recorded vote, I was unable to leave a previously scheduled engagement. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 56.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 3, 2021, I was not able to make the recorded vote below. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 56.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform you that I was unable to be present for the vote for the motion to adjourn today. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 56.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to clarify my position on the Motion to Adjourn considered on the floor this morning.

I support full consideration of the For the People Act and the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. I was unable to vote this morning. Had I been present, I would have voted: nay, on rollcall No. 56.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Buchanan (LaHood)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Gaetz (McHenry)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Huffman (McNerney)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (McGovern)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neguse (Perlmutter)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Kuster)
Rodgers (WA) (Joyce (PA))
Roybal-Allard (Escobar)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Speier (Scanlon)
Vargas (Correa)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MRS. LESKO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in part B of House Report 117–9.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 4208.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to offer an amendment to remove section 4208 from H.R. 1.

Section 4208 is a dangerous provision of this bill that will put people's private information on display and put their personal security at risk.

This section aims to forbid anonymous speech. Throughout American history, anonymous speech about political matters has played a vital role. From the Federalist Papers, to those who supported the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s, many in history had very legitimate fears of having their identities uncovered and relied on anonymous speech to show their support for certain policies and initiatives.

Section 4208 removes the protection of anonymous speech forever. By requiring public reporting of the private information of individuals, partnerships, associations, and any group of people who spend $500 or more on political advertising—which is a very broad definition in this bill—we put individuals at risk.

Furthermore, we drastically limit free speech and destroy the First Amendment. Notably, the courts have already begun to warn against the constitutionality of similar provisions in State law. We cannot allow this to stand. Not only will it cause a security problem for these individuals but, as we have seen, people could lose their jobs, be shamed, or even worse.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding, and I am proud to support her amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1, the so-called For the People Act a/k/a the for the politicians act. Supporters of this bill claim that it is the fix needed for the problems within our Nation's electoral system, but in reality this bill is a power grab that will blur the lines between official and campaign resources and leave taxpayers footing the bill.

It is shameful that this body is even considering this legislation that forces hardworking Americans amid an unprecedented crisis to give politicians money. H.R. 1 would funnel millions of taxpayer dollars into the campaign accounts of politicians through voucher and funding match programs. This bill will allow 16-year-olds to vote, give $25 vouchers to individuals to donate to the candidate of their choice, redefines free speech, triggers universal mail-in ballots, creates an election czar, strips voter ID requirements, and so much more.

This bill jeopardizes the future of Americans' freedom of speech with new requirements for public disclosure of support of political campaigns and candidates.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot claim to be protecting the rights and freedoms enshrined in our Constitution when this, the For the People Act—more aptly named the for the politicians act—is under consideration.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYNE).

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's amendment, and I will be supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1, the underlying bill, the ''destroy election integrity and centralize all power in Washington, D.C., act'' that Democrats are, once again, pushing because they never have and never will believe in the rights of our States and the limited power of Federal Government.

Some of my colleagues who took every opportunity to emphasize that democracy was on the ballot in this past election have returned to Congress eager to change election laws in their favor.

H.R. 1 is wholly about control—control of free speech and control of how elections are conducted. And when they exercise this control, their purpose is to crush opposing views, because opposing views will not be tolerated when there are Democrat majorities at stake.

America's strength lies in its free speech and decentralized elections, and we must continue to make our election system more resilient to natural challenges and foreign actors. H.R. 1 fails to do this on all fronts.

Mr. Speaker, I was elected by the people of the 24th District of Texas to stand up for freedom, the rule of law, and limited government. I urge my colleagues to vote against this vile new form of tyranny in H.R. 1.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with this amendment. It would strike section 4208 of H.R. 1 which requires online platforms to retain records of certain online political advertisements. According to Forbes magazine, political advertisers spent $1.6 billion online in the 2020 election—almost 10 times what they spent in 2012.

At a time when Americans are increasingly bombarded with political ads online, striking this provision is not useful and would harm the efforts of this bill to provide increased transparency in political advertising. Fundamentally, Americans deserve to know who is paying for online political ads to ensure that they are informed voters.

Digital advertising can also have a far greater reach than broadcast advertising. Online political ads are relatively inexpensive to produce and can be disseminated instantly to vast audiences across great distances without regard to geographic boundaries. It is time for our disclosure and disclaimer laws and regulations to be updated to reflect how campaigns are run in the 21st century and how to keep pace with changing technology.

The online platform records requirements in this section are key to the Honest Ads Act, which is a part of H.R. 1, designed to improve transparency in political advertising. By requiring online platforms to retain copies of political ads, everyday Americans at home will be able to see who is paying for what. These requirements are narrowly drawn and only apply to online platforms with over 50 million monthly unique visitors and to advertisers who run over $500 a year in political advertisements.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the measure and protect this important reform.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the insurrection on January 6 had a specific purpose: to overturn our election and to violently disenfranchise millions of voters.

The immediate threat to the Capitol has been quelled, but our democracy's future is still unclear. Across the country there are ongoing efforts to suppress and limit votes. Dark money fuels campaigns without transparency and accountability, and partisan gerrymandering tilts the playing field.

A vote for H.R. 1 is a vote for equality, for transparency, and for returning power to the people.

Mr. Speaker, 56 years ago on March 7, John Lewis almost lost his life on the Edmund Pettus Bridge for the right to vote. He said: ''Your vote is precious, almost sacred. It is the most powerful, nonviolent tool we have to create a more perfect union.''

Let's strive for that more perfect union. Let's confirm our democracy and vote ''yes'' on H.R. 1.

□ 1045

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would just note that the late Justice Scalia, who was not exactly one of our liberal beacons on the Court, said this: ''Requiring people to stand up in public for their political acts fosters civic courage, without which democracy is doomed.''

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposes to knock out the

heart of the Honest Ads Act, so the public won't know who is purchasing ads online. That is the exact opposite of what we need to be doing. We need far greater transparency about who is polluting the airwaves and who is polluting the internet with propaganda and fake news. We should know who is paying for all of that.

This used to be a very solid bipartisan commitment between Democrats and Republicans. Everybody agreed there should at least be disclosure of campaign spending.

Now, they not only want to put out propaganda online, but they don't even want anybody to know who is paying for it. That is the opposite direction that we should be moving in America.

We should be defending everybody's right to vote, everybody's right to participate against all of the schemes to undermine voting rights, and we should make sure that everybody knows who is putting money into the political system.

I urge a ''no'' vote on that amendment.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, in Florida, we have strong redistricting standards that were passed by a large majority of Florida voters and placed in our State constitution.

I also recognize that strong standards and criteria are provided for in H.R. 1.

Would the chairperson agree to working together with the State-adopted redistricting criteria to ensure H.R. 1 does not dilute the Florida requirements?

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to work with the gentlewoman as this bill advances towards enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I would urge a ''no'' vote on the Lesko amendment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in part B of House Report 117–9.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 88, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. 1055. LOWERING MANDATORY MINIMUM VOTING AGE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

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

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to elections held in 2022 or any succeeding year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

H.R. 1 is bold, transformative legislation, which fights voter suppression, promotes access to the ballot, cracks down on money in politics, and provides transparency to the American people.

Passing this bill has never been more urgent. We must act to protect and preserve our democracy.

My amendment gets to the heart of H.R. 1 and recognizes the contributions that young people continue to make to our democracy.

By lowering the Federal voting age from 18 to 16 years of age, my amendment would enfranchise young Americans to help shape and form the policies that will set the course for our future.

From police violence, to immigration reform, to climate change, to the future of work and the minimum wage, our young people are organizing, mobilizing, and calling us to action. They are at the forefront of social movements and have more than earned inclusion in our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, 16- and 17-year-old constituents of mine are supporting their families. They are working, not for enrichment or to build a resume, but because they have no choice. They are attending school full-time and taking care of loved ones in the midst of the COVID crisis.

Young people are contributing both to the labor force and their local economies by paying taxes, and yet they are deprived of the opportunity to exercise their right to vote.

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

Sixteen- and 17-year-olds today possess wisdom and maturity defined by today's challenges, hardships, and opportunities.

They deserve and demand a government that is accountable to them, a government that values their voices, and understands the depth and breadth of their lived experience.

They are not a monolith. But they are nation-builders, living through a global pandemic, confronting racial injustice, and rebuilding our democracy.

Now is the time for us to meet the moment and enfranchise 16- and 17-year-olds.

I would like to thank my colleagues and dear friends, Representatives MENG and SCHAKOWSKY, for their leadership on this issue and for cosponsoring my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank my friend, AYANNA PRESSLEY, the wonderful congresswoman from Massachusetts. I have had the pleasure of knowing AYANNA PRESSLEY well before she was even 16, and she was ready to vote as soon as that.

I want to say that all over the country, and especially in my district, I feel we see young people, young activists, who are working tirelessly to make their voices heard, from battling climate change, battling gun violence, to advocating for racial justice and economic equality.

This is their century, and our national leadership should be accountable to them, to these young people in their generation who will be most impacted by the existential threats that are looming before us today.

This is a serious proposal. Sixteen-year-olds are doing the work of adults, and they should be treated with the respect that they deserve and the participation that they should be able to have.

So I heartily support this amendment and urge my colleagues to consider it carefully and vote for it.

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

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER), my good friend.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation faces serious challenges, including an ongoing pandemic, vaccine distribution hurdles, continued lockdowns from out-of-touch Governors, prolonged closures of our schools, and one-in-four small businesses face the risk of permanent closure.

At a time when the American people are concerned with election integrity, a top priority of our Democrat leadership is to federalize election laws, removing the authority of State legislatures expressed in Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution.

H.R. 1, the bill before us today, would allow for taxpayer-funded campaigns through a government match on political contributions at a 6-to-1 ratio. So a $200 contribution would be matched by the taxpayer to the tune of $1,200.

H.R. 1 would also hinder the rights of States to determine their registration voting practices, including mandating automatic voter registration.

The suggestion being made by my Democrat friends and colleagues that opposition to this legislation is somehow a form of voter suppression is ridiculous. I and my colleagues would never consider engaging in a course of

action that suppresses a citizen's legitimate right to vote.

This is a partisan power grab that threatens election integrity. ''One citizen, one vote'' is my solemn resolve. I oppose this amendment and the underlying bill.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me rise to support the Pressley-Meng-Schakowsky amendment. I thank Congresswoman PRESSLEY for bringing this forward and to say that she is about the future and really about making sure that civic participation is really enhanced and moved forward by allowing for this amendment to come into this bill, H.R. 1, because this is what it is about. It is about our democracy, and she has been consistent in terms of inclusion and making sure our democracy works.

Elections are about the future, and no one has more at stake in that future than our youth. By age 16, we trust our young people with a host of important decisions and responsibilities. It is the moment when lifelong habits are built and when ideas about the world become to be fixed. Evidence has shown that when people start voting younger, they are more likely to exercise their right to vote as they grow older.

Too many of the arguments against lowering the voting age to 16 crumble when you really examine them clearly. Often the objection is simply that 16-year-olds are too young to exercise good judgment. This is really a patronizing thought. In fact, it is downright scary to think that we would have our government policies decide what constitutes as wisdom for our young people.

It is past time for us to elevate voting as one of the central responsibilities of our democracy. I urge an ''aye'' vote.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), my good friend.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment en bloc No. 4 and the underlying bill.

I have a long list of concerns with this bill, and at the top of this list is nationwide ballot harvesting.

Democrats in California have already legalized ballot harvesting in our State. Despite our concerns with the practice, Republicans were determined to play by the rules and utilized legal ballot collection methods in the last election.

One amendment in this package, offered by my California colleague, puts this hypocrisy on full display. Under current law, with my colleague's amendment, a foreign operative—maybe a Russian operative, maybe a Chinese spy—could still handle ballots for untold numbers of people. My colleague's amendment is a blatant attempt to criticize ballot harvesting only when the other guys do it.

In other words, California Democrats think it is fine when their paid operatives collect ballots from strangers and throw them in a bag. But they object when churches try to collect them for members of their congregation and put them in a box.

Don't be fooled. Democrats don't want to facilitate ballot collection for all Americans. They just want to make it easier for their operatives to harvest ballots and will cry foul whenever Republicans try to play by the same rules.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I stand in this Chamber today thanks to the young people of Westchester and Rockland Counties.

When I first ran for Congress, I was joined by a small group of young, committed volunteers. Many of them were not eligible to vote. Many of them were 16 and 17 years old. And my goodness, did they know more about policy and national politics than people who are four and five times their senior.

In this country, when you are 16 and 17 years old, we charge you as an adult in the courtroom. You are able to drive to the job we expect you to work in order to help support your family. So I think that the least we can do is give 16- and 17-year-olds a say in who governs them.

□ 1100

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), another great friend.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution vests primary responsibility in State legislatures to set the times, places, and manner of congressional elections, allowing States and localities to determine how best to conduct elections that suit the needs of voters in their communities.

But the bill before us today, and this amendment also, reverses the longstanding history of State control over the electoral process, makes unconstitutional changes to our election laws through a top-down Federal power grab, and places unprecedented limitations on political speech.

Rather than strengthening the election process by working with Republicans to find bipartisan solutions, H.R. 1 was written without any input from Republican Members. Some of the most egregious provisions include mandating that States allow ballot harvesting, mandating same-day registration in all 50 States, abolishing the signature requirements for mail-in ballots, mandating absentee ballots be accepted up to 10 days after election day, mandating that States send ballots in the mail proactively, and, finally, forcing taxpayers to pay politicians to campaign for office.

This bill is nothing more than an attempt by Democrats to cement their fragile and fleeting majorities at taxpayer expense.

The bill would limit the free speech of my voters, use my voters' tax dollars to fund candidates, and violate the Constitution by superseding the Commonwealth's ability to determine their own laws on voter eligibility.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this misguided and radical legislation.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, we must do right by the young organizers and activists who have fought for our democracy. They have a stake in our democracy, and they deserve to have a stake at the ballot box.

Civil rights heroes like the late John Lewis taught us through example that no one is too young to fight for access to the ballot. In fact, he supported this very amendment last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), a mediocre friend, not a great friend.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, after a divisive election season, allegations of election fraud, objections to the electoral college, and impeachment, a friend of mine on the other side of the aisle recently asked what it would take to unify our country. My answer is that it is certainly not this legislation which, from my standpoint, is the most divisive, unconstitutional, and destructive piece of legislation in my time in Congress.

They call it the For the People Act, but it should be called the for the politicians act because it would force taxpayers to fund political campaigns, including the campaigns of politicians with whom those taxpayers disagree.

Maybe a better name would be the election power grab act because it would normalize the chaos, uncertainty, and irregularities surrounding mail-in voting in the 2020 election by centralizing the administration of elections in Washington, D.C., commandeering States to permanently expand mail-in voting without safeguards, legalize ballot harvesting, disregard voter ID laws, permit same-day voter registration without citizenship verification, among other egregious measures.

Mr. Speaker, election laws should make it easy to vote and hard to cheat. This bill would not only make it easy to cheat, but it would also effectively make it legal to cheat.

At a time when half of Americans have lost confidence in the integrity of our elections, this bill will only drive distrust and division higher.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of ending division in our country, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this power grab of our elections.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON), another mediocre friend.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I have only been here 2 months, and in that

time, I have seen some bad legislation. To date, this is one of the worst that I have seen.

The age of consent has always coincided with the franchise. For nearly 200 years, it was 21. Then, in the 1970s, they changed it to 18. Our society has agreed since then, for 50 years, that 18 is when a child becomes an adult. I find it interesting that our friends across the aisle don't want to have 16- and 17-year-olds tried as adults when they commit violent adult crimes, yet they want those 16- and 17-year-olds to have the franchise. Some even, believe it or not, want 16- and 17-year-olds who are convicted of murder to be able to vote while they are in prison after they have been convicted.

Mr. Speaker, this is a horrible amendment, and I respectfully request that all of our Members join us in voting ''no.''

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN OF CALIFORNIA.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 179, I rise to offer amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 4 consisting of amendment Nos. 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56, printed in part B of House Report 117–9, offered by Ms. LOFGREN of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MS. SPANBERGER OF VIRGINIA

Add at the end of subtitle B of title VII the following:

SEC. 7105. DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS FOR MATERIALS POSTED ON ONLINE PLATFORMS BY AGENTS OF FOREIGN PRINCIPALS ON BEHALF OF CLIENTS.

(a) METHOD AND FORM OF DISCLAIMER; PRESERVATION OF DISCLAIMERS BY CERTAIN SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS DESCRIBED.—Section 4(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 614(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(b) It shall be unlawful'' and inserting ''(b)(1) It shall be unlawful''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) In the case of informational materials for or in the interests of a foreign principal which are transmitted or caused to be transmitted by an agent of a foreign principal by posting on an online platform, the agent shall ensure that the conspicuous statement required to be placed in such materials under this subsection is placed directly with the material posted on the platform and is not accessible only through a hyperlink or other reference to another source.

''(3) If the Attorney General determines that the application of paragraph (2) to materials posted on an online platform is not feasible because the length of the conspicuous statement required to be placed in materials under this subsection makes the inclusion of the entire statement incompatible with the posting of the materials on that platform, an agent may meet the requirements of paragraph (2) by ensuring that an abbreviated version of the statement, stating that the materials are distributed by a foreign agent on behalf of a clearly identified foreign principal, is placed directly with the material posted on the platform.

''(4) An online platform on which informational materials described in paragraph (2) are posted shall ensure that the conspicuous statement described in such paragraph (or, if applicable, the abbreviated statement described in paragraph (3)) is maintained with such materials at all times, including after the material is shared in a social media post on the platform, but only if the platform has 50,000,000 or more unique monthly United States visitors or users for a majority of months during the 12 months preceding the dissemination of the materials.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to materials disseminated on or after the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, without regard to whether or not the Attorney General has promulgated regulations to carry out such amendments prior to the expiration of such period.

(b) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS TO PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(b)(1) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 614(b)(1)), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by striking ''any person within the United States'' and inserting ''any person''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to materials disseminated on or after the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, without regard to whether or not the Attorney General has promulgated regulations to carry out such amendments prior to the expiration of such period.

(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE PLATFORMS DISSEMINATING INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS TRANSMITTED BY AGENTS OF FOREIGN PRINCIPALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 614) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) If the Attorney General determines that an agent of a foreign principal transmitted or caused to be transmitted informational materials on an online platform for or in the interests of the foreign principal and did not meet the requirements of subsection (b)(2) (relating to the conspicuous statement required to be placed in such materials)—

''(1) the Attorney General shall notify the online platform; and

''(2) the online platform shall remove such materials and use reasonable efforts to inform recipients of such materials that the materials were disseminated by a foreign agent on behalf of a foreign principal.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to materials disseminated on or after the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) DEFINITION.—Section 1 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 611) is amended by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

''(j) The term 'online platform' means any public-facing website, web application, or digital application (including a social network, ad network, or search engine).''.

SEC. 7106. CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF INDIVIDUALS WHO ENGAGE WITH THE UNITED STATES IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES FOR A FOREIGN PRINCIPAL IN ANY PLACE AS AGENTS OF FOREIGN PRINCIPALS.

Section 1(c)(1)(i) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611(c)(1)(i)) is amended by inserting after ''United States'' the following: ''(whether within or outside of the United States)''.

SEC. 7107. ANALYSIS AND REPORT ON CHALLENGES TO ENFORCEMENT OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938.

(a) ANALYSIS.—The Attorney General shall conduct an analysis of the legal, policy, and procedural challenges to the effective enforcement of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report on the analysis conducted under subsection (a), and shall include in the report such recommendations, including recommendations for revisions to the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as the Attorney General considers appropriate to promote the effective enforcement of such Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 476, strike lines 5 through 9 and insert the following:

''(B) a description of the audience targeted by the advertisement, the number of views generated from the advertisement, the number of views by unique individuals generated by the advertisement, the number of times the advertisement was shared, and the date and time that the advertisement is first displayed and last displayed.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 50, line 14, strike ''and'' at then end.

Page 50, line 20, insert ''and'' at the end.

Page 50, after line 20, insert the following:

(G) an explanation of what information the State and local election officials maintain with respect to an individual voter registration status for purposes of elections for Federal office in the State, how that information is shared or sold and with whom, what information is automatically kept confidential, what information is needed to access voter information online, and what privacy programs are available, such as those described in section 1055;

Page 88, after line 8 insert the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1055. REQUIRING STATES TO ESTABLISH AND OPERATE VOTER PRIVACY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall establish and operate a privacy program to enable victims of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sexual assault, and trafficking to have personally identifiable information that the State or local election officials maintain with respect to an individual voter registration status for purposes of elections for Federal office in the State, including addresses, be kept confidential.

(b) NOTICE.—Each State shall notify residents of that State of the information that

State and local election officials maintain with respect to an individual voter registration status for purposes of elections for Federal office in the State, how that information is shared or sold and with whom, what information is automatically kept confidential, what information is needed to access voter information online, and the privacy programs that are available.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each State shall make information about the program established under subsection (a) available on a publicly accessible website.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The terms ''domestic violence'', ''stalking'', ''sexual assault'', and ''dating violence'' have the meanings given such terms in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291).

(2) The term ''trafficking'' means an act or practice described in paragraph (11) or (12) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 666, insert after line 2 the following new section (and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly):

SECTION 6010. EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR OFFENSES UNDER FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971.

(a) CIVIL OFFENSES.—Section 309(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30109(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

''(10) No person shall be subject to a civil penalty under this subsection with respect to a violation of this Act unless a complaint is filed with the Commission with respect to the violation under paragraph (1), or the Commission responds to information with respect to the violation which is ascertained in the normal course of carrying out its supervisory responsibilities under paragraph (2), not later than 15 years after the date on which the violation occurred.''.

(b) CRIMINAL OFFENSES.—Section 406(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30145(a)) is amended by striking ''5 years'' and inserting ''10 years''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to violations occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 154, beginning line 2, strike ''at least one voting system'' and insert ''a sufficient number, but at least one, of voting systems, as determined by the Commission in consultation with the United States Access Board and the National Institute of Standards and Technology,''.

Page 154, beginning line 3, strike ''for individuals with disabilities'' and insert ''to serve individuals with and without disabilities''.

Page 154, beginning line 7, strike ''at each polling place'' and insert ''for all in person voting options''.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 223, line 18 , insert '', without being subjected to intimidation or deceptive practices,'' after ''vote''.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 129, line 8, insert '', including by operating a polling place or ballot box that falsely purports to be an official location established for such an election by a unit of government'' before the period.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 220, line 20, strike ''clause'' and insert ''clause, and shall include on the institution's website and boost awareness on the institution's social media platforms,''.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

Page 94, insert after line 25 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

(c) PRIORITY FOR SCHOOLS RECEIVING TITLE I FUNDS.—In selecting among eligible local educational agencies for receiving funds under the pilot program under this part, the Commission shall give priority to local educational agencies that receive funds under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq).

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

Page 79, insert after line 9 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

''(c) ENSURING AVAILABILITY OF FORMS.—The State shall ensure that each polling place has copies of any forms an individual may be required to complete in order to register to vote or revise the individual's voter registration information under this section.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

Page 248, line 15, strike the closing quotation mark and the second period.

Page 248, insert after line 15 the following:

''(c) MINIMUM HOURS OF OPERATION OUTSIDE OF TYPICAL WORKING HOURS.—Each State shall establish hours of operation for all polling places in the State on the date of any election for Federal office held in the State such that no polling place is open for less than a total of 4 hours outside of the hours between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm in time zone in which the polling place is located.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF NEW YORK

Page 548, strike lines 3 through 12 and insert the following:

(c) STUDY AND REPORT ON IMPACT AND EFFECTIVENESS OF VOUCHER PROGRAMS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Federal Election Commission shall conduct a study on the efficacy of political voucher programs, including the program under this part and other similar programs, in expanding and diversifying the pool of individuals who participate in the electoral process, including those who participate as donors and those who participate as candidates.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall publish and submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), and shall include in the report such recommendations as the Commission considers appropriate which would enable political voucher programs to be implemented on a national scale.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF NEW YORK

Page 255, after line 16, insert the following:

SEC. 1909. GAO STUDY ON VOTER TURNOUT RATES.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on voter turnout rates delineated by age in States and localities that permit voters to participate in elections before reaching the age of 18, with a focus on localities that permit voting upon reaching the age of 16.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF NEW YORK

Page 255, insert before line 17, the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1909. STUDY ON RANKED-CHOICE VOTING.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General shall conduct a study on the implementation and impact of ranked-choice voting in States and localities with a focus on how to best implement a model for Federal elections nationwide. The study shall include the impact on voter turnout, negative campaigning, and who decides to run for office.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Comptroller General shall transmit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), including any recommendations on how to best implement a ranked-choice voting for Federal elections nationwide.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MS. UNDERWOOD OF ILLINOIS

In section 542(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 5111 of the bill—

(1) strike ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (D);

(2) redesignate subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F); and

(3) insert after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

(E) the extent to which the program increased opportunities for participation by candidates of diverse racial, gender, and socio-economic backgrounds; and

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

On page 124, line 1, strike ''criminal penalties'' and insert ''criminal, civil, or other legal penalties''.

On page 128, line 17, strike ''criminal penalties'' and insert ''criminal, civil, or other legal penalties''.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MS. WILLIAMS OF GEORGIA

Page 88, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. 1055. INCLUSION OF VOTER REGISTRATION INFORMATION WITH CERTAIN LEASES AND VOUCHERS FOR FEDERALLY ASSISTED RENTAL HOUSING AND MORTGAGE APPLICATIONS.

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFORM STATEMENT.—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in coordination with the Election Assistance Commission, shall develop a uniform statement designed to provide recipients of such statement pursuant to this section of how they can register to vote and their voting rights under law.

(b) LEASES AND VOUCHERS FOR FEDERALLY ASSISTED RENTAL HOUSING.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall require—

(1) each public housing agency to provide a copy of the uniform statement developed pursuant to subsection (a) to each lessee of a dwelling unit in public housing administered by such agency—

(A) together with the lease for such a dwelling unit, at the same time such lease is provided to the lessee; and

(B) together with any income verification form, at the same time such form is provided to the lessee;

(2) each public housing agency that administers rental assistance under the Housing Choice Voucher program under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)), including the program under paragraph (13) of such section 8(o), to provide a copy of the uniform statement developed pursuant to subsection (a) to each assisted family or individual—

(A) together with the voucher for such assistance, at the time such voucher is issued for such family or individual; and

(B) together with any income verification form, at the same time such form is provided to the applicant or assisted family or individual; and

(3) each owner of a dwelling unit assisted with Federal project-based rental assistance

to provide a copy of the uniform statement developed pursuant to subsection (a) to provide to the lessee of such dwelling unit—

(A) together with the lease for such dwelling unit, at the same time such form is provided to the lessee; and

(B) together with any income verification form, at the same time such form is provided to the applicant or tenant;

except that the Secretary of Agriculture shall administer the requirement under this paragraph with respect to Federal project-based rental assistance specified in subsection (e)(1)(D),

(c) APPLICATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LOANS.—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall require each creditor that receives an application (within the meaning of such term as used in the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691)) for a residential mortgage loan to provide a copy of the uniform statement developed pursuant to subsection (a) in written form to the applicant for such residential mortgage loan, within 5 business days of the date of application.

(d) OPTIONAL COMPLETION OF APPLICATION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require any individual to complete an application for voter registration.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) FEDERAL PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE.—The term ''Federal project-based rental assistance'' means project-based rental assistance provided under—

(A) section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f);

(B) section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q);

(C) section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013);

(D) title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1471 et seq.), including voucher assistance under section 542 of such title (42 U.S.C. 1490r);

(E) subtitle D of title VIII of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.);

(F) title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12721 et seq.);

(G) the Housing Trust Fund program under section 1338 of the federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4588); or

(H) subtitle C of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11381 et seq.).

(2) OWNER.—The term ''owner'' has the meaning given such term in section 8(f) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(f)).

(3) PUBLIC HOUSING; PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY.—The terms ''public housing'' and ''public housing agency'' have the meanings given such terms in section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)).

(4) RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LOAN.—The term ''residential mortgage loan'' includes any loan which is secured by a first or subordinate lien on residential real property (including individual units of condominiums and cooperatives) designed principally for the occupancy of from 1- to 4- families.

(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau may issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bloc of amendments provides important additions to H.R. 1 that strengthen the bill and enhance voter access.

Among the amendments in the bloc is an amendment from the gentlewoman from Virginia that would require foreign agent disclaimers to be included on social media content. This increases transparency by requiring disclaimers to be embedded on the face of a social media post itself, and those disclaimers must remain whenever the post is subsequently shared.

There are four amendments from the gentlewoman from California, including one that addresses longstanding privacy concerns of survivors of domestic and sexual abuse who want to register to vote but do not want their personal information to be publicly accessible; and a second that requires all in-person voting locations to have a sufficient number of accessible voting machines for their voters.

There is an amendment from the gentleman from California that clarifies prohibitions on polling places or ballot drop boxes that falsely purport to be an official location established for an election.

I would note that, in California, the Republican Party in southern California established drop boxes that purported to be from the registrar of voters. That was deceptive. An agreement was reached with the secretary of state that they could have the boxes, but they couldn't hold themselves out to be the registrar of voters.

H.R. 1 calls for all States to provide same-day voter registration. The gentlewoman from Michigan's amendment makes an important addition that will help ensure the successful carrying out of this requirement: States must ensure that they have adequate copies of registration forms and other relevant voter registration at polling places.

There is an amendment from the gentleman from New York that requires the GAO to conduct a study on voter turnout rates, broken down by age in States and localities that permit voters to participate in elections before the age of 18. This is an issue that merits examination, and this amendment will ensure that Congress is fully equipped to debate the issue.

There is an amendment from the gentlewoman from Illinois that would require the GAO to review small-donor campaign financing to study the extent to which the program increases opportunities for candidates of diverse racial, gender, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

There is an amendment from the gentlewoman from Georgia that would require the Director of the CFPB to work with the EAC to develop a statement providing certain individuals with information regarding voter registration and their voting rights. This commonsense reform ensures that tenants and homeowners will have easy access to voter registration and other voter-related information.

Finally, there is an amendment from the gentlewoman from California that would ensure that the bill's prohibitions against election disinformation cover false claims that voters will face civil and other legal penalties for voting.

I support these amendments, and I urge their adoption.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the en bloc. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), a good friend and a problem solver.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on an issue that is so important to so many of the people from my district, and that is election integrity.

I am confident in the integrity of our democracy, but the fact remains that over 59 percent of Americans do not have confidence in the integrity of our election process.

Time and time again, I have worked across the aisle with my Democratic colleagues to try to come together on commonsense reforms to address the issue of election integrity, and the issue that I am passionate about today is the question of voter ID.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) and I had an amendment that we asked to be considered and debated on this floor to say that funds under this bill would not go to States that did not have a voter ID law in place. A simple reform to make sure that we have voter ID cards issued across America is a simple, commonsense integrity measure for our election systems to make sure that our votes count and the people casting the votes are those individuals who are registered to make that vote.

We have IDs in America for simple things like buying alcohol, renting a car, and going into your grocery stores to get food stamps. We issue government IDs for EBT cards. There are simple ways to make sure that people have access to identification so that they could perform one of the most fundamental civic duties and fundamental rights that we have, and that is to vote.

To ask an individual to have an ID is a simple measure, and my Democratic colleagues did not allow us to have that debate and have an open, honest conversation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on these amendments and continue to work with us to ensure that the election integrity of our country is safe and secure.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

My amendment would require the Comptroller General to analyze the impact of the voluntary small-donor financing program on the racial, gender, and socioeconomic diversity of candidates for public office.

As the first woman and first person of color to represent Illinois' 14th Congressional District, I know that Americans with diverse backgrounds and experiences are electable everywhere in this country, but too often, excellent candidates without personal wealth or corporate backing are outspent and overpowered long before the voters get a say.

The Brennan Center found that small-donor financing cannot only make running for public office an opportunity for more Americans, but also increase the racial and gender diversity of our elected officials by giving every candidate a fighting chance.

My amendment would make sure H.R. 1 fulfills its promise of letting the people decide who represents them. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), who can take you on a tour of the best Philly cheesesteak places in the world.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, prior to my coming to Congress, I dedicated my entire life as an FBI agent to fighting corruption and fighting for electoral reform, having overseen that program for the entire Nation. H.R. 1 sets us back.

H.R. 1 should not be called For the People. It should be called for the politicians. We know what we need to do to fix this system, Mr. Speaker.

Several of my colleagues and I have introduced legislation that would actually restore faith in this institution and in the electoral process: term limits, no budget-no pay, a balanced budget amendment, single-issue legislation, abolishing congressional pensions, ending ballot harvesting, providing free photo IDs to every registered voter, ensuring signature matching, and, with the exception of military ballots, requiring that all ballots be received by 8 p.m. on election night.

Mr. Speaker, this is common sense. What this body is doing today is the opposite. My colleagues are further eroding trust in this system, and that is a real shame because we have the opportunity to fix this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to know why House leadership refuses to put these issues on the floor that would unequivocally pass with overwhelming margins in the House and the Senate. If it is going to pass overwhelmingly here, that means the American people want it. Let's put those on the floor.

□ 1115

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership and for adding to this legislation—my legislation—the For the People Act, adding the Coretta Scott King Mid-Decade Redistricting Prohibition Act that I wrote as long ago as 2006.

Madam Speaker, section 2402 prohibits a State that has been redistricted in accordance with this legislation from doing it in the mid-decennial, waiting till the next time, the decennial apportionment; so no mid-decade kind of redistricting that has been so unhelpful to all of us.

Madam Speaker, I rise, as well, to support the Swalwell amendments regarding the college student voting, as well as prohibiting false voting polling places and adding colleges and universities' responsibility to give civic information to our students.

I also support the privacy information required by the Speier amendment to ensure that there is no domestic violence and dating violence because your voting information gets out.

And I also support the Waters amendment that prohibits misinformation, which threatens potential voters with civil or legal penalties if they exercise their right to vote. I can assure you, this happens in the minority community.

And I do support the 16-years-of-age amendment, because if you can be on the front lines of civil rights and protest for justice and democracy, you have the right to vote.

Madam Speaker, let's educate our young people so they can vote. I am very happy to support the en bloc.

Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the ''For the People Act of 2021,'' which expands access to the ballot box, reduces the influence of big money in politics, and strengthens ethics rules for public servants.

Specifically, the For the People Act will:

Make it easier, not harder, to vote by implementing automatic voter registration, requiring early voting and vote by mail, committing Congress to reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act and ensuring the integrity of our elections by modernizing and strengthening our voting systems and ending partisan redistricting.

Reform the campaign finance system by requiring all political organizations to disclose large donors, updating political advertisement laws for the digital age, establishing a public matching system for citizen-owned elections, and revamping the Federal Election Commission to ensure there's a cop on the campaign finance beat.

Strengthen ethics laws to ensure that public officials work in the public interest by extending conflict of interest laws to the President and Vice President; requiring the release of their tax returns; closing loopholes that allow former members of Congress to avoid cooling-off periods for lobbying; closing the revolving door between industry and the federal government; and establishing a code of conduct for the Supreme Court.

H.R. 1 expands access to the ballot box by taking aim at institutional barriers to voting.

This bill ensures that individuals who have completed felony sentences have their full rights restored and expands early voting and simplify absentee voting; and modernize the U.S. voting system.

I am particularly proud and appreciative to Chairwoman LOFGREN and Congressman SARBANES that the For The People Act incorporates in Section 2402 of the legislation the Coretta Scott King Mid-Decade Redistricting Prohibition Act that I first offered in 2006 during the Judiciary Committee markup of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 reauthorization and as standalone legislation in the 114th Congress.

This provision, section 2402, prohibits a State that has been redistricted in accordance with this legislation from engaging in redistricting again until after the next decennial apportionment unless required by a court to do so to comply with the Constitution of the United States, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Constitution of the State, or the terms or conditions of this subtitle.

Madam Speaker, this legislation is particularly timely because more than 55 years after the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, we are still discussing voter suppression—something which should be a bygone relic of the past, but yet continues to disenfranchise racial minorities, immigrants, women, and young people.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was a watershed moment for the Civil Rights Movement—it liberated communities of color from legal restrictions barring them from exercising the fundamental right to civic engagement and political representation.

But uncaged by Supreme Court's infamous 2013 decision in *Shelby County* v. *Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), which neutered the preclearance provision of the Voting Rights Act, 14 states, including my state of Texas, took extreme measures to enforce new voting restrictions before the 2016 presidential election.

If is not a coincidence that many of these same states have experienced increasing numbers of black and Hispanic voters in recent elections.

If not for invidious, state-sponsored voter suppression policies like discriminatory voter ID laws, reduced early voting periods, and voter intimidation tactics that directly or indirectly target racial minorities, the 2016 presidential election might have had a drastically different outcome.

Madam Speaker, let me list some of the salutary features of the legislation that will make it easier for Americans to exercise their right to vote, the most precious right of all because as President Johnson said in securing passage of the Voting Rights Act, the right to vote ''is preservative of all other rights.''

H.R. 1 modernizes the voter registration system by requiring each state to make available online voter registration, correction, cancellation, and designation of party affiliation.

In addition, H.R. 1:

Requires states to permit voters to register on the day of a federal election, including during early voting.

Limits the authority of states to remove registrants from the official list of eligible voters in elections for federal office in the state based on interstate voter registration crosschecks .

Requires states to provide annual reports on voter registration statistics to the Election Assistance Commission.

Provides HAVA funds to implement the voter registration modernization reforms .

Makes it unlawful to hinder, interfere or prevent an individual from registering to vote.

Instructs the Election Assistance Commission to develop best practices for states to deter and prevent such violations.

H.R. 1 explicitly prohibits 'voter caging', the pernicious practice of using returned nonforwardable mail as the basis for removing registered voters from the rolls, and it prohibits challenges to eligibility from individuals who are not election officials without an oath of good faith factual basis.

Importantly, the legislation prohibits providing false information about elections to hinder or discourage voting and increases penalties for voter intimidation.

I support the declaration in the legislation of the right of citizens to vote in federal elections will not be denied because of a criminal conviction unless a citizen is serving a felony sentence in a correctional facility and it requires states and the federal government to notify individuals convicted of a state or federal felony, respectively, of their reenfranchisement

H.R. 1 promotes election accuracy, integrity, and security by requiring states to use individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots and that said ballots be counted by hand or an optical character recognition device and that a voter be given the opportunity to correct his or her ballot should a mistake be made; and it also requires that provisional ballots from eligible voters at incorrect polling places be counted.

The legitimacy and stability of democratic governance is always enhanced by increased voter participation in elections, so I am very pleased that H.R. 1 outlaws many practices resorted to by voting opponents to reduce election participation.

In particular, H.R. 1 requires at least 15 consecutive days of early voting for federal elections and that early voting locations be near public transportation, in rural areas, and open for at least 10 hours per day.

Additionally, the legislation prohibits a state from imposing restrictions on an individual's ability to vote by mail and requires a state to carry out a program to track and confirm the receipt of absentee ballots and to make this information available to the voter who cast the ballot.

Also, the bill requires the prepayment of postage on return envelopes for voting materials, which includes any voter registration form, any application for an absentee ballot, and any blank absentee ballot transmitted by mail.

Madam Speaker, another important feature of H.R. 1 is that it promotes voter access by mandating several improvements to election administration, including:

Treating universities as voter registration agencies;

Requiring states to notify an individual, not later than 7 seven days before election, if the individual's polling place has changed;

Requiring states to allow voters to sign sworn affidavits to vote in lieu of presenting photo ID;

Providing accommodations for voters residing in Indian lands;

Ensuring equitable and efficient operation of polling places, reducing long lines and wait times for voters;

Requiring states to provide secured drop boxes for voted absentee ballots in elections for federal office;

Prohibiting states from restricting curbside voting;

Imposing requirements for federal election contingency plans in response to natural disasters and emergencies; and

Clarifying that failure to vote is not grounds for removing registered voters from the rolls.

Of course, nothing in this legislation prohibits or restricts the authority of states to provide greater opportunities for voting, and the bill makes that explicitly clear.

This litany of good measures demonstrates all the many ways and means through which H.R. 1 expands voter participation and election integrity, and our experience of the previous four years counsels the urgency of adopting them.

I am much less confident of the ability of one component of the bill—the title mandating creation of ''Independent Redistricting Commissions''—to strengthen our democracy; in fact I believe that title of the legislation should be stricken because of its potential to negatively effective marginalized communities and minority groups.

I am not contending that independent redistricting commissions are an unconstitutional usurpation of authority belonging exclusively to state legislatures; that argument was presented and rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Arizona State Legislature* v. *Arizona*. Independent Redistricting Commission, 576 U.S. 787 (2015).

Instead, the nation's experience with independent redistricting commissions is still in its early stages, and I believe that instead of mandating a one-size fits all approach, Congress should allow further experimentation to occur in the states, the ''laboratories of democracy,'' as they were described by Justice Brandeis in *New State Ice Co.* v. *Liebmann*, 285 U.S. 262 (1932).

In addition, it appears to me that the selection process laid out in the bill for choosing members of the independent redistricting commissions is too random and will not result in a commission comprised of members reflective of the communities directly affected by the work of the commission, particularly members of racial and language minorities.

Madam Speaker, the issue of redistricting and how to do it fairly is a never-ending one, and, as most political scientists agree, it is virtually impossible to draw most congressional and legislative districts in ways that are competitive; redistricting exacerbates geographical polarization, but it does not create it.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1 must be passed because many of the civil rights that I fought for as a student and young lawyer have been undermined or been rolled back by reactionary forces in recent years.

To add insult to injury, the immediately preceding Administration issued an Executive Order establishing a so-called ''Election Integrity'' Commission to investigate not voter suppression, but so-called ''voter fraud'' in the 2016 election.

The 45th President and his followers were unceasing in their efforts to perpetuate the myth of voter fraud, but it remains just that: a myth.

Between 2000 and 2014, there were 35 credible allegations of voter fraud out of more than 834 million ballots cast—that is less than 1 in 28 million votes.

An extensive study by social scientists at Dartmouth College uncovered no evidence to support Trump's hysterical and outrageous allegations of widespread voter fraud ''rigging'' the 2016 election.

Just for the record, Madam Speaker, the popular vote of the 2016 presidential election was:

Hillary Clinton: 65,853,5160.

Donald Trump: 62,884,8240.

Trump's deficit of 2.9 million was the largest of any Electoral College winner in history by a massive margin, and despite the allegations of the current Administration, there have been only 4 documented cases of voter fraud in the 2016 election.

The same is true for the 2020 presidential election, which again Donald Trump claimed was fraudulent after losing the popular vote to President Biden by more than 7 million votes, and the Electoral College by 306–232, the exact margin that he claimed constituted a landslide and epic blowout when he won the Electoral College vote in 2016.

Again, and just for the record, Madam Speaker, the popular vote of the 2020 presidential election was:

Joe Biden: 81,281,502.

Donald Trump: 74,222,593.

The Trump Campaign brought more than 63 legal challenges to the 2020 election, claiming the outcomes were tainted by wide-spread and massive fraud but every court, whether state or federal, and nearly 90 judges, including Trump appointees, summarily rejected these baseless claims for failure of proof.

Of course, this did not deter the reckless 45th President who then went on to threaten and coerce state election officials to corruptly change vote counts and after that ploy failed, incited his loyalists to storm the U.S. Capitol and use force and violence if necessary to prevent the Congress from conducting the constitutionally required Joint Meeting to count the electoral votes cast and announce the winner of the presidential election.

Madam Speaker, the Trump Voter Fraud Commission, like many of Trump's business schemes, was a massive scam built on countless lies that did not hold up to any level of scrutiny.

As Members of Congress, we should be devoting our time, energy, and resources addressing Russian infiltration of our election infrastructure and campaigns, along with other pressing issues.

Instead of enjoying and strengthening the protections guaranteed in the Voting Rights Act—people of color, women, LGBTQ individuals, and immigrants—have been given the joyless, exhausting task of fending off the constant barrage of attacks leveled at our communities by Trump and other conspiracy theorists.

Not only are we tasked with reversing the current dismal state of voter suppression against minorities; we are forced to refute the blatant, propagandist lie of voter fraud.

To this end, I have been persistent in my efforts to protect the rights of disenfranchised communities in my district of inner-city Houston and across the nation.

Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have cosponsored dozens of bills, amendments, and resolutions seeking to improve voters' rights at all stages and levels of the election process.

This includes legislation aimed at:

Increasing voter outreach and turnout;

Ensuring both early and same-day registration;

Standardizing physical and language accessibility at polling places;

Expanding early voting periods;

Decreasing voter wait times;

Guaranteeing absentee ballots, especially for displaced citizens;

Modernizing voting technologies and strengthening our voter record systems;

Establishing the federal Election Day as a national holiday; and

Condemning and criminalizing deceptive practices, voter intimidation, and other suppression tactics.

Along with many of my CBC colleagues, I was an original cosponsor of H.R. 9, the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act, which became public law on July 27, 2006.

I also authored H.R. 745 in the 110th Congress, which added the legendary Barbara Jordan to the list of civil rights trailblazers whose memories are honored in the naming of the Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act.

This bill strengthened the original Voting Rights Act by replacing federal voting examiners with federal voting observers—a significant enhancement that made it easier to safeguard against racially biased voter suppression tactics.

As noted earlier, in the 114th Congress, I introduced H.R. 75, the Coretta Scott King Mid-Decade Redistricting Prohibition Act of 2015, which prohibits states whose congressional districts have been redistricted after a decennial census from redrawing their district lines until the next census.

Prejudiced redistricting, or gerrymandering as it is more commonly known, has been used for decades to weaken the voting power of African Americans, Latino Americans, and other minorities since the Civil Rights Era.

Immediately after the Shelby County v. Holder ruling, which lifted preclearance requirements for states with histories of discrimination seeking to change their voting laws or practices, redistricting became a favorite tool for Republicans who connived to unfairly gain 3 congressional seats in Texas.

In the 110th Congress, I was the original sponsor of H.R. 6778, the Ex Offenders Voting Rights Act of 2008, which prohibited denial of the right to vote in a federal election on the basts of an individual's status as a formerly incarcerated person.

The Ex-Offenders Voting Rights Act sought to reverse discriminatory voter restrictions that disproportionately affect the African American voting population, which continues to be targeted by mass incarceration, police profiling, and a biased criminal justice system.

Those of us who cherish the right to vote justifiably are skeptical of Voter ID laws because we understand how these laws, like poll taxes and literacy tests, can be used to impede or negate the ability of seniors, racial and language minorities, and young people to cast their votes.

Voter ID laws are just one of the means that can be used to abridge or suppress the right to vote but there are others, including:

Curtailing or Eliminating Early Voting;

Ending Same-Day Registration;

Not counting povisional ballots cast in the wrong precinct on Election Day;

Eliminating Teenage Pre-Registration;

Shortened Poll Hours;

Lessening the standards governing voter challenges used by vigilantes, like the King Street Patriots in my city of Houston, to cause trouble at the polls;

''Voter Caging,'' to suppress the turnout of minority voters by sending non-forwardable mail to targeted populations and, once the mail is returned, using the returned mail to compile lists of voters whose eligibility is then challenged on the basis of residence under state law; and

Employing targeted redistricting techniques to dilute minority voting strength, notably ''Cracking'' (i.e., fragmenting and dispersing concentrations of minority populations); ''Stacking'' (combining concentrations of minority voters with greater concentrations of white populations); and ''Packing'' (i.e., overconcentrating minority voters in as few districts as possible).

Madam Speaker, we must not allow our democracy to slide back into the worst elements of this country's past, to stand idly by as our treasured values of democracy, progress, and equality are poisoned and dismantled.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 1, the ''For The People Act of 2021.''

Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the rule governing debate of H.R. 1, the ''For the People Act of 2021,'' which expands access to the ballot box, reduces the influence of big money in politics, and strengthens ethics rules for public servants.

H.R. 1 is intended to increase public confidence in our democracy by reducing the role of money in politics, restoring ethical standards and integrity to government, and strengthening laws to protect voting.

I am particularly proud and appreciative to Chairwoman LOFGREN and Congressman SARBANES that the For The People Act incorporates in Section 2402 of the legislation the Coretta Scott King Mid-Decade Redistricting Prohibition Act that I first offered in 2006 during the Judiciary Committee markup of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 reauthorization and as standalone legislation in the 114th Congress.

This provision, section 2402, prohibits a State that has been redistricted in accordance with this legislation from engaging in redistricting again until after the next decennial apportionment unless required by a court to do so to comply with the Constitution of the United States, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Constitution of the State, or the terms or conditions of this subtitle.

Madam Speaker, this legislation is particularly timely because more than 55 years after the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, we are still discussing voter suppression—something which should be a bygone relic of the past, but yet continues to disenfranchise racial minorities, immigrants, women, and young people.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was a watershed moment for the Civil Rights Movement—it liberated communities of color from legal restrictions barring them from exercising the fundamental right to civic engagement and political representation.

But uncaged by Supreme Court's infamous 2013 decision in *Shelby County* v. *Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), which neutered the preclearance provision of the Voting Rights Act, 14 states, including my state of Texas, took extreme measures to enforce new voting restrictions before the 2016 presidential election.

It is not a coincidence that many of these same states have experienced increasing numbers of black and Hispanic voters in recent elections.

If not for invidious, state-sponsored voter suppression policies like discriminatory voter ID laws, reduced early voting periods, and voter intimidation tactics that directly or indirectly target racial minorities, the 2016 presidential election might have had a drastically different outcome.

H.R. 1 expands access to the ballot box by taking aim at institutional barriers to voting.

Let me list some of the salutary features of the legislation that will make it easier for Americans to exercise their right to vote, the most precious right of all because as President Johnson said in securing passage of the Voting Rights Act, the right to vote ''is preservative of all other rights.''

H.R. 1 modernizes the voter registration system by requiring each state to make available online voter registration, correction, cancellation, and designation of party affiliation.

In addition, H.R. 1:

Requires states to permit voters to register on the day of a federal election, including during early voting.

Limits the authority of states to remove registrants from the official list of eligible voters in elections for federal office in the state based on interstate voter registration crosschecks.

Requires states to provide annual reports on voter registration statistics to the Election Assistance Commission.

Provides HAVA funds to implement the voter registration modernization reforms.

Makes it unlawful to hinder, interfere or prevent an individual from registering to vote.

Instructs the Election Assistance Commission to develop best practices for states to deter and prevent such violations.

H.R. 1 explicitly prohibits 'voter caging', the pernicious practice of using returned non-forwardable mail as the basis for removing registered voters from the rolls and it prohibits challenges to eligibility from individuals who are not election officials without an oath of good faith factual basis.

Importantly, the legislation prohibits providing false information about elections to hinder or discourage voting and increases penalties for voter intimidation.

I support the declaration in the legislation of the right of citizens to vote in federal elections will not be denied because of a criminal conviction unless a citizen is serving a felony sentence in a correctional facility and it requires states and the federal government to notify individuals convicted of a state or federal felony, respectively, of their reenfranchisement.

H.R. 1 promotes election accuracy, integrity, and security by requiring states to use individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots and that said ballots be counted by hand or an optical character recognition device and that a voter be given the opportunity to correct his or her ballot should a mistake be made; and it also requires that provisional ballots from eligible voters at incorrect polling places be counted.

The legitimacy and stability of democratic governance is always enhanced by increased voter participation in elections, so I am very

pleased that H.R. 1 outlaws many practices resorted to by voting opponents to reduce election participation.

In particular, H.R. 1 requires at least 15 consecutive days of early voting for federal elections and that early voting locations be near public transportation, in rural areas and open for at least 10 hours per day.

Additionally, the legislation prohibits a state from imposing restrictions on an individual's ability to vote by mail and requires a state to carry out a program to track and confirm the receipt of absentee ballots and to make this information available to the voter who cast the ballot.

Also, the bill requires the prepayment of postage on return envelopes for voting materials, which includes any voter registration form, any application for an absentee ballot, and any blank absentee ballot transmitted by mail.

Madam Speaker, another important feature of H.R. 1 is that it promotes voter access by mandating several improvements to election administration, including:

Treating universities as voter registration agencies;

Requiring states to notify an individual, not later than 7 seven days before election, if the individual's polling place has changed;

Requiring states to allow voters to sign sworn affidavits to vote in lieu of presenting photo ID;

Providing accommodations for voters residing in Indian lands;

Ensuring equitable and efficient operation of polling places, reducing long lines and wait times for voters;

Requiring states to provide secured drop boxes for voted absentee ballots in elections for federal office;

Prohibiting states from restricting curbside voting;

Imposing requirements for federal election contingency plans in response to natural disasters and emergencies; and

Clarifying that failure to vote is not grounds for removing registered voters from the rolls.

Of course, nothing in this legislation prohibits or restricts the authority of states to provide greater opportunities for voting, and the bill makes that explicitly clear.

This litany of good measures demonstrates all the many ways and means through which H.R. 1 expands voter participation and election integrity and our experience of the previous four years counsels the urgency of adopting them.

I am much less confident of the ability of one component of the bill—the title mandating creation of ''Independent Redistricting Commissions''—to strengthen our democracy; in fact I believe that title of the legislation should be stricken because of its potential to negatively effective marginalized communities and minority groups.

I am not contending that independent redistricting commissions are an unconstitutional usurpation of authority belonging exclusively to state legislatures; that argument was presented and rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Arizona State Legislature* v. *Arizona*. Independent Redistricting Commission, 576 U.S. 787 (2015).

Instead, the nation's experience with independent redistricting commissions is still in its early stages and I believe that instead of mandating a one-size fits all approach, Congress should allow further experimentation to occur in the states, the ''laboratories of democracy,'' as they were described by Justice Brandeis in *New State Ice Co.* v. *Liebmann*, 285 U.S. 262 (1932).

In addition, it appears to me that the selection process laid out in the bill for choosing members of the independent redistricting commissions is too random and will not result in a commission comprised of members reflective of the communities directly affected by the work of the commission, particularly members of racial and language minorities.

Madam Speaker, the issue of redistricting and how to do it fairly is a never-ending one and, as most political scientists agree, it is virtually impossible to draw most congressional and legislative districts in ways that are competitive; redistricting exacerbates geographical polarization, but it does not create it.

For this reason, unlike the other titles of H.R. 1, I withhold my support for Title II, Subtitle E, Part 2.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Naples, Florida, (Mr. DONALDS), my good friend, who represents many of my former constituents from Illinois who have left Illinois because of overtaxation.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, the For the People Act. This is really just a takeover of elections by Washington, D.C.

Madam Speaker, I got a chance to go through some of this bill—790 pages. Most of these things would basically eviscerate Florida's election law.

You see, I served in Florida's legislature. We had the responsibility for adjusting legislation law from time to time. Our State was a State that went through hanging chads in 2000, and we have made the adjustment systematically in the State legislature to make sure that Florida has the very best election laws in these United States.

You see, on election night, November 3, we were done counting around 9:30. We knew the results by 10 o'clock. We have absentee ballots, we have voter ID, we have early voting, and we have a robust count system on election day.

The people of Florida have never been disenfranchised when it comes to elections. The people of Florida have come accustomed to having a voter system that works. And what this body is trying to do with H.R. 1 is completely destroy Florida's election laws. That is, to me, ridiculous. This Capitol should never allow that. If we are going to do anything, we should replicate what Florida has actually done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. UNDERWOOD). The gentleman needs to put his mask up.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Speaker, I am sorry. It keeps falling down.

Madam Speaker, I was trying to make a point—

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Speaker, the point is clear: 33 States have voter ID laws. Many States have already taken care of these problems themselves. State legislatures should be changing their laws. This Capitol should not. And the people of the State of Florida definitely do not want the things that are in this bill. Our system is the best. Frankly, leave Florida alone.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, before I reserve, can I make a parliamentary inquiry?

When a mask falls down unintentionally from a speaker, what is the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members must properly wear their masks at all times.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Is this being enforced equally on the majority and minority?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not answer a hypothetical question, but the Speaker's announced policy applies to all Members.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. So I should ask the second-rate parliamentarian off the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 4½ minutes. The gentleman from Illinois has 6 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 1 to crack down on foreign-backed disinformation and propaganda on social media. This amendment is the text of the Bipartisan Foreign Agent Disclaimer Enhancement—FADE—Act.

Under the FADE Act, political ads, issue campaigns, and content funded or directed by a foreign principal and intended to influence the American people must be disclosed to the Department of Justice. But too often, this rule does not extend to the world of social media.

Additionally, foreign agents acting from abroad too often evade current disclaimer requirements. Amid the pandemic and following the 2020 general election, foreign governments continue to exploit existing vulnerabilities in our national security, including influencing Americans directly and infiltrating public discourse without their knowledge. Foreign adversaries, such as Russia, China, and Iran, are among the most active, and they are increasingly assertive in their efforts.

Madam Speaker, this amendment will help protect against foreign influence that seeks to sow political division and promote dangerous information contrary to the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

My amendment would require disclaimers—clearly stating this content is coming from a foreign principal.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW), my good friend and best-dressed member of our conference.

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I am not so sure about that, but I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1.

We were warned for years about the rise of socialism. Well, here it is, served on a platter, using your money to pay for politicians campaigns.

Do you like those robocalls during campaign season?

How about the negative TV ads and the mailers?

Or how about all of the political stuff that just comes out?

Well, your tax dollars are paying for them. And, yes, this is taxpayer dollars, no matter how they tell you otherwise.

Madam Speaker, this bill puts Washington, D.C., in charge of our States' elections and how those elections are run. It would keep the status quo, like we saw this past November, with voter rolls that are not up to date and live ballots being mailed to voters who have died, moved, or even multiple ballots to the same voter.

Madam Speaker, elections do have consequences. And when leaders said the goal was to change America, they were telling the truth; and here we are.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. WILLIAMS), who serves in the seat of our late, beloved John Lewis.

Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is our duty to not only do the work of the people, but to ensure that people have a voice in our democracy.

H.R. 1 amplifies the voice of the people, empowers individuals to shape our democracy, and breaks down barriers to voting. It is historymaking by design, as a portion of H.R. 1 was written by my predecessor, Congressman John Lewis. We must honor his legacy and take this necessary step forward because Georgians and all people in this country deserve to retain their right to accessible elections.

Madam Speaker, I have added provisions to this bill that underscore not only the importance of voting, but making it easier for hardworking people to do so. And making it easier, not harder to vote, should always be our main concern.

Madam Speaker, this week, Georgia's legislators moved forward to further restrict Black and Brown communities from voting by enacting new ID laws for absentee ballot applications and limiting the use of ballot drop boxes—old tactics, but the same tricks. We cannot let self-serving politicians stack the deck through voter suppression and discrimination.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 1 so that we can make it easier for people to cast their ballots and have their voices be heard.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a summary of letters submitted yesterday by the Institute for Free Speech and others opposing H.R. 1.

INSTITUTE FOR FREE SPEECH,
March 3, 2021.

Re H.R. 1 Would Greatly Harm Free Speech.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Institute for Free Speech strongly opposes H.R. 1, the Orwellian For the People Act. More appropriately known as the For the Politicians Act, this radical bill would, in fact, greatly harm the ability of the people to freely speak, publish, organize into groups, and petition their elected representatives in pursuit of a better government.

In particular, H.R. 1 would impose onerous and unworkable standards on the ability of Americans and groups of Americans to discuss the policy issues of the day with elected officials and the public. Certain sections of the bill would violate the privacy of advocacy groups and their supporters, limit political speech on the internet, and compel speakers to recite lengthy government-mandated messages identifying some of their supporters by name in their communications.

Importantly, these restrictions would reach far beyond campaign speech to regulate discussion of legislative issues and public affairs. For advocacy groups, unions, and trade associations, several of the limits proposed in H.R. 1 would operate as a total ban on speech

If signed into law, all of these provisions would be interpreted and enforced by a newly partisan Federal Election Commission. Under H.R. 1, the Commission would be radically transformed from its historic and deliberately bipartisan structure to one under partisan control of the president. As nine former members of the Federal Election Commission with a combined 60 plus years of service warned in a recent letter to Congress, the likely impact would be to shrink public confidence in the impartial enforcement of campaign finance laws, weaponize these regulations for partisan gain, and silence much political speech through new rules on groups that speak about public affairs

H.R. 1 would also force Americans to pay for speech they oppose. This new financing system is a riverboat gamble on an untested—and costly—scheme that would have many unforeseen effects. Existing research has proven that similar schemes elsewhere have failed to achieve proponents' stated goals. Instead, the program will likely incentivize—and subsidize—candidates with hateful messages, create new avenues for corruption, increase polarization, give government greater control over campaigns, waste tax dollars, and fail markedly at improving the quality of governance or the diversity of those who are elected to higher office

At its core, H.R. 1 would greatly increase the already high legal and administrative compliance costs, liability risk, and costs to donor and associational privacy for civic groups that speak about policy issues. Organizations will be further deterred from speaking or will have to divert additional resources away from their advocacy activities to pay for compliance staff and lawyers. Some groups will not be able to afford these costs or will violate the law unwittingly. The effect will be less speech by Americans and organizations, allowing politicians to act with less accountability to public opinion and criticism.

Few bills are more antithetical to the text of and principles underlying the First Amendment than H.R. 1. The numerous, overlapping, and interrelated provisions in this legislation combine to impose and tighten severe government controls on speech about campaigns, judicial nominees, and policy issues in truly shocking ways. Any American lacking expertise in campaign finance law would have little to no hope of understanding this bill or the voluminous restrictions it proposes on political speech and association. The sad result will be a political discourse dominated by Washington, DC insiders. Far from being For the People, H.R. 1 is truly For the Politicians.

The best way to give the American people a voice and to safeguard democracy is to protect and enhance the right to free speech guaranteed by the First Amendment. While the Institute takes no position on the myriad provisions in H.R. 1 that deal with election administration, voting rights, and redistricting, the portions of H.R. 1 that trample on free speech are sufficient to warrant our firm opposition to this measure. For the above reasons, the Institute for Free Speech strongly opposes passage of H.R. 1.

Sincerely,

DAVID KEATING,
President.

ILLINOIS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Springfield, IL, February 19, 2021.

To: Illinois Federal Delegation

Fr: Illinois Representative Joe Sosnowski, 69th District, Illinois House of Representatives

TO THE ILLINOIS FEDERAL DELEGATION: As a state legislator elected to be a voice for the people of Illinois, I write to express my opposition to H.R. 1/S. 1, an unconstitutional takeover of citizens' right to free speech and association.

As elected officials, we both have a duty to represent our constituents best interests and a responsibility to defend the United States Constitution. Therefore, it is my obligation to urge you to oppose the deceptively named For the People Act. The legislation is ill-considered and deeply unconstitutional, and I have seen firsthand the chilling effects of the donor disclosure provisions that it would enact.

As a member of the American Legislative Exchange Council, a membership organization of state legislators dedicated to principles of limited government, free markets and federalism. In 2013, activists launched a campaign to reveal, then harass and shame, the ALEC donor base. Their goal was simple: Harassing ALEC donors and corporate members would chill their participation with and support for the organization, ultimately cutting off a funding source for ALEC.

Worse, public elected officials used their platform to heighten this threat of donor disclosure in order to further intimidate ALEC supporters. In 2013, every company tangentially associated with ALEC received an official letter from US Senator Richard Durbin, demanding to know whether it had served as a member of ALEC or provided any funding to ALEC, with the intent of intimidating them. Durbin wrote that he would read their responses into the official Congressional record, forever memorializing their support and creating a public target list for activists opposed to the organization. Even the Chicago Tribune, the Senator's hometown newspaper that had endorsed his candidacy, rebuked Durbin's attempt at creating an enemies list by using his high federal office as a cudgel against his enemies.

H.R. 1/S. 1 would institutionalize this harassment and intimidation and extend it to all nonprofits, regardless of their issue area or political persuasion. Whatever issues you

support or oppose, this should be of serious concern to you. If this legislation is enacted, passionate activists on both sides of the aisle would have access to a government-run database of donors who give to every organization from ALEC and the Family Research Council to the ACLU and Planned Parenthood. Does anyone doubt that the blunt instrument of donor disclosure in H.R. 1/S. 1 would put millions of Americans' peace and livelihoods at risk of significant, material harm?

These tactics are flimsy bureaucratic structures designed to harass nonprofits and chill speech, despite fundamental violations of the First Amendment. In keeping with today's cancel culture, H.R. 1/S. 1 is a government-sanctioned attempt to chill speech and participation. Good governance watchdogs argue this measure increases transparency. Transparency is good when applied to government, but when it strips away Constitutionally protected privacy for individuals, it is exceedingly dangerous. For the federal government to expose our constituents as supporters of any nonprofit's cause would be an enormous overreach of centralized power.

If passed, the donor disclosure provisions in H.R. 1/S. 1 would bludgeon our democratic institutions and threaten the safety and peace of our everyday constituents. It would further normalize the darkness of cancel culture and intimidation through overregulation in American society. Therefore, we call on you to oppose H.R. 1/S. 1.

Sincerely,

Representative JOE SOSNOWSKI,
69th District, Illinois House of Representatives, Illinois ALEC State Chair.

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

Madam Speaker, over the last couple of days, I have spoken a lot about my opposition to this bill's creation of a public fund filled with dollars from corporate fines to directly fund the campaign coffers of every Member of this institution and candidates.

And my Democrat colleagues have continued to say this isn't public funding or corporate donations because it is corporate fines.

So what is the truth?

I think my chart here tells the story. So we have corporate fines. That is corporate dollars, something that we, as Members of Congress in our campaigns, cannot accept right now. Those corporate dollars that pay these corporate fines that we set the levels of in this institution, they then go to the U.S. Government in this new—that H.R. 1 creates—the Freedom From Influence Fund.

It is really a laundering machine. So they launder that corporate money that we cannot accept right now into the Treasury and it comes out clean as public money. It is money that used to be used for things like the Crime Victims Fund. Instead, this new laundered money, this taxpayer money—because it is public, it is under the control of us—then goes out exponentially to all of us, to our campaigns to pay for attack ads, fundraisers, mailers, phone calls, whatever you want.

But either way, it is government spending—government sending corporate dollars directly to us. This is, and should be, prohibited, but H.R. 1 changes that and it puts more money into politics and not less.

How about the Crime Victims Fund or victims of domestic violence get these dollars?

Let's make sure that we address programs that deal with sexual assault, child abuse, and other crimes. This money will not go into the Crime Victims Fund because it is going to all of us. All 50 State attorneys general have told us that this vital Crime Victims Fund is nearly depleted. But instead of plussing it up, here we are today, funding our own campaigns with a ''yes'' vote.

Madam Speaker, this bill isn't for the people. It is for the politicians. This is why I am offering a motion to recommit so that we can put forward a bill that works for the American people.

Madam Speaker, if we adopt this motion to recommit, we will instruct the Committee on House Administration to consider an amendment to remove all public financing from this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of the amendment immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, it is one reason I am opposed to H.R. 1, and giving Democrats another chance to join me, stopping this charade, stopping enriching themselves in their own campaign. This is one last chance before you do it again.

Madam Speaker, another reason I oppose H.R. 1 is because the election mandates on States in this bill go against what our Founding Fathers intended and essentially nationalizes our election system.

If signed into law, H.R. 1 would be the greatest expansion of the Federal Government's role in our elections than we have ever seen. By moving these decisions to D.C., we are further removing people from the laws that govern their elections. People should have more say in how their elections are run, not less. Our goal is to always ensure all eligible voters are able to vote and all lawful votes are counted. That is not what H.R. 1 does. And the only witness who has run an election before said during the single House Administration hearing held on this bill that H.R. 1 will undermine many of the election laws States have put into place to make it easier for people to vote and improve their election process for their voters.

One-size-fits-all mandates from Washington will not fix the problems we have seen in elections across the country. They will just cause more chaos and confusion. These issues need to be solved at the local and State level. Instead of dictating to States, we should be working with them and localities to address these issues. And I stand ready and willing to work with my Democrat colleagues to do just that, but I will not vote for a Federal takeover of elections and I will not vote to use the Federal Government to put more money into my campaign. It is bad policy and it is bad for the American people.

Madam Speaker, I urge support for the motion to recommit at the appropriate time, and I urge a ''no'' vote on the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1130

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close if the gentleman is ready to yield back or use the rest of his time.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I would like to request a meeting with the Parliamentarian. I personally witnessed one of my Democratic colleagues immediately remove his mask and was never told to put it back on from the Chair at the time. So all we ask for is consistency.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill. I urge support for the motion to recommit. I urge my Democratic colleagues: Don't vote to put money into your own campaigns.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the secretary of state of Colorado, with a number of other secretary of states, urging support for this bill; and a letter from former leaders of the American Civil Liberties Union and concerned first amendment scholars urging support.

JENA GRISWOLD,
COLORADO SECRETARY OF STATE,
March 2, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER SCHUMER, SPEAKER PELOSI, LEADER MCCONNELL, AND LEADER MCCARTHY: It's no accident that the 2020 elections were the most secure in American history. A monumental effort by election administrators—from board of elections officials, to county clerks, to poll workers—ensured our country's democratic process was stronger than ever, even with the unique challenge posed by the COVID–19 pandemic.

While the 2020 elections proved that our democracy is resilient, the elections also showed us that they cannot be taken for granted. Our elections were safe, secure, and successful because countless patriotic Americans took action to protect them. The policies that gave voters better options to safely

register to vote and cast a ballot in the face of the pandemic were a resounding success and must now be made permanent.

Modernizing elections meant that eligible voters did not have to choose between casting a ballot and risking their health. It also resulted in record turnout for both parties. Policies like vote-by mail for all and early voting saw resounding success in states and municipalities across the country. Now, only Congress can ensure that every eligible voter across America has access to these voting options in the future. That's why we need to immediately enact the *For The People Act* (H.R. 1) into law.

The *For The People Act* offers a comprehensive path to securing and modernizing American democracy for generations to come. The bill provides clear guidance for all 50 states and the District of Columbia to implement election processes that work for administrators and voters alike, and its adoption into law is critical to the future of American elections. Proven policies such as automatic and same-day voter registration will remove administrative obstacles for eligible voters while maintaining up-to-date and accurate voter rolls. Voter-verified paper ballots will ensure every vote is accurately recorded and allow administrators to run key audits to verify election results. Other provisions, such as independent redistricting commissions to combat gerrymandering and shining light on dark money, will further strengthen the integrity of our elections.

As the chief elections officials in our respective states, and as the administrators who will be tasked with executing many of the policies proposed in H.R. 1, we can confidently state that this bill is designed to make our democracy stronger and safer than ever. We proudly and firmly support the *For The People Act*, and we strongly recommend its passage in the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate.

Sincerely,

Katie Hobbs, Arizona Secretary of State; Shirley Weber, California Secretary of State; Jena Griswold, Colorado Secretary of State; Denise Merrill, Connecticut Secretary of State; Kimberly Bassett, Secretary of the District of Columbia; Shenna Bellows, Maine Secretary of State; Jocelyn Benson, Michigan Secretary of State; Steve Simon, Minnesota Secretary of State; Maggie Toulouse Oliver, New Mexico Secretary of State; Shemia Fagan, Oregon Secretary of State; Nellie Gorbea, Rhode Island Secretary of State; Jim Condos, Vermont Secretary of State.

FORMER LEADERS OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION AND CONCERNED FIRST AMENDMENT SCHOLARS,

February 18, 2021.

Re H.R. 1, For the People Act.

Hon. ZOE LOFGREN,
Chair, House Administration Committee, Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN SARBANES,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chair, House Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIR LOFGREN, CHAIR NADLER, AND REP. SARBANES: The undersigned are former leaders of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and concerned academics who have devoted much of their careers to the defense of the First Amendment and the protection of American democracy. We write in support of speedy House enactment of H.R.1, the For the People Act.

American democracy is at a perilous crossroads. H.R.1 responds with sweeping reforms countering voter suppression and partisan gerrymandering that have targeted communities of color; overhauling our deeply inequitable campaign finance system; and reducing the influence of secret ''dark money'' in federal elections. We view H.R. 1 as the most significant prodemocracy legislation since the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Some have argued that despite the overwhelmingly positive content of H.R.1, enactment should be delayed in the House pending legislative hearings and efforts to amend certain provisions in the 700-page legislation, especially provisions requiring disclosure of the identities of large donors to tax-exempt organizations operating on the margins of electoral politics We agree that, ordinarily, best legislative practice would call for hearings designed to resolve First Amendment concerns over important legislation. But, given the importance of shoring up the democratic process, the limited window of opportunity for passage of H.R.1, the likely delay in Senate consideration, and the nature of the First Amendment objections to disclosure, we believe that immediate passage of H.R.1 in its present form is the preferable course of action.

Objectors to immediate passage of HR 1 appear to us to: (1) underestimate the risks to enacting HR 1 posed by substantial delay in House passage; (2) understate the importance of closing loopholes in our campaign finance disclosure laws; and (3) overstate the risks to First Amendment freedom posed by the bill's disclosure provisions. We live in a democratic culture saturated by great wealth. The Supreme Court has rendered it almost impossible to directly regulate the role of money in determining electoral outcomes. One of the few practical reform windows left open is public disclosure of the sources of money-driven influence over electoral politics. Such disclosure is important, not only to prevent corruption, but to allow ordinary citizens to evaluate the truth of electoral speech by knowing who is paying for it. We recognize the need to preserve anonymity for persons whose speech or association might be deterred by fear of disclosure. That is why the H.R.1 disclosure rules apply. only to large donations exceeding $10,000. Moreover, current First Amendment doctrine already provides an ''as applied'' exception to disclosure rules if a genuine fear of retaliatory action were to exist.

In short, we do not view First Amendment concerns over the precise scope of disclosure requirements affecting large donors to tax exempt organizations operating on the margins of electoral politics as outweighing the need for expeditious enactment of the clearly desirable aspects of H.R.1 into law.

We urge you to press for speedy enactment of H.R. 1 in its current form.

Respectfully submitted,

Aryeh Neier, President Emeritus of the Open Society Foundations, ACLU Executive Director, 1970–78; Burt Neuborne, Norman Dorsen Professor of Civil Liberties Emeritus at NYU School of Law, ACLU National Legal Director, 1981–86; Helen Hershkoff, Herbert Mand. Svetlana Wachtel/Professor of Constitutional Law and Civil Liberties at NYU School of Law, ACLU Associate Legal Director, 1987–95; John Shattuck, Senior Fellow at the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy, Harvard Kennedy School, Professor of Practice in Diplomacy, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, Director of the ACLU's Washington office, 1976–84; Judith Resnik, Arthur Liman Professor of Law at Yale Law School; Erwin Chemerinsky, Dean and Jesse Choper Distinguished Professor of Law at Berkley Law School, University of California; Robert Post, Sterling Professor of Law and former Dean of Yale Law School; Geoffrey Stone, Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law and former Dean of the University of Chicago Law School.

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

I appreciate that the ranking member has shown us this chart because he has proven that all of the Republican Members claiming that there was tax money funding the pilot project for the small matching donors were wrong.

This is a pilot project that is funded by an additional fine on corporate wrongdoing. It doesn't take money away from anything else. It is an additional fine that, if H.R. 1 doesn't pass, will not be imposed.

I was interested to hear our colleague from New Jersey say it is your money that will be used. Well, it is only your money if you are a corporate malfeasance individual, a corporate wrongdoer that gets fined; and I don't think very many of us have sympathy for that crew.

I would like to just give some perspective here because all over the United States, because of the pandemic, efforts were made to allow for people to vote and not have to endanger their health. So absentee voting became more of the norm. There were more early voting efforts, a lot of things of that nature, because of the pandemic.

And what happened?

There was a huge increase in turnout, both among Republicans and Democrats. It was a safe and secure election, the most safe and secure election in modern history. There wasn't a bunch of fraud.

Some of my colleagues said that people don't trust our system.

Why is that?

Because there are politicians in this country that are misleading the American public about that election. And I would say the former President is first among them, telling things that are not true and convincing people of that.

So now that we have had this huge turnout because of the pandemic, we are seeing States—Republicans, I must say, unfortunately, all over the United States trying to cut off access to the ballot.

In Georgia, they just passed a whole slew of voter restriction measures to try and tamp down turnout, and we see hundreds of bills being introduced to do that.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this en bloc and on the underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1 is postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 34 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1215

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TITUS) at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 37, printed in part B of House Report 117–9, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 125, nays 302, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—125

Adams
Auchincloss
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Carbajal
Carson
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cooper
Correa
Crist
Davis, Danny K.
DeFazio
DelBene
Delgado
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
García (IL)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kirkpatrick
Lamb
Langevin
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lowenthal
Malinowski
Maloney, Sean
McGovern
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Schakowsky
Schiff
Sewell
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stanton
Strickland
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Underwood
Vargas
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—302

Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Bourdeaux
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Cárdenas
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
Demings
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Franklin, C. Scott
Fudge
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kind
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lesko
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Nehls
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pappas
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pfluger
Porter
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Ross
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Torres (CA)
Trone
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—4

Doyle, Michael F.
Dunn
Foxx
Horsford

□ 1304

Messrs. THOMPSON of California and BUTTERFIELD changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. DINGELL, Messrs. GOLDEN and KIM of New Jersey changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries)
Buchanan (LaHood)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Gaetz (McHenry)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Huffman (McNerney)
Kelly (IL) (Kuster)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (McGovern)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neguse (Perlmutter)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Kuster)
Rodgers (WA) (Joyce (PA))
Roybal-Allard (Escobar)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Speier (Scanlon)
Vargas (Correa)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN OF CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments en bloc No. 4, printed in part B of House Report 117–9, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.