

the last August when Donald Trump was President.

Dangerously, there are 66 trained murderers from the terrorist watch list that have crossed. Separately, half a million illegal aliens have invaded in the last year, admitted the Department of Homeland Security.

Biden and the Democrats are responsible for a national security crisis due to the open border, with American families at a greater risk of murderous attacks than ever before.

In conclusion, we will not forget 9/11. God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years as the global war on terrorism continues, moving from a safe haven in Afghanistan to America. God bless Ukrainian victory.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 91. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 810 South Pendleton Street in Easley, South Carolina, as the "Private First Class Barrett Lyle Austin Post Office Building".

H.R. 92. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 110 Johnson Street in Pickens, South Carolina, as the "Specialist Four Charles Johnson Post Office".

H.R. 2142. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 170 Manhattan Avenue in Buffalo, New York, as the "Indiana Hunt-Martin Post Office Building".

H.R. 3508. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 39 West Main Street, in Honeoye Falls, New York, as the "CW4 Christian J. Koch Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 3539. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 223 West Chalan Santo Papa in Hagatna, Guam, as the "Atanasio Taitano Perez Post Office".

H.R. 4693. An act to advance targeted and evidence-based interventions for the prevention and treatment of global malnutrition and to improve the coordination of such programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5809. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1801 Town and Country Drive in Norco, California, as the "Lance Corporal Kareem Nikoui Memorial Post Office Building".

H. R. 5577. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3900 Crown Road Southwest in Atlanta, Georgia, as the "John R. Lewis Post Office Building".

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5641. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to increase the threshold for eligibility for assistance under sections 403, 406, 407, and 502 of such Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3884. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 404 U.S. Highway 41 North in Baraga, Michigan, as the "Cora Reynolds Anderson Post Office".

S. 4552. An act to extend the program for authority to acquire innovative commercial items using general solicitation procedures.

S. 4553. An act to extend other transaction authority for the Department of Homeland Security.

S. 4899. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to Remedy election revocations relating to administration of COVID-19 vaccines.

S. 4900. An act to reauthorize the SBIR and STTR programs and pilot programs, and for other purposes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8873, PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION REFORM ACT

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1372 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1372

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8873) to amend title 3, United States Code, to reform the process for the counting of electoral votes, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1372, providing for consideration of H.R. 8873, the Presidential Election Reform Act, under a closed rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, as well as one motion to recommit.

This bipartisan legislation, brought forward by Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. CHENEY of Wyoming, is the product of more than 2 years of work by the Committee on House Administration and more than a year and a half of deliberations and investigation by the January 6th Select Committee.

The electoral college, of course, has been with us from the beginning of the Republic. In a sense, this is legislation America has been working on since 1887, for the last 135 years, because that was the last time that Congress legislated to try to lend statutory coherence and legislative direction to the provisions of the Constitution governing the electoral college.

The electoral college, as you know, Madam Speaker, is a Byzantine, complex, and multifaceted institution, but it is clear, in the wake of the debacle of January 6, 2021, that we must modernize it, update it, and make it work as well as possible for as long as we have it.

That is why both supporters of the electoral college system and those who would replace it with a national popular vote for President, and that is a camp I am in, a camp that represents around two-thirds of the American people, are strongly supporting this legislation and should be supporting this legislation in order to clarify the mechanisms of our Presidential election process.

First of all, this legislation reaffirms that the Vice President's role at the count of the electoral college electors on January 6 is a ministerial role and does not include any substantive authority to count or reject or dismiss or nullify or vaporize electoral college votes sent in by the States, nor does the Vice President have any independent, substantive power to halt or delay the joint session or to return electoral college votes to the States.

We believe there was never any ambiguity about that. Former President Trump was told there was no ambiguity about it by his own Vice President, by his White House counsel, by the Attorney General of the United States, yet insisted that there was some kind of ambiguity and wiggle room for the Vice President to step outside of his assigned constitutional role and simply declare the electoral college votes of certain States, including Arizona, Georgia, and Pennsylvania, null and void and return them to the legislatures of those States for some undefined further action.

All of that is clearly outside the history of the electoral college and what is contemplated constitutionally. We clarify that in this legislation.

Moreover, the current provisions in the Electoral Count Act governing objections brought forward to the receipt of electoral college votes from particular States would be changed in this legislation.

Under the current rules, all it takes is a Member of the House and a Member of the Senate to bring an objection

to the receipt of electoral college votes from a State. That would be changed to a requirement, under this act, of one-third of the House and one-third of the Senate together raising an objection, obviously meaning that this could not be done for purely fanciful purposes. There would have to be a substantial body of Members in both Chambers who agree that there is a serious objection being made.

By the way, the Senate proposal differs slightly in that they are suggesting a one-fifth requirement on both sides as opposed to the one-third requirement that is being advanced in this legislation.

Furthermore, the rules in this statute define explicitly the constitutional grounds upon which an objection to electoral college votes can be made. These objections are limited to a very narrow set of discrete issues that are grounded in the constitutional text of the 12th Amendment or other parts of the Constitution, such as whether an elector has voted for two candidates from the elector's own State, which is clearly in violation of the 12th Amendment.

The rules also clarify the denominator, or the method of calculating the whole number of electors that have been cast for the purpose of winning a Presidential election.

Our counting rules would also clarify the applicable parliamentary procedure at the count, ensuring that strategic bad faith actors are unable to exploit procedural loopholes in an effort to delay or subvert the count.

Confusion has plagued electoral counts in Congress at different points in our history, almost since the beginning of the Republic. We are confident that under this bill, future counts will be far more orderly and ministerial in nature, even during controversial elections, and will act simply to certify the choice of the American people as expressed through the State elections, which is the full extent of Congress' counting role under the Constitution.

We want to make sure that Congress does not pretend to arrogate to itself the power to decide who is going to be the President. The role of Congress is simply to count the electoral college votes that have come in. Maybe if I get a moment later, I can get into a little more specificity about the grounds for objection.

There is also clarification of when a State's Presidential election can be extended in case of a truly catastrophic event. Today's Federal law allows a State legislature to appoint electors by itself if a State has had a failure to elect at its November election. That very vague provision is dangerous, dangerously unclear, and it was targeted by former President Trump's supporters in 2020.

Our legislation provides, instead, that voting in a State's Presidential election can only be extended if a State experiences a genuinely catastrophic event, which we define specifically

with respect to natural disasters and terrorist attacks and like calamities. The event must also be widespread enough to potentially affect the outcome of the State's election. All of this is mediated judicially by appearance before a Federal court. Any extension may only cover the area that was directly affected by the event, and any extension cannot last longer than 5 days after election day.

We know that a provision like this is, unfortunately, necessary. The September 11 terror attacks on America occurred on primary election day in New York City, and Hurricane Sandy in 2012 very nearly derailed New York and New Jersey's Presidential elections that year. We are confident that our bill ensures that Federal law will account for unforeseen emergencies in future Presidential elections.

There are other provisions that I hope to get into in a little more detail, but I close, Madam Speaker, just by saying that this is an absolutely necessary and urgent update of the Electoral Count Act, which hasn't been touched since 1887.

We saw in January 2021 how some of the imperfections in the current process can be exploited by actors who are determined to derail the electoral college counting process or, indeed, overthrow the whole election. We want to do whatever we can, within the confines of the electoral college system, in this legislation to improve the situation and to prepare for the next Presidential election.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman and my good friend from Maryland for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us today provides for consideration of H.R. 8873, which—let's just call it what it is—this is a partisan messaging bill from my friends across the aisle.

My colleagues want to ram this bill through Congress to change the way Presidential elections are conducted. H.R. 8873 is attempting to reform the Electoral Count Act for the first time since 1887. This is the first time in 135 years we are taking a look at this. Yet, despite that, no hearings were held on this bill, and the text was introduced just a mere 24 hours before it was presented in the Rules Committee yesterday.

During testimony before the Rules Committee, the sponsor of the bill, Chair LOFGREN, mentioned repeatedly the lengthy process they undertook to draft this bill, including consulting the country's leading so-called experts. Yet, she did not bother to bring this legislation before her own committee for consideration.

Given the majority's constant claims of democracy itself being under attack,

one would think that the Democratic Party and my colleagues across the aisle would bring bills through the appropriate channels and mechanisms. But my colleagues across the aisle will also try to tell you that this bill is a reform, it is a reaction to the objections to certifying the 2020 election. However, both sides of the aisle have long used their legal authority to object to Presidential elections.

Notable individuals that have exercised this authority include no other than Hillary Clinton, Joe Biden, KAMALA HARRIS, NANCY PELOSI—and that is just to name a few.

Again, they have all used this authority to object to Presidential elections. Even our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, and someone I consider a good friend, objected to the 2016 elections. My other Rules Committee colleague and good friend from Maryland also objected.

In fact, following the 2016 election, Democrats objected to certifying the electoral votes of more States than Republicans did in 2021.

Following her loss to President Trump, Hillary Clinton continued to attack the integrity of our democratic process by insisting ad nauseam that President Trump was, "an illegitimate President."

Stacey Abrams—another great example—the current Georgia Democratic gubernatorial nominee, has built a national brand on denying election results and making baseless accusations of suppression and voter fraud. She claimed that she won the 2018 election for Governor and has yet to concede the 2018 race.

But we can go all the way back to 2005. Democrats objected in that year to certifying Ohio's electoral votes with Senator Barbara Boxer joining Representative Stephanie Tubbs Jones to require a vote.

Madam Speaker, 31 Members of the House voted against certifying these results; 12 of whom are still in Congress today, and I presume those 12 are now supporting this legislation, hypocritically. But this precedent goes back even further than 2005 and 2001.

We can take this back to 1961 with President John F. Kennedy. JFK—this is a great history lesson—drafted his own secret slate of electors declaring himself the winner of Hawaii's electoral votes when the State was originally called for Richard Nixon.

Let's just talk about today. Despite the history, today, the actual purpose of this bill is nothing more than an attempt to federalize our elections. This is a way to backdoor H.R. 1 into legislation.

This is nothing more than an attack on President Trump and the 2020 election, an attack on a man who has not been in office for nearly 2 years. This is about giving Congress unprecedented authority on how to interpret State law, how to restrict State discretion, and how to impose control on State election officials.

Madam Speaker, for those reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I was delighted to hear my friend offer those comments. I am afraid I don't really understand his objection to this legislation. He says we are trying to ram this through. After 135 years of doing nothing about the Electoral Count Act, I guess you have to be a true conservative to see 135 years as moving too quickly in reforming the provisions of this very opaque, and in places, vague and inscrutable language.

But in any event, the gentleman from Pennsylvania argues there have been times that Members of both parties have raised objections in the past. That is absolutely right. Both Republicans and Democrats have made objections on the floor in the past. Obviously, none of the objections attributed to those on our side had anything to do with a violent assault on the institutions of the country or an attempt to get the Vice President to step outside of his constitutional role, or other efforts to conduct what has been called a political coup in the country.

In any event, the gentleman is correct that there have been a lot of objections raised. If that is your problem, then you should be absolutely supporting this legislation because we are proposing to go from a situation where any single Member can raise an objection if he or she can get a Senator to join them, to a situation where you need a third of the entire House of Representatives and a third of the entire U.S. Senate before an objection can be raised. The objections can be raised only according to very specific constitutional criteria. They have to be grounded in the text of the Constitution.

For example, if a State has not been admitted yet, and yet is purporting to offer electors, that would be grounds for rejecting it and for adjusting the denominator. If there are attempts by electors to vote for two people from the same State, which is clearly in violation of the 12th Amendment, then that would be rejected.

Right now, anybody can object for any reason he or she wants. There were people in 2021 who were running around talking about precinct problems in particular States or claims of votes appearing in the middle of the night.

Now, there was nothing to any of those. More than 60 Federal and State courts rejected every claim of electoral fraud and corruption. But in any event, that is not the job of the House of Representatives to be out trying to police the counting of ballots in Pennsylvania or Arizona or Georgia, or any other State.

All we are supposed to do is take the certificate of ascertainment that is provided by the Governor based on the State legislature's determination of

what the vote is in the casting of the electors from the State. So once that certificate of ascertainment comes in, our job is to accept it.

Now, if someone tries to not comply with what the will of the State really was—say, if a Governor says I disagree with how the people voted, I am not going to turn it in—then that person can be taken to court by one of the Presidential candidates, or both, or all of the Presidential candidates, and can be ordered to comply with the political will of the people of the State. If the Governor still refuses to do it, then the Court is empowered to give it to another appropriate official like the Secretary of State, who would then have the authority to file the certificate of ascertainment with the Congress of the United States and with the archivist.

So what we are trying to do is take, shall we say, an antique kind of instrument, the electoral college, and we are trying to bring it up to date, so it works for us in America in the 21st century. If your objection is it is too easy for people of any party to object, I think you totally should be supporting this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, who I should say was very much with us on January 6. He was there that night. He was the last person at the dais before we were forced to evacuate from the Chamber.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, my colleague from Pennsylvania mentioned me by name in his speech. And I just want to say, because I think it is important to clear things up, please do not compare my objections or the objections of others in the past to what happened on January 6. It is insulting.

Our objections were symbolic. What happened on January 6 was violent. It was an attempt to overthrow the government of the United States of America. It was an attempt to basically overturn the will of the American people.

Madam Speaker, we are here today because democracy faces a crisis of legitimacy, not just here at home, but around the world.

According to Freedom House, 2021 was the 16th consecutive year in which more countries declined in freedom than gained. Democracy's reach has ebbed and flowed through the decades, but it is clear that right now we are in a democratic recession.

More countries are turning toward authoritarianism than ever before. Countries we had thought were free are losing ground. Even the United States, the global bastion of democracy, has been labeled a backsliding democracy for the first time in our history. This fact alone should set off alarm bells in all of our heads.

I have seen what happens when democracies fall, and I have seen the good that can come when the United States upholds democratic values around the world.

We can't preach democracy abroad when democracy is under attack at home. Because the deal is, there are people sowing the narrative that democracies cannot handle the problems of this century. There are people who advocate for authoritarian regimes that ignore the will of the people. In the global struggle between democracy and autocracy, these bad actors are a cold reminder that it isn't inevitable that democracy prevails. We have to fight like hell to make sure that it does.

Madam Speaker, all this is to say that the world is watching what we do here today. We have to make a choice, and if we make the wrong one, the consequences will be grave. No one is coming to save us. We have to save ourselves.

The Presidential Elections Reform Act addresses some serious issues with our Presidential elections. It used to be that our leaders would respect the will of the voters—win or lose. In a functional democracy, that is how it works. But now, people who don't like the results of an election feel empowered to lie and reject those results—sometimes violently.

The dismantling of our democracy won't happen all at once; it will continue to erode bit by bit until one day we will look around and see that it is too late. And the thing is, it starts with the elections.

Our elections are the keystone of our democracy. They are how the will of the people becomes the action of the government. We have a responsibility to shore up the institutions of our democracy against the forces that seek to erode them.

The Presidential Election Reform Act gives us the opportunity to do just that.

This bill is about strengthening democracy, prohibiting election officials from refusing to certify elections, clarifying that the Vice President can't just throw away electoral college votes, ensuring States only send one accurate election certificate to Congress so we don't see illegal, fraudulent slates of electors like we did in 2020.

These reforms will strengthen our elections and breathe life into our democratic institutions. Perhaps equally as important, they will send a signal to the world that American democracy is more resilient than the forces that seek to subvert it.

Madam Speaker, I know that sometimes when we talk about things like democracy or democratic institutions, it sounds abstract and lofty. Let me be perfectly clear. There is nothing abstract about this.

If we cannot ensure free and fair elections, we cannot ensure a free and fair society. We have to ask ourselves whether we believe our country should be governed with force or with consent.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, our government cannot work and our democracy cannot survive if we fall on different sides of this question. The choice we make matters. What we do here today matters.

This should not be partisan; it should not be controversial. We all have a stake when it comes to the survival of our democracy. If you believe that freedom and democracy are worth it and you believe in the promise of what America can be, I implore you to vote in favor of the Presidential Election Reform Act.

Vote like the future of our democracy depends on this bill, because it does.

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

Madam Speaker, I would remind my colleague and good friend from Massachusetts that he objected to Alabama in 2017, just like my good friend from Maryland objected in 2017 to Florida.

Now, as far as this bill being rammed through, I would take a minute to rebut the accusation that it hasn't been rammed through. It absolutely was.

We were given almost exactly 24 hours to look at this bill before it came to the Committee on Rules. When we had the hearing in the Committee on Rules, to my knowledge, that was the only hearing that we have had in the House because Chair LOFGREN didn't even have the foresight or the willingness to take this through her own committee process, her own committee that she chairs.

So I am just saying let's follow the process. And let's be frank about something. If this bill were just about increasing the number of necessary objectors to one-third in this Chamber and one-third in the other Chamber, it might have a chance of passing with bipartisan support. But that is not what this bill does. This bill is a backdoor for H.R. 1.

□ 1245

Let me just give you a few examples of extra material in this bill that makes it unpalatable.

This bill allows for Presidential candidates to sue to extend the voting period, even after polls have closed, due to a broadly defined catastrophic event. Then a panel of Federal judges, not State election officials, are then responsible for deciding whether States must allow for up to 5 additional days of voting. The real kicker here is that this suit must be filed no more than 1 day after the election. So you can see how a "catastrophic event" would probably be any Democrat that is losing on the night of the election.

Rather than working with Republicans in a bipartisan manner on a skinny form of an actual reform bill, House Democrats and the January 6 committee are desperately trying to score cheap political points on a bill that does nothing to improve the Elec-

toral Count Act and does everything to take away constitutional and State sovereignty over elections.

Let's be blunt about something else. The American people don't care about this, especially when they are dealing with catastrophe after catastrophe and failed policy after failed policy of this administration. So while House Democrats are focusing on a partisan messaging bill that has zero chance of actually becoming law, our southern border just hit a record 2 million border crossings this fiscal year. That is the highest amount ever recorded in a single year.

Meanwhile, for the past year-and-a-half, the Biden administration has been transporting illegal immigrants from the southern border to places all over the country, often in the dead of night, and with zero notification to elected officials.

That is why if we defeat the previous question, I will personally offer an amendment to the rule immediately to consider H.R. 6592, the Immigration Transparency and Transit Notification Act of 2022.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER), my good friend, who is here to explain more on this amendment.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania for his leadership and for his support of this commonsense legislation.

Madam Speaker, I do rise to oppose the previous question so that we may immediately consider my bill, H.R. 6592, the Immigration Transparency and Transit Notification Act, which would provide much-needed transparency for the secret immigration flights sent by the Biden administration to my hometown and to communities across, primarily, rural America.

Thanks to their open border policies, the Biden administration has been sending hundreds of flights full of illegal immigrants into American communities, often in the dead of night. Over the last year-and-a-half, these flights have been landing in towns across America, placing thousands of illegal immigrants into communities with no prior notice, yet no one has flinched, no mainstream media attention, no outrage from the podium at the White House or Democrats in this House.

Now that Chicago, Washington, D.C., and Martha's Vineyard have received flights, now it has become a seemingly national crisis.

Remember, the Biden administration was flying thousands of these illegals secretly to middle America for well

over a year now, and no one has batted an eye.

Sanctuary cities and States offering benefits to illegal immigrants and the open border rhetoric from the Biden administration continue to induce illegal immigration and likely violates Title 8 of the U.S. Code.

Republicans have endlessly called on the Biden administration and my colleagues in this House, Democrat colleagues, to secure our border and ultimately put an end to this practice of airdropping illegal immigrants into American communities. This should not be a partisan issue.

I became aware of these flights in my area only from local whistleblowers at our local airport. I engaged in good faith with DHS and HHS and was met with nothing but nontruths and empty promises. We were first told no illegals were being flown into Pennsylvania. This, of course, turned out to be completely untrue. I saw it with my own eyes.

I was also told that it was just a coincidence these flights were coming in at 2 o'clock in the morning into remote rural airports. One flight was around midnight on Christmas night.

After these meetings, I was told that I would receive notification of future flights. No such notifications were ever received, yet the flights continued.

At this point, I introduced this responsible piece of legislation to bring transparency, accountability, and decency, and local help and support to the situation.

The current situation at our border is not humane. Millions of illegals are enduring a treacherous journey, as we all know, facing perilous conditions, assault, rape, and death, all because the Biden administration's words and actions, and that of the cartels certainly, that we allow to exist, have led them to believe that they can come.

This is not humane, Madam Speaker. Nothing about the Biden administration's border policy is. When such illegals arrive on ghost flights, as mentioned, in these communities, no one on the ground has any idea where they are coming from or where they are going.

In addition to all of this, we have deadly drugs like fentanyl pouring across the border, killing over 100,000 Americans just in the past year.

The cartels are getting rich as migrants are giving away their life savings under the pretense set out by the Biden administration that they are welcomed here. The illegals are not to blame for making this journey. It is the cartels and the Biden administration's encouraging them who are to blame. The false message is out: Show up to our border and all will be fine.

As a result, our border is overrun and border communities and others across the country—yes, even now Martha's Vineyard—are now feeling the effects of this. It needs to stop.

Of course, if our southern border is secured, there would be no need for

such ghost flights to take place. Effective border policy should be fully implemented. Catch and release must end. Our border must be secured.

Until these policies change and our border is secured, I offer this legislation to bring accountability and transparency to these flights and ensure American communities are properly informed, ensure that the sponsor is legitimate and verified and safe, that we are not aiding and abetting human trafficking, and we give the State's Governor the authority to approve flights and determine if they have the means to provide the support necessary.

The schools should also be notified, Madam Speaker. How is it when 10 young children here illegally, who do not speak English, show up at a school district on a Monday morning, without notification? It is wrong. It is a terrible shame that it took flights to liberal enclaves like New York, Chicago, D.C., and Martha's Vineyard for this to be taken seriously and receive the attention that it finally deserves.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, our border must be secured. I think I am making my point.

Until then, this bill will bring order and transparency to this practice. I hope my Democrat colleagues are truly outraged by some of these practices, as I have outlined. I urge them to join me in defeating the previous question in support of my bill. In doing so, we will address the reality that so many communities across America have been facing for nearly 2 years. Let's act responsibly.

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

Madam Speaker, we are here to fortify the integrity of American Presidential elections, the process by which the people choose their own President. One can only regard with amazement the gentleman from Pennsylvania's casual assurance that the American people don't care about this. The American people don't care about solidifying the process by which we elect our own President? The American people don't care about whether or not a Presidential election is going to be stolen by a lot of backroom games and manipulation of the rules? I beg to differ. Even the Wall Street Journal today endorsed the legislation that we are bringing forward.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I would reiterate Mr. RASKIN's point that certainly the voters in Pennsylvania that I have heard from care deeply about whether or not their votes are counted.

Madam Speaker, the Presidential Election Reform Act will reinforce one of the defining American characteristics of our American experiment in democracy: the peaceful transition of Presidential power.

It is critical to that experiment that Americans have faith that our leaders will honor the will of the people when they vote. The process of counting and transmitting votes is a question of procedure and should not be treated as an opportunity to manipulate the outcome of a free and fair election as it was in the wake of the 2020 election.

I am heartened that the legislation under consideration today is a bipartisan bill. I don't care if you are a Democrat, a Republican, a conservative, a liberal, an Independent. If you love this country and believe in a government by the people, for the people, and of the people, we all have an obligation to confront the dangers posed by antidemocratic agents who try to undermine our elections, abandoning the rule of law and the peaceful transfer of power for their own personal or political gain.

I regret that we must bring this bill to strengthen the guardrails of our democracy after the subversive actions of the disgraced former President and his supporters threatened to derail our government entirely.

But we must confront those continuing threats to our electoral system, in Pennsylvania and across the Nation, where bad actors continue to promote lies about election security. To be clear, there was never justification for the efforts to overturn the 2020 election. But bad actors lied about the election results and willfully misinterpreted the law, and Members of the former President's party, whether explicitly or by their silence, continue to support these lies and baseless legal challenges.

These tactics demand the bipartisan set of reforms we are considering today to insulate our democracy from demagoguery.

I look forward to working with my colleagues of all political stripes to strengthen the guardrails of our democracy and to support and defend the Constitution.

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

Madam Speaker, I can tell you that in my area of Pennsylvania, nobody is talking about this. What they are talking about is failed economic policy, failure to support law enforcement, which is leading to both inflation, economic hardship, and some of the highest crime rates we have ever seen on record.

I would implore my colleagues across the aisle to actually talk to real Americans, not just the woke yuppies that comprise their voting base, to see what Americans care about. But something tells me that the American people will say loud and clear what they care about come November.

It is also rich hearing about all of these "assaults on democracy." Let's just go back to 2019. In 2019, Hillary Clinton said: "No, it doesn't kill me, because he knows"—meaning Trump—"that he is an illegitimate President." So you have the former Presidential candidate calling the former President an illegitimate President. That is clearly echoing some of the sentiments that my friends across the aisle are now accusing us of doing.

ADAM SCHIFF, for example, my colleague from California, in his opening statement for the Senate's January 2020 impeachment trial said: "The President's misconduct cannot be decided at the ballot box, for we cannot be assured that the vote will be fairly won." How about that for criticizing and questioning the democratic process?

Representative John Lewis, in 2017, said: "I don't see this President-elect as a legitimate President. I think the Russians participated in helping this man get elected, and they helped destroy the candidacy of Hillary Clinton." That was a baseless claim based on the Steele dossier that was discredited.

Representative JERRY MCNERNEY of California, in 2017: "The election of Mr. Trump lacks legitimacy."

VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, just this month—this isn't even the last Presidential election cycle. This was this month, regarding a special election. This month, when discussing MAYRA FLORES' upset victory in his upcoming election against her, said: "They stole that last election." So it is quite rich hearing all of these accusations now coming from my friends across the aisle.

When we call into question election results, it is somehow a threat to democracy. When they do it, they are magically upholding democracy.

But it just doesn't stop with my friends across the aisle here in this Chamber. Let's talk about KAMALA HARRIS. She agreed with the radio show host that she should be concerned over Trump's legitimacy. She said: "We should believe exactly what the intelligence community has told us, which is Russia did interfere in the election of the President in 2017." That is the now Vice President saying that.

Also, it is absolutely rich that she cites the intelligence community, when they knew the Steele dossier was a product of the Hillary Clinton campaign; the same intelligence community that wasn't able to discern that the Russian interference story was a hoax; the same intelligence community that told us that the Hunter Biden laptop was Russian disinformation, despite knowing that the FBI had that laptop in their possession at the time they made that baseless accusation; the same intel community, by the way, that told us that Kabul would stand strong for months on end and Ukraine would fall within hours. So that is the intel community that my friends across the aisle are citing.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GARBARINO), my good friend, to speak more on the issue of immigration and transparency.

□ 1300

Mr. GARBARINO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge the defeat of the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6592, the Immigration Transparency and Transit Notification Act of 2022.

The crisis at our southern border is a threat to our national security, public safety, and public health. While this administration continues to tell the American people that all is well,entanyl, the number one killer of young people in America, has flooded across the border at record rates; drug smugglers and human traffickers are thriving; and the migrants themselves are facing dire conditions all because President Biden told them it was okay to come here illegally.

Since Joe Biden took office, over 1 million undocumented immigrants have been allowed to resettle here. Long before border State Governors started busing migrants to sanctuary cities so they might share the burden of this crisis, President Biden was putting them on flights and buses in the dead of night and sending them to communities far north of the border without a warning to the people who live there or the officials who would become responsible for them.

The New York Post first exposed secret, dead-of-the-night flights of migrants into Westchester, New York, last year. But to date, the administration has refused all requests for transparency and accountability regarding these resettlements, this despite multiple letters from myself and other Members of Congress requesting that they stop these covert flights and provide information to Congress and local officials about who these migrants are and what vetting they received before being dropped off in our communities.

H.R. 6592 would require officials to be notified before undocumented immigrants may be placed in their jurisdiction and would provide Governors with the authority to refuse placement.

We cannot continue to turn a blind eye to the border crisis or the strain that these relocations are placing on communities across the country.

Madam Speaker, I urge this body to act and immediately consider H.R. 6592 to require transparency and accountability of the administration for the relocation of undocumented immigrants throughout the United States and put the power to oversee these relocations in the hands of people in these communities which are most affected by it.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I just want to quickly point out the false equivalency just invoked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

On the one hand, you have people of both political parties pointing out the 100 percent documented interference of

Vladimir Putin in our 2016 Presidential election, with millions and millions of dollars spent on his so-called Internet Research Agency to engage in cyber surveillance, cyber espionage, and cyber sabotage of our election. On the other side, we have a violent insurrection incited by the President of the United States, where 150 of our officers were wounded and injured, ending up with broken arms, legs, jaws, and necks; concussions; contusions; and traumatic brain injury.

Those are two very different things. One is an exercise of people's First Amendment right to speak. The other is a violent effort to overthrow the electoral process and the constitutional order of the United States.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, on January 6, America witnessed the first and most serious attempt since the Civil War to stop our democracy. It was an insurrection engineered by the then-President, Donald Trump, so that he could put forth a coup and remain in power. It did not succeed.

We came here that night over blood-stained floors and smashed doors and windows, and we voted. We voted to put in place the will of the voters of America to transfer power. Fortunately, the attempt by the President was unsuccessful.

Nevertheless, in Hollywood, there is always a sequel, often to a very bad movie. We are headed for a new sequel in 2024. Unless we change the 1887 Electoral Count Act, we will see a sequel. We know, all across this Nation, that it is being set up.

There are candidates running for critical offices—secretaries of state, various county offices—with the intent to use the 1887 Electoral Count Act to put in place a sequel to the January 6, 2021, violent insurrection. It is in place now. It is an attempt happening now to have a new coup, to use the 1887 law.

We must pass this bill. We must change the law. It is ancient. It has already been proven by January 6 and the attempted coup then to use that law to install in the Presidency a person who was not legitimately elected by the people of America.

We have to do this. It is our task. It is our work, and this bill does it.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I have a lot of respect and admiration for my good friend from California, and he knows that. But if you want to talk about sequels, let's just talk about all the times the Democrats objected to election results. We can go all the way back for decades.

Many Democrats, including Hillary Clinton, BARBARA LEE, MAXINE WATERS, and SHEILA JACKSON LEE, have cast doubt on every single Republican Presidential victory in the last two decades. In fact, every single Democrat President since 1977 has cast doubt on the legitimacy of U.S. elections.

I will just go through some of that because my good friend from California

said this looks like a sequel to a bad movie. Let's just look at the current administration. In both 2013 and 2016, Biden claimed that Gore won the 2000 Presidential election. In May 2019, Biden said that he "absolutely" agrees that Trump is an "illegitimate President." That is the current Democratic President casting doubt on elections.

It doesn't stop with him, though. Let's again go to his Vice President, KAMALA HARRIS. In 2019, the Vice President agreed that Trump was an illegitimate President.

It is just not those that were elected to office. Let's look at key senior staffers.

For nearly two decades, Biden Chief of Staff Ron Klain claimed that Al Gore won the 2000 election.

President Biden's press secretary, Karine Jean-Pierre, tweeted that the 2018 Georgia gubernatorial race was stolen. Jean-Pierre also cast doubt just not on that election but also on the 2016 election by tweeting: "Stolen election, welcome to the world of #unpresidential Trump."

Jamal Simmons, the communications director for KAMALA HARRIS, for years tweeted that Bush had stolen the 2000 election.

Then-Representative Marcia Fudge of Ohio, now the HUD Secretary, said that Trump "may not be a legitimate President."

If you are talking about sequels to bad movies, this goes all the way back to the 1970s, when my friends across the aisle undermined faith in our elections by loose talk and baseless claims that elections were stolen.

I will end the list of quotes with this because it is my good friend from Maryland. In 2002, my friend from Maryland wrote that the Supreme Court had "[frozen] the election results" in an "outrageous assault on democracy," saying that the Court had determined the outcome of a Presidential election.

In 2003, my good friend also called Bush America's first "court-appointed President."

I have a litany of other quotes from my friends across the aisle, not only current Members serving in this Chamber but also well-known Democrats from across the United States that have questioned results of elections.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), my friend.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Presidential Election Reform Act, but first, let me respond to my colleague from Pennsylvania, who partially quoted me in the first impeachment trial.

I did, in fact, predict that if the former President was not held accountable for trying to extort Ukraine by withholding military aid to get Ukraine's help to cheat in the election that he would go on to try to cheat in

even new and worse ways in the upcoming election. In fact, I believe I said that the odds were not 5 percent, not 10 percent, not even 50 percent, but 100 percent that he would go on to try to cheat again. In that, sadly, I was all too correct.

Over the last year, the House Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol has conducted a thorough investigation into the multiple lines of effort by President Trump and his allies to overturn the election, efforts that included a pressure campaign against the Vice President to violate the Constitution and assume powers he does not hold to unilaterally reject valid electoral count votes.

Our democracy held, but barely. These events have revealed underlying vulnerabilities to our democracy, vulnerabilities that could be exploited in a future Presidential election.

This bill will help ensure that the will of the American people, as expressed through their votes, cannot be overturned by any official of any political party at any time or for any purpose.

Consistent with the Constitution, it raises the threshold for challenging a slate of electors during a joint session of Congress. It reaffirms the role of the presiding officer, that it is a ministerial one. Perhaps most important, it affirms that State officials cannot change the rules of an election after the fact in an effort to overturn the will of the people, as expressed through their popular vote.

This bill will help ensure that the cornerstone of our democracy, free and fair elections and the peaceful transfer of power, remains in place for future generations of Americans. This is not a partisan task but a patriotic one.

Over the past several months, we have told the story of what happened on January 6, documenting the events for the American people.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHIFF. Now is the time for our committee and this Congress to look to the future. It is my hope that this legislation becomes one of the most significant pieces of our legacy, that it makes our Constitution, our country, and our democracy stronger and more secure.

Mr. RESCENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, inflation is at the highest rate in over 40 years, literally the highest rate since I have been alive. The majority of American workers confirmed their income has fallen behind the rising cost of things like buying groceries, paying utility bills, and just filling up their gas tanks.

We have set a record for the highest illegal border crossings in 1 year, including 78 individuals on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

So far in 2022, homicide rates have increased roughly 50 percent compared to this time in 2019.

The Federal Government is also set to run out of funding in 9 days, yet here we are, focused for the second week in a row on trying to attack President Trump, a President that hasn't been in office for nearly 2 years. That is how we are spending our time.

House Democrats have chosen once again to put on yet another partisan, political show while the American people are at home suffering the consequences of their failed agenda, suffering the consequences of inflation that is out of control, wages that are dropping, energy costs that are skyrocketing, and crime rates that are making them less safe in their communities.

H.R. 8873 tramples on States' rights and would do serious harm to the integrity of our elections.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, to my dear friend from Pennsylvania, if you think that this legislation is an attack on President Trump, you simply haven't read the legislation because there is nothing in there attacking President Trump. This is about reforming the Electoral Count Act so it works for the American people.

As long as we are going to have the electoral college, we must update it and modernize it to make it work and to make sure that the will of the people is vindicated at every level—at the State level, with the Governor who has to provide the certificate of ascertainment; and then, when it comes here, we have to be able to receive it and not have the Presidential electoral process consumed by a bunch of ideological antics and tantrums.

My friend mobilizes a number of episodes of Democrats raising objections in the past. Of course, I could equal each one of those with Republicans raising objections in the past because this has become a fine bipartisan tradition in the history of the electoral college. But if you think it is too easy for people to get up and object, support our legislation because we are saying you can't make an objection until you get one-third of the House of Representatives to sign the objection to attest to its validity and its substance.

□ 1315

Then in order for it to be validated, you need not just a third of the House, you need a third of the Senate. You need bicameral adoption of the objection by a third of each body before it is even heard and then debated. So if you think that too much frivolous stuff is going on, well, then you should be supporting our legislation.

The rest of what you are saying is just complaint about political rhetoric,

and I happen to like the political rhetoric pointing out that Vladimir Putin is an enemy of democracy not just in Ukraine but in the United States and all over the world. Maybe we disagree about that. I know that there are some cheerleaders for Vladimir Putin over on that side of the aisle.

In any event, remember this: Today, you can object for any reason at all, and one person can get up and do it if they can find one other person in the other Chamber, but under this legislation, under the Presidential Election Reform Act there will be a neatly cabined set of approved constitutional objections, all of them grounded in the text of the Constitution:

For example, if a State purports to submit more electoral college votes than they actually have.

For example, an elector in the Presidential election process constitutionally cannot hold another Federal office, so if they hold another Federal office that will be grounds for an objection.

For example, a President must be a natural-born citizen at least 35 years of age. So it would be a valid objection to claim that the candidate that a State is purporting to cast electors for is only 26 years old.

Also, under section 3 of the 14th Amendment, Federal office holders must not be guilty of insurrection or rebellion against the Union; something that was insisted upon by the radical Republicans after the Civil War. Therefore, that would be a legitimate ground for objection.

Presidents are limited to two terms in office, so that would be a legitimate ground for objection if a State purports to cast electors for someone who has already served two terms in office. Under Article II, section 1, clause 4, and the 12th Amendment, electors must vote on the same day throughout the Nation distinctly by ballot for President and Vice President, one of whom must not be an inhabitant of the elector's State.

In other words, we finally have provided real precision and definiteness as to what is a valid objection. That doesn't mean the objection is necessarily ratified bicamerally by concurrent majorities, which is what you need in order to uphold it, but it is not a free-for-all. You can't just start finger painting on it.

To the extent that the gentleman's only substantive objection I have heard is that in the past it has been too easy for Members of both parties to raise objections, then you should absolutely be supporting this legislation.

This is a thorough legislative project that reflects the common sense and the wisdom of people who are the real experts in this field.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. RESCENTHALER is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1372

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 6592) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to notify the relevant Federal, State, and local officials of a jurisdiction before placing a covered alien in such jurisdiction, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6592.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered;

The motion to commit on Senate 1098; and

Passage of Senate 1098, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 209, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 445]

YEAS—219

Adams	Chu	Garamendi
Aguilar	Cielline	Garcia (IL)
Allred	Clark (MA)	Garcia (TX)
Auchincloss	Clarke (NY)	Golden
Axne	Cleaver	Gomez
Barragán	Clyburn	Gonzalez,
Bass	Cohen	Vicente
Beatty	Connolly	Gottheimer
Bera	Cooper	Green, Al (TX)
Beyer	Correa	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Harder (CA)
Blumenauer	Courtney	Hayes
Blunt Rochester	Craig	Higgins (NY)
Bonamici	Cuellar	Himes
Bourdeaux	Davids (KS)	Horsford
Bowman	Davis, Danny K.	Houlahan
Boyle, Brendan	Dean	Hoyer
F.	DeFazio	Huffman
Brown (MD)	DeGette	Jackson Lee
Brown (OH)	DeLauro	Jacobs (CA)
Brownley	DelBene	Jayapal
Bush	Demings	Jeffries
Bustos	DeSaulnier	Johnson (GA)
Butterfield	Deutch	Johnson (TX)
Carbajal	Dingell	Jones
Cárdenas	Doggett	Kahele
Carson	Doyle, Michael	Kaptur
Carter (LA)	F.	Keating
Cartwright	Escobar	Kelly (IL)
Case	Eshoo	Khanna
Casten	Espallat	Killde
Castor (FL)	Evans	Kilmer
Castro (TX)	Fletcher	Kim (NJ)
Cheney	Foster	Kind
Cherfilus-	Frankel, Lois	Kirkpatrick
McCormick	Gallego	Krishnamoorthi

Kuster	Neguse	Scott, David
Lamb	Newman	Sewell
Langevin	Norcross	Sherman
Larsen (WA)	O'Halleran	Sherrill
Larson (CT)	Ocasio-Cortez	Sires
Lawrence	Omar	Slotkin
Lawson (FL)	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Lee (CA)	Panetta	Soto
Lee (NV)	Pappas	Spanberger
Leger Fernandez	Pascarell	Speier
Levin (CA)	Payne	Stansbury
Levin (MI)	Peltola	Stanton
Lieu	Perlmutter	Stevens
Lofgren	Peters	Strickland
Lowenthal	Phillips	Suozi
Luria	Pingree	Swalwell
Lynch	Pocan	Takano
Malinowski	Porter	Thompson (CA)
Maloney,	Pressley	Thompson (MS)
Carolyn B.	Price (NC)	Titus
Maloney, Sean	Quigley	Tlaib
Manning	Raskin	Tonko
Matsui	Rice (NY)	Torres (CA)
McBath	Ross	Torres (NY)
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Trahan
McEachin	Ruiz	Trone
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Underwood
McNerney	Rush	Veasey
Meeks	Ryan (NY)	Velázquez
Meng	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
Mfume	Sánchez	Schultz
Moore (WI)	Sarbanes	Waters
Morelle	Scanlon	Watson Coleman
Moulton	Schakowsky	Welch
Mrvan	Schiff	Wexton
Murphy (FL)	Schneider	Wild
Nadler	Schrader	Williams (GA)
Napolitano	Schrier	Wilson (FL)
Neal	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth

NAYS—209

Aderholt	Fischbach	LaHood
Allen	Fitzgerald	LaMalfa
Amodei	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn
Armstrong	Fleischmann	Latta
Arrington	Flood	LaTurner
Babin	Flores	Lesko
Bacon	Fox	Letlow
Baird	Franklin, C.	Long
Balderson	Scott	Loudermilk
Banks	Fulcher	Lucas
Barr	Gaetz	Luetkemeyer
Bentz	Gallagher	Mace
Bergman	Garbarino	Malliotakis
Bice (OK)	Garcia (CA)	Mann
Biggs	Gibbs	Massie
Billrakis	Gimenez	Mast
Bishop (NC)	Gohmert	McCarthy
Boebert	Gonzales, Tony	McCaul
Bost	Gonzalez (OH)	McClain
Brady	Good (VA)	McClintock
Brooks	Gooden (TX)	McHenry
Buchanan	Gosar	McKinley
Buck	Granger	Meijer
Bucshon	Graves (LA)	Meuser
Budd	Graves (MO)	Miller (IL)
Burchett	Green (TN)	Miller (WV)
Burgess	Greene (GA)	Miller-Meeks
Burton	Griffith	Moolenaar
Calvert	Grothman	Mooney
Cammack	Guest	Moore (AL)
Carey	Guthrie	Moore (UT)
Carl	Harris	Mullin
Carter (GA)	Harshbarger	Murphy (NC)
Carter (TX)	Hartzler	Nehls
Cawthorn	Hern	Newhouse
Chabot	Herrrell	Norman
Cline	Hice (GA)	Obornolte
Cloud	Higgins (LA)	Owens
Clyde	Hill	Palazzo
Cole	Hinson	Palmer
Comer	Hollingsworth	Pence
Conway	Hudson	Perry
Crawford	Huizenga	Pfleger
Crenshaw	Issa	Posey
Curtis	Jackson	Reschenthaler
Davidson	Jacobs (NY)	Rice (SC)
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balaart	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (KY)
Donalds	Jordan	Rose
Duncan	Joyce (OH)	Rosendale
Dunn	Joyce (PA)	Rouzer
Ellzey	Katko	Roy
Emmer	Keller	Rutherford
Estes	Kelly (MS)	Salazar
Fallon	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Feenstra	Kim (CA)	Schweikert
Ferguson	Kustoff	Scott, Austin
Finstad		

Sempolinski	Steube	Wagner
Sessions	Stewart	Walberg
Simpson	Taylor	Waltz
Smith (MO)	Tenney	Weber (TX)
Smith (NE)	Thompson (PA)	Webster (FL)
Smith (NJ)	Tiffany	Wenstrup
Smucker	Timmons	Westerman
Spartz	Turner	Williams (TX)
Stauber	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Steel	Valadao	Wittman
Stefanik	Van Drew	Womack
Steil	Van Dune	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—4

Crow	Kinzinger
Herrera Beutler	Vargas

□ 1406

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon)	Granger (Ellzey)	Newman (Beyer)
Bass (Correa)	Johnson (TX)	Palazzo
Brown (MD)	(Jeffries)	(Fleischmann)
(Ruppersberger)	Kirkpatrick	Ryan (OH)
Bush (Bowman)	(Pallone)	(Correa)
Chu (Beyer)	Lamb (Pallone)	Sánchez
Conway	McEachin	(Pallone)
(Valadao)	(Beyer)	Swalwell
DeFazio	Meng (Escobar)	(Correa)
(Pallone)	Moore (UT)	Trone
Garcia (IL)	(Curtis)	(Ruppersberger)
(Correa)	Napolitano	
Gomez (Evans)	(Correa)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 209, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 446]

YEAS—219

Adams	Cleaver	Gottheimer
Aguilar	Clyburn	Green, Al (TX)
Allred	Cohen	Grijalva
Auchincloss	Connolly	Harder (CA)
Axne	Cooper	Hayes
Barragán	Correa	Higgins (NY)
Bass	Costa	Himes
Beatty	Courtney	Horsford
Bera	Craig	Houlahan
Beyer	Crow	Hoyer
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Huffman
Blumenauer	Davids (KS)	Jackson Lee
Blunt Rochester	Davis, Danny K.	Jacobs (CA)
Bonamici	Dean	Jayapal
Bourdeaux	DeFazio	Jeffries
Bowman	DeGette	Johnson (GA)
Boyle, Brendan	DeLauro	Johnson (TX)
F.	DelBene	Jones
Brown (MD)	Demings	Kahele
Brown (OH)	DeSaulnier	Keating
Brownley	Deutch	Kelly (IL)
Bush	Dingell	Khanna
Bustos	Doggett	Killde
Butterfield	Doyle, Michael	Kilmer
Carbajal	F.	Kim (NJ)
Cárdenas	Escobar	Kind
Carson	Eshoo	Kirkpatrick
Carter (LA)	Espallat	Krishnamoorthi
Cartwright	Evans	Kuster
Case	Fletcher	Lamb
Casten	Foster	Langevin
Castor (FL)	Frankel, Lois	Larsen (WA)
Castro (TX)	Gallego	Larson (CT)
Cheney	Garamendi	Lawrence
Cherfilus-	Garcia (IL)	Lawson (FL)
McCormick	Garcia (TX)	Lee (CA)
Chu	Golden	Lee (NV)
Cielline	Gomez	Leger Fernandez
Clark (MA)	Gonzalez,	Levin (CA)
Clarke (NY)	Vicente	Levin (MI)

Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta

Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Peltola
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (NY)
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill

Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—209

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Conway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann

Flood
Flores
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow

Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sempolinski
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Staubert
Steel
Stefanik

Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner

Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dyne
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westernman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—4

Kaptur
Kinzinger

Thompson (PA)
Vargas

□ 1418

So the resolution was agreed to.

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

Baird (Bucshon)
Bass (Correa)
Brown (MD)
Bucshon (Ruppersberger)
Bush (Bowman)
Chu (Beyer)
Conway
(Valadao)
DeFazio
(Pallone)
Garcia (IL)
(Correa)
Gomez (Evans)

Granger (Ellzey)
Johnston (TX)
(Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick
(Pallone)
Lamb (Pallone)
McEachin
(Beyer)
Meng (Escobar)
Moore (UT)
(Curtis)
Napolitano
(Correa)

Newman (Beyer)
Palazzo
(Fleischmann)
Ryan (OH)
(Correa)
Sánchez
(Pallone)
Swalwell
(Correa)
Trone
(Ruppersberger)

CONGRESSIONAL BASKETBALL
TEAM DEFEATS LOBBYISTS

(Mr. WENSTRUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my teammates to recognize the accomplishments of the Congressional Basketball Team.

The Congressional Basketball Team won Monday's 22nd Annual Congressional Basketball game against a team of lobbyists.

We ended a drought for the Members' team going back to 2014. So we were due. We won 46-36 but most importantly, this event was sponsored by the Hoops for Youth Foundation, a not-for-profit organization that supports at-risk kids in our communities.

The Hoops for Youth Foundation was founded with the mission of creating opportunities for at-risk kids through basketball. They work to teach kids that the skills they use on the basketball court can be used every day in life to help them succeed.

It is a fun game. We come together. We won in a nice bipartisan fashion. BLAKE MOORE was the MVP. He played an outstanding game, and we congratulate him for that. It was a great team effort.

Madam Speaker, we say thank you to the non-profit that put this together for us and the success we had with raising money and having fun at the same time.

Go team House of Representatives!

JOINT CONSOLIDATION LOAN
SEPARATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PIN-GREE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to commit on the bill (S.

1098) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize borrowers to separate joint consolidation loans, offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 202, nays 228, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 447]

YEAS—202

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Conway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann

Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)

Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sempolinski
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Staubert
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dyne
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westernman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NAYS—228

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass

Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester

Boebert
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (MD)