## MARKUP OF H.R. 4460, H.R. 4396, H.R. 4316, H.R. 3162, H.R. 3229, H.R. 6513, H.R. 4555, AND H.R. 6493

### **MARKUP**

BEFORE THE

# COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

NOVEMBER 30, 2023

Printed for the use of the Committee on House Administration



www.govinfo.gov www.cha.house.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

WASHINGTON: 2024

55-980

#### COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

BRYAN STEIL, Wisconsin, Chairman

BARRY LOUDERMILK, Georgia
H. MORGAN GRIFFITH, Virginia
GREG MURPHY, North Carolina
STEPHANIE BICE, Oklahoma
MIKE CAREY, Ohio
ANTHONY D'ESPOSITO, New York
LAUREL LEE, Florida

JOSEPH MORELLE, New York, Ranking Member TERRI A. SEWELL, Alabama NORMA TORRES, California DEREK KILMER, Washington

Caleb Hays, Deputy Staff Director Jamie Fleet, Minority Staff Director

## $C\quad O\quad N\quad T\quad E\quad N\quad T\quad S$

	Page		
OPENING STATEMENTS			
Chairman Bryan Steil, Representative from the State of Wisconsin			
Ranking Member Joseph Morelle, Representative from the State of New York	2		
Statement			
Laurel Lee, Representative from the State of Florida	4		
SUBMISSIONS FOR THE RECORD			
H.R. 4396	7		
H.R. 4316	14		
Amendment to H.R. 4316	17		
H.R. 3162	23		
H.R. 4555	29		
Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H.R. 4555	32		
Amendment to H.R. 4555	39		
H.R. 3229	55		
Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H.R. 3229	58		
Amendment to H.R. 3229	63		
H.R. 4460	66		
Amendment to H.R. 4460	79		
H.R. 6493	86		
Amendment to H.R. 6493	93		
Confirmation Of Congressional Observer Access Act of 2023	97		
Roll call votes	105		

#### MARKUP OF H.R. 4460, H.R. 4396, H.R. 4316, H.R. 3162, H.R. 3229, H.R. 6513, H.R. 4555, AND H.R. 6493

#### November 30, 2023

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:15 a.m., in room 1310, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Bryan Steil

[Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Steil, Loudermilk, Griffith, Murphy,

Bice, Carey, D'Esposito, Lee, Morelle, Sewell, Torres, and Kilmer. Staff present: Caleb Hays, Deputy Staff Director, General Counsel, Parliamentarian; Hillary Lassiter, Chief Clerk; Alex Deise, Elections Counsel, Assistant Parliamentarian; Thomas Lane, Elections Counsel and Director of Election Coalitions; Caitlin O'Dell, Legal Assistant and Deputy Clerk; Khalil Abboud, Minority Deputy Staff Director, Chief Counsel; Jamie Fleet, Minority Staff Director; Sarah Nasta, Minority Elections Counsel; and Sean Wright, Minority Senior Elections Counsel.

#### OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. BRYAN STEIL, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, A U.S. REP-RESENTATIVE FROM WISCONSIN

Chairman Stell. The Committee on House Administration will come to order.

I note that a quorum is present.

Without objection, the chair is authorized to declare a recess at

any time.

Today we have an opportunity to strengthen Americans' confidence in our elections by passing commonsense election integrity bills out of this Committee.

Over the past year we have held nine hearings and two public roundtables with 42 witnesses on the issue of voter confidence. Today we will consider several bills that focus on increasing confidence in our elections.

I want to thank Mr. Morelle and his staff for collaboratively working with us to move a few of these measures forward.

Each of the bills will protect Americans' confidence in our elections from foreign interference and ensure that only American citizens are allowed to vote in American elections.

Recently we have seen States across the country consider measures to allow noncitizens to vote in State and local elections.

Right here in Washington, D.C., in our Nation's capital, the city council passed a bill allowing noncitizens to vote in city elections

starting next year.

Consider the implications of this. This means a Russian national, working at the Russian Embassy, holding a Russian passport, residing in Washington, D.C., for simply 30 days, next year could leave the Russian Embassy, walk to a polling location with his passport in his pocket, and vote for mayor in the city of D.C., and not even have to show his Russian passport.

This is our opportunity to clean up this mess, to make sure that

American elections are for American citizens.

I think we can all agree that Russian nationals should not be allowed to vote in our Nation's capital.

Today will bring us one step closer to blocking these election insecurities and strengthening Americans' confidence in our elections.

Under our Constitution, most of the responsibility for Federal elections lies with the States, while Congress has a smaller role. It is important that we work with the States to ensure free, fair, and secure elections.

This summer our Committee passed the American Confidence in Elections Act, the ACE Act. This Federalist approach offers States tools to improve election integrity and gets the Federal Government out of the way.

The legislation we will consider today is a series of standalone bills that echo the ACE Act's work and help strengthen our elec-

tions.

Today we will prevent Federal funds from flowing to States that allow noncitizens to vote. We will stop foreign adversaries from voting in Washington, D.C., elections. We will stop the Biden administration from weaponizing Federal agencies. We will prevent Federal dollars from being used for partisan election activities.

The fact of the matter is simple: When Americans trust their elections, that they are secure, they are more likely to participate.

American elections are for American citizens. Period. Full stop. The American people deserve an election system that they can trust.

I look forward to today's discussions and passing these bills out of Committee.

I now recognize the Ranking Member, Mr. Morelle, for 5 minutes for the purpose of offering his opening statement.

## OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH MORELLE, RANKING MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW YORK

Mr. MORELLE. Good morning.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for gathering us together for this markup, which consists of a series of eight separate measures dealing with election law.

I note, because it bears repeating over and over, that we are less than a year away from the 2024 elections. There are 46 days until Republicans gather to caucus in Iowa, and over 150 (sic) Americans across every State and territory will cast ballots next year.

Everyone in this room would agree there is a tremendous amount of work that needs to be done between now and next No-

vember to ensure that the United States is once again blessed with safe, secure elections, as we were in 2022, 2020, and every year before that.

Unfortunately, election policy is often where those of us on this Committee find our disagreements most profound. We remain open on our side of the aisle to finding commonsense bipartisan agreement on provisions that expand access to the ballot, protect the franchise, and shine a spotlight on the influence of special interests.

Let us never forget, as a Justice for the Supreme Court said many years ago, the right to vote is preservative of all rights.

I am optimistic, as you indicated, Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this, that a few of today's proposed measures hopefully will gain bipartisan support.

I want to express my appreciation to you and both the majority and minority staffs for months-long discussion on the confirmation of the Congressional Observer Access Act of 2023, which I hope will result in a bipartisan vote to report the bill out of Committee.

I am also optimistic that we will find consensus on a measure to ensure foreign nationals do not seek to influence State and local ballot initiatives, referenda, or recall elections, a proposal suggested, as we all can recall, as part of the FEC's package of bipartisan legislative recommendations.

Unfortunately, many of the other proposed bills before us are recycled pieces of the ACE Act, which we feel is an omnibus of antivoter, pro-dark money package of bills previously reported by the Committee's majority.

Counterintuitively, as States and localities prepare to facilitate a colossal undertaking next year, this Committee is considering some extreme partisan messaging bills that, frankly, have zero chance of becoming law and would reduce resources available to State and local officials.

I continue to believe that I think it is a shame we do not use our limited time before the next election to take steps necessary to adequately resource and support election officials, deter and prevent mis- and disinformation, and shine a spotlight on the oncoming torrent of dark money.

As the old saying goes, elections have consequences. Today's agenda, sadly, represents the priorities of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

From my perspective, the measures before us today are solutions in search of problems. We do not inspire confidence in our elections by parroting disproven claims of rigged elections, nonexistent voter fraud, and supporting fraudulent audits of election results.

I do note that we had exhaustive testimony here—some would say exhausting testimony—over ten hearings, dozens of hours. The suggestions that there is widespread fraud, suggestions that there have been elections which have been rigged had no evidence at all in any of those hearings, not a shred of evidence on any of it.

For my mind, what we do in Congress and what legislative bodies do is hold hearings on concerns that we may have, and once we hear testimony, when there is evidence presented, work on solutions. Here we have got solutions searching for problems.

Our Republican colleague from Colorado, Congressman Buck, recently said: "As a Republican Party, if we are going to offer good, solid policy answers to the real challenges we face in America, we have got to get past the lies. We have got to have credibility with the American public. I think we can do that, but we have to move forward."

I urge my colleagues to heed Mr. Buck's call to restore their party's credibility with the American public by ceasing the baseless insinuations and the constant undermining of the results of the 2020 election, knowing full well they lack any evidence of any kind of malfeasance or fraud across the country.

Indeed, the record of this Committee, as I indicated, and the hours and hours that we spent, there is no evidence of significant voter fraud in 2020. Every witness called before us had an opportunity to present that evidence, did not do it, and all indicated they thought Joe Biden won the 2020 election.

This is a record that we build together. We should heed it. I urge all of us to move forward, as Mr. Buck said, by working on commonsense bipartisan legislation that addresses our most pressing

concerns.

I will have more to say on the bills, obviously, as they are called up for consideration.

Again, thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your consideration and for the work on this.

I yield back.

Chairman Steil. I thank the Ranking Member.

Without objection, the opening statements of all other Members will be included in the record if they are provided to the clerk of the Committee by 12 p.m. tomorrow.

As required by House rules, with one exception, a copy of all measures has been made available to Members and the public at least 24 hours in advance.

The one exception is the COCOA Act, which our Ranking Member was referencing.

I thank Mr. Morelle.

Mr. Morelle, Mr. Carey, and I, we were hard at work, and we crossed the line late yesterday afternoon. We have posted that legislative text online, available, and we will bringing that up today. A copy of the language as I said was available online

A copy of the language, as I said, was available online.

I will now call up H.R. 4396, the American Confidence in Elections: District of Columbia Citizen Voter Act, sponsored by Mr. Bost of Illinois and a component bill of the ACE Act. This bill bans noncitizens from voting in D.C. elections, including local elections.

I will now yield 5 minutes to Ms. Lee to speak on the bill.

## STATEMENT OF HON. LAUREL LEE, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE FLORIDA

Ms. Lee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The District of Columbia Citizen Voter Act would require U.S.

citizenship to vote in any D.C. election.

Last year the D.C. City Council enacted the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022 that gave noncitizens that are 18 years old and have resided in D.C. for 30 days the right to vote in any D.C. election.

18 United States Code section 611 prohibits noncitizens from voting in Federal elections. While States and localities are free to permit noncitizens to vote in State and local elections, article I, section 8, clause 17 of the United States Constitution gives Congress complete control over the District of Columbia. Therefore, Congress can and should overturn this D.C. noncitizen voting law.

Elections in the District of Columbia should be an example for the Nation. Allowing noncitizens, like embassy staff, to vote in D.C. elections is inappropriate and contrary to our system of democracy.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. Chairman Steil. The gentlelady yields back.

I will recognize Mr. Morelle, if you would like to give a statement

Mr. MORELLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would indeed.

I think my majority colleagues and those on our side of the aisle disagree on the status of Washington, D.C., itself. House Democrats believe that taxation without representation is undemocratic and contrary to our Nation's founding principles.

I think it is clear to say that in 1789 our Founders would never have conceived that over 700,000 Americans would lack full voting representation in Congress simply for living in the Capital City.

To rectify this, House Democrats last Congress passed H.R. 51, which would have established statehood for the people of D.C. outside the Federal district where our Federal buildings lie.

Clearly—and I do not mean in this any dismissive way or any other way than to suggest Republicans do not see it that way—we have a disagreement about how we view this.

Saving that disagreement for later discussion, the claims upon which this bill is based are baseless. Contrary to the talking points about elections in D.C., noncitizen embassy employees are unlikely ever to qualify as D.C. residents for the purpose of voting.

Embassy employees are necessarily here for a temporary purpose. They are consular officers posted to the United States. A noncitizen embassy employee will leave D.C. when their deployment

By that very fact, by definition, embassy employees are not going to be voting in D.C. elections under D.C. law. They are not residents, simply put.

Frankly, we have had no evidence in all the testimony we took that indicates even a single embassy employee ever voted in a D.C. election fraudulently. Frankly, there would be penalties associated with that if that were the case. No evidence of that kind exists.

We are focusing on this issue because, frankly, I think my majority colleagues want to distract from the unpopular, restrictive, antivoter policies they are trying to force on District residents. They are trying to draw attention away from the fact that this Congress has, frankly, I think from most people's view, has been nothing short of a disaster.

One of our Republican colleagues from Texas, Congressman Roy, recently noted he knows of not one, quote, "material, meaningful, significant thing the Republican majority has done," end quote.

I am always looking to find bipartisan agreement, and I am grateful to Mr. Roy for issuing a Republican statement I can support. I wish the majority would advance something more meaningful that we could work together on, but instead we are considering this bill I think as a distraction.

I would urge defeat of the bill, and I will urge our colleagues to oppose it.

With that, I yield back. Chairman STEIL. The gentleman yields back.

The clerk will report the bill.

The CLERK. H.R. 43-

Chairman STEIL. Without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Also, without objection, the bill shall be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

[House bill H.R. 4396 follows:]

#### 118TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION

## H. R. 4396

To amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to prohibit noncitizen voting in District of Columbia elections, and for other purposes.

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

June 30, 2023

Mr. Bost (for himself, Ms. Mace, and Mr. Weber of Texas) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration

## **A BILL**

To amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to prohibit noncitizen voting in District of Columbia elections, and for other purposes.

- 1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
- 2 tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
- 3 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
- 4 This Act may be cited as the "American Confidence
- 5 in Elections: District of Columbia Citizen Voter Act".
- 6 SEC. 2. BAN ON NONCITIZEN VOTING IN DISTRICT OF CO-
- 7 LUMBIA ELECTIONS.
- 8 (a) REQUIREMENTS.—Title III of the Help America
- 9 Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended—

1	(1) by redesignating sections 304 and 305 as				
2	sections 305 and 306, respectively; and				
3	(2) by inserting after section 303 the following				
4	new section:				
5	"SEC. 304. BAN ON NONCITIZEN VOTING IN DISTRICT OF				
6	COLUMBIA ELECTIONS.				
7	"(a) In General.—No individual may vote in a Dis-				
8	trict of Columbia election unless the individual is a citizen				
9	of the United States.				
10	"(b) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTION DEFINED.—				
11	In this section, the term 'District of Columbia election'				
12	means any election for public office in the District of Co-				
13	lumbia, including an election for Federal office, and any				
14	ballot initiative or referendum.".				
15	(b) Conforming Amendment Relating to En-				
16	FORCEMENT.—Section 401 of the Help America Vote Act				
17	of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21111) is amended by striking "and				
18	303" and inserting "303, and 304".				
19	(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents				
20	of such Act is amended—				
21	(1) by redesignating the items relating to sec-				
22	tions 304 and 305 as relating to sections 305 and				
23	306, respectively; and				

9

3

- 1 (2) by inserting after the item relating to sec-
- 2 tion 303 the following new item:

"Sec. 304. Ban on noncitizen voting in District of Columbia elections.".

0

Chairman Steil. I will recognize myself first to strike the last word.

Just as a follow up to my colleague's comments, I think it is important to know that the law passed in Washington, D.C., simply says an individual has to reside in D.C. for 30 days. To my knowledge, almost everyone that comes and works at an embassy resides in Washington, D.C., for over 30 days. If it is unlikely, it should be even easier to pass the bill.

I think it makes complete sense to make sure that we are keeping U.S. elections for U.S. citizens and, in particular, in Washington, D.C. Ms. Lee laid out why that is a Federal interest. I think this bill is not only a good idea, I think it is actually necessary to protect the integrity of our elections in our Nation's capital.

I will yield back.

Does any other Member wish to seek recognition?

Mrs. Torres.

Mrs. TORRES. Yes, Chairman. I would like to also strike the last word.

It is outrageous. The comments that have been spoken here about D.C.'s ability to elect their own elected officials with their own votes, it is so outrageous, some of the statements, and offensive. It is the bullies bullying the D.C. residents.

To correct some of the unfortunate misinformation that continues to be spread here, I do not know if any of you have ever even tried to get a temporary parking permit in D.C. and how difficult it is to prove that you are a resident of D.C.

to prove that you are a resident of D.C.

In order for you to vote in D.C., you have to be 18 years of age. You have to prove residency not by simply renting an apartment. You cannot do that. Then you also cannot be a voter in any other State

So, please, stop the political theater here. Focus on balancing a budget, passing a budget. Your inability to be able to do anything in order to be able to do your job is incredibly frustrating, and these are the people that are trying to tell D.C. residents and voters and taxpayers how to live their lives and how to govern themselves. You are completely out of order.

I yield back.

Chairman STEIL. The gentlewoman yields back.

I will not dispute how difficult it is to get a parking permit in D.C. I think a lot of D.C. government leaves a lot to be desired, that is not the point here, no different than the massive number of carjackings in the city. This bill is focused in just on the voting provisions.

I will recognize Mr. Loudermilk for 5 minutes. Mr. LOUDERMILK. I move to strike the last word.

Just real quickly, Mr. Chairman, I disagree with a little bit of

what my friend from California just said.

Even if all of that is true, that it is that difficult to become a registered voter in D.C., nothing in this bill would make it any harder than it already is, unless you were not legally—you were not a citizen of the United States. I do not see that there is a compelling reason not to move forward with this piece of legislation.

I yield back.

Chairman Steil. The gentleman yields back.

Ms. Sewell is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

As the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Elections, voter accessibility is something I care very deeply about, and I know that all of us in this Committee do.

I agree with my colleagues, both Ranking Member Morelle as well as Representative Torres, that we are looking for a solution to a problem that does not exist.

I do not think that we have been able to have one example, concrete example, of where this actually occurred with an embassy resident trying to become a resident of D.C. for voting purposes.

I think that the right to vote, as all of us know, is an American democracy cornerstone. There are currently right now in D.C. 712,000 residents of D.C. that do not have full voting representation in Congress.

D.C. residents are American citizens. I think all of us would agree on that. They pay Federal taxes. They serve in the military. The decision that they make for their communities are often overridden by the interests of those who do not live in the District of Columbia, i.e., us in Congress.

I am not a resident of the city of D.C., nor do I think anybody on this Committee is. There are—all the 712,000 residents who are residents of D.C. do not have equal voting rights as American citizens.

Forty-five percent of the residents of the District of Columbia are African American. The District of Columbia Citizen Voter Act is an effort to not only disenfranchise voters of color, but an effort to further distract us from the conversation that we should be having when we bring up D.C. residents, and that is a conversation on D.C. statehood.

The residents that live in our Nation's capital should be able to fully participate in our democracy. They do not at current. We would do well as a Committee to address that concern instead of looking for a solution to a problem that does not exist.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman Stell. The gentlewoman yields back.

Does any other Member seek recognition?

If not, the question occurs on ordering H.R. 4396 reported favorably to the House.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it, and the motion is agreed to.

Mr. Morelle. May I ask for a recorded vote?

Chairman Steil. A recorded vote has been requested.

Chairman Steil. The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil? Chairman STEIL. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil votes aye.

Mr. Loudermilk?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Griffith?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Dr. Murphy?

Dr. Murphy. Aye.

The CLERK. Dr. Murphy votes aye.

Mr. Carey?

Mr. CAREY. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Carey votes aye.

Mrs. Bice?

Mrs. BICE. Aye.

The CLERK. Mrs. Bice votes aye.

Mr. D'Esposito? [No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Lee?

Ms. Lee. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.

Mr. Morelle?

Mr. Morelle. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Morelle votes no.

Ms. Sewell?

Ms. Sewell. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Sewell votes no.

Mr. Kilmer? [No response.]

The CLERK. Mrs. Torres?

Mrs. Torres. No.

The CLERK. Mrs. Torres votes no.

Mr. Chairman, on this vote there are five—

Chairman STEIL. Mr. Loudermilk seeks recognition. I think he is looking to see how he is recorded.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. See how I was recorded.

The CLERK. Mr. Loudermilk is not recorded.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Loudermilk votes aye.

Chairman STEIL. The clerk will report the tally.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote there are six ayes and three noes.

Chairman STEIL. The amendment—or the bill—is agreed to. Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

I will now call up H.R. 4316, the Citizen Ballot Protection Act, sponsored by Mr. Palmer of Alabama and a component of the ACE Act.

Many States across the country have laws preventing noncitizens from voting in their elections. One way they enforce this prohibition is by requiring proof of citizenship when individuals register to vote.

This bill allows States to enforce this prohibition and ensure their elections are free from foreign interference.

I will now recognize the Ranking Member, Mr. Morelle, if you would like to give a statement on the bill.

Mr. MORELLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As I think you indicated, this is one of the provisions from the ACE Act which we consider extremely partisan and we also believe is a blatant attempt to disenfranchise voters that many of my colleagues do not want to participate.

Requiring voter registration applicants to provide proof of citizenship on the Federal form with their voter registration application prevents eligible citizens from registering to vote at alarming rates. This is because millions of Americans do not have readily available the most common types of documents used to prove citizenship, including a passport, which many Americans do not have, or a birth certificate, which may not have readily available.

For those who have either lost or not had—lost access to or never had those documents, securing proof of citizenship is a costly and

lengthy process that for many proves impossible.

Moreover, because many Americans do not just carry around proof of citizenship, that requirement hampers voter registration drives, which are a critically important tool to engage eligible voters in civic participation. I think my colleagues know this very well.

In fact, several States have attempted to require voters to provide documentary proof of citizenship at the time of registration

and it has not gone well in many cases.

In Kansas, tens of thousands of eligible citizens, or about a tenth of all voter registration applicants, had their applications blocked in the first few years after a proof of citizenship requirement was implemented.

Arizona saw similar results from its documentary proof of citi-

zenship law.

Worse yet, the rejections are not spread equally across the eligible voter population. Instead, adding a proof of citizenship requirement disproportionately prevents otherwise eligible voters of color, young voters, low-income voters, elderly voters, and voters without stable housing from registering to vote.

That is not the point of the NVRA. The NVRA is a seminal piece of legislation designed to expand access to voter registration for all

eligible Americans and improve civic participation.

By permitting States to engage in a practice known to disenfranchise thousands of eligible voters, this bill does just the opposite.

In fact, in 1993, when the NVRA was passed, Congress considered the very question of whether to add a proof of citizenship requirement to the Federal form and rejected the idea. The bill then passed with bipartisan support, including from Republicans representing the same States that many Members of this Committee represent today.

We should be doing everything we can to expand access to the voting booths and to the ballot. It is essential for American progress, it is essential to instill confidence in Americans that they are going to have the right to vote because it is their constitutional

right.

I will be voting no. I want to uphold the goals of the NVRA, and urge my colleagues to do so, as well.

With that, I will yield back.

Chairman Steil. The gentleman yields back.

The clerk will please report the bill.

The Clerk. H.R. 4316——

Chairman STEIL. Without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Also, without objection, the bill should be considered read and open to amendment at any point.

[House bill H.R. 4316 follows:]

#### 118TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION

## H. R. 4316

To amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to permit a State to include as part of the mail voter registration form a requirement that applicants provide proof of citizenship, and for other purposes.

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

June 23, 2023

Mr. Palmer (for himself, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Clyde, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Higgins of Louisiana, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Crenshaw, Mr. Biggs, and Mr. Bost) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration

### A BILL

To amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to permit a State to include as part of the mail voter registration form a requirement that applicants provide proof of citizenship, and for other purposes.

- 1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
- 2 tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
- 3 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
- 4 This Act may be cited as the "Citizen Ballot Protec-
- 5 tion Act".

1	SEC. 2. CONTENTS OF STATE MAIL VOTER REGISTRATION
2	FORM.
3	(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(a) of the National Voter
4	Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20505(a)) is amend-
5	ed—
6	(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ", except that
7	a State may, in addition to the criteria stated in sec-
8	tion 9(b), require that an applicant provide proof
9	that the applicant is a citizen of the United States"
10	after "elections for Federal office"; and
11	(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting "and such
12	form may include a requirement that the applicant
13	provide proof that the applicant is a citizen of the
14	United States" after "elections for Federal office".
15	(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect
16	on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Chairman STEIL. I have an amendment at the desk that makes a small technical and conforming change.

The clerk will please report the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment to H.R.—

Chairman STEIL. Without objection, further reading of the amendment is dispensed with.

[Cheirman Steil's amendment to H.P. 4316 followed]

[Chairman Steil's amendment to H.R. 4316 follows:]

# AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4316 OFFERED BY M\_\_.

Page 2, insert after line 14 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provision accordingly):

- 1 (b) Technical Correction.—Section 6(a)(1) of
- 2 such Act (52 U.S.C. 20505(a)(1)) is amended by striking
- 3 "Federal Election Commission" and inserting "Election
- 4 Assistance Commission".



Chairman STEIL. Would any Member like to speak on the amendment? On the—this is on the—I apologize—on the technical and conforming amendment. It is a simple conforming with the law piece.

If no further debate on this underlying technical correction, if not, the question is on the Steil amendment.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Does any—the amendment is agreed to.

We now bring the underlying—do any Members wish to seek recognition for the underlying bill?

Ms. Sewell is recognized.

Ms. SEWELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Voting is a fundamental civil right, and it should not be infringed upon no matter what your race or ZIP Code is. Far too often efforts to suppress voters—like strict ID requirements, bans on early voting and vote by mail, closed polling stations without notification, and voter roll purges and requiring proof of citizenship—continue to resurface.

A recent study by the Brennan Center revealed that this year alone at least 14 States have enacted 17 restrictive voting laws. This exceeds the number of restrictive laws enacted in every year for the past decade besides 2021, when 33 restrictive voting laws were passed by State legislatures.

Section 6 of the National Voter Registration Act specifically prohibits requiring proof of citizenship and was upheld by the Supreme Court in the Inter Tribal Council of Arizona v. Arizona case in 2013. Yet we still see efforts to try to require proof of citizenship

Let us discuss what happened when they were tried, when proof of citizenship was tried on the State level in Arizona and in Kansas.

In 2005, Arizona implemented a proof of citizenship to register law. Evidence shows that Arizona's law acts as a significant obstacle to registration as measured by the tens of thousands who attempted to register and had been rejected. More than 10,000 people in Maricopa County alone were blocked.

Across the State, three of the most populous counties, one in three applications were rejected due to documentary requirement in the last 5 months of the law.

Two and a half years after the law had been implemented, it had blocked at least 31,000 applicants from registering, according to a Federal district court. By 2008, the number of rejected applications reached 38,000 voters or potential voters.

In 2017, a study of the Maricopa County's recorder revealed that 17,000 of the rejected forms were filled out by American citizens.

In 2013, Kansas followed suit with a discriminatory proof of citizenship requirement as well. Nationally recognized voting experts examined attempted registration between 2013 and 2015. Dr. McDonald's report revealed that more than 14 percent of the new registrants, 35,000 people, were blocked by the documentary requirement.

The experience in Arizona and Kansas proved that this practice represents a significant obstacle to voter registration and is not about voter accessibility or about citizenship. More, it is about voter suppression.

In fact, national studies showed that between 5 and 7 percent of Americans do not have any documents to prove that they are citi-

zens. Yet they are citizens.

Women who require their names to be changed, in fact, national studies showed that women who changed their names upon getting married are less likely to have their documentation. Citizens recovering from a natural disaster are less likely to have documentation. 59 percent of Americans do not have a passport to prove documentation.

It has been proven that this practice disproportionately prevents young voters, voters of color, low-income voters, voters with unstable housing, and elderly voters from registering to vote. This is what we all want to consider as a supposed commonsense measure to protect access to the franchise.

I think those of us on this side of the aisle would agree that this does not. Rather, it is an attempt to further restrict access to the

ballot box by valid American citizens.

Thank you. I yield back the balance of my time. Chairman STEIL. The gentlewoman yields back.

Ms. Lee is recognized for 5 minutes. Ms. Lee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Article I, section 4 of the United States Constitution, the Elections Clause, confirms that States are given the primary role in administering elections, not the Federal Government. One of the powers that is given to States is the power to establish voter qualifications, such as age, residency, and citizenship.

It is a State decision whether to require documentary proof of citizenship when voters register to vote. H.R. 4316 does not mandate that States have this requirement. It simply allows them to enact and/or enforce these laws if they choose. This does no more than confirm and articulate States' authorities under the Elections Clause.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman STEIL. The gentlewoman yields back.

Does any other Member seek recognition?

If not, the question occurs on ordering H.R. 4316, reported favorably to the House.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it, and the motion to report is agreed to.

Mr. Morelle. I ask for a recorded vote.

Chairman STEIL. A recorded vote has been requested. The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil? Chairman STEIL. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil votes aye.

Mr. Loudermilk?

Mr. Loudermilk. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Loudermilk votes ave.

Mr. Griffith?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Dr. Murphy?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mrs. Bice?

Mrs. BICE. Aye.

The CLERK. Mrs. Bice votes aye.

Mr. Carey?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. D'Esposito?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Lee?

Ms. Lee. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.

Mr. Morelle?

Mr. Morelle. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Morelle votes no.

Ms. Sewell?

Ms. Sewell. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Sewell votes no.

Mr. Kilmer?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mrs. Torres?

Mrs. Torres. No.

The CLERK. Mrs. Torres votes no.

Chairman STEIL. Does any Member wish to change their vote?

The clerk will report the tally.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote there are four ayes and three noes.

Chairman STEIL. The motion is agreed to. Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

Looking at Member attendance, we are going to jump ahead to 3162, the Protecting American Voters Act, introduced by Mr. Roy of Texas, also included in the ACE Act.

This bill would require the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Commissioner of Social Security to provide citizenship information concerning registered voters to a State upon request at no cost. States need the tools to ensure their voter lists are clean and to enforce their noncitizen voting prohibitions.

I will now yield 5 minutes to Mrs. Bice to speak on the bill.

Mrs. Bice. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This legislation, sponsored by my colleague from Texas, Chip Roy, requires the Department of Homeland Security and the Social Security Administration, upon request of a State, to provide citizenship information concerning registered voters at no cost.

States need tools to ensure voter lists are clean and they have

the ability to remove their noncitizen voting prohibitions.

Under the National Voter Registration Act, noncitizens can end up on a State's voter rolls when they apply for a driver's license. If the State has prohibitions against noncitizens voting, they should have the information to enforce those laws.

The DHS does currently have the authority to share data regarding naturalized citizens with the States, but the discretion is left to the Secretary of the DHS.

The Social Security Administration cannot share Social Security

information for the purposes of election integrity.

This legislation also includes safeguards to prevent the disclosure of Social Security numbers and ensures the information costs nothing to the State.

With that, I yield back.

Chairman STEIL. The gentlewoman yields back. Mr. Morelle, would you like to speak on the bill?

Mr. MORELLE. I would. Thank you. Chairman STEIL. You have 5 minutes. Mr. MORELLE. Yes, sir. Thank you.

This bill is another attack on eligible voters of color disguised as fraud prevention, which this Committee has shown no evidence exists.

At the expense of American voters, this bill would facilitate faulty but extensive information sharing between the Federal Government and State election officials.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle love to wax poetically about how their efforts will prevent voter fraud. As this Committee's exhaustive series of hearings has borne out, voter fraud is virtually nonexistent in American elections. No evidence has been presented through these series of hearings.

During the Trump administration, the Department of Justice charged only three people in cases involving election fraud. That is three out of more than a hundred million ballots cast in Federal

elections during the former President's 4 years in office.

In only one of these three instances was a noncitizen charged with voting illegally. Notably, I just mention parenthetically, in that case the defendant had also committed a significant amount of tax fraud.

It makes me wonder, if my Republicans colleagues are so concerned about preventing fraud, why they also trying to defund the IRS, an agency dedicated to actually detecting tax fraud.

Rather than preventing fraud, this bill is truly an attack on the rights of voters, threatening to give States the tools to improperly remove eligible U.S. citizens from their voter rolls.

It is clear to me the bill fixes zero problems, and it creates huge ones. It would permit the Secretary of Homeland Security to rely exclusively on the infamous SAVE immigration data base to provide information about citizenship.

The system is notoriously unreliable. In fact, the data base has been the subject of multiple lawsuits throughout the country when States have used it to verify the citizenship status of voter registration applicants and registered voters because of how often it improperly identifies U.S. citizens as noncitizens and results in the

improper removal of eligible voters.

The bill would also facilitate the use of Social Security information to verify citizenship status. This is nonsensical. The Social Security Administration is not an accurate repository for up-to-date and comprehensive citizenship information. The SSA simply does not maintain this information.

Indeed, noncitizens who are authorized to work in the United States are required to get Social Security numbers before being allowed to start a job. That means that an applicant who obtains a Social Security number and later becomes a citizen might be improperly flagged as a noncitizen. It also means that the mere fact that an individual has a Social Security number does not confirm their citizenship status.

What is more, providing information about citizenship status is not part of SSA's mission. This unfunded mandate would divert already scarce resources from the agency's critical work of administering Social Security benefits and serving the American public.

It is clear the bill is another poorly disguised—if it is disguised at all—attack on American voters. I will vote no on this bill. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I will yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman STEIL. The gentleman yields back.

The clerk will please report the bill.

The Clerk. H.R. 31——

Chairman Steil. Without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Also, without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

[House bill H.R. 3162 follows:]

#### 118TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION

## H. R. 3162

To amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Commissioner of Social Security to provide information to States upon request which will enable States to verify the citizenship status of applicants for voter registration in elections for Federal office in the State and remove individuals who are not citizens of the United States from the list of individuals registered to vote in elections for Federal office in the State, and for other purposes.

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 9, 2023

Mr. Roy (for himself, Mr. Rosendale, Mr. Sessions, and Mr. Burgess) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration

### A BILL

To amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Commissioner of Social Security to provide information to States upon request which will enable States to verify the citizenship status of applicants for voter registration in elections for Federal office in the State and remove individuals who are not citizens of the United States from the list of individuals registered to vote in elections for Federal office in the State, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-

1

2	tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,					
3	SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.					
4	This Act may be cited as the "Protecting American					
5	Voters Act".					
6	SEC. 2. REQUIRING PROVISION OF INFORMATION UPON RE-					
7	QUEST TO ENABLE STATES TO VERIFY CITI-					
8	ZENSHIP STATUS OF APPLICANTS FOR					
9	VOTER REGISTRATION AND INDIVIDUALS ON					
10	VOTER REGISTRATION LISTS.					
11	(a) Provision of Information Upon Request.—					
12	Section 9 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993					
13	(52 U.S.C. 20508) is amended by adding at the end the					
14	following new subsection:					
15	"(e) Provision of Information Upon Request					
16	TO ENABLE STATES TO VERIFY CITIZENSHIP STATUS OF					
17	APPLICANTS AND REGISTRANTS.—					
18	"(1) IN GENERAL.—At the request of a State					
19	election official, the Secretary of Homeland Security					
20	and the Commissioner of the Social Security Admin-					
21	istration shall provide the official with such informa-					
22	tion as may be necessary to enable the official to					
23	verify that an applicant for voter registration in elec-					
24	tions for Federal office held in the State or a reg-					
25	istrant on the official list of eligible voters in elec-					

1	tions for Federal office held in the State is a citizen
2	of the United States.
3	"(2) USE OF SAVE SYSTEM.—The Secretary of
4	Homeland Security may respond to a request re-
5	ceived under paragraph (1) by using the system for
6	the verification of immigration status under the ap-
7	plicable provisions of section 1137 of the Social Se-
8	curity Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-7), as established pur-
9	suant to section 121(e) of the Immigration Reform
10	and Control Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–603).
11	"(3) Sharing of information.—The Sec-
12	retary and the Commissioner may share information
13	with each other with respect to an individual who is
14	the subject of a request received under paragraph
15	(1) in order to enable the Secretary and the Com-
16	missioner to respond to the request.
17	"(4) Privacy.—The Secretary shall carry out
18	this subsection in accordance with such safeguards
19	as the Commissioner determines to be necessary or
20	appropriate to protect the confidentiality of the so-
21	cial security account number of any individual.
22	"(5) Prohibiting fees.—The Secretary may
23	not charge a fee for responding to a State's request

under paragraph (1).

24

1	"(6) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall pro-
2	mulgate such regulations as may be necessary to
3	carry out this subsection.".
4	(b) Clarification of Authority of State To
5	REMOVE NONCITIZENS FROM OFFICIAL LIST OF ELIGI-
6	BLE VOTERS.—
7	(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(a)(4) of the Na-
8	tional Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C.
9	20507(a)(4)) is amended—
10	(A) by striking "or" at the end of subpara-
11	graph (A);
12	(B) by adding "or" at the end of subpara-
13	graph (B); and
14	(C) by adding at the end the following new
15	subparagraph:
16	"(C) a determination that the registrant is
17	not a citizen of the United States;".
18	(2) Conforming amendment.—Section
19	8(c)(2)(B)(i) of such Act (52 U.S.C.
20	20507(c)(2)(B)(i) is amended by striking "(4)(A)"
21	and inserting "(4)(A) or (C)".
22	(c) Effective Date.—The amendments made by
23	this section shall apply with respect to elections held on
24	or after January 1, 2024.

Chairman Steil. Does any Member seek recognition?

Ms. Lee.

Ms. Lee. Mr. Chairman, I reserve.

Mr. Chairman, the Protecting American Voters Act is directed at helping us achieve the twin pillars of voter access to elections, but also ensuring that we have accurate elections with a high level of

One of the primary responsibilities of State and local election officials is to maintain accurate and current voter rolls so that we can ensure all eligible Americans are able to vote and also that we have an accurate and complete list of who those eligible voters in a community are.

The Social Security Administration and the Department of Homeland Security are two entities that have access to information about eligibility because they do have information about citizenship and that is a part of a State's determination of voter eligibility and

current and accurate voter information.

This bill would enable and help support the role of State and local election officials in maintaining accurate and current voter rolls, which is certainly something that I know we all share an interest in them being equipped and able to do that role.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. Chairman STEIL. The gentlewoman yields back.

Does any other Member seek recognition on the bill?

Mr. Murphy.

Dr. MURPHY. Thank you.

I just would like to bring up to the fact that all of these bills we are trying to restore confidence in the American voting system.

Now the fact that we have now 8 million people that have come into our border who are undocumented, who are not citizens of this country, with possibly an apparent motive is to get them to be voting individuals, I think it is paramount and requisite that we have each individual point that is enforced that American citizens are the ones who vote, not people, not individuals who came into this country illegally.

Thank you.

With that, I will yield back.

Chairman Steil. The gentleman yields back.

Does any other Member seek recognition?

I will recognize myself for 5 minutes, just to follow up with what

you said, Mr. Murphy.

I completely agree. I think that one of the keys here is we are providing States the tools that they need to be able to maintain the election integrity standards. This is true with the previous bill that we just passed out of Committee. It provides States the tools they need, allows the Federal Government to conform to States.

This is saying, if States are seeking access into the Social Security data base for citizenship purposes, they should rightly be able

to have that access at no cost.

I think this is a very commonsense reform to make sure we are protecting the integrity of our elections and making sure that U.S. elections are for U.S. citizens.

I vield back.

Does any other Member seek recognition?

If not, there is no further debate, we will—if not, the question is now on the bill, 3162.

All those in favor, signify by saying ave.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it.

Mr. Morelle. I would ask for a recorded vote.

Chairman Steil. A recorded vote has been requested.

The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil?

Chairman Steil. Aye. The Clerk. Mr. Steil votes aye.

Mr. Loudermilk?

Mr. Loudermilk. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Loudermilk votes aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Griffith?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Dr. Murphy?

Dr. Murphy. Aye.

The CLERK. Dr. Murphy votes aye.

Mrs. Bice?

Mrs. BICE. Aye.

The CLERK. Mrs. Bice votes aye.

Mr. Carey?

Mr. CAREY. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Carey votes aye.

Mr. D'Esposito?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Lee?

Ms. Lee. Aye. The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes aye.

Mr. Morelle?

Mr. Morelle. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Morelle votes no.

Ms. Sewell?

Ms. Sewell. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Sewell votes no.

Mr. Kilmer?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mrs. Torres?

Mrs. Torres. No.

The CLERK. Mrs. Torres votes no.

Chairman Steil. Does any Member wish to change their vote?

The clerk will report the tally.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote there are six ayes and three noes.

Chairman Steil. The motion passes. Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

We will now move on to H.R. 4555, the Federal Election Audit Act, which is sponsored by Dr. Murphy and is also a component of the ACE Act.

This bill amends the Help America Vote Act to allow States to use existing Federal dollars to conduct substantive independent audits of the accuracy and effectiveness of voting systems and election procedures.

The clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk. H.R. 4555——

Chairman STEIL. Without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Also, without objection, the bill shall be considered read and open to amendment at any point.

[House bill H.R. 4555 follows:]

Ι

#### 118TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION

## H.R. 4555

To amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to allow the use of requirements payments to conduct a post-election audit with respect to an election for Federal office in a State.

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

July 11, 2023

Mr. Murphy introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration

### A BILL

To amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to allow the use of requirements payments to conduct a postelection audit with respect to an election for Federal office in a State.

- 1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
- 2 tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
- 3 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
- 4 This Act may be cited as the "Federal Election Audit
- 5 Act".

1	SEC.	2.	USE	OF	REQUIREMENTS	<b>PAYMENTS</b>	FOR	POST
---	------	----	-----	----	--------------	-----------------	-----	------

- 2 ELECTION AUDITS.
- 3 Section 251(b)(1) of the Help America Vote Act of
- 4 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21001(b)(1)) is amended by inserting ",
- 5 including to conduct and publish an audit of the effective-
- 6 ness and accuracy of the voting systems, election proce-
- 7 dures, and outcomes used to carry out an election for Fed-
- 8 eral office in the State and the performance of the State
- 9 and local election officials who carried out the election"
- 10 after "requirements of title III".

 $\circ$ 

Dr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I have an Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute at the desk.
Chairman STEIL. The clerk will report the amendment.
The CLERK. An Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute—

Chairman STEIL. Without objection, the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute is considered as read and will be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.
[Dr. Murphy's Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute follows:]

## AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H.R. 4555

#### OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

#### 1 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

- 2 This Act may be cited as the "Federal Election Audit
- 3 Act".
- 4 SEC. 2. USE OF REQUIREMENTS PAYMENTS FOR POST-
- 5 ELECTION AUDITS.
- 6 (a) Permitting Use of Payments for Audits.—
- 7 Section 251(b)(1) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002
- 8 (52 U.S.C. 21001(b)(1)) is amended by inserting ", in-
- 9 cluding to conduct and publish an audit of the effective-
- 10 ness and accuracy of the voting systems, nonvoting elec-
- 11 tion technology (as defined in paragraph (4)(B)), election
- 12 procedures, and outcomes used to carry out an election
- 13 for Federal office in the State and the performance of the
- 14 State and local election officials who carried out the elec-
- 15 tion, but only if the audit meets the requirements of para-
- 16 graph (4)(A)" after "requirements of title III".
- 17 (b) Requirements for Audits; Nonvoting Elec-
- 18 TION TECHNOLOGY DEFINED.—Section 251(b) of such

1	Act (52 U.S.C. 21001(b)) is amended by adding at the
2	end the following new paragraph:
3	"(4) Requirements for audits conducted
4	WITH REQUIREMENTS PAYMENTS.—
5	"(A) IN GENERAL.—An audit described in
6	paragraph (1) meets the requirements of this
7	paragraph if—
8	"(i) no individual who participates in
9	conducting the audit is an employee or
10	contractor of an office of the State or local
11	government which is responsible for the
12	administration of elections for Federal of-
13	fice or of a subsidiary or affiliate of such
14	an office; and
15	"(ii) the audit includes an examina-
16	tion of compliance with established proc-
17	esses for voter registration, voter check-in,
18	voting, tabulation, canvassing, post-election
19	proceedings (such as recounts and
20	recanvasses), and reporting of results.
21	"(B) Nonvoting election technology
22	DEFINED.—In paragraph (1), the term 'non-
23	voting election technology' means technology
24	used in the administration of elections for Fed-
25	eral office which is not used directly in the cast-

1	ing, counting, tabulating, or collecting of ballots
2	or votes, including each of the following:
3	"(i) Electronic pollbooks or other sys-
4	tems used to check in voters at a polling
5	place or verify a voter's identification.
6	"(ii) Election result reporting sys-
7	tems.
8	"(iii) Electronic ballot delivery sys-
9	tems.
10	"(iv) Online voter registration sys-
11	tems.
12	"(v) Polling place location search sys-
13	tems.
14	"(vi) Sample ballot portals.
15	"(vii) Signature systems.
16	"(viii) Such other technology as may
17	be recommended for treatment as non-
18	voting election technology as the Standards
19	Board may recommend.".
20	(e) Sense of Congress Regarding Timing of Au-
21	DITS.—It is the sense of Congress that post-election audits
22	of the effectiveness and accuracy of the voting systems,
23	election procedures, and outcomes used to carry out an
24	election for Federal office in a State and the performance
25	of the State and local election officials who carried out

### G:\CMTE\HA\18\R\H4555ANS.XML

4

- 1 the election are most effective when the audits are com-
- 2 pleted before the expiration of the period during which
- 3 persons are authorized under State law to challenge the
- 4 results of the election.



(91244914)

Chairman Steil. I now yield 5 minutes to Dr. Murphy, the bill's sponsor.

Dr. Murphy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Free and fair elections are a hallmark of American democracy and have been our national standard for over two centuries.

However, in recent years trust in our elections has eroded on both sides of the political spectrum. Trust in the accuracy of electoral outcomes should not be influenced by the outcome itself.

To ensure accuracy and restore confidence in our election system, today we are debating the Federal Election Audit Act. This measure would provide Federal funds to States who wish to conduct comprehensive post-election audits in an effort to boost transparency and improve election integrity.

As this Committee learned through the hearing process earlier this year, many States and localities do not conduct comprehensive audits, thus assuring election equipment worked properly and bal-

lots were cast by eligible and qualified voters.

I just would remind everybody we audit everything in every society. We do it in medicine all the time. Doing it now for one of the things that is most precious to our democracy—elections—really should be, as we say, a no-brainer.

The Federal Election Audit Act, as introduced, permits States to use requirement payments or grant funds to conduct audits of the accuracy and effectiveness of voting systems, as well as election

procedures.

This Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute includes several relevant expansions and improvements to the underlying language based on our oversight process and feedback. The language is also identical to what is found in this Committee's American Confidence in Elections Act.

First, audits are be conducted independently. State and local officials, or contractors of such offices, may not conduct an audit.

Second, audits are comprehensive. It prescribes what an examination would cover over voter registration, voter check-in, voting tabulation, canvassing, and post-election procedures.

Finally, audits are timely. States' audits should be conducted before the expiration so one can challenge the results of an election under a State law.

In no way should this be considered a partisan issue and funding to aid States should ensure that elections are mechanically sound and taxpayer recourses are being used effectively.

Further, every State retains autonomy to administer their own elections as they see fit. It is enshrined in our Constitution, and nothing in this act infringes upon this. We believe all eligible American voters must be able to vote and all lawful votes must be counted

This legislation was crafted with thoughtful consideration and a sincere recognition of the bipartisan concern of the American people in election integrity. It is a sound piece of legislation that seeks to protect the sanctity of our elections and instill confidence in all, and I urge passage of the bill.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back. Chairman STEIL. The gentleman yields back. I will now recognize the Ranking Member, Mr. Morelle, if you would like to give a statement on the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute.

Mr. MORELLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think we all agree that post-election audits are an important tool to help ensure the accuracy of our elections. However, I have

serious concerns about the bill before us today.

H.R. 4555, the Federal Election Audit Act, would allow certain Help America Vote Act funds, HAVA funds, to be used to conduct and publish an audit of the effectiveness and accuracy of the voting systems, election procedures, and outcomes of an election, as well as the performance of election officials who carried out the election.

While this seems like good policy on its face, we have seen how post-election audits can be weaponized in furtherance of election-

related lies and disinformation and election denialism.

The Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute offered by the ma-

jority also raises significant concerns.

Prohibiting any individual, first of all, who is an employee or contractor of a State or local government office responsible for the administration of the election from participating in conducting the audit removes critical individuals with great knowledge and expertise from the process.

State and local election administrators are the experts in how their elections are run. We should not be effectively barring them

from participating in an audit.

There are too many stark examples of bad actors conducting or attempting to conduct audits of the 2020 election to simply allow Federal funds to be used to pay third parties without any guardrails.

The false claims about the 2020 election results led to the fraudulent post-election audits in a cynical attempt to cast doubt on elec-

tion results. That is why they existed.

In Arizona, for example, despite overwhelming evidence of President Biden's victory and without proof of any fraud, allies of the former President in the State of Arizona hired Cyber Ninjas, an organization with zero experience auditing elections, none whatsoever, and whose CEO had spread publicly conspiracy theories and election disinformation.

They were chosen to conduct another audit of the 2020 election results in Maricopa County, even though post-election audits had already been conducted. At the end of the day, the cost to the Arizona taxpayers was significant and unnecessary.

Attempts to conduct deceptive or disruptive audits were seen in

other States as well, such as Colorado and Michigan.

Post-election audits are a necessary and critical part of the election administration process. We should be providing States with

the resources they need to conduct them effectively.

However, this bill, while it does allow States to use HAVA funds to conduct the audits, my majority colleagues fail to provide any election funding in their appropriations bill, in the Financial Services and General Government appropriations bill, all but ensuring that State and local election officials are underresourced heading into another Presidential election year.

If my colleagues are going to allow Federal dollars to be used to conduct the audits described in the bill, they should allow State and local election officials to participate in conducting them and should ensure that proper guardrails are in place.

I will be offering an amendment, Mr. Chair, shortly, that would do all of that. Failure to adopt that amendment would, in my view, lead us to vote no, and I would urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 4555.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman STEIL. The gentleman yields back.

Does any Member seek recognition?

Do any additional Members seek recognition for the purpose of offering an amendment?

Mr. MORELLE. I do, Mr. Chair.

Chairman Steil. Mr. Morelle is recognized.

Mr. MORELLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman STEIL. The clerk will please distribute and report the amendment.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment to the amendment—

Chairman STEIL. Without objection, further reading of the amendment will be dispensed with.

[Ranking Member Morelle's amendment to H.R. 4555 follows:]

### AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4555 OFFERED BY MR. MORELLE OF NEW YORK

Page 1, line 1, strike "TITLE" and insert "TITLE; FINDINGS".

Page 1, line 2, strike "This Act" and insert "(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act".

Page 1, after line 3, insert the following:

1	(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:
2	(1) Following the 2020 presidential election,
3	false claims were made about the results in multiple
4	states and across the country.
5	(2) These false claims of election fraud or mal-
6	feasance led to several attempted and actual fraudu-
7	lent post-election audits in an attempt to cast doubt
8	on the 2020 election results.
9	(3) Numerous hand-counts and forensic audits
10	conducted in Arizona found no irregularities or dis-
11	crepancies, and did not change the results of the
12	presidential election.
13	(4) In 2021, despite the overwhelming evidence
14	of President Biden's victory, and without proof of
15	any fraud, allies of former President Trump in the

(912499|5)

. 1	Arizona Senate hired an organization known as
2	Cyber Ninjas to conduct another audit of the 2020
3	presidential election in Arizona's Maricopa County.
4	(5) Cyber Ninjas had no experience auditing
5	elections, though the company's CEO had spread
6	conspiracy theories and election disinformation on
7	the Internet.
. 8	(6) The audit cost Arizona taxpayers millions of
9	dollars, even though post-election audits had already
10	been conducted in the State.
11	(7) In 2021, third party vendors without experi-
12	ence in election auditing contacted several counties
13	in Colorado offering to conduct audits in the State,
. 14	despite the fact that Colorado law already mandates
. 15	post-election risk-limiting audits.
16	(8) The post-2020 election risk-limiting audit in
17	Colorado found that there was no significant fraud
18	or irregularities that would have altered the outcome
19	of any election in Colorado.
20	(9) Attempts to conduct deceptive or disruptive
21	audits in Colorado forced the Secretary of State of
22	Colorado, in order to protect the integrity of Colo-
23	rado elections, to issue rules prohibiting sham elec-

tion audits from being conducted in the State.

24

1	(10) In 2021, election deniers attempted to
2	force Michigan to conduct a sham post-election audit
3,	similar to the one conducted in Arizona, despite no
4	evidence showing significant fraud or irregularities
5	in the State.
6	(11) In 2022, the Michigan Bureau of Elections
7	confirmed that its official post-election audit con-
8	firmed that President Biden had carried the State in
9	2020.
10	(12) Risk-limiting audits are considered the
11	"gold standard of post-election audits" and
12	"[p]olitical scientists, statisticians, and election-secu-
13	rity experts have all lauded the benefits of post-elec-
14	tion, risk-limiting audits." See Christopher Deluzio,
15	A Smart and Effective Way to Safeguard Elections,
16	Brennan Ctr. for Just. (July 25, 2018).
17	(13) Following the 2020 presidential election,
18	the Georgia Secretary of State selected the presi-
19	dential contest for a statewide risk-limiting audit,
20	which confirmed that the original machine count ac-
21	curately portrayed the winner of the election.
22	(14) Post-election audits are a necessary and
23	critical part of the election administration process
24	and bolster confidence in the outcome of an election;
25	however, the 2020 election illustrated how this proc-

ess can be abused by those willing to deny the out-1 2 come of an election, spread false information about our electoral process, and profit from the spread of 3 4 lies and misinformation. 5 (15) Congress has the duty to ensure that any 6 post-election audit which utilizes taxpayer dollars 7 meets the highest standards of rigor and integrity, 8 and that taxpayer dollars are not used to further 9 election denialism.

In the matter proposed to be inserted in section 251(b)(1) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 by section 2(a) of the bill, strike "paragraph (4)" and insert "paragraph (4) and subsection (g),".

Add at the end the following:

### 10 SEC. 3. REQUIREMENTS FOR USE OF PAYMENTS TO CON-

- 11 DUCT AUDITS.
- 12 (a) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 251 of the Help Amer-
- 13 ica Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21001) is amended by
- 14 adding at the end the following new subsection:
- 15 "(g) REQUIREMENTS FOR USE OF PAYMENTS TO
- 16 CONDUCT AUDITS.—
- 17 "(1) LIMITATIONS ON PARTICIPATION OF
- 18 THIRD PARTIES.—A State may not use a require-
- 19 ments payment to conduct any audit described in

1	subsection (b)(1) if the State permits a third party,
2	including a vendor, to have access to voting systems
3	or other election equipment, voter information, bal-
. 4	lots, or voter registration systems as part of con-
5	ducting the audit, unless-
6	"(A) the appropriate State or local election
7	official authorizes the third party to have such
8	access;
9	"(B) the audit is conducted with full trans-
10	parency to the public on the basis of a com-
11	prehensive plan established and made public
12	prior to the conduct of the audit;
13	"(C) the State implements procedures to
14	ensure the proper chain of custody and security
15	of any equipment and supplies used to conduct
16	the audit; and
17	"(D) the State implements procedures to
18	protect voter privacy in the conduct of the
19	audit
20	"(2) Special requirements for con-
21	DUCTING AUDITS OF OUTCOMES OF ELECTIONS.—
22	"(A) Audit requirements.—A State
23	may not use a requirements payment to con-
24	duet a post-election audit of the outcome of an

	, <b>0</b>
1	election unless the audit is conducted in accord-
2	ance with the requirements of this paragraph.
3	"(B) Rules and procedures.—
4	"(i) In General.—Prior to con-
5	ducting the audit, the chief State election
6	official of the State shall establish rules
7	and procedures for conducting the audits.
8	"(ii) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The rules
9	and procedures established under clause (i)
10	shall include the following:
11	"(I) Rules and procedures for en-
12	suring the security of ballots and doc-
13	umenting that prescribed procedures
14	were followed.
15	"(II) Rules and procedures for
16	ensuring the accuracy of ballot mani-
17	fests produced by jurisdictions.
18	"(III) Rules and procedures for
19	governing the format of ballot mani-
20	fests and other data involved in post-
21	election audits.
22	"(IV) Methods to ensure that
23	any cast vote records used in a post-
24	election audit are those used by the
25	voting system to tally the results of

### G:\CMTE\HA\18\D\H4555AMD1.XML

7

1	the election contest sent to the chief
2	State election official of the State and
3	made public.
4	"(V) Rules and procedures for
5	the random selection of ballots to be
6	inspected manually during each audit.
7	"(VI) Rules and procedures for
8	the calculations and other methods to
9	be used in the audit and to determine
10	whether and when the audit of each
11	election contest is complete.
12	"(VII) Rules and procedures for
13	testing any software used to conduct
14	post-election audits.
15	"(C) PUBLIC REPORT.—
16	"(i) IN GENERAL.—After the comple-
17	tion of the post-election audit and at least
18	5 days before the election contest is cer-
19	tified by the State, the State shall make
20	public and submit to the Commission a re-
21	port on the results of the audit, together
22	with such information as necessary to con-
23	firm that the audit was conducted prop-
24	erly.

1	"(ii) Format of data.—All data
2	published with the report under clause (i)
3	shall be published in machine-readable,
4	open data formats.
5	"(iii) Protection of anonymity of
6	VOTES.—Information and data published
7	by the State under this subparagraph shall
8	not compromise the anonymity of votes.
. 9	"(iv) Report made available by
10	COMMISSION.—After receiving any report
11	submitted under clause (i), the Commis-
12	sion shall make such report available on its
13	website.
14	"(3) Definitions.—In this subsection:
15	"(A) POST-ELECTION AUDIT.—The term
16	'post-election audit' means, with respect to any
17	election contest, a post-election process that—
18	"(i) has a probability of at least 95
19	percent of correcting the reported outcome
20	if the reported outcome is not the correct
21	outcome;
22	"(ii) will not change the outcome if
23	the reported outcome is the correct out-
24	come: and

1	"(iii) involves a manual adjudication
2	of voter intent from some or all of the bal-
3	lots validly east in the election contest.
4	"(B) REPORTED OUTCOME; CORRECT OUT-
5	COME; OUTCOME.—
6	"(i) REPORTED OUTCOME.—The term
7	'reported outcome' means the outcome of
8	an election contest which is determined ac-
9	cording to the canvass and which will be-
10	come the official, certified outcome unless
11	it is revised by an audit, recount, or other
12	legal process.
13	"(ii) CORRECT OUTCOME.—The term
14	'correct outcome' means the outcome that
15	would be determined by a manual adju-
16	dication of voter intent for all votes validly
17	east in the election contest.
18	"(iii) Outcome.—The term 'outcome'
19	means the winner or set of winners of an
20	election contest.
21	"(C) MANUAL ADJUDICATION OF VOTER
22	INTENT.—The term 'manual adjudication of
23	voter intent' means direct inspection and deter-
24	mination by humans, without assistance from
25	electronic or mechanical tabulation devices, of

1	the ballot choices marked by voters on each
2	voter-verifiable paper record.
3	"(D) BALLOT MANIFEST.—The term 'bal-
4	lot manifest' means a record maintained by
5	each jurisdiction that—
6	"(i) is created without reliance on any
7	part of the voting system used to tabulate
8	votes;
9	"(ii) functions as a sampling frame
10	for conducting a post-election audit; and
11	"(iii) accounts for all ballots validly
12	cast regardless of how they were tabulated
13	and includes a precise description of the
14	manner in which the ballots are physically
15	stored, including the total number of phys-
16	ical groups of ballots, the numbering sys-
17	tem for each group, a unique label for each
18	group, and the number of ballots in each
19	such group.".
20	(b) STUDY ON POST-ELECTION AUDIT BEST PRAC-
21	TICES.—
22	(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National
23	Institute of Standards and Technology shall estab-
24	lish an advisory committee to study post-election au-

### G:\CMTE\HA\18\D\H4555AMD1.XML

### 11

1	dits and establish best practices for post-election
2	audit methodologies and procedures.
3	(2) Advisory committee.—The Director of
4	the National Institute of Standards and Technology
5.	shall appoint individuals to the advisory committee
6	and secure the representation of—
7	(A) State and local election officials;
8	(B) individuals with experience and exper-
9	tise in election security;
10	(C) individuals with experience and exper-
11	tise in post-election audit procedures; and
12	(D) individuals with experience and exper-
13	tise in statistical methods.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Chairman Steil. The gentlewoman from Florida reserves a point of order.

Mr. Morelle is recognized for 5 minutes in support of the amendment.

[Ranking Member Morelle's amendment to H.R. 3229 follows:]

Mr. MORELLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment that I am offering makes clear the very real potential for post-election audits to be abused by those willing to deny the outcome of an election, spread false information about our electoral process, and profit from the spread of lies and misinformation at the expense of voters and which ultimately undermine our democratic institutions.

Congress has the obligation to protect the electoral process and the American taxpayer and ensure that any post-election audit which utilizes tax dollars meets the highest standards of rigor and integrity and that taxpayer dollars are not used to further election denialism.

My amendment would add findings outlining just a few examples of how post-election audits were weaponized by election deniers in the wake of the 2020 election. This is public record, and it is in the amendment that I offer.

Additionally, my amendment would place limitations on the participation of third parties in any audit funded by these HAVA dollars unless the appropriate State or local official authorizes the third party's access, the audit is conducted with full transparency to the public based on a comprehensive plan established and made public ahead of time, the State implements procedures to ensure the proper chain of custody and security of any equipment or supplies used in the audit, and, finally, that the State implements procedures to protect voter privacy.

Finally, my amendment requires that if HAVA funds are being used to conduct an audit of an election outcome under this act, that

it must be a risk-limiting audit.

Risk-limiting audits are considered the gold standard of postelection audits, and we should ensure that any audit of election outcomes meets that standard.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the amendment.

I yield back the balance my time.

Chairman STEIL. The gentleman yields back.

Dr. Murphy is recognized.

Dr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, I think all of us on this Committee are very earnest that we want fair elections and free elections.

I will remind the Committee, however, of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton contesting the election with former President Donald Trump in several different regards.

I appreciate Mr. Morelle trying to improve the bill. However, I find this amendment a distraction, it will, repeating some of the other points that we have discussed ad nauseam in the Committee. I would urge my colleagues to vote no.

Chairman STEIL. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Ms. Sewell is recognized.

Ms. SEWELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just wanted to support the Morelle amendment.

I think that we have seen in the 2020 election, after the 2020 election, as he so eloquently said, lots of chances where States may have been well-intentioned but they chose third-party vendors to actually do the audits that were biased.

We need guardrails to make sure that we are, in fact, doing the audit properly and that we are not just trying to hold up someone from being sworn in and moving on with the process, but we are actually providing transparency and accountability.

I think that because his amendment provides better transparency and more accountability, that we should support his amendment.

Thank you.

Chairman STEIL. The gentlewoman yields back.

Is there further debate on the amendment?

Seeing none, does the gentlewoman from Florida insist on her point of order?

Ms. Lee. No, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back.

Chairman Stell. If not, the question is on the amendment from Mr. Morelle.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. MORELLE. A roll call?

Chairman STEIL. A roll call vote is ordered, and the clerk will please call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil?

Chairman Steil. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil votes no.

Mr. Loudermilk?

Mr. Loudermilk. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Loudermilk votes no.

Mr. Griffith?

Mr. Griffith. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Griffith votes no.

Dr. Murphy? Dr. Murphy. No.

The CLERK. Dr. Murphy votes no.

Mrs. Bice?

Mrs. BICE. No.

The CLERK. Mrs. Bice votes no.

Mr. Carey?

Mr. CAREY. No.

The Clerk. Mr. Carey votes no.

Mr. D'Esposito?

Mr. D'Esposito. No.

The CLERK. Mr. D'Esposito votes no.

Ms. Lee?

Ms. Lee. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes no.

Mr. Morelle?

Mr. Morelle. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Morelle votes aye. Ms. Sewell?

Ms. Sewell. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Sewell votes aye.

Mr. Kilmer?

Mr. Kilmer. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Kilmer votes aye.

Mrs. Torres?

Mrs. Torres. Aye.

The CLERK. Mrs. Torres votes aye. Chairman Steil. Does any Member wish to change their vote?

The clerk will report the tally.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote there are four ayes and eight noes.

Chairman Stell. The amendment is not agreed to.

Does any other Member seek recognition?

If not, the question now occurs on the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute offered by Dr. Murphy.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it, and the motion to report is agreed to.

Mr. MORELLE. May I ask for a recorded vote?

Chairman Steil. A recorded vote has been requested. The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil?

Chairman Steil. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil votes aye.

Mr. Loudermilk?

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Loudermilk votes aye.

Mr. Griffith?

Mr. Griffith. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Griffith votes aye.

Dr. Murphy?

Dr. MURPHY. Aye.

The CLERK. Dr. Murphy votes aye.

Mrs. Bice?

Mrs. BICE. Aye.

The CLERK. Mrs. Bice votes aye.

Mr. Carey?

Mr. CAREY. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Carey votes aye.

Mr. D'Esposito?

Mr. D'Esposito. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. D'Esposito votes aye.

Ms. Lee?

Ms. Lee. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.

Mr. Morelle?

Mr. Morelle. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Morelle votes no.

Ms. Sewell?

Ms. Sewell. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Sewell votes no.

Mr. Kilmer?

Mr. KILMER. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Kilmer votes no.

Mrs. Torres?

Mrs. Torres. No.

The CLERK. Mrs. Torres votes no.

Chairman Steil. Does any Member wish to change their vote?

If not, the clerk will report the tally.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote there are eight ayes and four noes.

Chairman STEIL. The Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute is agreed to. Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on upon the table.

The question now occurs on ordering H.R. 4555 reported favorably to the House.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it.

Mr. MORELLE. I would ask for a recorded vote, please.

Chairman Steil. A recorded vote has been requested.

The clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil?

Chairman Steil. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil votes aye.

Mr. Loudermilk?

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Loudermilk votes aye.

Mr. Griffith?

Mr. GRIFFITH. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Griffith votes aye.

Dr. Murphy?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mrs. Bice?

Mrs. BICE. Aye.

Chairman STEIL. Mrs. Bice votes aye.

Mr. Carey?

Mr. CAREY. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Carey votes aye.

Mr. D'Esposito?

Mr. D'Esposito. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. D'Esposito votes aye.

Ms. Lee?

Ms. Lee. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.

Dr. Murphy?

Dr. Murphy?

Dr. MURPHY. Aye.

The CLERK. Dr. Murphy votes aye.

Mr. Morelle?

Mr. Morelle. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Morelle votes no.

Ms. Sewell?

Ms. Sewell. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Sewell votes no.

Mr. Kilmer?

Mr. KILMER. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Kilmer votes no.

The CLERK. Mrs. Torres?

Mrs. Torres. No.

The CLERK. Mrs. Torres votes no.

Chairman STEIL. Does any Member wish to change their vote?

The clerk will report the tally.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote there are eight ayes and four noes?

Chairman Steil. Without objection, the motion is agreed to and the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

I will now call up 3229, Stop Foreign Funds in Elections Act, from Representative Fitzpatrick.

The clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk. H.R. 3229——

Chairman Steil. Without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Also, without objection, the bill shall be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

[House bill H.R. 3229 follows:]

### 118TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION

# H. R. 3229

To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the prohibition against contributions and donations by foreign nationals in connection with elections to contributions or donations in connection with ballot initiatives and referenda.

### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 11, 2023

Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mr. GOLDEN of Maine) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration

## **A BILL**

To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the prohibition against contributions and donations by foreign nationals in connection with elections to contributions or donations in connection with ballot initiatives and referenda.

- 1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
- 2 tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
- 3 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
- 4 This Act may be cited as the "Stop Foreign Funds
- 5 in Elections Act".

1	SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS
2	BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN CONNECTION
3	WITH BALLOT INITIATIVES AND REFERENDA.
4	(a) Prohibition.—Section 319(a)(1)(A) of the Fed-
5	eral Election Campaign Act of $1971$ (52 U.S.C.
6	30121(a)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting ", including a
7	State or local ballot initiative or referendum" after "State,
8	or local election".
9	(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by
10	this section shall apply with respect to contributions and
11	donations made on or after the date of the enactment of
12	this Act.

Chairman Steil. I have an Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute at the desk.

The clerk will please report the amendment.

The CLERK. An Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute—

Chairman STEIL. Without objection, the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute is considered as read and will be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

[The Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute offered by Chairman Steil follows:]

### AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE то Н.К. 3229

#### OFFERED BY MR. STEIL OF WISCONSIN

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

### 1 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

- 2 This Act may be cited as the "Stop Foreign Funds
- 3 in Elections Act".
- 4 SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS
- 5 BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN CONNECTION
- 6 WITH BALLOT INITIATIVES AND REFERENDA.
- 7 (a) Prohibition.—Section 319(a)(1)(A) of the Fed-
- 8 eral Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C.
- 30121(a)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting ", including a
- 10 State or local ballot initiative or referendum" after "State,
- or local election".
- 12 (b) Rule of Construction.—Section 319 of such
- 13 Act (52 U.S.C. 30121) is amended by adding at the end
- 14 the following new subsection:

(912407|1)

- 15 "(e) Rule of Construction Regarding State or
- 16 LOCAL ELECTIONS AND BALLOT INITIATIVES AND
- 17 Referenda.—Nothing in this section may be construed
- 18 to treat a State or local election or a State or local ballot

2

- 1 initiative or referendum as an election for any other pur-
- 2 pose under this Act.".
- 3 (c) Effective Date.—The amendment made by
- 4 this section shall apply with respect to contributions and
- 5 donations made on or after the date of the enactment of
- 6 this Act.



(91240711)

Chairman Steil. This bipartisan bill, introduced by Mr. Fitzpatrick of Pennsylvania and cosponsored by Mr. Kilmer, would prohibit contributions by foreign nationals in elections or in connection with ballot initiatives or referenda.

American elections and legislative efforts like referenda are for the benefit of American citizens, not foreign nationals. Foreign money should have no place in our politics at the Federal, State, and local level

and local level.

This bill was one of the Federal Election Commission's top nonpartisan legislative recommendations in 2022 and comes from all six Commissioners. That is three Republicans and three Democrats.

This amendment ensures that State or local campaign or ballot question committees are not subject to Federal registration or reporting requirements that would unnecessarily duplicate State efforts.

I will now recognize the Ranking Member, Mr. Morelle, if he would like to give a statement on the bill.

Mr. Morelle. Thank you. As I mentioned earlier in my opening statement, I am grateful to you and to staffs for collaboration here. I have a discrete amendment that I will offer a little later and make general comments.

In the interest of time, I am happy to yield back the balance of

my time.

Chairman Stell. The gentleman yields back. I recognize Mr. D'Esposito for 5 minutes. Mr. D'Esposito. Thank you, Chairman Steil.

H.R. 3229, The Stop Foreign Funds in Elections Act, is a necessary bill to protect our elections from foreign influence. This important piece of legislation would prohibit contributions or donations by foreign nationals in connection with State or local ballot initiatives. Federal law already takes several steps to ensure foreign nationals do not participate in Federal, State, or local elections.

Foreign nationals cannot, directly or indirectly make a contribution or donation of money, or other thing of value, or make an expressed or implied promise to make a contribution or donation in connection with a Federal, State, or local election. Foreign nationals are also prohibited from contributing and donating to political party committees and from making expenditures, independent expenditures, and disbursements for electioneering communications. Of course, noncitizens are also prohibited from voting in Federal elections.

However, Federal law does not prohibit foreign nationals from making contributions or donations in connection with State or local initiatives or referendum. This legislation rectifies that problem. American elections are for the benefit of American citizens and not foreign nationals. Foreign money should have no place in our elections at the Federal, State, or local level.

This bill was one of the Federal Election Commission's top bipartisan legislative recommendations in 2022, and comes from all six commissioners, three Republicans and three Democrats. It is essential that this is implemented before the next election in 2024. I urge the support from all my colleagues for this bipartisan bill that

assures that the right to vote and that participation in American elections belongs to the citizens of the United States of America, not foreign nationals.

Mr. Chairman, thank you. I yield back.

Chairman STEIL. The gentleman yields back.

I will now recognize Mr. Kilmer for 5 minutes, the cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. KILMER. Thanks, Mr. Chair. Thanks for taking this bill up. I want to just commend our colleague, Mr. Fitzpatrick, for bringing it forward.

As you mentioned, I cosponsored this. I think it is really important to keep foreign money out of our elections. That is really what this bill is about, also applying that prohibition to State and local ballot initiatives and referenda. I am really glad to see the Committee move this bill forward.

As has been mentioned, this comes out of a bipartisan recommendation from the Federal Election Commission. If you follow the FEC over the years, they do not always agree on much, but they agree that it is important to keep foreign money out of our election system. I also think it is important that again, mirroring one of the recommendations out of the FEC, that we take up the amendment that would ensure recall amendments are also included in this prohibition. That is something that the Commission recommended, and I think that is an important step to safeguarding the integrity of our elections.

I actually think it is valuable for our Committee to consider taking up other bipartisan recommendations that the Federal Election Commission has advanced. Things like some of their requests around staffing and recruitment. There have been bipartisan proposals around establishing a blue-ribbon advisory panel to look at how potential nominees are put forward to the FEC. I think that

is worth our Committee looking at.

I also just want to, you know, just on a side note here, as we look at how to keep foreign money out of elections, an area that I think we have got to fix a loophole in is online political expenditure. Right now, if any of us, if our campaigns, if an outside entity puts an ad on television, that is disclosed. There is a public file. They have to put their name on it. That is true on radio; that is true on broadcasts; that is not true on online political expenditure. We have a bill, Anonymous Ads Act, which is a bipartisan bill, just to replicate the same requirements that exist in TV and radio and have them apply to large-scale political expenditures. I think that is really important. Again, if we are going to be serious about keeping foreign money out of elections, we know more and more political spending is migrating into that online arena. I would hope to see this Committee take that up, too.

For now, I want to thank the Committee for moving forward with The Stop Foreign Funds in Elections Act, and hopefully, we can

keep the bipartisan train running.

I yield back.

Chairman STEIL. The gentleman yields back. Does any other Member seek recognition?

Ms. Sewell is recognized.

Ms. Sewell. I move to strike the last word.

Eliminating foreign interference in our local, State, and Federal elections is an issue that transcends party lines, because we all agree that the fact that corruption has no place in our politics. This is why I currently co-lead the Stop Foreign Interference and Ballot Initiative Act, which Representatives Porter and Gallagher have introduced to ban foreign donations for ballot measures and recall elections.

Currently, it is illegal for foreign entities to donate to American politicians and political campaigns, but there is a legal loophole that enables foreign nationals to donate to State and local ballot initiatives. It is time to close that gap in our elections to protect our democracy and ensure that Americans can trust that their Government leaders are looking out for their best interests and not those of foreign governments, businesses, or other foreign investors.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman STEIL. The gentlewoman yields back.

Does any other Member seek recognition?

Mr. MORELLE. I do.

Chairman Steil. Mr. Morelle is recognized.

Mr. Morelle. I do have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman STEIL. The clerk will please distribute and report the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment to H.R. 3229.

Chairman STEIL. Without objection, further reading of the amendment will be dispensed with.

Did the gentlewoman from Florida——

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Chairman STEIL. The gentlewoman reserves a point of order.

Mr. Morelle is recognized in support of the amendment.

[Ranking Member Morelle's amendment follows:]

# AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3229 OFFERED BY MR. MORELLE OF NEW YORK

Page 2, line 3, strike "REFERENDA" and insert "REFERENDA AND RECALL ELECTIONS".

Page 2, line 7, strike "referendum" and insert "referendum or recall election".



(91243111)

Mr. Morelle. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks, again, for who were folks working on this and the collaboration. I want to particularly thank Mr. Kilmer for his work and his comments here. More evidence that he will be missed in the next Congress. I am sad-

dened by that, but grateful for his ongoing contributions.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Election Commission determined as has been said in a recent enforcement matter, that the Federal Election Campaign Acts Foreign National Prohibition does not reach ballot initiatives that do not appear to be linked to an officeseeking candidate at the Federal, State, or local level. To address the statutorial mission, the FEC included, as has been said here, a recommendation to amend the prohibition to include State and local ballot initiatives, referenda and recall elections as one of the Commission's highest priority legislative recommendations.

The underlying bill here largely tracks the bipartisan legislative recommendations of the FEC, except for, it excludes the recall elections provision. This discrete amendment simply ensures the bill is in complete alignment with the FEC's bipartisan legislative recommendations. I encourage my colleagues to support what I consider a reasonable amendment in the spirit of what the FEC

worked on.

Before yielding back, I, again, want to note that I am glad to see the Committee taking seriously the risk of foreign interference in domestic election. In that spirit, I encourage my colleagues to consider additional comprehensive democracy reform, which closes loopholes for foreign campaign spending, like the Freedom to Vote Act, which includes the DISCLOSE Act.

I would also welcome the opportunity to work across the aisle to advance additional measures, which the FEC bipartisan legislative recommendations included. Mr. Kilmer has already acknowledged that as well, and I hope we are able to secure final passage on the administration fines measure before the program sunsets later this year. I think that is something that you and I both agree on.

Again, thank you for all the work on this. With that, I yield back

the balance of my time.

Chairman STEIL. I thank the Ranking Member for his amendment. It further enhances the underlying legislation that I know Mr. Kilmer and Mr. Fitzpatrick put a lot of time into. I thank you for the amendment. I will be supportive of the amendment.

Does any other Member seek recognition on the amendment?

Does the gentlewoman from Florida reserve her point of order?

Ms. LEE. No, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Chairman STEIL. Is there any further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is now on the amendment from Mr. Morelle. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the amendment is agreed to.

Does any Member seek recognition on the underlying Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute?

Seeing none, the question now occurs on the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute.

All those in favor signify by saying ave.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the chair, ayes have it, and the motion to report is agreed to.

The question now occurs on ordering H.R. 3229, reported favorably to the House.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the chair, the motion to report is agreed to. Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

I will now call up H.R. 4460, the No Vote for Non-Citizens Act, sponsored by Mr. Griffith and included in the ACE Act. This bill would ensure that only eligible American citizens can vote in Federal elections.

I will now yield 5 minutes to the bill's sponsor, Mr. Griffith.

[House bill H.R. 4460 follows:]

118TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION

# H. R. 4460

To amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 and the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to ensure that only eligible American citizens may participate in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes.

### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

July 3, 2023

Mr. GRIFFITH introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned

### A BILL

To amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 and the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to ensure that only eligible American citizens may participate in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes.

- 1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
- 2 tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
- 3 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.
- 4 (a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the
- 5 "Non-citizens: Outlawed from Voting in Our Trusted
- 6 Elections Act of 2023" or the "NO VOTE for Non-Citi-
- 7 zens Act of 2023".

1	(b) Findings; Sense of Congress.—
2	(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:
3	(A) Every eligible person who wishes to
4	cast a ballot in a Federal election must be per-
5	mitted to do so according to law, and their bal-
6	lot must be examined according to law, and, it
7	it meets all lawful requirements, counted.
8	(B) Congress has long required States to
9	maintain Federal voter registration lists in a
10	manner that promotes voter confidence.
11	(C) The changes included herein are not
12	intended to be an expansion of Federal power
13	but rather a clarification of State authority.
14	(D) The Fifteenth Amendment, the Nine-
15	teenth Amendment, the Twenty-Fourth Amend-
16	ment, and the Twenty-Sixth Amendment
17	among other references, make clear that the
18	Constitution prohibits voting by non-citizens in
19	Federal elections.
20	(E) Congress has the constitutional au-
21	thority, including under the aforementioned
22	amendments, to pass statutes preventing non-
23	citizens from voting in Federal elections, and
24	did so with the Illegal Immigration Reform and
25	Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

1	(F) Congress may further exercise its con-
2	stitutional authority to ensure the Constitu-
3	tion's prohibition on non-citizen voting in Fed-
4	eral elections is upheld.
5	(G) Since the Constitution prohibits non-
6	citizens from voting in Federal elections, such
7	ineligible persons must not be permitted to be
8	placed on Federal voter registration lists.
9	(H) Improper placement of an ineligible
10	non-citizen on a Federal voter registration list
11	leads to—
12	(i) confusion on the part of the ineli-
13	gible person with respect to their ineligi-
14	bility to cast a ballot; and
15	(ii) an increased likelihood that
16	human error will permit ineligible persons
17	to cast ballots in Federal elections.
18	(I) State officials have confirmed that
19	poorly maintained voter registration lists lead to
20	ineligible persons casting ballots in Federal
21	elections.
22	(J) A former Broward County, Florida,
23	elections supervisor has confirmed that ineli-
24	gible non-voters were able to cast ballots in pre-
25	vious elections and that she was not able to lo-

1	cate as many as 2,040 ballots during the 2018
2	midterm recount.
3	(K) This clarification of State authority to
4	maintain Federal voter registration lists to en-
5	sure non-citizens are not included on such lists
6	will promote voter confidence in election proc-
7	esses and outcomes.
8	(L) Congress has the authority to ensure
9	that no Federal elections funding is used to
10	support States that permit non-citizens to cast
11	ballots in any election.
12	(M) Federal courts and executive agencies
13	have much of the information States may need
14	to maintain their Federal voter registration
15	lists, and those entities should make that infor-
16	mation accessible to State election authorities.
17	(N) It is important to clarify the penalty
18	for any violation of law that allows a non-citizen
19	to cast a ballot in a Federal election.
20	(O) To protect the confidence of voters in
21	Federal elections, it is important to implement
22	the policy described herein.
23	(2) Sense of congress.—It is the sense of
24	Congress that—

1	(A) many States have not adequately met
2	the requirements concerning the removal of in-
3	eligible persons from State voter registration
4	rolls pursuant to section 8 of the National
5	Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C.
6	20507) and should strive to audit and update
7	their voter registration rolls on a routine basis;
8	(B) allowing non-citizens to cast ballots in
9	American elections weakens our electoral sys-
10	tem and the value of citizenship and sows dis-
11	trust in our elections system;
12	(C) even if a State has the sovereign au-
13	thority, no State should permit non-citizens to
14	cast ballots in State or local elections;
15	(D) States should use all information
16	available to them to maintain Federal voter reg-
17	istration lists and should inform Congress if
18	such data is insufficient; and
19	(E) Congress may take further action in
20	the future to address this problem.
21	SEC. 2. ENSURING ONLY ELIGIBLE AMERICAN CITIZENS
22	MAY PARTICIPATE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.
23	(a) Clarifying Authority of States To Remove
24	NONCITIZENS FROM VOTING ROLLS.—

1	(1) AUTHORITY UNDER REGULAR REMOVAL
2	PROGRAMS.—Section 8(a)(4) of the National Voter
3	Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20507(a)(4)) is
4	amended—
5	(A) by striking "or" at the end of subpara-
6	graph (A);
7	(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as
8	subparagraph (C); and
9	(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A)
10	the following new subparagraph:
11	"(B) the registrant's status as a noncitizen
12	of the United States; or".
13	(2) Conforming amendment relating to
14	ONGOING REMOVAL.—Section 8(c)(2)(B)(i) of such
15	Act $(52 \text{ U.S.C. } 20507(e)(2)(B)(i))$ is amended by
16	striking "(4)(A)" and inserting "(4)(A) or (B)".
17	(b) REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN SEPARATE STATE
18	VOTER REGISTRATION LIST FOR NONCITIZENS.—Section
19	8(a) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52
20	U.S.C. 20507(a)) is amended—
21	(1) in paragraph (5)(B), by striking "and" at
22	the end;
23	(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at
24	the end and inserting "; and"; and

1	(3) by adding at the end the following new
2	paragraph:
3	"(7) in the case of a State that allows individ-
4	uals who are not citizens of the United States to
5	vote in elections for public office in the State or any
6	local jurisdiction of the State, ensure that the name
7	of any registrant who is not a citizen of the United
8	States is maintained on a voter registration list that
9	is separate from the official list of eligible voters
10	with respect to registrants who are citizens of the
11	United States.".
12	(e) REQUIREMENTS FOR BALLOTS FOR STATE OF
13	LOCAL JURISDICTIONS THAT ALLOW NONCITIZEN VOT-
14	ING.—Section 301(a)(1) of the Help America Vote Act of
15	2002 (52 U.S.C. $21081(a)(1)$ ) is amended by adding at
16	the end the following new subparagraph:
17	"(D) In the case of a State or local juris-
18	diction that allows individuals who are not citi-
19	zens of the United States to vote in elections
20	for public office in the State or local jurisdic-
21	tion, the ballot used for the casting of votes by
22	a noncitizen in such State or local jurisdiction
23	may only include the candidates for the elec-
24	tions for public office in the State or local juris

1	diction for which the noncitizen is permitted to
2	vote.".
3	(d) REDUCTION IN PAYMENTS FOR ELECTION AD-
4	MINISTRATION TO STATES OR LOCAL JURISDICTIONS
5	THAT ALLOW NONCITIZEN VOTING.—
6	(1) IN GENERAL.—Title IX of the Help Amer-
7	ica Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21141 et seq.) is
8	amended by adding at the end the following new sec-
9	tion:
10	"SEC. 907. REDUCTION IN PAYMENTS TO STATES OR LOCAL
11	JURISDICTIONS THAT ALLOW NONCITIZEN
12	VOTING.
13	"(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other pro-
14	vision of this Act, the amount of a payment under this
15	Act to any State or local jurisdiction that allows individ-
16	uals who are not citizens of the United States to vote in
17	elections for public office in the State or local jurisdiction
18	shall be reduced by 30 percent.
19	"(b) Prohibition on Use of Funds for Certain
20	ELECTION ADMINISTRATION ACTIVITIES.—Notwith-
21	standing any other provision of law, no Federal funds may
22	be used to implement the requirements of section $8(a)(7)$
23	of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C.
24	20507(a)(7)) (as added by section 2(b) of the NO VOTE
25	for Non-Citizens Act of 2023) or section 301(a)(1)(D) of

1	the	Help	America	Vote	Act	$\mathbf{of}$	2002	(52	U.S.C.
---	-----	------	---------	------	-----	---------------	------	-----	--------

- 2 21081(a)(1)(D)) (as added by 2(c) of the NO VOTE for
- 3 Non-Citizens Act of 2023) in a State or local jurisdiction
- 4 that allows individuals who are not citizens of the United
- 5 States to vote in elections for public office in the State
- 6 or local jurisdiction.".
- 7 (2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of con-
- 8 tents of such Act is amended by adding at the end
- 9 the following new item:

"Sec. 907. Reduction in payments to States or local jurisdictions that allow noncitizen voting.".

- 10 (e) Promoting Provision of Information by
- 11 FEDERAL ENTITIES.—
- 12 (1) In General.—Each entity of the Federal
- 13 Government which maintains information which is
- 14 relevant to the status of an individual as a registered
- voter in elections for Federal office in a State shall,
- upon the request of an election official of the State,
- provide that information to the election official.
- 18 (2) Policies and procedures.—Consistent
- with section 3506(g) of title 44, United States Code,
- an entity of the Federal Government shall carry out
- 21 this subsection in accordance with policies and pro-
- 22 cedures which will ensure that the information is
- provided securely, accurately, and in a timely basis.

1	(3) Conforming amendment relating to
2	COVERAGE UNDER PRIVACY ACT.—Section 552a(b)
3	of title 5, United States Code, is amended—
4	(A) by striking "or" at the end of para-
5	graph (11);
6	(B) by striking the period at the end of
7	paragraph (12) and inserting "; or"; and
8	(C) by adding at the end the following new
9	paragraph:
10	"(13) to an election official of a State in ac-
11	cordance with section 2(e) of the NO VOTE for
12	Non-Citizens Act of 2023.".
13	(f) Ensuring Provision of Information to
14	STATE ELECTION OFFICIALS ON INDIVIDUALS RECUSED
15	From Jury Service on Grounds of Noncitizen-
16	SHIP.—
17	(1) REQUIREMENT DESCRIBED.—If a United
18	States district court recuses an individual from serv-
19	ing on a jury on the grounds that the individual is
20	not a citizen of the United States, the court shall
21	transmit a notice of the individual's recusal—
22	(A) to the chief State election official of
23	the State in which the individual resides; and
24	(B) to the Attorney General.

1	(2) Definitions.—For purposes of this sub-
2	section—
3	(A) the "chief State election official" of a
4	State is the individual designated by the State
5	under section 10 of the National Voter Reg-
6	istration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20509) to be
7	responsible for coordination of the State's re-
8	sponsibilities under such Act; and
9	(B) the term "State" means each of the
10	several States, the District of Columbia, the
11	Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American
12	Samoa, Guam, the United States Virgin Is-
13	lands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern
14	Mariana Islands.
15	(g) Prohibition on Voting by Noncitizens in
16	FEDERAL ELECTIONS.—
17	(1) In General.—Section 12 of the National
18	Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20511)
19	is amended—
20	(A) by striking "A person" and inserting
21	"(a) In General.—A person"; and
22	(B) by adding at the end the following new
23	subsection:
24	"(b) Prohibition on Voting by Aliens.—

1	"(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any
2	alien to vote in any election in violation of section
3	611 of title 18, United States Code.
4	"(2) PENALTIES.—Any person who violates this
5	subsection shall be fined under title 18, United
6	States Code, imprisoned not more than one year, or
7	both.".
8	(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection and the
9	amendments made by this subsection shall apply
10	with respect to elections held on or after the date of
11	the enactment of this Act.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate it. It is a pretty simple bill. I know some people may not like it, but what it says is, is that if you are going to—and certainly the State and local governments are able to do that, but if you are going to allow noncitizens to vote in your local and State elections, that you have to keep separate rolls, and you have to have separate ballots if you have two elections going on at the same time. If you are voting for a State or local issue at the same time as there is a Federal election, then they have to have ballots separate for the noncitizens voters as opposed to the citizen voters.

That is fairly simple. I know there is some controversy over the funding requirements, but those make sense to me. What we are saying is if you do that, then you only receive 70 percent of the money you would have otherwise received. A big part of that is, the Federal Government gives that money so that we can make sure that when we have a combined ballot, the Federal Government is helping the States and the local governments and all make sure

they do that process, and they get it correctly.

If you are going to have separate ballots and you are not going to have those ballots be the same, then the Federal Government's responsibility is less. Frankly, I think you can make intellectual argument for less than the 70 percent. We felt like that would be unfair to go below the 70 percent level. We left it at 70 percent.

That covers most of it. I mean, if we want to get into a big discussion, there are a couple of other little provisions in there relating to maintaining communications between the Federal Government and the State government. If the Federal Government has a jury pool and they say that people should not be in the jury because they are not citizens, then if they make that determination at Federal court, then that should be communicated to the local and State governments that those folks are not, therefore, American citizens not eligible to vote in the Federal election process.

I vield back.

Chairman STEIL. The gentleman yields back. I appreciate your work in this area, Mr. Griffith. It is an important topic, and I know it is passionate to you.

Does the Ranking Member, Mr. Morelle, want to speak on the statement on the bill?

Mr. Griffith. There is an amendment at the desk.

Chairman Steil. An amendment at the desk. The gentleman has an amendment at the desk. The clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. Morelle. Yes.

The CLERK. An amendment to H.R. 4460.

Chairman STEIL. Without objection, further reading of the amendment will be dispensed with.

Ms. Lee. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Chairman STEIL. The gentlewoman from Florida reserves a point of order.

Mr. Morelle is now recognized for 5 minutes in support of the amendment.

[Ranking Member Morelle's amendment to H.R. 4460 follows:]

# AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4460 OFFERED BY MR. MORELLE OF NEW YORK

Page 1, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 5, line 20 and insert the following:

#### 1 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS.

- 2 (a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the
- 3 "Election Administration Act".
- 4 (b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that every eligible
- 5 person who wishes to cast a ballot in a Federal election
- 6 must be permitted to do so according to law, and their
- 7 ballot must be examined according to law, and, if it meets
- 8 all lawful requirements, counted.

Page 5, line 21, strike "ONLY ELIGIBLE AMERICAN CITIZENS" and insert "ELIGIBLE VOTERS".

Page 5, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 6, line 16 (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly).

Page 8, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 12, line 7.

Page 12, strike lines 8 through 11 and insert the following:

- 1 (c) Effective Date.—This section and the amend-
- 2 ments made by this section shall apply with respect to
- 3 elections held on or after the date of the enactment of
- 4 this Act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 and the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to ensure that eligible voters may participate in elections.".



(91254813)

Mr. Morelle. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I admit, looking at this bill I am confused about the guiding philosophy of the modern Republican Party. As was stated earlier, I think a misreading of the United States Constitution, which clearly gives Congress the power to do it. My majority colleagues often say that the States have primacy. Do they support the power of States to create their own laws to govern themselves? Are they for local control? Do they want to use Federal power to override and overrule local governments? Because that is exactly what we have here.

They enjoy a waxing poetic of the sacrosanct nature of their view, States' rights and local control. This bill directly contradicts those principles. It strong-arms local jurisdictions and mandates extreme partisan restrictions. I am all for real-election security.

This bill does not increase the security of our elections.

I want to be very clear about this bill up front. Everybody in the room knows it is a messaging bill, has no chance of passage. Frankly, it is gimmicky. With next year's elections fast approaching, we should be focusing on how we support election administrators coast to coast who continue to face increased pressures to do their jobs and do it effectively. Instead, we are considering a recycled provision of the ACE Act that slashes already scarce funding for election administrators and mandates heavy-handed voter purges using flawed systems that disproportionately target naturalized citizens.

Let us be clear also, Democrats ardently believe that Government can, indeed should, be used to expand prosperity and opportunity, ensure safety and health, and most importantly safeguard rights and freedoms. This bill is an attempt to restrict freedom rather than to expand it. Where Democrats, through our Freedom to Vote Act, aim to aid the exercise of democracy and self-government, this bill does the opposite, nothing but decrease local control

without increasing election security.

It would slash funds that are critically needed to keep our elections safe, investments necessary to the success of free and fair elections, which we all continue to talk about. I suspect my majority colleagues may think the bill is a clever way to punish blue States for their sovereign and entirely constitutional decisions. This is their right to make these choices. I do warn my colleagues this bill would not just punish Democrats, HAVA funds benefit everyone. Our election infrastructure safeguards the rights of every

California, for example, would lose 30 percent of its HAVA funds under this bill. My majority colleagues might have forgotten Republicans received almost 4 million votes in California in 2022. In fact, over 13 percent of 2022 voters live in just four States; California, New York, Maryland, and Vermont. These four States which send 24 Republicans to Congress, including the former Republican Speaker of the House and the chair of the Republican conference, could lose a third of their HAVA funds under this bill.

Voters in those States would be penalized by Republicans in Washington. Voters would see their election infrastructure dramatically weakened, and would vote in elections that are underfunded, and therefore, necessarily less secure and more vulnerable to malicious acts. That is not what I think any of us want at a time when election administrators have repeatedly told this Committee

of their dire need for increased funding. Slashing these funds would be a grave mistake.

I recently met with the commendable public servants who, under great strain and scrutiny, run Rochester's elections, Monroe County's elections. I will tell you here and now, I will never vote to cut even a cent of funding for these hardworking people. It is not just my community. Each of the public servants who run the elections for the 11 percent of the Republican conference from the four States I mentioned about, would lose essential funding as a punishment for decisions made outside of their control.

The Committee's majority keeps pushing a narrative that the confidence of the American people is in crisis. I have never been that cynical. If anything shakes the American people's confidence in our Government, it is watching the slow motion Hindenburg disaster that has been this majority's efforts over the last 9 months.

I offer this amendment to strip away the provisions of the bill that would punish election administrators at a time they most need our support. It would leave a sensible proposal that States or jurisdiction that allow noncitizen voting should maintain proper registration lists and ballots that ensure that all eligible voters, in their jurisdiction, are able to access and cast the appropriate ballot.

If my majority colleagues will abandon denialism, conspiracy theories uprooted in fact, certainly untethered from this Committee's record that shows absolute dearth of legitimate reasons to contest the outcome of the 2020 election, then we can find common ground. That is what this amendment seeks to do. I urge my colleagues to support real election security.

I urge them to support my amendment, and with that, I yield back.

Chairman STEIL. The gentleman yields back.

Mr. Griffith is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Griffith. I thank the Chairman.

You know, it is interesting because you always see things in a different light than other folks. I think this is a very reasonable measure. What, in essence, is happening is in some of the States—and they have every right to do that. This bill does not attack that right, but it says if you are going to have two different election processes, we spend money to guarantee or to assure free and fair Federal elections.

If the rules are then changing at State and local elections because other people are allowed to vote, that is a different ballot process. What this bill says is we are going to have separate ballots. We are going to have those folks, you know, two separate rolls, two separate ballots. We are trying to make sure there are free and fair Federal elections.

In theory, one could argue that since it is a separate roll and a separate ballot, and everything is separate, that it should be cut to 50 percent. To say that we are slashing it when, in fact, we are probably giving 20 percent more money than we ought to because when you divide the process—I see confusion on Mr. Morelle's face—if you are taking the process that is 100 percent now and you are cutting it in two, would seem you should only pay for 50 percent of it.

Mr. Griffith. If you go to the grocery store, and you only get half a pound of ground round, you probably do not pay for a whole pound of ground round. That is all we are saying. We are only involved in half or half of these election processes now. We are willing to pay a little bit more because we understand that it may be detrimental in some ways. It is not meant as a punishment. It is meant as a commonsense approach to spending Federal dollars that we do not have enough of, that we have a huge deficit over. We are just trimming it back a little bit and saying, We are going to pay the part that the Federal Government is invested in. If you have chosen to go in a completely separate direction, have separate rolls, and I think that is important that we do, but if you have separate rolls and you have a separate balloting process, then you have every right to do that. If you make that choice, that is something you have to pay for. Even then, we are still paying 70 percent.

I yield back. I am opposed to the amendment if you could not tell.

Chairman STEIL. The gentleman yields back.

Is there further debate on the amendment?

Does the gentlewoman from Florida insist on her point of order?

Ms. Lee. No, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Chairman STEIL. If not, the question is on the amendment from Mr. Morelle.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, no.

In opinion of the chair, the noes have it and the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. Morelle. I request a recorded vote.

Chairman STEIL. A roll call vote is ordered. The clerk will please call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil?

Mr. Steil. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil votes no.

Mr. Loudermilk?

Mr. Loudermilk. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Loudermilk votes no.

Mr. Griffith?

Mr. Griffith. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Griffith votes no.

Dr. Murphy?

Dr. MURPHY. No.

The CLERK. Dr. Murphy votes no.

Mrs. Bice?

Mrs. BICE. No.

The CLERK. Mrs. Bice votes no.

Mr. Carey?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. D'Esposito?

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. No.

The CLERK. Mr. D'Esposito votes no.

Ms. Lee?

Ms. Lee. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes no.

Mr. Morelle?

Mr. Morelle. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Morelle votes aye.

Ms. Sewell?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Kilmer?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mrs. Torres?

Mrs. Torres. Aye.

The CLERK. Mrs. Torres votes aye. Mr. Carey?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Sewell?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Kilmer.

[No response.]

Chairman Steil. Does any Member wish to change their vote?

The clerk will report the tally.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, there are two ayes and seven noes.

Chairman STEIL. The amendment is not agreed to.

Do any other Members seek recognition?

If not, the question now occurs on ordering H.R. 4460 reported favorably to the House.

All in favor signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it, and the motion is agreed to.

Mr. Morelle. I ask for a recorded rote.

Chairman Steil. A recorded vote has been requested. The clerk will record the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil?

Mr. Steil. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil votes aye.

Mr. Loudermilk?

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Loudermilk votes aye.

Mr. Griffith?

Mr. Griffith. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Griffith votes aye.

Dr. Murphy?

Dr. MURPHY. Aye.

The CLERK. Dr. Murphy votes ave.

Mrs. Bice?

Mrs. BICE. Aye.

The CLERK. Mrs. Bice votes aye.

Mr. Carey?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. D'Esposito?

Mr. D'Esposito. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. D'Esposito votes aye.

Ms. Lee?

Ms. Lee. Ave.

The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.

Mr. Morelle?

Mr. Morelle. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Morelle votes no.

Ms. Sewell?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Kilmer?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mrs. Torres?

Mrs. Torres. No.

The CLERK. Mrs. Torres votes no.

Mr. Carey?

Mr. CAREY. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Carey votes aye.

Ms. Sewell?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Kilmer?

[No response.]

Chairman STEIL. Does any Member wish to change their vote? The clerk will report the tally.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote there are eight ayes and two noes.

Chairman STEIL. The bill is agreed to. Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

I will now call up H.R. 6493, the Promoting Free and Fair Elections Act of 2023 sponsored by Mrs. Hageman and included in the ACE Act. The bill would repeal a Biden executive order that gives Federal agencies unprecedented power to influence the elections process, essentially turning them into an extension of left's get-out-the-vote operation. I encourage support of the bill.

I will now yield 5 minutes to Mr. Loudermilk to speak on the

[House bill H.R. 6493 follows:]

	(Original Company of Mankon)
	H CONGRESS ST SESSION  H. R.
То	limit the involvement of Federal agencies in voter registration activities, and for other purposes.
	IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
M	introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on
	Commission on
	A BILL
	To limit the involvement of Federal agencies in voter registration activities, and for other purposes.
1	Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
2 7	tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
3 :	SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
4	This Act may be cited as the "Promoting Free and
5	Fair Elections Act of 2023".
6 :	SEC. 2. FEDERAL AGENCY INVOLVEMENT IN VOTER REG-
7	ISTRATION ACTIVITIES.
8	(a) Clarification of Federal Agency Involve-
9	MENT IN VOTER REGISTRATION ACTIVITIES.—Executive
g:\V\H\112923\H112923. November 29, 2023 (9:42	

- 1 Order 14019 (86 Fed. Reg. 13623; relating to promoting
- 2 access to voting) shall have no force or effect, and any
- 3 contract or arrangement entered into by an agency to
- 4 carry out activities pursuant to sections 3 and 4 of such
- 5 Executive Order shall be abrogated.
- 6 (b) AGREEMENTS WITH NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGA-
- 7 NIZATIONS.—None of the funds made available for the sal-
- 8 aries and expenses of an agency may be used to solicit
- 9 or enter into an agreement with a nongovernmental orga-
- 10 nization to conduct voter registration or voter mobilization
- 11 activities, including registering voters or providing any
- 12 person with voter registration materials, absentee or vote-
- 13 by-mail ballot applications, voting instructions, or can-
- 14 didate-related information, on the property or website of
- 15 the agency.
- 16 (c) Report on Prior Voter Registration and
- 17 MOBILIZATION ACTIVITIES.—Not later than 30 days after
- 18 the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each agency
- 19 shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees
- 20 a report describing the activities carried out by the agency
- 21 pursuant to sections 3 and 4 of Executive Order 14019
- 22 (86 Fed. Reg. 13623).
- 23 (d) Prohibiting Voter Registration and Mobi-
- 24 LIZATION IN FEDERAL WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS.—Sec-

1	tion $443(b)(1)$ of the Higher Education Act of $1965\ (20$
2	U.S.C. $1087-53(b)(1)$ ) is amended—
3	(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking "and";
4	(2) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as sub-
5	paragraph (E); and
6	(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the fol-
7	lowing:
8	"(D) does not involve registering or mobi-
9	lizing voters on or off the campus of the institu-
10	tion; and".
11	(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:
12	(1) AGENCY.—The term "agency" has the
13	meaning given the term in section $3502(1)$ of title
14	44, United States Code.
15	(2) Appropriate congressional commit-
16	TEES.—The term "appropriate congressional com-
17	mittees' means—
18	(A) the Committee on Rules and Adminis-
19	tration of the Senate;
20	(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the
21	Senate;
22	(C) the Committee on House Administra-
23	tion of the House of Representatives; and
24	(D) the Committee on the Judiciary of the
25	House of Representatives.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to lend my support for H.R. 6493 by Mrs. Hageman of Wyoming. President Biden's Executive Order, 14019 reflects a startling expansion of the Federal Government into election administration, a space the Constitution clearly dictates that the States have primary authority.

H.R. 6493 would repeal this executive order and roll back yet another attempt by Democrats to expand the reach of the Federal Government into elections. Federal agencies exist to help Americans solve problems they have, such as verifying their veteran

health benefits, not to ask if they are registered to vote.

The Department of Labor and the Department of the Interior, for example, have no statutory or logical role in voter administration. Yet, this executive order asks them to develop new voter registration activities for which they are not appropriately equipped, limiting the agency's ability to complete its actual responsibilities.

Instead of propping up new Federal programs to register voters, the Federal Government should look to the agency that is already tasked with assisting in voter registration efforts, the Election Assistance Commission. The EAC, as the only Federal agency statutorily intended to work in the election administration space, is well-equipped to support Americans in accessing their voter registration information.

With an agency as robustly prepared to assist in voter registration information already in existence, there is no need to expend Federal funds and resources for other Federal agencies to enter the election administration space.

I urge support for 6493, and I yield back. Chairman Steil. The gentleman yields back.

Is there further debate?

Apologies. Mr. Morelle is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORELLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I do want to just comment, again, about when I consider the misreading of the Federal election, which gives Congress always the right to alter laws, and there is no primacy identified in the Federal Constitution. It is a misreading of a simply written statement that should be easily understood. I will make that point. I will try to make it repeatedly.

As it relates to the bill, the bill itself, in my view, is beyond ridiculous and is deeply cynical. It repeals an executive order by the President promoting voter participation by directing Federal agencies to, quote, "consider ways to expand citizens' opportunities to register to vote and to obtain information about and participate in

the electoral process.

I, frankly, for the life of me, do not understand what my colleagues find objectionable about that. The executive order has a simple purpose, directing existing Federal resources, like Department websites or agency social media accounts to encourage more people to vote. It is the American way. We want everyone to participate.

Frankly, when we see the disparity between certain groups of Americans and their voting turnout, we should want to work on making sure that every single American who is eligible avails

themselves of the ballot.

I struggle to understand their version of encouraging people to participate in our democracy. That is all the bill does. Importantly, by using existing resources, the implementation of the executive order does not cost the taxpayer an additional penny. Without those existing resources, the executive order helps to make—with those without additional resources helps make voting and voter registration more accessible to all Americans while improving voter confidence and election security.

Importantly, the executive order helps our servicemembers by directing the Department of Defense to implement an end-to-end tracking system on military ballots and offer each member of the Armed Forces on Active Duty the opportunity to register to vote in Federal elections, update voter registration, or request an absentee

ballot.

I, frankly, do not understand what is objectionable about American servicemembers voting or being assisted and aided in their efforts to vote while on active duty. As the purpose was stated in the order itself, it is our duty to ensure that registering to vote, and the act of voting be made simple and easy for all those eligible to do so. I could not have, nor would I have tried, to say it better.

The Republican bill would do exactly the opposite. It would make it harder for servicemembers and veterans to register to vote. It prevents the Department of Defense, of Veterans Affairs from encouraging voter participation and registration, which is a disservice to every single man and woman who serves in our Nation's uniform

The executive order on promoting access to voting has been working. After the President's executive order, the VA sent a survey to over 12 million veterans to understand the veterans' experience of the voter registration process. The VA also launched a website with nonpartisan voter registration and elections information specifically for veterans. The VA is developing pilot programs for VA health facilities to receive and accept NVRA designations.

Now, why, in God's name, would any Member of this Committee, if they support our veterans and support voter registration, oppose the executive order? It is not just the VA that has been successful. Crucially, the Department of the Interior has been improving voter registration access for Native Americans who have long been excluded from the full Democratic participation. For example, the Department of the Interior's accepted NVRA designations of the Tribal colleges and universities it operates, ensuring students have regular access to voter registration services.

Further, the Interior has raised awareness about barriers Native American voters face by translating the report of the interagency steering group on Native American voting rights into six native languages, both in writing and in audio. By supporting this bill, my colleagues will be dismantling vital programs that materially help

Native Americans participate in democracy.

Again, I am at a loss to understand why anyone would want to do that. I applaud the administration for working on this executive order. The right to vote is cherished in America. It is what makes us the great republic we are. I urge all my colleagues to oppose the bill, and ensure that the administration, this one and future ones, can continue to promote voter participation in our democracy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman Steil. The gentleman yields back. The Clerk will please report the bill.

The CLERK. H.R. 6493.

Chairman STEIL. Without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with. Also, without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. Loudermilk is recognized for 5 minutes. Mr. LOUDERMILK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to clarify a couple things my good friend Mr. Morelle brought up that were not exactly correct. This bill would not affect the Department of Defense. That is, as a veteran, I can tell you the Department of Defense has a totally separate program that is run from the Pentagon under the Department of Defense to deal with voting. This would not affect that.

Second, the VA has enough challenges providing adequate healthcare and benefits to veterans. They need to focus on that, not on voting. We have the American Legion, which is an organization developed by Congress that does a great job—as a member of the American Legion—does great job of engaging people in voting.

Look, people have a lot of distrust in the Federal Government. It is because of the performance of Federal agencies not doing their jobs. Everyone here understands that because if the agencies were doing jobs they should, we would not have constituent services. We have them because the Federal Government fails in most of the things that it tries to do for the American people. Let us focus on those rolls.

Third, I will close with, yes, our interpretation of the Constitution relating to the States having the primary authority in setting the means and methods and ways of voting is not a misreading of it, unless you want to argue with the folks who were there at the Constitutional Convention because both the Federalist Papers and Anti-Federalist papers clarify that.

With that, Mr. Chair, I yield back.

Chairman STEIL. The gentleman yields back.

Does any other Member seek recognition?

Ms. Sewell is recognized.

Ms. Sewell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Voting is a cornerstone of our democracy. Far too often, many Americans confront significant obstacles when they try to exercise the franchise. These obstacles include difficulties with voter registration, lack of education around elections, and barriers to access to the polling place.

For years, African-American voters, voters of color, voters with disabilities, voters with limited access to language assistance, members of our military serving overseas, and other Americans citizens that live abroad face challenges while trying to exercise

their right.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, we have a duty to ensure that registering to vote and the practice of voting is simple, accessible for all the American people that are eligible to do so. Today, we have only wasted time by discussing efforts to restrict access to the ballot box.

Generations of Americans, many of whom are from my hometown of Selma, Alabama, march, fought, bled, and some even died for the equal right of all Americans to vote. It was their sacrifices that brought us the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Today, we know old battles have become new again, indeed their legacy, and our very democracy are under attack. This is why I reintroduced the John Robert Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act in September, because it would restore the full protections of the Voting Rights Act, strengthen our democracy, and ensure that every American has access to the ballot box.

The Promoting Free and Fair Elections Act of 2023, which we are discussing, is an egregious piece of legislation that would make it harder for citizens to vote by limiting ways that citizens can access the franchise. According to a coalition report by the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, 63 million eligible Americans were not registered to vote during the last Presidential election, and many of those were disproportionately people of color.

The study the coalition released indicated that if the Federal agencies integrate a high-quality voter registration opportunity for the people that they serve as the President's executive order states, they would collectively generate an additional 3.5 million voter registration applications per year.

Voting should be free. Voting should be fair. Voting should be accessible for all Americans. We do our constituents a huge disservice when we waste time discussing ways that we can suppress the vote, versus trying to make it easier for Americans to vote.

With that, I ask my Chairman if he would consider bringing up the John Robert Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, which would strengthen voting and not suppress it. Thank you.

Chairman STEIL. The gentlewoman yields back.

I know Mrs. Bice will have a friendly amendment at the conclusion on this, but if we can continue on discussion of the underlying bill.

Does any other Member seek recognition?

Mrs. Torres.

Mrs. Torres. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this effort to strip away voter protections from the American people. At a time when we are so close to an election, Republicans should be focused on making it easier for Americans to be able to cast their vote. Instead, they are trying to choose who gets to vote in an election.

Let me just give you an example. When we try to prevent military personnel, whether they are veterans or Active Duty. In the Senate, right now, we have a Senator that has withheld 400—or blocked 400 promotions, which impacts 1.4 million Active-Duty military personnel. He has blocked these promotions for 266 days that equal to 6,384 hours of blocking military promotions.

They are impacted by everything the Congress does. Here, again, you are trying to tell our military personnel that it is OK to mistreat them, that it is OK to take political actions against them, but it is not going to be comfortable for them to fill out a voter application, to be able to change their address, and to be able to cast their vote.

I oppose this effort, and I want to encourage my colleagues to find a different way to be more inclusive in helping our voters vote rather than blocking and trying to choose who votes and who does not get to vote.

I yield back.

Chairman STEIL. The gentlewoman yields back.

Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mrs. Bice is recognized.

Mrs. BICE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman STEIL. The clerk will report the amendment, will distribute and report the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment to H.R. 6493 offered by Mrs. Bice of Oklahoma, Page 1——

Oklahoma. Page 1——
Chairman STEIL. Without objection, further reading of the amendment will be dispensed with.

Mrs. Bice is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. Bice's amendment to H.R. 6493 follows:]

#### **AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6493**

#### OFFERRED BY MRS. BICE OF OKLAHOMA.

Page 1, line 4, strike "Promoting Free and Fair Elections Act of 2023" and replace with "Safeguarding Electoral Integrity Act of 2023."

Mrs. BICE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This amendment is a friendly amendment and very simple. Evidently, this bill was titled the exact same as an already-filed bill. We are changing the name of this to the Safeguarding Electoral Integrity Act of 2023 at the request of the author, Mrs. Hageman.

With that, I yield back.

Chairman STEIL. The gentlewoman yields back.

Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. Morelle.

Mr. Morelle. Yes. I move to strike the last word. I do not object to the amendment, but this gives me a chance simply to read in because I do not want to argue with my dear friend, Mr. Loudermilk. I just want to read a sentence that is actually from the United States Constitution, article 1, section 4, clause 1, Elections Clause, "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof. The Congress may, at any time, by law make or alter such regulations."

It is a pretty clear reading. James Madison, the author, primarily, of the U.S. Constitution actually agreed with the interpretation that Congress may, at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations. This notion of primacy, I think about it this way, when I was about, I do not know, 17 years old, I would say to my dad, Can I go out tonight. He would say, You can go out tonight, but you have to be home by 11.

you have to be home by 11.

I do not know how anyone else interprets that. I know in my household that but meant that he was making a decision. I read

it the same way. We keep talking about this. We keep having the same argument, but I thought I would put into the record one more time what the actual Constitution of the United States says.

With that, I certainly support the amendment, but wanted to

make sure I got in on the record.

I yield back, Mr. Chair.

Chairman STEIL. The gentleman yields back.

Is there further debate on the underlying amendment from Mrs.

If not, the question is on the amendment from Mrs. Bice.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment is agreed to. The question now—do any other

Members seek recognition?

If not, the question now occurs on H.R. 6493 reported favorably to the house.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of chair, the ayes have it, and the motion to report is agreed to.

Mr. MORELLE. I would like a recorded vote.

Chairman Steil. A recorded vote has been requested. The Clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil?

Mr. Steil. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Steil votes aye.

Mr. Loudermilk?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Griffith?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Dr. Murphy?

Dr. Murphy. Aye.

The CLERK. Dr. Murphy votes aye.

Mrs. Bice?

Mrs. BICE. Aye.

The CLERK. Mrs. Bice votes aye. Mr. Carey?

Mr. CAREY. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Carey votes aye.

Mr. D'Esposito?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Lee?

Ms. Lee. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.

Mr. Morelle?

Mr. Morelle. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Morelle votes no.

Ms. Sewell?

Ms. Sewell. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Sewell votes no.

Mr. Kilmer?

Mr. Kilmer. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Kilmer votes no.

Mrs. Torres?

Mrs. Torres. No.

The CLERK. Mrs. Torres votes no.

Mr. Loudermilk?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Griffith?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. D'Esposito?

[No response.]

Chairman Stell. Does any Member wish to change their vote? The clerk will report the tally.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, there are five ayes and four noes.

iour noes.

Chairman Steil. The bill is agreed to. Without objection, the mo-

tion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

I now call up the Confirmation Of Congressional Observer Access Act of 2023 sponsored by Mr. Carey. The Ranking Member and I have also cosponsored this legislation. We kind of got across the line yesterday, and I appreciate the work not only of you, Mr. Morelle, but his minority staff engaging with our staff to get this

legislative text correct.

The congressional Election Observers Program utilized both parties is authorized under the Constitution, but is not codified in Federal law. Official congressional observation of Federal elections is crucial for creating records in cases of contested congressional elections. The bill ensures that congressional observers have full access to congressional election administration processes, including polling places, and election tabulation facilities.

I will now yield 5 minutes to Mr. Carey, the sponsor of the bill. Mr. CAREY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Confirmation Of Congressional Observer Access Act, or COCOA Act, codifies the authority of Congress to deploy congressional staff to observe close races in order to develop a record of information for use during the election—used during election contest. I appreciate the Ranking Member Morelle and his staff that worked on this legislation in a very bipartisan way to make this a bipartisan piece of legislation. I also want to thank the Chairman for bringing this bill in front of the Committee for markup.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman STEIL. The gentleman yields back.

Ranking Member Morelle is recognized to give a statement on the bill.

Mr. MORELLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am grateful that despite whatever differences we may have on some of the bills, that we end on a positive note. I am grateful to Mr. Carey, my friend, for offering the bill, and particularly grateful to staff on both the majority and minority side for coming together, and am grateful that we are able to have a bipartisan agreement.

that we are able to have a bipartisan agreement.

The congressional Election Observer Program is important. I am grateful for the changes you were willing to make address the concerns we raised. I am pleased we are able to agree on the need to preserve the authority of election officials to remove an observer who is being disruptive or interfering with the elections process, as

well as the additional language stating our sense that all House employees deployed as observers must adhere to the Code of Official Conduct while serving in this important role.

I think it is important to balance transparency with security, particularly at a time when election officials across the country have raised, I think, legitimate concerns about safety, security, and privacy. We should hold ourselves and our staff to those highest standards.

I am glad you, again, and your staff are willing to work with us, and that we are able to reach a bipartisan agreement. I support the bill and urge my colleagues to join me in voting yes on the measure

Again, thank you, all, and I yield back the balance of my time. Chairman STEIL. The gentleman yields back. The Clerk will report the bill.

The CLERK.

[No verbal response.]

Chairman STEIL. Without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with. Also without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Do any Members seek recognition? Does any Member seek recognition?

If not, the question now occurs on the underlying bill.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it, and the motion to report is agreed to.

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table. Finally, I would like to enter into the record a letter announcing that assistant clerk vacancy previously held by William Johnson, a member of my staff of November 5, 2023.

[The COCOA Act referred to follows:]

(Original Signature of Member)

118TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION

## H.R.

To amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to confirm the requirement that States allow access to designated congressional election observers to observe the election administration procedures in congressional elections.

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Carey (for himself, Mr. Morelle, and Mr. Steil) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on

### A BILL

- To amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to confirm the requirement that States allow access to designated congressional election observers to observe the election administration procedures in congressional elections.
- 1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
- 2 tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
- 3 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS.
- 4 (a) Short Title.—This Act may be cited as the
- 5 "Confirmation Of Congressional Observer Access Act of
- 6 2023" or the "COCOA Act of 2023".

1

(b) FINDINGS RELATING TO CONGRESSIONAL ELEC-

2	TION OBSERVERS.—Congress finds the following:
3	(1) Article 1, section 5, clause 1 of the Con-
4	stitution grants Congress the authority to "be the
5	Judge of the Elections, Returns and Qualifications
6	of its own Members".
7	(2) The House of Representatives serves as the
8	final arbiter over any contest to the seating of any
9	putative Member-elect.
10	(3) Congress has exercised this authority—and
11	responsibility—since our Nation's very beginning
12	from the First Congress through the One Hundred
13	Eighteenth Congress. Over our history, election con-
14	tests have remained a normal and regular part of
15	the biennial process for electing, recognizing, and
16	seating new Members. Although Congress has opted
17	to revise the statutory framework by which it con-
18	siders election contests, consideration of such con-
19	tests has been a regular and recurring part of Con-
20	gress' constitutional prerogatives and work. For ex-
21	ample, across our Nation's history, more than ap-
22	proximately 610 elections have been contested in the
23	House—an average of more than 5 per Congress
24	Indeed, even discounting the Reconstruction period
25	and its surge in election contests, there have been

1	110 contested election cases considered in the House
2	since 1933—an average of more than 2 contests per
3	Congress.
4	(4) These election contest procedures are con-
5	tained in the precedents of each House of Congress.
6	Further, for the House of Representatives the proce-
7	dures exist under the Federal Contested Elections
8	Act.
9	(5) For decades, the House of Representatives
10	has appointed its staff to watch the administration
11	of congressional elections in the States and terri-
12	tories. Critically, congressional observers serve to
13	gather real-time information and data for the House
14	in anticipation of an election contest being filed.
15	SEC. 2. ACCESS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION OBSERV-
16	ERS.
17	(a) Access Required.—Title III of the Help Amer-
18	ica Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amend-
19	ed—
20	(1) by redesignating section 304 and 305 as
21	sections 305 and 306; and
22	(2) by inserting after section 303 the following
23	new section:

1	"SEC. 304. ACCESS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION OB-
2	SERVERS.
3	"(a) Finding of Constitutional Authority.—
4	Congress finds that, regardless of legislative action, it has
5	the authority to send congressional election observers to
6	observe polling locations, any location where processing,
7	scanning, tabulating, canvassing, recounting, auditing, or
8	certifying voting results is occurring, or any other part
9	of the process associated with elections for Federal office
10	under the authorities granted under article 1, section 5,
11	clause 1 and article 1, section 4, clause 1 of the Constitu-
12	tion of the United States. Procedures described herein do
13	not establish any new authorities or procedures with re-
14	spect to Congress' constitutional authority to observe con-
15	gressional elections but are provided simply to permit a
16	convenient statutory reference for existing congressional
17	authority and activity.
18	"(b) Requiring States to Provide Access for
19	Observers.—
20	"(1) REQUIREMENT.—A State shall provide
21	each individual who is acting as a designated con-
22	gressional election observer for an election for Fed-
23	eral office with full access to clearly observe all ele-
24	ments of election administration procedures, includ-
25	ing, but not limited to, access to any area in which
26	a ballot is cast, processed, scanned, tabulated, can-

1	vassed, recounted, audited, or certified, including
2	during pre- and post-election procedures.
3	"(2) Restrictions on activities of observ-
4	ERS.—No designated congressional election observer
5	may handle a ballot or election equipment (whether
6	voting or nonvoting or whether tabulating or nontab-
7	ulating), advocate for any position or candidate, take
8	any action to reduce ballot secrecy or voter privacy,
9	take any action to interfere with the ability of a
10	voter to east a ballot or an election administrator to
11	carry the administrator's duties, or otherwise inter-
12	fere with the election administration process.
13	"(3) Rule of construction.—Nothing in
14	this section shall prohibit a designated congressional
15	election observer from asking questions of an elec-
16	tion administrator, election official, or election work-
17	er, or any other State or local official.
18	"(e) CONDUCT OF OBSERVERS.—
19	"(1) Removal.—
20	"(A) AUTHORIZATION REMOVAL BY ELEC-
21	TION OFFICIAL.—If a State or local election of-
22	ficial has a reasonable basis to believe that a
23	designated congressional election observer has
24	engaged in or imminently will engage in intimi-
25	dation or deceptive practices prohibited by Fed-

1	eral law, or in the disruption of voting, proc-
2	essing, scanning, tabulating, canvassing, or re-
3	counting of ballots, or the certification of re-
4	sults, a State or local election official may re-
5	move that observer from the area involved.
6	"(B) Notice to committee.—If a des-
7	ignated congressional election observer is re-
8	moved from an area under subparagraph (A),
9	the election official shall—
10	"(i) inform the chair and ranking mi-
11	nority member of the Committee on House
12	Administration of the House of Represent-
13	atives; and
14	"(ii) provide written notice detailing
15	the reason or reasons the designated con-
16	gressional election observer was removed.
17	"(2) Rule of construction.—For purposes
18	of this subsection, the mere presence of a designated
19	congressional election observer during an observation
20	of election administration procedures, without any
21	additional indicia supporting a reasonable basis for
22	removal, is not a sufficient reason for removal under
23	subparagraph (A).
24	"(3) Right to replace observer.—If a des-
25	ignated congressional election observer is properly

(91268312)

1	removed under subparagraph (A), the chair or rank-
2	ing minority member of the Committee on House
3	Administration of the House of Representatives, as
4	appropriate, may send another designated congres-
5	sional election observer as a replacement for the re-
6	maining duration of the observation of election ad-
7	ministration procedures.
8	"(4) Clarification regarding applica-
9	BILITY OF CODE OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT.—It is the
10	sense of Congress that, because the Code of Official
11	Conduct for the House of Representatives (rule
12	XXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives)
13	requires all employees of the House to behave at all
14	times in a manner that reflects creditably on the
15	House, an employee of the House who serves as a
16	designated congressional election observer is subject
17	to the Code of Official Conduct in the employee's
18	role as such an observer.
19	"(d) Designated Congressional Election Ob-
20	SERVER DESCRIBED.—In this section, a 'designated con-
21	gressional election observer' is a House employee (as con-
22	templated by the Rules of the House of Representatives) $$
23	who is designated in writing by the chair or ranking mi-
24	nority member of the Committee on House Administration
25	of the House of Representatives, or the successor com-

(91268312)

- 1 mittee, to gather information with respect to an election,
- 2 including in the event that the election is contested in the
- 3 House of Representatives and for other purposes per-
- 4 mitted by article 1, section 5, clause 1 and article 1, sec-
- 5 tion 4, clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.
- 6 "(e) STATE DEFINED.—In this section 'State' means
- 7 each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Com-
- 8 monwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Is-
- 9 lands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth
- 10 of the Northern Mariana Islands.".
- 11 (b) Conforming Amendment Relating to En-
- 12 FORCEMENT.—Section 401 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21111)
- 13 is amended by striking "and 303" and inserting "303, and
- 14 304".
- 15 (c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents
- 16 of such Act is amended—
- 17 (1) by redesignating the items relating to sec-
- tions 304 and 305 as relating to sections 305 and
- 19 306; and
- 20 (2) by inserting after the item relating to sec-
- 21 tion 303 the following:

(91268312)

<sup>&</sup>quot;Sec. 304. Confirming access for congressional election observers.".

Chairman STEIL. This concludes the order of business for today's markup. Pursuant to House Rule 9, Clause 2(1), I ask that Committee Members have the right to file with the Clerk of the Committee supplemental, additional, minority, and dissenting views. Also without objection, Committee staff are authorized to make technical and conforming changes.

If there is no further business, I want to thank the Members for their participation. Without objection, the Committee stands adjourned

[Whereupon, at 12:05 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.] [roll call votes 1–18 follow:]



#### ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE:	
ROLL CALL #:	
SUBJECT:	

	RESPONSE TO CALL OF THE ROLL			OFFICE EXTENSION
Name	AYE	No	PRESENT	
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin	V			53031
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia				52931
Mr. Griffith, Virginia	,			53861
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina	V.			53415
Mr. Carey, Ohio	V			55516
Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma	V			52015
Mr. D'Esposito, New York	,			52132
Ms. Lee, Florida		,		55626
Mr. Morelle, New York		V,		
Ms. Sewell, Alabama				
Mr. Kilmer, Washington		,		
Mrs. Torres, California		$\vee$		

Vote#1



+396

# ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE:	
ROLL CALL #:	
SUBJECT:	

	RESPONSE	OFFICE EXTENSION		
NAME	AYE	No	PRESENT	
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin				53031
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia				52931
Mr. Griffith, Virginia				53861
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina				53415
Mr. Carey, Ohio				55516
Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma				52015
Mr. D'Esposito, New York				52132
Ms. Lee, Florida				55626
Mr. Morelle, New York			120	
Ms. Sewell, Alabama				
Mr. Kilmer, Washington				
Mrs. Torres, California				

le to 3

VOK #3



## ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE:	
ROLL CALL #:	
SUBJECT:	

	RESPONSE TO CALL OF THE ROLL			OFFICE EXTENSION
NAME	AYE	No	PRESENT	
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin	V.			53031
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia				52931
Mr. Griffith, Virginia				53861
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina				53415
Mr. Carey, Ohio				55516
Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma	V			52015
Mr. D'Esposito, New York	,	1		52132
Ms. Lee, Florida	V	,		55626
Mr. Morelle, New York		V.		
Ms. Sewell, Alabama		V		
Mr. Kilmer, Washington				
Mrs. Torres, California		$\overline{}$		



DATE:	
ROLL CALL #:	
SUBJECT:	

	RESPONSE TO CALL OF THE ROLL			OFFICE EXTENSION	
Name	AYE	No	PRESENT		
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin				53031	
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia	× /*			52931	
Mr. Griffith, Virginia				53861	
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina				53415	
Mr. Carey, Ohio	1			55516	
Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma				52015	
Mr. D'Esposito, New York				52132	
Ms. Lee, Florida			* *	55626	
Mr. Morelle, New York		1			
Ms. Sewell, Alabama					
Mr. Kilmer, Washington					
Mrs. Torres, California		1			

Volcthy
3/102

Kirch Pass.

Kirch Rolli
SUB.



# ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE:	
ROLL CALL #:	
SUBJECT:	

	RESPONSE	OFFICE EXTENSION		
NAME	AYE	No	PRESENT	
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin	V.			53031
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia				52931
Mr. Griffith, Virginia				53861
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina	V,			53415
Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma	V,			52015
Mr. Carey, Ohio	V.			55516
Mr. D'Esposito, New York				52132
Ms. Lee, Florida	<b></b>			55626
Mr. Morelle, New York		V.		
Ms. Sewell, Alabama		<b>V</b>		
Mr. Kilmer, Washington		,		
Mrs. Torres, California		V		

0 2



DATE:	
ROLL CALL #:	
SUBJECT:	

	RESPONSI	OFFICE EXTENSION		
NAME	AYE	No	PRESENT	
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin				53031
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia				52931
Mr. Griffith, Virginia				53861
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina				53415
Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma				52015
Mr. Carey, Ohio	1			55516
Mr. D'Esposito, New York				52132
Ms. Lee, Florida				55626
Mr. Morelle, New York		1		
Ms. Sewell, Alabama		1		
Mr. Kilmer, Washington				
Mrs. Torres, California		1		





DATE:		
ROLL CALL #:		
SUBJECT:	×	

	RESPONSE	OFFICE EXTENSION		
NAME	AYE	No	PRESENT	
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin	1	-		53031
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia	Ag			52931
Mr. Griffith, Virginia				53861
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina	1			53415
Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma	1			52015
Mr. Carey, Ohio	1			55516
Mr. D'Esposito, New York	1			52132
Ms. Lee, Florida	1			55626
Mr. Morelle, New York		1		
Ms. Sewell, Alabama		1		
Mr. Kilmer, Washington		)		2
Mrs. Torres, California		1		

8 ayes 4



DATE:		
ROLL CALL #:		
SUBJECT:	g.	

	RESPONSE	RESPONSE TO CALL OF THE ROLL		
Name	AYE	No	PRESENT	
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin	V.			53031
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia	<b>V</b> .			52931
Mr. Griffith, Virginia	V.			53861
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina	V			53415
Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma	V.		-	52015
Mr. Carey, Ohio	V.			55516
Mr. D'Esposito, New York	V.			52132
Ms. Lee, Florida	V	,		55626
Mr. Morelle, New York		V		
Ms. Sewell, Alabama	-	V.		
Mr. Kilmer, Washington				140
Mrs. Torres, California		V		



DATE:	
ROLL CALL #:	
SUBJECT:	

		RESPONSE	RESPONSE TO CALL OF THE ROLL		
5	NAME	AYE	No	PRESENT	
	Mr. Steil, Wisconsin		V.		53031
	Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia	-	V		52931
	Mr. Griffith, Virginia	3.	V		53861
Dr	Mr. Murphy, North Carolina		V.		53415
	Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma	. 12	V.		52015
	Mr. Carey, Ohio	•			55516
	Mr. D'Esposito, New York	* *	V.		52132
	Ms. Lee, Florida		V :		55626
	Mr. Morelle, New York	V,			
	Ms. Sewell, Alabama	V.	1-		
	Mr. Kilmer, Washington	V/			
	Mrs. Torres, California	V			

† ?



DATE:	
ROLL CALL #:	
SUBJECT:	

	RESPONSE TO CALL OF THE ROLL			OFFICE EXTENSION
NAME	AYE	No	PRESENT	
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin		\		53031
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia				52931
Mr. Griffith, Virginia		1		53861
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina		1		53415
Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma				52015
Mr. Carey, Ohio		Ì		55516
Mr. D'Esposito, New York				52132
Ms. Lee, Florida		1		55626
Mr. Morelle, New York	1			
Ms. Sewell, Alabama	1			
Mr. Kilmer, Washington	1		-	
Mrs. Torres, California	1			

DR



DATE:	
ROLL CALL #:	
SUBJECT:	

	RESPONSI	E TO CALL OF	THE ROLL	OFFICE EXTENSION	
NAME	AYE	No	PRESENT		
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin	V.			53031	
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia	V.			52931	
Mr. Griffith, Virginia	1			53861	
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina	V.			53415	
Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma	V.			52015	
Mr. Carey, Ohio	<b>V</b>			55516	
Mr. D'Esposito, New York	V,			52132	
Ms. Lee, Florida	<b></b>			55626	
Mr. Morelle, New York					
Ms. Sewell, Alabama		V.			
Mr. Kilmer, Washington		1			
Mrs. Torres, California		V			



DATE:	
ROLL CALL #:	
SUBJECT:	

	RESPONSE TO CALL OF THE ROLL			OFFICE EXTENSION
NAME	AYE	No	PRESENT	
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin	1		1	53031
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia	)			52931
Mr. Griffith, Virginia	\			53861
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina	\			53415
Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma	\			52015
Mr. Carey, Ohio	1			55516
Mr. D'Esposito, New York				52132
Ms. Lee, Florida	/			55626
Mr. Morelle, New York		1		×
Ms. Sewell, Alabama		1		
Mr. Kilmer, Washington		1		
Mrs. Torres, California		1		





DATE:	
ROLL CALL #:	
SUBJECT:	9

	RESPONSI	OFFICE EXTENSION		
NAME	AYE	No	PRESENT	
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin	1 4	V.		53031
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia		V		52931
Mr. Griffith, Virginia		V.		53861
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina		V.		53415
Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma		V		52015
Mr. Carey, Ohio	*	9		55516
Mr. D'Esposito, New York		V.		52132
Ms. Lee, Florida		<b></b>		55626
Mr. Morelle, New York				
Ms. Sewell, Alabama	-			
Mr. Kilmer, Washington	,			
Mrs. Torres, California	V			

	COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION CHAIRMAN BRYAN STEIL
Minendown	ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE:\_\_\_ ROLL CALL #:\_ SUBJECT:\_\_\_

	RESPONS	RESPONSE TO CALL OF THE ROLL			
Name	AYE	No	PRESENT		
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin				53031	
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia	7	1		52931	
Mr. Griffith, Virginia				53861	
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina				53415	
Mr. Carcy, Ohio		1		55516	
Mrs. Bree, Oklahoma				52015	
Mr. D'Esposito, New York		1		52132	
Ms. Lee, Florida		1		55626	
Mr. Morelle, New York	1				
Ms. Sewell, Alabama					
Mr. Kilmer, Washington					
Mrs. Torres, California	1				

2 ayes 7 nos



DATE:	
ROLL CALL #:	
SUBJECT:	

RESPONSE TO CALL OF THE I				OFFICE EXTENSION
NAME	AYE	No	PRESENT	
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin	$\vee$			53031
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia	V.			52931
Mr. Griffith, Virginia	V.			53861
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina	V.			53415
Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma	V			52015
Mr. Carey, Ohio	V			55516
Mr. D'Esposito, New York	V			52132
Ms. Lee, Florida		,		55626
Mr. Morelle, New York		<b>V</b>		
Ms. Sewell, Alabama				
Mr. Kilmer, Washington		,		
Mrs. Torres, California		V		



46	CHAIRMAN BRYAN STEIL	Email
19	ROLL CALL VOTE	Lanssuh
DATE:		
ROLL CALL #:_		
SUBJECT:		

	RESPONSE	TO CALL O	F THE ROLL	OFFICE EXTENSION
NAME	AYE	No	PRESENT	
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin				53031
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia	1		2	52931
Mr. Griffith, Virginia				53861
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina				53415
Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma				52015
Mr. Carey, Ohio				55516
Mr. D'Esposito, New York				52132
Ms. Lee, Florida	1			55626
Mr. Morelle, New York		Ì		
Ms. Sewell, Alabama				
Mr. Kilmer, Washington		,		
Mrs. Torres, California		\		,







DATE:	
ROLL CALL #:	
SUBJECT:	

	RESPONSE	OFFICE EXTENSION		
NAME	AYE	No	PRESENT	
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin	v			53031
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia				52931
Mr. Griffith, Virginia				53861
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina	V			53415
Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma	V.			52015
Mr. Carey, Ohio	V			55516
Mr. D'Esposito, New York				52132
Ms. Lee, Florida	V			55626
Mr. Morelle, New York		V.		
Ms. Sewell, Alabama		V.		
Mr. Kilmer, Washington		V.		
Mrs. Torres, California		V		



DATE:

SUBJECT:\_

# ROLL CALL VOTE 6493 Final passage ROLL CALL #:\_

,	RESPONSE TO CALL OF THE ROLL			OFFICE EXTENSION
Name	AYE	No	PRESENT	
Mr. Steil, Wisconsin	1			53031
Mr. Loudermilk, Georgia				52931
Mr. Griffith, Virginia		8		53861
Mr. Murphy, North Carolina				53415
Mrs. Bice, Oklahoma	1,			52015
Mr. Carey, Ohio				55516
Mr. D'Esposito, New York				52132
Ms. Lee, Florida				55626
Mr. Morelle, New York	1	)		
Ms. Sewell, Alabama				
Mr. Kilmer, Washington				
Mrs. Torres, California			,	

5 ayes 4 nos