

just fine for Members of Congress to serve on corporate boards or for Presidents to hide their tax returns, or anyone who is pleased with partisan gerrymandering or who is happy that we have done nothing to secure our elections from foreign hacking since 2016.

These are not partisan issues among the American people. On the contrary, when I vote “yes” on H.R. 1, I will be doing what the vast majority of my constituents are demanding: to make our democracy work better for everyone, regardless of our party or our point of view.

I can't wait to cast that vote.

□ 1215

EXPANDING ACCESS TO QUALITY AFFORDABLE HEALTHCARE

(Mr. DELGADO asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute.)

Mr. DELGADO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Act, a bill that I am proud to cosponsor. This bill is a critical step in expanding access to quality affordable healthcare by bringing down prescription drug costs.

Too many of my constituents and too many Americans across this country can't afford the healthcare coverage they need. There is no bigger driver of this problem than the skyrocketing cost of prescription drugs.

The United States pays the highest prices for prescription drugs in the world, and over the past decade, the prices of 90 percent of brand name drugs have more than doubled.

How is it that one in five American adults cannot afford the medicine they need?

In the wealthiest country in the world, it is inexcusable that we have seniors who have to choose between their prescriptions and buying groceries, cancer patients who can't afford their drugs, and diabetics who need to ration the insulin they need to survive.

The Medicare Prescription Drug Price Negotiation Act couldn't be more commonsense. It allows the Department of Health and Human Services to negotiate Medicare drug prices, putting consumers first, not the drug industry.

My constituents sent me here with a clear mandate to fight for quality affordable healthcare, and this bill is a crucial part of that work.

OUR POLITICS IS BROKEN

(Mr. COX of California asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute.)

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

I am an engineer, and as an engineer, I fix things that are broken, but it doesn't take an engineer to tell you that our politics is broken. Confidence in our government and in the House of Representatives has never been lower.

We have a system of gerrymandering where in many parts of the country today, voters don't choose their politicians, politicians choose their voters.

Special interest money has drowned out the voices of working people.

H.R. 1 is an opportunity to fix this imbalance. H.R. 1 will ensure the people's voices are heard at the ballot box.

H.R. 1 will ensure the influence of big money in our politics and our policies is ended.

H.R. 1 will ensure the voices of the people are heard.

Passing this bill is a moral imperative for our democracy and our Nation.

CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES EXPANSION TO CHILDCARE

(Ms. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute.)

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

Running for Federal office requires 60- to 90-hour workweeks. I worked every single day, every single weekend, and I also worked challenging hours, most days starting at 6:45 in the morning and ending with campaign events stretching well into the night.

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

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

For the past two centuries, Congress has written many, many laws about what women may and may not do, but until this year, women's representation in Congress was less than 20 percent.

Even with the election of my historic class, we are only 102 women. There are even fewer moms in Congress and even fewer single moms, as in, nobody but me.

I have introduced language today as a standalone bill I will introduce.

MAKING IT EASIER, NOT HARDER, FOR PEOPLE TO VOTE

(Ms. WEXTON asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute.)

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Speaker, our democracy isn't working the way it should for a majority of Americans, but H.R. 1, the For the People Act, can fix that.

This legislation will end partisan gerrymandering by creating independent redistricting commissions, letting the voters choose the politicians, not the politicians choosing their voters.

H.R. 1 will promote online registration, same day and automatic voter registration, because we should be making it easier, not harder, for people to vote.

It also prohibits arbitrary voter roll purges, expands early voting and vote-by-mail options, and ensures the restoration of voting rights for those who have paid their dues to society.

The right to vote is the cornerstone of our democracy. It is as sacred as the freedom of religion and speech.

The American people want clean and fair elections, and H.R. 1 is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to restore the faith and function in American democracy.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 172 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 172

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-7, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on House Administration or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. After the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of March 7, 2019, or March 8, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SARBANES). The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 172, providing for consideration of H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2019, under a structured rule.

The rule provides 2 hours of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution self-executes Chairwoman LOFGREN's manager's amendment and provides for the consideration of 72 amendments debatable for 10 minutes each.

The rule also provides authority for en bloc amendments, debatable for 20 minutes each.

The rule also provides 10 minutes of final general debate after amendment

consideration equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their designees.

Lastly, the rule provides suspension authority through Friday, March 8, 2019.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, this past weekend, I had the honor of traveling to Selma, Alabama, with over 40 of our congressional colleagues on a pilgrimage to observe the 54th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, the violent confrontation at the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma.

That confrontation seized the Nation's attention and launched one of the most important periods in the history of our Republic, culminating in the passage of the Voting Rights Act.

When our colleague, Representative JOHN LEWIS, along with Martin Luther King and other civil rights pioneers, organized voters to register, crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge and marched from Selma to Montgomery, they did so knowing that their lives and the lives of those they loved were at risk.

The institutional opposition they faced was fierce and violent, but their message of nonviolence and justice strengthened them and their resolve.

They marched and risked their lives in order to secure the right to vote. They understood that they would never be equal citizens of the United States until they had a voice in their destiny, and they understood that the United States could never be the republic it aspired to become until all of its citizens had the right to participate in decisions affecting their future.

We undeniably have made progress since then, but not enough, and frighteningly, we seem to be moving backward.

In recent years, we have seen new forms of voter suppression emerge, whether in the guise of strict voter ID laws, purges of voting rolls, partisan gerrymandering, or unfounded allegations of voter fraud.

As an election official, election protection organizer, and voting rights advocate for over 3 decades, I have seen all of these tactics in play. In fact, several of us in the Pennsylvania delegation were able to join this Congress in part because a Federal court ordered that Pennsylvania's congressional districts had been so gerrymandered that they must be redrawn, they were unconstitutional.

We have heard, and will undoubtedly hear again today, that Democrats are pushing voting rights reform because of the expectation that new voters will likely be Democratic voters. I would hope that those with a sense of history would resist this, recognizing that the very same argument was used to oppose the Voting Rights Act in 1965 out of fear that those who had been oppressed would factor that experience into their voting decisions.

It is telling that a similar fear motivates some in this Chamber today who

would rather deprive citizens of a fundamental right than face them at the ballot box.

The cynicism of those who would continue to place barriers in the way of those who wish to vote goes a long way to explaining why our citizens lack faith in us to work for them.

Those with power, voting and otherwise, too often try to preserve that power through means that are neither transparent nor understood by the people of this country. We have to be bold, and shed some of that institutional power in order to regain the trust of the people.

□ 1230

I thank my colleague, Representative JOHN SARBANES, who has worked for years in tirelessly crafting this legislation. I also thank Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership team for making this bill the top priority in the House for the 116th Congress. I am so proud that the first order of business of this Congress, our H.R. 1, is dedicated to good government and restoring trust in our democratic institutions.

Our elections are the bedrock of our democracy. During the recent midterm elections, the American people charged us, the new Congress, to make sure that our government works for them. They put their trust in us to champion our uniquely American creed: a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

H.R. 1, the For the People bill, is our commitment to that trust. This reform package will address many of the barriers to democracy that prevent too many eligible voters from having their voices heard, including our seniors, communities of color, servicemembers, college students, those with disabilities, and low-income families. But it is up to us to see it through.

I am immensely proud to be part of a Caucus that is prioritizing legislation that the people are asking for, legislation that will protect the right to vote for every American and ensure clean and fair elections, that will end the dominance of big money in our politics, and that will crack down on corruption to make sure that public servants put the public interest first.

Recent polls have found that many Americans do not vote because of difficulty registering or accessing their polling places and that Americans are really concerned about the ethical standards of their elected representatives and government officials and are equally concerned about the influence of special interests and corruption in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic majority takes what the people are asking for seriously. This is a bill that addresses their concerns and resets our democracy so that it works for the people, not special interests.

H.R. 1 will make it easier for eligible Americans to vote. Allowing and enabling Americans to vote should not be a divisive partisan issue. Our Nation

can only stand to benefit when all eligible voters have a voice.

The very fact that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have greater electoral success when fewer people come out to vote is not just a stain on our democracy but a direct threat to it.

Automatic voter registration will make it easier for young adults and working families to make sure that they are not left out of the process due to issues with registration.

This bill will make critical fixes to voter purging policies that have disenfranchised millions since section 4 of the Voting Rights Act was struck down by the Supreme Court in *Shelby v. Holder*. Over 4 million more names were purged from voter rolls after that decision came down than they were in the years before. These purges affected poor minority communities at a vastly disproportionate rate, further marginalizing people who already face significant institutional barriers to voting.

Election security has been a bipartisan concern across the country for years, and H.R. 1 will make considerable investments to ensure our elections are secure, independent, and free from foreign interference. Empowering the Election Assistance Commission will allow States to get the funding they need to upgrade or improve their election infrastructure, and improvements in election administration will help protect voting systems from cyber threats.

Election infrastructure is critical, and this bill finally recognizes the role that Congress must play in protecting our elections.

A specific priority of mine that I am excited to see included in the bill will make it easier for persons with disabilities to participate in the electoral process. For too long, individuals with disabilities have faced barriers that prevent them from participating in our democracy at the ballot box. I have introduced legislation included in H.R. 1 that will direct and assist States to improve access to voter registration and the ballot box for persons with disabilities.

These democracy-driven policies represent just a handful of the voting rights reforms contained in H.R. 1. They will improve access to voting, promote integrity in the voting process, and ensure the security of our elections.

Going further, H.R. 1 acts to shine a light and address the dark money which the Citizens United decision unleashed into our politics. Each year that we do not act on reversing *Citizens United*, more and more untraceable money is spent on campaigns.

This bill will overhaul the Federal Election Commission, the FEC, so that we have a real cop on the beat to enforce our campaign finance laws.

It will upgrade political advertising disclosures and require donors giving

more than \$10,000 to politically active organizations to be publicly identified.

Simultaneously, this bill seeks to empower everyday Americans by creating a small-dollar match system that will bring more people into the conversation while reducing the impact large donors can have on any one campaign. While small-dollar campaign funding is relatively new to the Federal system, it has been trialed in States and larger cities to great effect.

I am proud that H.R. 1 also includes a bill that I drafted to keep Presidential inaugural funds from becoming shadowy slush funds or opportunities for dark forces, whether foreign or domestic, to influence our government. The bill will prohibit donations to inaugural funds by foreign nationals or corporations, ban personal use of inaugural funds by a candidate, and require disclosure of all donations and disbursements.

H.R. 1 will also help to restore voter confidence in our democracy by codifying ethics standards for all three branches of government. The bill requires the development of a code of ethics for Supreme Court Justices, mandatory recusal of Presidential appointees from matters that concern the President, and increased enforcement of the registration of foreign agents.

The bill will prohibit Members of Congress from using taxpayer funds to settle employment discrimination cases against them, preventing Members of Congress from hiding this conduct and protecting taxpayer money from being misused.

Finally, H.R. 1 will address Presidential conflicts of interest by requiring sitting Presidents and Vice Presidents, as well as Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates, to release their tax returns. Those occupying the highest office in the land should be required to show if they have financial interests that would influence their decisionmaking. Having an executive beholden in any way to a private company or a nation only serves to undermine our democracy.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we had quite the debate on this bill in the Rules Committee last night, and I expect the debate on the floor today will be along similar lines. Today's bill is H.R. 1, which my friends on the other side of the aisle are calling by the misnomer "For the People Act." Unfortunately, this bill is completely misnamed.

It is not for the people. It is, instead, for the Democratic majority, by the Democratic majority, in hopes of maintaining the Democratic majority for many years to come. Every provision in this bill reflects that goal.

That began with the process the majority used to put this bill together.

H.R. 1 was referred to 10 different committees, yet only one, House Administration, held a markup. My friends hold a 2-to-1 advantage on that committee. There are only three Republicans who can participate.

Later, we will be hearing from some of the Republican ranking members of these committees, each of whom will talk about provisions that they had hoped to address, had their respective committees marked up the bill. This failure to allow other committees with jurisdiction to mark up the bill reinforces the desire of the majority to push this bill through as quickly as possible without any additional consideration. Without further hearings and markups, it is all too easy for the majority to sweep the bill's flaws under the rug and pass it quickly without allowing the American people to see what they are up to.

This bill would be more aptly named the "For the Politicians Act" or "Welfare for Politicians Act." It reinforces the idea that the majority cares only about passing a bill that will lead to more Democrats in the House of Representatives.

We do not have time today to go over every provision in this bill, but for now, I will take a moment to point out some of the bigger flaws in this product.

First, H.R. 1 takes taxpayer dollars and uses them to create a special piggy bank for campaigns. That is right, Democrats want to use taxpayer dollars of the American people to finance their political campaigns. H.R. 1 creates a matching program for small-dollar campaign contributions, thereby shifting taxpayer dollars to politicians to run their campaigns. In essence, Democrats are demanding that your tax dollars be used to subsidize and fund political candidates.

According to the Bipartisan Policy Center, since 2000, total spending on Federal elections has exploded, going from \$2.7 billion that cycle to \$6.4 billion in 2016. With so much money being raised from private sources, one wonders why the majority wants to waste taxpayer dollars adding even more money into campaigns.

Second, H.R. 1 completely takes over elections, removing authority from States and local election boards and giving it to Washington, D.C. Currently, States have the authority to determine how they want to structure their own elections, including voter registration, timing, and even redistricting. But all that goes away under H.R. 1. States would no longer be able to set voter registration requirements, nor hold elections where and how often they want, nor reapportion voters into appropriate districts. Instead, under H.R. 1, Washington, D.C., takes over all these functions.

I doubt any secretary of state or supervisor of elections in America supports this federalization of the election process. In fact, last night in the Rules Committee meeting, Mr. Speaker, I entered into the record a letter from the

Oklahoma State Election Board opposing H.R. 1 on precisely these grounds.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD that letter again today.

OKLAHOMA STATE ELECTION BOARD,
Oklahoma City, OK, March 4, 2019.

Re Election Administration Provisions of
H.R. 1.

Hon. TOM COLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE COLE: As Oklahoma's chief state election official, I am very proud of Oklahoma's election system. Our state has one of the most effective and efficient election systems in the world. It is uniform, it is fair, it is secure, it is accurate and it is fast.

As the House of Representatives prepares to consider H.R. 1, I want to take a moment to express some concerns about several of its provisions related to election administration. While I believe H.R. 1 to be well-intentioned by its sponsors, its "one-size-fits-all" requirements for state election systems would require Oklahoma to make extensive changes to the way we run elections. I am concerned that some of H.R. 1's mandates could negatively impact the very things Oklahoma's election system does so well.

Based on my review of H.R. 1, here is a list of my top concerns.

"Voting by Mail": To combat Oklahoma's past history of absentee ballot fraud, several decades ago the Oklahoma Legislature enacted legislation requiring most voters to have their identity confirmed by a notary public when voting by absentee ballot. Oklahoma law also requires absentee ballots to be received by the county election board no later than 7:00 p.m. on Election Day. These procedures help prevent fraud and enable county election boards to have 100% of absentee ballots counted on election night. Unfortunately, H.R. 1 seems to do away with these safeguards and efficiencies, instead requiring county election boards to (1) accept signed affidavits in lieu of notarized ones and (2) to accept an absentee ballot postmarked on Election Day. H.R. 1's mandates would prevent Oklahoma from counting all absentee ballots by Election Day, would require the counting of absentee ballots to continue for days or weeks after an election, and would take away a critical security feature of our election system.

"Early voting": In Oklahoma, county election boards typically have a very small staff. (Many have only the secretary and one assistant.) For federal and state elections, Oklahoma currently allows "early voting" on the Thursday, Friday and Saturday prior to Election Day. Most counties have a single early voting site, but several have two sites. Even with the assistance of absentee voting boards paid for by the State Election Board, most counties barely have enough budget and staff to successfully conduct early voting on the three days currently required. H.R. 1's requirement for FIFTEEN CONSECUTIVE DAYS of early voting is simply not feasible given the small budgets and staffing levels of the 77 county election boards. This would make it virtually impossible for county election board staff to perform their other critical duties (e.g., processing mail absentee ballots, processing voter registration applications, and preparing supplies for precinct workers) if they are instead conducting early voting during this time.

"Same Day Voter Registration": Oklahoma has a very reasonable deadline for voter registration (applications must be submitted by the 24th day prior to an election). H.R. 1 requires county election boards to conduct voter registration during "early"

voting periods and on Election Day. This mandate is not currently feasible with the current funding and staffing levels of county election boards. The logistics of predicting how many ballots to print and how many precinct officials to assign to polling places, with the number of potential voters unknown, would be extremely difficult and inefficient. Same day voter registration increases the risk that due to error or fraud an ineligible person is allowed to register and vote.

"Provisional ballots": Oklahoma has a county-based election system. While Oklahoma uses the same voting system statewide, for security reasons each county's system is siloed and does not directly interact with other counties' systems. (For example, one county cannot print or count another county's ballot.) Oklahoma law requires a voter to vote in the assigned polling place in the county where the voter is registered. Provisional ballots are issued for a variety of reasons, and, if eligible, are counted after 2:00 p.m. on the Friday following Election Day. However, H.R. 1 requires a provisional ballot to be counted even if it is cast in the wrong county, which creates a security risk and is not currently possible given Oklahoma's election security features.

"Online Voter Registration": Oklahoma will implement online voter registration in the near future. Unfortunately, H.R. 1 sets different requirements for its federally-mandated online voter registration system than is required by Oklahoma law. (For example, H.R. 1 does everything from defining acceptable signature requirements, to mandating a telephone version of an online voter registration system, to micromanaging the features required for a state's customer support system.) Further, Oklahoma's future online voter registration system will require that a registrant's identity be confirmed by matching the person's information with an existing driver license or state I.D., but H.R. 1 sets different (and less secure) standards for confirming a registrant's identity.

"Federalism": While I believe H.R. 1's sponsors are well-intentioned, a great many of its election provisions—even those that are not concerns—relate to policy decisions that are best left to the states under our federal system. I am concerned that, in its current form, H.R. 1 could lead to costly and lengthy litigation.

While these are not my only concerns, they are the most serious. I appreciate your representation of our state in Congress, and I feel it is my duty as Oklahoma's chief election official to make you aware of some of the potential negative impacts H.R. 1 could have on our state's election system.

If you ever have any questions about elections in Oklahoma, please feel free to contact me or Assistant Secretary Pam Slater. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

PAUL ZIRIAX, SECRETARY,
Oklahoma State Election Board.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I would also point out that, in the case of redistricting, if the State cannot reach a resolution, H.R. 1 hands over the redistricting function to an unelected Federal court here in Washington, D.C. Everywhere you look, this bill represents an erosion of traditional State authority and a power grab for Democrats here in Washington.

Perhaps even more egregiously, the bill places limits on freedom of speech, criminalizing actions that we would currently describe as mere advocacy for candidates. Not since the Sedition Act of 1798 has the Federal Government

tried to pass something that tramples so heavily on freedom of speech as H.R. 1. The bill is so bad in this regard that even the American Civil Liberties Union is opposing it, which is a perfect illustration of just how bad H.R. 1 really is.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. Everywhere you look, H.R. 1 fails to do what the majority has promised. They have promised it is to be about returning power to the people. Instead, this bill only gives power and money to Democratic politicians. It takes away authority from States and gives it to the Federal Government, wastes taxpayer dollars on political campaigns, weakens the voting system, and limits freedom of speech.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine how any Member can stand up with a straight face and support this bill. I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the Rules Committee for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the For the People Act, H.R. 1, and the rule.

We promised the American people, and our neighbors back home have urged us on, to strengthen America's ethics laws, to fix our broken campaign finance system, and to empower American voters.

I represent the State of Florida, and you better believe that we have to protect access to the ballot box, ensure the voting rights of everyone, and count every vote.

I thank the Rules Committee for including a bipartisan amendment that I have worked on to address the abuse of zombie campaigns. Many folks don't understand this, but sometimes Members who retire from Congress keep their campaign accounts, and they live on for decades, hence the title "zombie campaigns." Oftentimes, they will misuse the unspent campaign funds. It is wrong for campaign accounts to live on forever, and we are going to address that abuse as well.

This bill has important reforms that strengthen American democracy, root out corruption, and ensure that our government here in the United States of America works for the people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong bipartisan vote.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), my good friend.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution for consideration of H.R. 1.

H.R. 1 includes provisions that fall under the jurisdiction of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, of which I am ranking member.

Buried in the 600-page bill are requirements that would greatly expand

the role of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, in election security. NIST is an important agency under our committee's jurisdiction. NIST also plays an important nonregulatory role, providing guidance to State and local governments to help ensure that election results are secure and accurate.

Keeping our elections safe from cyberattacks and fraud is not a partisan priority. It is a priority for all of us.

Unlike the more partisan parts of H.R. 1, I believe that if we had been given a chance on the committee, Chairwoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON and I would have been able to come to an agreement on bipartisan legislation to update NIST election security activities.

□ 1245

However, the Democratic leadership has rushed this legislation to the floor without giving our committee an opportunity to even hold a single hearing on the bill.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, quite simply, all of the issues raised from NIST were ignored. The opportunity to have a hearing on this subject matter in the committee was ignored.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and the underlying bill. We can do better.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and, of course, in support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act, which would provide the most significant reform to our democratic system in decades.

This landmark legislation represents the fulfillment of a promise to the American people to restore our democracy by expanding access to the ballot, reducing the corrupting influence of corporate money and political campaigns, and restoring ethics, integrity, and transparency to government.

We live in a time in our Nation's history where Americans have a deep sense that government does not work for them, and they are right. That cynicism is caused by policies that respond to the voices of the rich and powerful while ignoring those of ordinary Americans and practices that seek to reduce and restrict participation in our electoral process.

Americans are sick and tired of corruption and mismanagement here in Washington, and they elected us with the expectation that we will take real steps to clean up the mess and return power to the people of our great country.

H.R. 1 provides us with the opportunity to do this by offering the most sweeping reforms to our democracy since Watergate, and it makes real

strides in rooting out corruption, strengthening voting rights, and restoring government by and for the people.

I want to particularly thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your extraordinary leadership in shaping this bill and drafting it and working with our colleagues all across the Caucus and producing this product.

H.R. 1 includes the DISCLOSE Act, which I introduced to shine the light on unlimited corporate spending that has overrun our elections.

Without fixing our broken campaign finance system and taking power from the powerful special interests and returning it to the people of this country, it will also be impossible to make progress on the other issues that are important to the American people.

The DISCLOSE Act will require organizations that spend money on elections to promptly disclose donors who give \$10,000 or more during the election cycle and prevent political operatives from actions meant to conceal the identity of donors.

I have also introduced legislation which would require motor vehicle registries to automatically register all eligible citizens to vote when they obtain services from their motor vehicle registries.

In 2006, at least 32.6 million eligible Americans were not registered to vote and, thus, unable to cast a ballot.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Rhode Island an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, making registration automatic will ensure that everyone who wishes to be added to the voter rolls will not have to think twice about it, and I am proud that H.R. 1 will implement automatic voter registration.

For too long, Mr. Speaker, Washington has acted on behalf of wealthy and powerful special interests. Last Congress, Republicans passed legislation to take away healthcare from 23 million Americans, to give billions in tax cuts to billionaires, and to ease gun restrictions in the wake of the deadliest shooting in modern America. Americans responded by voting them out and entrusting us to clean up this culture of corruption. Let us repay that trust by passing this landmark legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the For the People Act, and I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is about what is called the For the People Act, but, to me, it should be called the "For the Swamp Act."

Now, we are going to have plenty of time later to debate the particulars of

the bill, but right now we are talking about the rule and what brings this to the floor.

I just want to remind everybody that this bill was given jurisdiction in 10 committees—10 committees—but 1 committee marked it up; one committee took a look at it and said: Well, this is wrong. Let's fix this. Let's change that.

One committee with nine people—2 percent of Congress—has been involved in this bill.

Now, we understand we are in the minority here. We get that. We get that we are not going to get our way, but we are asking to have a say. That is all we are asking for here.

This bill is about shutting down the open process and honest debate—this rule resolution, which actually makes sense, because the underlying bill does the same thing for the American people.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee of Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, in 1997, I stood on this floor and urged action to fix our broken campaign finance system. I spoke then about how newspapers were filled with daily stories detailing how unregulated campaign contributions were corrupting our political system and threatening the very essence of our democracy. That was my first year serving in this institution.

I am sorry to say that this problem hasn't only persisted, it has gotten worse than many of us could have ever imagined.

Who could have thought that the Supreme Court would issue a disaster ruling like *Citizens United*? that some would try to have us believe that corporations are people? that we would have a President in the White House who has taken the Republican culture of corruption to a whole new level?

Now, I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker. The news that once made the front page of the newspaper is now in front of us on our smartphones non-stop.

We see over and over again how big money has infected our political process and prevented action on things that the American people care most about, how new roadblocks are being put in place to prevent some eligible Americans from casting their ballots, and how some have used their office to side with special interests over the public interest.

This legislation is about finally fixing our broken democracy, including modernizing and securing our election system. We care so much about this that the For the People Act is literally our top priority. That is why it is H.R. 1.

Now, my Republican friends are talking about process like it is something

to be ashamed of. Are they kidding? I mean, these are crocodile tears. When they were in charge at the last Congress, their priority, their H.R. 1, was a tax cut for the superrich. Ours is literally a bill for the people.

And their H.R. 1, by the way, as you can see from this chart, had zero hearings. None. Our H.R. 1 had five.

Our H.R. 1 had 15 hours of hearings. Do you know how many hours of hearings their H.R. 1 had? Zero, a big fat zero. No hearings at all.

We had expert witnesses come to testify and give their input, pro and con. They had none when they did H.R. 1.

Our bill, as we have a structured rule, we have made over 70 amendments in order. When they had their H.R. 1 bill to help the superrich, do you know how many amendments they made in order? Zero. None. A big fat closed rule.

The cost of our legislation to kind of cleanup our democracy is zero. Do you know how much theirs was? At least \$1.5 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here is how the legislative process is supposed to work. And imagine what we could achieve once we get special interests out of the way, whether it is lowering the cost of prescription drugs or strengthening our healthcare system or passing sensible gun safety legislation or protecting the Dreamers.

This is about ensuring that our elections actually reflect the Constitution my friends on the other side of the aisle so often talk about. The Preamble does not begin with “We, the corporations” or “We, the special interests.” It says, “We, the People.”

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join with the majority in supporting this rule and the underlying legislation so we can finally put our government back in the hands of the people.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), my good friend and distinguished Republican ranking member on the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for his service on the important Rules Committee as our ranking member and for his service in Congress and on that particular committee.

Much of this grab bag of Democratic party favors in this bill are entirely unrelated to each other. How, for example, does imposing unfunded Federal mandates on State administration of elections relate to mandating the President divest from business holdings?

The House Administration Committee is the only committee to mark up this legislation. However, House Administration only marked up the portions of the bill that were in their jurisdiction.

The amendment in the nature of the substitute was 447 pages; the Rules print was 622 pages.

The Committee on Oversight and Reform had substantial jurisdiction over this legislation. We sent a letter to the chairman asking for a markup. We got a letter back from him saying we would do that after the vote on the bill. Now, how the heck does that work? How the heck does that work?

So this needs to slow down. I think the underlying legislation is wrong for the country. The idea that every single taxpayer is now going to have to finance public campaigns, finance election campaigns—just what the voters wanted, just what they need. The very people who are in this swamp, you now have to pay for them to get reelected to stay in this swamp.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Ohio an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge that we oppose the rule. If the rule does pass, I would certainly urge that we oppose the legislation as well.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Texas is ground zero for voter suppression. Texas Republicans enacted the most stringent voter ID law in the country. They slashed communities across our State through partisan gerrymandering. And now, this year, in what a Federal court has just described as a “ham-handed move” which “exemplifies the power of government to strike fear and anxiety and to intimidate the least powerful among us,” the Abbott administration has initiated a massive voter purge by making the false claim that tens of thousands of people have voted illegally in our State.

Our State has a problem. It is not too many people voting illegally; it is too few people voting at all. The difference that you see in this debate is that we believe elections should be won for one party or the other based on turning out the voters, and too often, our Republican colleagues believe they are won by throwing out the voters.

I believe that the important reform that we are considering today will replace these purges with the urge to have voters participate by removing the many obstacles that stand in their way.

It makes the right to vote more than a paper guarantee. It makes it a reality by allowing people to know their own power, to shape our democracy, and hold every public official accountable. “For the People” means stopping the steady Trump erosion of our democracy by empowering the people to make their voices heard.

I am so pleased that this legislation includes a provision that I authored to ensure that we seek the business tax returns, as well as the personal individual returns, of candidates for President.

Now, this particular amendment is directed not specifically at Mr. Trump, but his conduct underscores why we must require it. He had his personal law firm review his tax returns, and they awarded him an all-clear from any Russian connection.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, they noted that he was the sole or principal owner of 500 separate business entities that stretched from Azerbaijan to Miami, and they gave him an all-clear, upon which he asked us to rely without noting that the same firm had proudly boasted that it was “the Russia law firm of the year.”

Some of us believe we need a little more credible source to review his conduct. But not just review his conduct, that of anyone, for either party, who aspires to be the most powerful person in the entire world.

Even President Nixon invited the Joint Committee on Taxation to review his tax returns, explaining that the people have got to know whether their President is a crook—something very relevant to our times. Candidates who cannot meet the very low Richard Nixon standard have no right to our highest office.

If left untouchable and unreachable, without exposure to sunlight, we will find business tax returns hide the darkest secrets. It is good that we have a strong act demanding disclosure of those returns.

□ 1300

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my good friend, fellow member of the Rules Committee, and classmate.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, a little over 2 years ago, President Trump stood on the west front of this Capitol and pledged to dedicate his administration to taking care of the forgotten men and women of this country. This bill does not take seriously the plight of those forgotten men and women. It does take seriously the plight of protecting Democratic incumbents and candidates.

This bill can't become law. It is never going to pass in the Senate. It is never going to be signed by the President. But it is important to talk about it because it reveals the agenda of the Democratic majority here in the House of Representatives.

This bill, things like the Green New Deal, things like a massive single-payer healthcare system, and it is pretty clear that Democrats don't care about the economy. They don't care about the middle class. Every election I have been in, people talk about rebuilding the middle class.

My gosh, Donald Trump has rebuilt the middle class, but you don't care

about that. You don't care about jobs. You don't care about what people earn in those jobs, otherwise you wouldn't be opening the borders the way you are. You care about your own power. You care about maintaining your own power. It is our job to notify and magnify what is going on with the Democratic leadership of this House of Representatives. That is why I am speaking out about it today.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Our friends across the aisle are nothing if not courageous. They have got the brazen temerity to raise the question of process after running the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America; the most closed House of Representatives that anyone has ever seen.

Let's compare their H.R. 1 when they got started with our H.R. 1. Well, their's was filed, marked up, and passed in 2 weeks with no hearings, no amendments made in order, and no expert testimony at all.

Our H.R. 1 was filed on the first day of the new Congress for all of the public to read. There have been hearings in five different committees with over 15 hours of expert testimony, culminating in a full committee markup in House Administration. Sixty days later, we are now on the floor for consideration in an open and transparent way.

You would think they would have the decency not to raise the question of process after running the House of Representatives like King Kong over the last 2 years. But the people who ran it like King Kong now want to turn it into a Quaker meeting house somehow. They should be thanking us for the openness of our proceedings.

Their H.R. 1 blew a \$1.5 trillion hole in the deficit, a staggering and unprecedented assault on the fiscal integrity of the United States of America, to shower tax cuts on the wealthy and well-connected.

Our H.R. 1 is an effort to reclaim our democracy from the wealthy and well-connected people who were the beneficiaries of their H.R. 1 by creating a 21st century campaign finance system that responds to the people.

On the substance of the matter, it is amazing to me that my colleagues raise the question of the swamp. They got elected 2.5 years ago campaigning against the swamp. It was a great slogan they borrowed from NANCY PELOSI. They moved to Washington. They moved into the swamp. They built a hotel on it, and they have turned the Government of the United States into a money-making operation for the President, and the President's family, and the President's friends and business associates.

Now, what are we doing in H.R. 1? We are trying to reclaim American democ-

racy. This legislation is anti-gerrymandering legislation. This legislation says that every State in the Union will have to have an independent redistricting commission. No politicians involved.

They want the politicians to be involved. Amazingly, they embrace the title of being the gerrymander party. They want to keep gerrymandering because that is how they maintain their stranglehold on political power.

The whole purpose of H.R. 1 is to liberate us from the gerrymandering of our elections. That is why we start with independent redistricting commissions. We move to publicly financed elections, because either the big, wealthy, special interests are going to own the elections, or else the people are going to own them through a small, donor-leveraged system. And that is what we are doing. We have got ethics reform in this legislation.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I encourage, everyone to actually read the terms of this landmark reform legislation, which insists upon ethics reform at the Supreme Court, ethics reform in the executive branch, empowering the Office of Government Ethics to have real subpoena power, and to actually be able to ferret out the corruption which is engulfing the Trump administration today, and to prevent corruption in the future.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), my friend and the ranking Republican Member on the House Administration Committee.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is great to be here and follow my colleague on the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Obviously, as you will hear over the next 1 minute and 50 seconds, we disagree. This bill was rushed. This bill does not live up to the promises that the Democratic majority said they were going to do when they ran the House and how open, how bipartisan, and how transparent they were supposed to be.

H.R. 1 means this is the Democrat majority's priority. This bill was introduced on January 3, and at a press conference introducing this bill, many different outside, special interest groups were noted for having helped craft this piece of legislation.

It was 571 pages. It has turned into 622 pages. It has turned into 72 amendments that were ruled in order.

Now, let's take a step back. Ten committees of this House had jurisdiction within this bill. One committee, the smallest committee in the House of Representatives, the House Administration Committee is the only one to mark this bill up.

That is not regular order. That is not an open process. And, frankly, it is a process that the American people should demand be much different.

We Republicans were not consulted during the drafting of this piece of legislation. We Republicans during the only markup that lasted 5 hours, offered 28 amendments that would have made this bill better, and not a single one was passed. All failed on a party-line vote.

That is not bipartisanship. That is not openness. That is not a process that is inclusive, and, frankly, the American people should be very petrified what this bill will do. It is not a bill that responds to people, as my colleague, Mr. RASKIN, just mentioned. This is a bill that is going to cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars, creating a mandatory program that is going to line the campaign coffers of every single Member of Congress with government money.

That is not what the American taxpayers are wanting. That is not what this institution should be doing. We want every single person in this country to be able to cast their vote and make sure that they have the right to do it, the ability to do it, and to ensure that that vote is protected. This bill does nothing to make sure that happens.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am confused when I listen to the gentleman from Illinois when he complains about process. He complains that we have over 70 amendments in order, as if that were a bad thing.

We think that is a good thing. And when they did their H.R. 1, which was a big, fat giveaway to big corporate special interests in this country, they had no amendments. They had no hearings in any committees.

The House Administration Committee happens to be the main committee of jurisdiction, and they did a hearing and a markup. So did the other committees. They all did hearings. I don't understand what the problem is.

The problem is, you don't like this bill because it undercuts your stranglehold on the political system where all of the big money, corporate special interests can basically get their way with the Republican majority. Enough.

People, whether they are Democrats, Republicans, or Independents, have had enough of this corrupt political system that my Republican friends have embraced. We are sick of it. They are sick of it. We are going to change it and it begins here today with passing H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both side of the aisle: stand with us, clean up our political system and support H.R. 1.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my good friend and fellow member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. COLE, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, for yielding me time to speak on this most important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I tell those of you who are here today and throughout America, this is a terrible bill. I have to tell you, the more that I read about it, the more that I study about it, the worse I think that it is.

First of all, it is a total overreach of the Federal Government into States' rights. In this bill, the majority didn't even consult with the secretaries of States and the election officials throughout the entire country to see if they even liked it. And so you are mandating to the States how they should run their elections.

Not only that, it is mandating to the States how they should run redistricting. Now, in the State of Arizona, the voters of Arizona set up a redistricting commission and determined how it should be run. But in this bill it says, no, no, it shouldn't be up to the State. It shouldn't be up to the voters. We know better here in Washington, D.C. how to do your business.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, the worst part is that it subsidizes politicians with public money, a 6-to-1 matching ratio giving millions, billions more dollars to candidates. My constituents don't want to see any more of those TV commercials at all; no more signs; no more robocalls. This bill would add more money to those nasty things.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the distinguished Republican ranking member on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Republican leader on the Rules Committee for yielding.

It is unfortunate we are here today to debate a bill like this. This bill is nothing more than a partisan power grab. That is the sum and substance of what has been offered here as H.R. 1.

This is about the priorities of Democrats in the House, and the priorities of Democrats in the House is to change our election laws in such a way as to benefit their party and hurt the American voters and their will at the ballot box. That is the deep problem here with H.R. 1.

This is a partisan power grab by one party to seize power by manipulating our laws to get an outcome counter to the will of the people.

It is not about fairness. It is just the opposite. This is a problem, the process that the Democrats went through, the majority went through for this bill. We had one markup in one committee even though we had multiple committees, including the House Financial Services

Committee. That is how big this bill is. It had multiple committees of jurisdiction that were supposed to have markups on this, and they did not go through that full process.

This bill, at the end of the day, seeks to limit free speech. It uses taxpayer dollars to fund partisan campaign efforts, and mandates outcomes designed to get more Democrats into power.

This is not about fairness. It is just the opposite. Let's vote against this rule, and let's vote down this bad bill.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I can't believe what I am hearing from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Against higher ethics in Congress, they are, what, accepting any kind of corruption in this institution and what corrupts our democracy? You are for gerrymandering? You want dark money to continue?

This is absurd. This is about strengthening our democracy. This should have 435 votes. I am so proud that two of my bills have been incorporated into H.R. 1; one is that we have a national holiday for our national elections. People shouldn't have to choose between their job or their families. They should be able to go and vote.

□ 1315

Presidents and all Presidential candidates should be mandated to put out 10 years of their tax returns so that the American people can vet them in their own minds to see if they are worthy of the highest office in the land.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to add a provision that bars candidates from receiving matching funds under this bill unless that candidate certifies that no tax lien exists on any property owned by that candidate by reason of a failure of the candidate to pay any Federal, State, or local tax.

Mr. Speaker, the logic of this is simple. If the majority is going to insist that millions—really, billions—of Federal tax dollars should be spent subsidizing campaigns, then the candidates should also certify that they have paid all the taxes due from them. If a candidate has a tax lien against them, then they should not receive taxpayer dollars to subsidize their campaign. This is common sense and simple fairness.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the gentleman from Oklahoma has any more speakers.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this rule and the underlying measure. The majority has brought up a misnamed bill that instead serves only to preserve its own power. H.R. 1 will create a taxpayer-funded ATM to waste Federal dollars on political campaigns.

Let me say that again: to waste Federal dollars on campaigns.

My friends are worried about the power of money, but they are injecting billions of new taxpayer dollars into this. And not only that, the taxpayer has no say in where those dollars go. They don't get to pick a candidate or whatever. We are just going to willy-nilly have their dollars support candidates whom they may or may not agree with.

This does not only apply to Democrats and Republicans. There are fringe candidates who will get funding under this, too, candidates, quite frankly, who will probably embarrass my friends and ourselves.

So I think this is an enormously misguided idea. It will take over elections and voter registration from States and transfer power to Washington.

Let me say that again. My friends are voting to literally turn over the State election operations of 50 separate States and federalize them. They haven't talked to very many secretaries of state. I think there was only one who actually was allowed to testify in opposition to this bill.

Instead, we are going to foist off billions of dollars in unpaid mandates on every State in the country so my friends can continue this misguided effort to alter the political landscape of the greatest Republic and democracy in the world.

This bill will weaken voting systems and weaken the enforcement mechanism that guards against fraud, and it will undermine Americans' fundamental First Amendment rights.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge my friends on the other side to reconsider their course of action. This bill is not going to be heard by the Senate; it will never be signed by the President of the United States; and instead of building a bipartisan coalition for election and campaign reform, it will partisanize this process further.

There was and still is an opportunity to have this bill considered in markups across every committee of jurisdiction. Instead, the majority is simply ramming it through, using a committee where they hold a 2-to-1 majority and limiting, frankly, the ability of Members to participate in the process of writing the bill.

We can do better than this, Mr. Speaker, and we should strive to do better than this now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question, “no” on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the reforms in H.R. 1, the For the People Act, will remove barriers to our democracy that drown out the voices of too many Americans.

H.R. 1 will put the people back in charge. These reforms will bring about systemic change which, in turn, will lead to policy outcomes that improve the lives of all Americans.

From lowering the cost of prescription drugs to rebuilding our Nation's infrastructure to raising wages and creating better job opportunities, each of these policies requires the voice of the people to be fully heard and respected. They all rest on fixing our broken democracy.

We have heard the call for change from our friends, neighbors, and constituents. That is how I got here and how so many of my colleagues did, too.

To those people who voted for such historic change, know that Democrats hear you, and we are ready to give you the government you deserve.

Crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma last weekend was a poignant reminder that change does not come quickly, and it certainly does not come easily. Heroes like Representative JOHN LEWIS remind us of the sacrifices that were made in order to preserve our uniquely American creed: “of the people, by the people, for the people.”

H.R. 1 is the top priority of Democrats because it will strengthen the very core of our democracy. It is a mandate with which we were entrusted by voters this past November, and it is the first step in restoring faith in our institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of this House to support this rule to show that you want big money out of politics. Support this bill to show that you believe voting should be made easier—not harder—for eligible voters, and support this rule to show that you believe those elected to public positions deserve to be held to the highest possible ethical standards.

In the words of our esteemed colleague, Representative LEWIS: “The fight to vote is precious, almost sacred. It is the most powerful nonviolent tool or instrument that we have in a democratic society.”

To the American people: We hear you. In the words of the civil rights anthem, we must keep our eyes on the prize and hold on to the vision of a more perfect Union, one in which the voices of the people are heard and respected. Our Caucus is eager to restore the promise of our democracy and give you the government you deserve. That is why we are urging passage of H.R. 1—“For the People.”

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. COLE is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 7 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution if offered by Representative Cole of Oklahoma or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 7. The amendment referred to in section 6 is as follows:

Page 421, insert after line 11 the following:

“(5) The candidate certifies that no lien exists on any property of the candidate by reason of a failure of the candidate to pay any Federal, State, or local tax.”.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Adoption of House Resolution 172, if ordered; and

Approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 191, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—232

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

Levin (MI)	Panetta	Sherrill
Lewis	Pappas	Sires
Lieu, Ted	Pascrell	Slotkin
Lipinski	Payne	Smith (WA)
Loeb sack	Perlmutter	Soto
Lofgren	Peters	Spanberger
Lowenthal	Peterson	Speier
Lowe y	Phillips	Stanton
Lujan	Pingree	Stevens
Luria	Pocan	Suo zzi
Lynch	Porter	Swalwell (CA)
Malinowski	Pressley	Takano
Maloney,	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Carolyn B.	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Maloney, Sean	Raskin	Titus
Matsui	Rice (NY)	Tlaib
McAdams	Richmond	Tonko
McBath	Rose (NY)	Torres (CA)
McCollum	Rouda	Torres Small
McEachin	Roybal-Allard	(NM)
McGovern	Ruiz	Trahan
McNerney	Ruppersberger	Trone
Meeks	Rush	Underwood
Meng	Ryan	Van Drew
Moore	Sánchez	Vargas
Morelle	Sarbanes	Veasey
Moulton	Scanlon	Vela
Mucarsel-Powell	Schakowsky	Velázquez
Murphy	Schiff	Visclosky
Nadler	Schneider	Wasserman
Napolitano	Schrader	Schultz
Neal	Schrier	Waters
Neguse	Scott (VA)	Watson Coleman
Norcross	Scott, David	Welch
O'Halleran	Serrano	Wexton
Ocasio-Cortez	Sewell (AL)	Wild
Omar	Shalala	Wilson (FL)
Pallone	Sherman	Yarmuth

NAYS—191

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

Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman

Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall

Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarella
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda

Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens

Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1400

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.” So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, due to my attendance at memorial services following the untimely passing of Dennis Richardson, Oregon's 26th Secretary of State, I was in Oregon and missed votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 106 and “nay” on rollcall No. 107.

NAYS—192

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)

Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse

Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Staubert
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Byrne
Carter (TX)
Clark (MA)

Rutherford
Spano
Trone

Walden

NOT VOTING—8

Byrne
Carter (TX)
Clark (MA)

Griffith
Horsford
Rutherford

Spano
Walden

□ 1351

Mr. KINZINGER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. CRAWFORD changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

Stated for:

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 106.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 192, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—232

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.

Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)

Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebisack
Loifgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan
Lujan
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy