Bedford County and all of Virginia, and I wish him and his family all the best during a well-earned retirement. His service leaves a legacy we can all be proud of.

HONORING BOB HUDZIK

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bob Hudzik, a constituent in my district who has made a profound difference in his community.

Bob, a world champion dart player and custodian at Mt. Olive High School, began Darts for Kids, a nonprofit organization that hosts an annual dart tournament. The proceeds go to families of children with life-threatening illnesses, usually to contribute to the cost of unforeseen medical expenses.

Their first tournament in 2013 raised about $10,000. To date, Darts for Kids has raised almost $175,000 and helped over 90 families with medical costs for children.

I recently cosponsored legislation that shines a light on individuals like Bob. H.R. 276, the RISE Act, would establish the Recognizing Inspirational School Employees Award Program within the Department of Education to highlight the dedication of education support professionals like Bob.

Bob is a perfect example of the people who make our communities great. I could not be prouder of all that Bob has done to better the lives of families in Mt. Olive, Illinois.

Keep up the great work, Bob.

BETTER REFORM FOR THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I am here today to speak out against H.R. 1.

When Republicans were in the majority, we reserved H.R. 1 for legislation that actually benefited the American people by putting more money in their pockets and growing the economy through the historic tax reform bill passed last year. Now here we are, under a new majority, planning to vote on a bill telling folks that their hard-earned taxpayer dollars will be going to a political candidate that they would never support.

This bill goes too far and is nothing more than a power grab from the Democrats to try to ensure one-party rule. This socialist, top-down, one-size-fits-all election system violates States' rights, fails to criminalize fraudulent voter registration, and eliminates every American's constitutional right to free speech under the First Amendment.

We do not need the heavy, overreaching hand of the Federal Government corrupting every single election across this great Nation.

Madam Speaker, I have said it before and I will say it again: This legislation is not reform for the better, and it is not for the people.

STATE AND LOCAL TAX DEDUCTION

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, forcing Americans to pay Federal tax money they have already paid to State and local governments is double taxation, and it is wrong. But that is just what the tax law passed by my Republican colleagues in 2017 did.

The law places a severe $10,000 restriction on the State and local tax deduction. According to the United States Department of the Treasury, more than 11 million households will exceed this new cap. In my district, around 42 percent of filers use the SALT deduction, and I have heard from many constituents stuck this year with a higher tax bill.

Madam Speaker, Illinois already pays approximately $1.36 for every dollar we receive in Federal spending. It is not right that our communities now must bear the burden for the President's irresponsible tax law.

Lifting these punishing caps is a top priority for my constituents, and I am pleased that there is growing bipartisan support for the effort. This week, I cosponsored legislation introduced by Chairwoman NITA LOWEY, a Democrat, and PETER KING, a Republican, to restore the full SALT deduction.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort and help bring needed tax relief to the communities we all represent.

TERM LIMITS FOR CONGRESS

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

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, my esteemed colleague, Representative ROONEY, has introduced a bill, H.J. Res. 20, to limit the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve to three terms. I signed on to cosponsor this bill right away.

Term limits would take power away from special interests and lobbyists and give it back to the people. When Members stay in Congress for too long, they lose touch with the people back home and allow special interests to hold sway more than regular people.

A Congress out of touch with its constituents cannot do a good job representing the American people. This bill would make sure our constituents will have a representative body that they recognize.

The power of incumbency is a counterbalance to the will of the people. Term limits would encourage independent congressional judgment and reduce election-related incentives for wasteful government spending.

This bill would create a much better political system by inspiring political leaders with a desire to serve their constituents, not themselves; political leaders who respond to voters' concerns, not a career path in special interests.

Madam Speaker, I call on my fellow Members to support this bill.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 172 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) kindly take the chair.

□ 1223

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes, with Ms. CASTOR of Florida (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 6, 2019, amendment No. 22 printed in part B of House Report 116–16 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 172, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 35, 36, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 59, 60, 65, 66, and 67 printed in part B of House Report 116–16, offered by Ms. LOFGREN of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 323, insert after line 6 the following new section:

SEC. 4103. PROHIBITION ON CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN CONNECTIONS WITH BALLOT INITIATIVES AND REFERENDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 319(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''election;'' and inserting the following: ''election, including a State or local ballot initiative or referendum;''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to elections held in 2020 or any succeeding year.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN OF WISCONSIN

Page 539, insert after line 16 the following (and redesignate the succeeding subtitle accordingly):

Subtitle E—Clearinghouse on Lobbying Information

SEC. 7401. ESTABLISHMENT OF CLEARINGHOUSE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Attorney General shall establish and operate within the Department of Justice a clearinghouse through which members of the public may obtain copies (including in electronic form) of registration statements filed under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) and the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.).

(b) FORMAT.—The Attorney General shall ensure that the information in the clearinghouse established under this Act is maintained in a searchable and sortable format.

(c) AGREEMENTS WITH CLERK OF HOUSE AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE.—The Attorney General shall enter into such agreements with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate as may be necessary for the Attorney General to obtain registration statements filed with the Clerk and the Secretary under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 for inclusion in the clearinghouse.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle A of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 8006. LIMITATION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS AND CONTRACTING AT BUSINESSES OWNED BY CERTAIN GOVERNMENT OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.

(a) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL FUNDS.—Beginning in fiscal year 2020 and in each fiscal year thereafter, no Federal funds may be obligated or expended for purposes of procuring goods or services at any business owned or controlled by a covered individual or any family member of such an individual, unless such obligation or expenditure of funds is necessary for the security of a covered individual or family member.

(b) PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS.—No federal agency may enter into a contract with a business owned or controlled by a covered individual or any family member of such an individual.

(c) DETERMINATION OF OWNERSHIP.—For purposes of this section, a business shall be deemed to be owned or controlled by a covered individual or any family member of such an individual if the covered individual or member of family (as the case may be)—

(1) is a member of the board of directors or similar governing body of the business; or

(2) directly or indirectly owns or controls 51 percent or more of the voting shares of the business.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term ''covered individual'' means—

(A) the President;

(B) the Vice President;

(C) the head of any Executive department (as that term is defined in section 101 of title 5, United States Code); and

(D) any individual occupying a position designated by the President as a Cabinet-level position.

(2) FAMILY MEMBER.—The term ''family member'' means an individual with any of the following relationships to a covered individual:

(A) Spouse, and parents thereof.

(B) Sons and daughters, and spouses thereof.

(C) Parents, and spouses thereof.

(D) Brothers and sisters, and spouses thereof.

(E) Grandparents and grandchildren, and spouses thereof.

(F) Domestic partner and parents thereof, including domestic partners of any individual in paragraphs (2) through (5).

(3) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term ''federal agency'' has the meaning given that term in section 102 of title 40, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO OF CALIFORNIA

In title VI of the bill—

(1) redesignate subtitle C as subtitle D (and conform the succeeding subtitle accordingly); and

(2) insert after subtitle B the following:

Subtitle C—Disposal of Contributions or Donations

SEC. 6201. TIMEFRAME FOR AND PRIORITIZATION OF DISPOSAL OF CONTRIBUTIONS OR DONATIONS.

Section 313 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30114), as amended by section 5113 and section 5302, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) DISPOSAL.—

''(1) TIMEFRAME.—Contributions or donations described in subsection (a) may only be used—

''(A) in the case of an individual who is not a candidate with respect to an election for any Federal office for a 6-year period beginning on the day after the date of the most recent such election in which the individual was a candidate for any such office, during such 6-year period; or

''(B) in the case of an individual who becomes a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, before the date on which such individual becomes such a registered lobbyist.

''(2) MEANS OF DISPOSAL; PRIORITIZATION.—Beginning on the date the 6-year period described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) ends (or, in the case of an individual described in subparagraph (B) of such paragraph, the date on which the individual becomes a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995), contributions or donations that remain available to an individual described in such paragraph shall be disposed of, not later than 30 days after such date, as follows:

''(A) First, to pay any debts or obligations owed in connection with the campaign for election for Federal office of the individual.

''(B) Second, to the extent such contribution or donations remain available after the application of subparagraph (A), through any of the following means of disposal (or a combination thereof), in any order the individual considers appropriate:

''(i) Returning such contributions or donations to the individuals, entities, or both, who made such contributions or donations.

''(ii) Making contributions to an organization described in section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(iii) Making transfers to a national, State, or local committee of a political party.''.

SEC. 6202. 1-YEAR TRANSITION PERIOD FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual described in subsection (b), any contributions or donations remaining available to the individual shall be disposed of—

(1) not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section; and

(2) in accordance with the prioritization specified in subparagraphs (A) through (D) of subsection (c)(2) of section 313 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30114), as amended by section 6201 of this subtitle.

(b) INDIVIDUALS DESCRIBED.—An individual described in this subsection is an individual who, as of the date of the enactment of this section—

(1)(A) is not a candidate with respect to an election for any Federal office for a period of not less than 6 years beginning on the day after the date of the most recent such election in which the individual was a candidate for any such office; or

(B) is an individual who becomes a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995; and

(2) would be in violation of subsection (c) of section 313 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30114), as amended by section 6201 of this subtitle.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 153, insert after line 13 the following:

(3) ACCESS AND CULTURAL CONSIDERATIONS.—The Commission shall ensure that the manual described in paragraph (2) provides training in methods that will enable poll workers to provide access and delivery of services in a culturally competent manner to all voters who use their services, including those with limited English proficiency, diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds, disabilities, and regardless of gender, sexual orientation, or gender identity. These methods must ensure that each voter will have access to poll worker services that are delivered in a manner that meets the unique needs of the voter.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER OF ILLINOIS

Page 528, insert after line 19 the following (and redesignate the succeeding subtitle accordingly):

Subtitle C—Recommendations to Ensure Filing of Reports Before Date of Election

SEC. 6201. RECOMMENDATIONS TO ENSURE FILING OF REPORTS BEFORE DATE OF ELECTION.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Election Commission shall submit a report to Congress providing recommendations, including recommendations for changes to existing law, on how to ensure that each political committee under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, including a committee which accepts donations or contributions that do not comply with the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of such Act, will file a report under section 304 of such Act prior to the date of the election for which the committee receives contributions or makes disbursements, without regard to the date on which the committee first registered under such Act, and shall include specific recommendations to ensure that such committees will not delay until after the date of the election the reporting of the identification of persons making contributions that will be used to repay debt incurred by the committee.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

Page 71, strike lines 6 through 13 and insert the following:

(b) BREAKDOWN OF INFORMATION.—In preparing the report under this section, the State shall, for each category of information described in subsection (a), include a breakdown by race, ethnicity, age, and gender of the individuals whose information is included in the category, to the extent that information on the race, ethnicity, age, and gender of such individuals is available to the State.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. ESPAILLAT OF NEW YORK

At the end of part 2 of subtitle E of title II of division A (page 246, after line 8), add the following new section:

SEC. 2415. REPORT ON DIVERSITY OF MEMBERSHIPS OF INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSIONS.

Not later than May 15 of a year ending in the numeral one, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the extent to which the memberships of independent redistricting commissions for States established under this part with respect to the immediately preceding year ending in the numeral zero meet the diversity requirements as provided for in sections 2411(a)(2)(B) and 2412(b)(2).

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Insert after section 8035 the following:

SEC. 8036. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEE TRAVEL IN CONTRAVENTION OF CERTAIN REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, no Federal funds appropriated or otherwise made available in any fiscal year may be used for the travel expenses of any senior Federal official in contravention of sections 301–10.260 through 301–10.266 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORT ON TRAVEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act and every 90 days thereafter, the head of each Federal agency shall submit a report to the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate detailing travel on Government aircraft by any senior Federal official employed at the applicable agency.

(2) APPLICATION.—Any report required under paragraph (1) shall not include any classified travel, and nothing in this Act shall be construed to supersede, alter, or otherwise affect the application of section 101–37.408 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(c) TRAVEL REGULATION REPORT.—Not later than one year after enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Government Ethics shall submit a report to Congress detailing suggestions on strengthening Federal travel regulations. On the date such report is so submitted, the Director shall publish such report on the Office's public website.

(d) DEFINITION OF SENIOR FEDERAL OFFICIAL.—In this Act, the term ''senior Federal official'' has the meaning given that term in section 101–37.100 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and includes any senior executive branch official (as that term is defined in such section).

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Insert after section 8035 the following:

SEC. 8036. REPORTS ON COST OF PRESIDENTIAL TRAVEL.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Air Force, shall submit to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report detailing the direct and indirect costs to the Department of Defense in support of presidential travel. Each such report shall include costs incurred for travel to a property owned or operated by the individual serving as President or an immediate family member of such individual.

(b) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''immediate family member'' means the spouse of such individual, the adult or minor child of such individual, or the spouse of an adult child of such individual.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Insert after section 8035 the following:

SEC. 8036. REPORTS ON COST OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE TRAVEL.

(a) REPORTS ON SENIOR EXECUTIVE TRAVEL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report detailing the direct and indirect costs to the Department of Defense in support of travel by senior executive officials on military aircraft. Each such report shall include whether spousal travel furnished by the Department was reimbursed to the Federal Government.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Required use travel, as outlined in Department of Defense Directive 4500.56, shall not be included in reports under subsection (a)

(c) SENIOR EXECUTIVE OFFICIAL DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''senior executive official'' has the meaning given the term ''senior Federal official'' in section 101–37.100 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and includes any senior executive branch official (as that term is defined in such section).

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. MCADAMS OF UTAH

Page 537, insert after line 7 the following (and redesignate the succeeding subsection accordingly):

(b) REDUCTION OF PERCENTAGE EXEMPTION FOR DETERMINATION OF THRESHOLD OF LOBBYING CONTACTS REQUIRED FOR INDIVIDUALS TO REGISTER AS LOBBYISTS.—Section 3(10) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1602(10)) is amended by striking ''less than 20 percent'' and inserting ''less than 10 percent''.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. PHILLIPS OF MINNESOTA

Page 552, strike lines 1 and 2 and insert the following:

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''1 year'' in each instance and inserting ''2 years''; and

(B) by inserting '', or conducts any lobbying activity to facilitate any communication to or appearance before,'' after ''any communication to or appearance before''; and

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. PHILLIPS OF MINNESOTA

Page 499, line 4, strike '', consisting'' and insert ''that includes individuals representing each major political party and individuals who are independent of a political party and that consists''.

Page 499, line 11, insert ''The President shall also make reasonable efforts to encourage racial, ethnic, and gender diversity on the panel.'' after the period.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. HARDER OF CALIFORNIA

Add at the end of subtitle C of title VII the following new section:

SEC. 7202. REQUIRING LOBBYISTS TO DISCLOSE STATUS AS LOBBYISTS UPON MAKING ANY LOBBYING CONTACTS.

(a) MANDATORY DISCLOSURE AT TIME OF CONTACT.—Section 14 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1609) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

''(a) REQUIRING IDENTIFICATION AT TIME OF LOBBYING CONTACT.—Any person or entity that makes a lobbying contact with a covered legislative branch official or a covered executive branch official shall, at the time of the lobbying contact—

''(1) indicate whether the person or entity is registered under this chapter and identify the client on whose behalf the lobbying contact is made; and

''(2) indicate whether such client is a foreign entity and identify any foreign entity required to be disclosed under section 4(b)(4) that has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity.''; and

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to lobbying contacts made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. HORSFORD OF NEVADA

In subtitle A of title VI of the bill, insert after section 6006 the following new section (and redesignate the succeeding provision accordingly):

SEC. 6007. REQUIRING FORMS TO PERMIT USE OF ACCENT MARKS.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Section 311(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30111(a)(1)) is amended by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting the following: '', and shall ensure that all such forms (including forms in an electronic format) permit the person using the form to include an accent mark as part of the person's identification;''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect upon the expiration of the 90-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MS. FINKENAUER OF IOWA

Page 201, line 7, strike ''subsection (c)'' and insert ''subsection (c) and subsection (d)''.

Page 204, insert after line 10 the following:

(d) TREATMENT OF STATE OF IOWA.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the State of Iowa, so long as congressional redistricting in such State is carried out in accordance with a plan developed by the Iowa Legislative Services Agency with the assistance of a Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission, under law which was in effect for the most recent congressional redistricting carried out in the State prior to the date of the enactment of this Act and which remains in effect continuously on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Page 204, line 13, strike ''section 2401(c)'' and insert ''sections 2401(c) or section 2401(d)''.

Page 252, line 4, strike ''paragraph (2)'' and insert ''paragraph (2) and paragraph (3)''.

Page 252, insert after line 19 the following:

(3) EXCEPTION FOR STATE OF IOWA.—In the case of the State of Iowa, the Commission may not make a payment to the State under this section until the State certifies to the Commission that it will carry out congressional redistricting pursuant to the State's apportionment notice in accordance with a plan developed by the Iowa Legislative Services Agency with the assistance of a Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission, as provided under the law described in section 2401(d).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

This package of 17 important amendments was made in order by the rule. The substance of these amendments ranges from commonsense information-gathering to protecting our Nation from foreign influence.

For instance, one amendment expands an existing ban to protect against a greater universe of threats. It provides that the Federal Election Campaign Act, which already bans foreign nationals from contributing to American elections, ought also to ban them from contributing to State or local ballot initiatives or referenda, where their undue influence might allow outside control of State and local matters.

Our colleagues have also joined with us in efforts to understand and appreciate the different experiences of American voters and to ensure that voters of all kinds are included at the ballot box by supporting information-sharing between States and the Election Assistance Commission.

One amendment focuses on greater reporting of demographic information, shining a light on who is voting so that we can better grasp who is participating or perhaps feels left out of our diverse electorate.

In States where information about age, gender, race, and ethnicity is already available to the State, this amendment will simply require States to include that demographic information about voters in their annual report to the Election Assistance Commission on voter registration statistics.

Our colleagues also support efforts by the Government Accountability Office to study the extent to which membership diversity requirements have been met in State redistricting commissions, ensuring that justice and fairness in representing the people is the priority, not partisan advantage to either party.

In a similar vein of being welcome to diverse voters, an amendment requires that the poll worker training manual provided by the Election Assistance Commission ensures that services are delivered in a culturally competent manner to voters who need these services, including voters with disabilities, those with limited English proficiency, and voters of diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds, all regardless of the gender, sexual orientation, or gender identity of the prospective voter.

This amendment seeks to give each voter full and equal access to the poll worker services that are critical to inclusive and efficient election administration and engagement with our sacred duties in this election.

This amendment also contains several component parts that focus on transparency and accessibility of information to everyday citizens so they can feel confident about the integrity, prudence, and independence of this government.

One amendment would stop campaign contributions providing an endless piggybank to candidates long after they have left office, or their campaign.

Another amendment gives citizens an important and accessible window into lobbying information. It would require the Attorney General to establish within the Department of Justice a single lobbying information disclosure portal through which members of the public could obtain hard copies and electronic copies of registration statements filed under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 and the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938. The effect of this amendment would be to combine and make easily accessible information that is currently available from disparate sources, including the House, the Senate, and the Department of Justice. Efforts like these increase information flow, transparency, and confidence in our government.

Madam Chair, I think these amendments are worthy of our support.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank my friend and chairperson of our committee, Ms. LOFGREN. It is great to be able to work together and show some bipartisanship.

As many who may have been paying attention yesterday to our long debate on this bill know, that has been one of my chief complaints about H.R. 1. We haven't seen the bipartisanship that the new majority, the new Democratic majority, promised.

□ 1230

Every one of these amendments were offered by members of the Democratic conference. While our amendments in the only markup process that we had for this 622-page bill were all shot down on a partisan roll call, I want the RECORD to show that Republicans believe in bipartisanship and this en bloc group of amendments clearly shows that.

While individually I may not have supported every one of them, this is what bipartisanship and good principle compromise leads to. It leads to us spending a lot less time on the floor debating individual amendments, but also saving time for the amendments that are that much more important.

And I certainly hope that, unlike I have seen throughout the process already, this en bloc of bipartisan amendments, this en bloc of really Democratic amendments that have been accepted on a bipartisan basis, could be the linchpin. As we move forward today, I certainly hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle can accept some Republican amendments because we have yet to accept one. So I hope this is a goodwill gesture that will lead to more bipartisanship as the day goes on.

Again, while I and many members of our conference may not have supported these amendments individually, we felt it was a good faith effort to be able to work together. And, again, I want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, especially with the House Administration Committee, a committee that has done its due diligence in putting a massive, mammoth bill forward to the floor today. I still have problems with the process, I still have problems with the overall bill, but this en bloc amendment should not be one of those.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, a few of the Members who have offered amendments would like to speak briefly on them.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HARDER).

Mr. HARDER of California. Madam Chair, I thank Chair LOFGREN for her leadership on this issue.

Madam Chair, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my amendment to limit the influence of lobbyists on elected officials.

Here is a stat that blows me away. D.C. is home to 11,000 registered lobbyists. That is 25 lobbyists per Member of Congress.

During one of my first nights in D.C., I got invited to dinner with some of my freshman colleagues. I thought it was going to be a chance to talk about the issues that I hear from families in my community: the cost of healthcare, education, maybe jobs. But imagine my surprise when the only thing these lobbyists wanted to talk about was what would benefit their clients.

This happens in the city every day. Thousands of lobbyists here, in one city, creating an ecosystem of easy access where they can push their client's agenda in front of elected representatives.

My amendment is simple. It says that if you are a lobbyist and you reach out to a Member of Congress, you must make clear that you are a lobbyist, you must make clear who your clients are, and you better tell us who pays you. This is common sense.

Back home, I hear a common frustration that Washington doesn't listen. This problem is real and it has got to stop. My community has had enough with back-room deals. This amendment is one step in the right direction, and I urge this body to vote in favor.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN), who has several amendments.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Madam Chair, as I travel throughout my district, I hear Arizona's concerns about the integrity of our elections, our elected leaders, and those who serve them in the highest positions of our government.

At a time when millions of Americans feel uncertain about the state of our democracy, Congress must act.

I am proud to support H.R. 1, which will strengthen our democracy and close ethics loopholes.

I want to thank the chairwoman and the ranking member for agreeing to adopt my three amendments to the underlying bill. These amendments, which include my Taxpayers DIME Act and my Protecting Defense Dollars Act, will do right by our taxpayers by increasing transparency and accountability when it comes to travel, including on government and military aircraft.

These amendments will crack down on bureaucrats abusing ethics rules in place of lavish travel on private jets, first-class flights, and more. Several of these amendments have previously received bipartisan support.

Regardless of party, those who serve the American public must be held to the highest ethical standards. Our ability to hold government officials accountable to taxpayers is a hallmark of our democracy, and we must work to uphold that right.

Again, I thank my colleagues for including my commonsense amendments in this package.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), who has an amendment here.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Chair, I want to thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Chair, the American people elected a new Congress to clean up corruption and make Washington work for them.

To that end, this week we will pass H.R. 1 to elevate the people's voice in our politics, restrict the influence of dark money in our campaigns, expand voting rights protections, and limit corporate influence.

At the foundation of this effort is a commitment to increasing transparency, so the American people know who is behind the money funding the political ads they see and how much these individuals are spending.

Currently, too many political action committees, including so-called super-PACs, have an easy way around the important disclosure requirements. By officially organizing a PAC or super-PAC just before an election, these committees can spend on ads to influence an election, without disclosing anything until after the voting has already occurred.

In another scheme, PACs borrow money to pay for advertising and operations and incur debts that are not paid off by donors until long after the election.

Both of these practices are extremely troubling and obfuscate who is donating to PACs. Voters are left in the dark until it is too late.

This amendment is a simple first step to address these abuses by requiring the Federal Election Commission to report recommendations to Congress for how we can crack down on these practices by PACs.

I call on my colleagues to join us to increase transparency and support this amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. HICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 565, strike line 12 and all that follows through ''court.'''' on line 20.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, the Office of Government Ethics is a prevention and education agency. OGE is responsible for ensuring compliance with ethics requirements, such as financial disclosure and conflict of interest rules.

These are the folks that the executive branch employees call when they have an ethics question. Their mission is to advise Federal employees on ethics matters.

OGE is not an investigative office, but that is exactly what H.R. 1 wants to turn OGE into, by granting the director the authority to subpoena information and records.

Here is the thing. OGE does not even need to have subpoena authority. It already has the power to request any information needed from Federal agencies, and the Federal agencies are required to comply under the Ethics in Government Act.

The only reason to give subpoena authority is to empower OGE to harass executive branch employees. This is not farfetched, Madam Chair.

The former director of OGE, Shaub, was openly hostile to the Trump administration and to Mr. Trump personally, even before he took office. Under Shaub, OGE went so far as using its official Twitter account in an attempt to coerce President-Elect Trump to divest his business interests. That is not what OGE's role is supposed to be.

We don't want to allow an office that has become so partisan to have subpoena authority and thereby open the door to overt harassment to executive branch employees.

I would just remind my Democrat friends that if this bill does become law—and it won't—but if it does, a future Democratic administration will eventually also have to deal with the same type of issues with the Office of Government Ethics.

Let me further remind everyone that the inspector general of the agency already has authority to subpoena information and documents, so we don't need to expand this and extend it to the director.

At the end of the day, this bill has much bigger problems than this small OGE subpoena authority provision. It is a bad bill. I will not be supporting it, obviously, but I know that many of my friends on the other side of the aisle will be supporting this bill.

Frankly, there is no amendment that is made in order by the Rules Committee that can fix this legislation. Some amendments, I believe, including this one, can at least make it marginally better, but it is a bad bill through and through.

I believe the American people, frankly, are going to be outraged when they find out what is in this piece of legislation, such as public financing for congressional candidates. The American people don't want that. They don't want tax dollars, particularly, six times going to Federal candidates.

And then there is the automatic voter registration requirement. I think the American people will be irate when they find out about this. This particular provision forces States to transfer individuals' personal information from government agencies and services and then transfer those over to election officials for voter registration.

Obviously, that is a violation of the 10th Amendment, but it is even worse than that. The Democratic authors of this legislation will not tell the American people that this provision will lead to huge numbers of illegal aliens and noncitizens being registered to vote.

And here is the problem. Illegal aliens and noncitizens use government agencies and services. Their information, according to H.R. 1, would then be sent to election officials, along with everyone else's, and they will be registered to vote.

The only safeguard that H.R. 1 has to prevent an illegal alien from being automatically registered to vote is if the alien proactively declines, which is not likely to happen because they don't want to draw attention to themselves to begin with because they are here illegally. So for us to expect that they would go publicly and draw attention to themselves, it just simply is not going to happen. That just flies in the face of logic.

Not only does H.R. 1 make it significantly more likely for ineligible voters to be registered, it also makes it next to impossible for States to remove ineligible voters from the voter registration list once they are on there. I doubt that anyone could have devised a better way, or a worse way, as it really is,

to ensure illegal aliens get registered to vote.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 1, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I must oppose the gentleman's amendment. It strips the subpoena power from the Director of the Office of Government Ethics.

Recent years have made it clear that the OGE needs to be strengthened. The subpoena power is a key enforcement tool, and a necessary one, for the Office of Government Ethics.

The former head of OGE said, in working with the current administration it has become clear we need to strengthen the ethics program. That individual resigned as head of the agency in July of last year, after almost 5 years as its head.

The OGE was set up in the aftermath of the 1970 Watergate scandal to clean up government. Some of that cleanup has relied on norms of behavior that are no longer in effect. We need to make sure that we have the ability with the OGE head to actually obtain information so they can do their job.

□ 1245

I do want to touch on a few other points raised by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE).

You know, there has been a lot of discussion over and over that the small donor program is funded by taxpayers. That is incorrect. You can just read the bill and see that is incorrect.

The freedom from influence fund is entirely funded by a nominal, additional assessment on criminal tax fraud cases, at the upper end, and corporate malfeasance fines and forfeitures. That is the entire source of funding. If there is not enough funding from those sources to fully fund the program, then the program is not fully funded.

That is in the bill itself; so I think it is important that we all understand that.

In terms of the automatic voter registration system, this has worked very successfully in a number of States, and six more are in the process of implementing it.

There are quite a few—we think, ample—safeguards to make sure that only those eligible to vote are, in fact, registered to vote. AVR agencies have reliable data about citizenship status and age, and there are separate rules for those agencies that don't collect that information.

I would note, also, that there has been discussion about how this is an unfair Federal imposition on States. This is only for Federal elections. This whole bill, H.R. 1, is about Federal elections. And why is that? Article I, Section 4 gives the authority to Congress to pass laws about the conduct of Federal elections.

We have seen over and over, throughout the United States, efforts to suppress the vote in ways we think are improper by purging eligible voters from the rolls, by preventing people from registering through bogus and arcane ID rolls, by making sure that voters can't get to the polls because they have moved the polls, by eliminating early voting that is so helpful to people who work so hard that they might not be able to get to the polls before the poll closes. So this is for Federal elections.

And why is that important? Each one of us here in the House of Representatives has one vote. That is as it should be, as the Founders established it.

The people who send us here should have the equivalent right to vote for their Representative. There shouldn't be a way that one person in one State has an adequate right to vote but the vote is suppressed in some other State. That is not democracy; that is not fair; and that is what H.R. 1 will fix.

Madam Chair, I urge that we oppose the gentleman from Georgia's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 72, insert after line 2 the following:

SEC. 1052. LOWERING MANDATORY MINIMUM VOTING AGE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

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

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to elections held in 2020 or any succeeding year.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

H.R. 1 is bold, transformative legislation which seeks to restore the people's faith that government works for the public interest, not special interests.

We were sent to Washington with a sacred task to do everything in our power to reinstate Americans' hope and faith in our democracy.

My amendment to H.R. 1 strikes at one of the fundamental goals of this legislation by ensuring that those who have a stake in our democracy will also have a say in our democracy. By lowering the voting age from 18 to 16 years of age, my amendment will allow young people to have a say in our Federal elections, to help shape and inform the policies that will set the course for the future.

From gun violence to climate change, our young people are organizing, mobilizing, and calling us to action. They are at the forefront of social and legislative movements and have earned inclusion in our democracy.

Beginning at the age of 16, young people are contributing to both the labor force and their local economies by paying income taxes, and yet they are deprived of the opportunity to exercise their right to vote.

In this country, we affirm that when a person walks into the voting booth and pulls that lever, there is no meritocracy or hierarchy. The booth is the equalizer.

Despite many reasons in our lives growing up—in my family—to feel invisible and small, my mother reminded me, as a super voter each election day that, on this day, we were powerful. I believed that then, and I still do. When we step into that voting booth, we bring the totality of our lived experiences. The vote we cast absorbs and honors it all.

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

A 16-year-old in 2019 possesses a wisdom and maturity that comes from 2019 challenges, hardships, and threats.

A 16-year-old will bring with them the 2019 fears that their father's insulin will run out before the next paycheck.

A 17-year-old will bring with them the 2019 hopes to be the first in their family to earn a college degree.

A 16-year-old will bring with them the 2019 lessons they learned picking up shifts, waiting tables to support their family while their mother was deployed.

A 17-year-old will bring with them the 2019 solemn vow to honor the lives of their classmate stolen by a gunman.

And now is the time for us to demonstrate the 2019 courage that matches the challenges of the modern-day 16- and 17-year-old.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Representatives MENG and SCHAKOWSKY, for their leadership on this issue and for cosponsoring my amendment; the Rules Committee, under the leadership of Chairman MCGOVERN, for bringing my amendment to the House floor for consideration; and I also wish to thank my staff, Aissa and Lynese, specifically.

Madam Chair, I respectfully request my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

Ms. MENG. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) for yielding her time.

I strongly agree with my friend from Massachusetts. I thank her for sponsoring this important amendment, and

I am proud to cosponsor it with her. It addresses a crucial and often ignored issue that I have been fighting to raise awareness of during my time in Congress.

I have met with students across the State of New York and across the country and am incredibly impressed with their drive and passion directed at the democratic process.

Across the country, these students are getting involved. They are marching. They are advocating for their generation's future, and they are asserting their position in our society.

This is why I am proud to have introduced a constitutional amendment in the 115th and the 116th Congress to lower the voting age to 16 for Federal, State, and local elections.

The amendment in front of us today gives 16-year-olds the right to vote in Federal elections. In localities that have already granted 16-year-olds the right to vote, we have seen an increase in voter participation and better debate.

Madam Chair, 16-year-olds participate in our democracy already. They are legally permitted to work. They pay Federal taxes on their income and can even be tried as adults in court. It is only just that they are given the right to vote.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) for championing this cause. I know this fight will continue.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY), my new colleague, for participating in the legislative process. This is why we are here. We are here to debate the issues, whether we agree or disagree. That is what this institution is all about. And it is great to see new Members be active on very important issues.

I have to say, I think there might be a constitutional issue with this amendment. The last time we lowered the voting age, in 1971, I believe we had 18-year-olds fighting for our country in Vietnam.

It seemed wrong back then. The kids that were eligible for the draft. Through no fault of their own, through no choice of their own, they were asked to go fight for our freedoms in a foreign country. Being 1 year old at the time, I don't really remember that debate, but I can tell you, it was the right thing to do.

However, for constitutional reasons—and, also, I am of the opinion that we shouldn't arbitrarily lower the voting age just because, right now, I believe Democrats think they will gain more votes.

H.R. 1 is bad enough because I believe it will institutionalize a Democrat majority here in this House of Representatives, but to be so brash and, possibly, unconstitutional to decide and lower the voting age only for political reasons is something that I don't think this institution should be doing.

I have two 18-year-old boys who got to cast their first vote this year. There was some thought before election day. I didn't know if I would get their votes, but since then, they told me they have voted for me. And a close race like mine, it made a difference.

But this policy is not well thought out. It is not constitutional, and it should not be part of this bill. I am going to urge a ''no'' vote.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Chair, I respectfully disagree with the gentleman from Illinois, and I, too, appreciate the opportunity to engage in a civil discourse with him.

The data supports the fact that by extending the table of democracy, given what we have learned in Maryland, that, in fact, we have seen more robust voter participation by both 16- and 17-year-olds and those over the age of 18. I think that we should be cultivating that relationship with the young people and their government and their participation as early as possible.

Although a constitutional amendment is one approach, I do think that we have a mandate from this electorate, as a Congress, to be bold; and this is the opportunity to do exactly that, and we should be acting.

There is nothing spontaneous about this. There have been advocates who have been organizing in communities for decades on this very issue and, of course, colleagues in this very House.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, how much time is remaining?

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I just want to share a thought on this.

It is interesting that recently we just raised the alcohol purchasing age to 21. We don't allow a 16-year-old to buy a beer, and the decisionmaking is because of their ability to reason at that age. That is why we moved their ability to buy a simple beer to age 21. And now the other side wants to grant a 16-year-old the ability to decide the future of the country. I think this is foolish.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, it is a great debate to have.

The problem we have here in this country, all 16-year-olds are still legally minors. They can't be tried as adults in the court of law unless, under special circumstances, of heinous crimes.

They can't join the military. They won't even be eligible for the draft that took so many of our young men to Southeast Asia, where many never came home, the last time the voting age was lowered.

In some States, 16-year-olds can't even drive their car alone. They can't take out a loan. They can't take out a mortgage. They can't open a credit card. And they can't even run for the offices that we would be asking them to be allowed to vote for.

This is an amendment that has political reasons behind it. It is the reason that I believe the Democrats are pushing it. It is because they believe they will be able to increase the number of Democrat votes that are put forth in the next election.

This institution should not be used for that. This bill is political enough. This bill, as a whole, is nothing more than a charade to make permanent the Democratic majority that just came into existence just a few months ago.

□ 1300

That is why I believe H.R. 1 is a bill that should be voted against. Please vote ''no'' on H.R. 1, and please vote ''no'' on this amendment for the reasons that I put forth.

Again, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts and my colleague from New York for being here and participating in this process.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TENNESSEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 315, line 1, strike ''**Relating to Illicit Money Undermining Our Democracy**''.

Page 317, insert after line 6 the following:

SEC. 4002. FINDINGS RELATING TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH AS A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The First Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees the most fundamental right of our democratic society: ''Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech''.

(2) The right to free speech guarantees that the American people can freely speak about their political beliefs.

(3) The Federal government should not concern itself with the political ideology or affiliation of any of its citizens, when applying the law, offering services, or evaluating applications for federal benefits or awards.

(4) The protection of free speech is broad and covers expressive and political speech.

(5) Political speech, including the financial contributions to political or issue advocacy campaigns, is a vital part of our Nation's free exchange of ideas and avenues of free expression must be preserved and protected.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today to offer my amendment expressing the sense of Congress that free speech should be protected.

H.R. 1 is a misguided bill with many problems. One problem, in particular, has united everyone from the Heritage Foundation to the ACLU. It is the bill's assault on free speech.

The ACLU itself says H.R. 1 will ''chill speech essential to our public discourse.'' When the ACLU admonishes a Democrat bill, everyone should take notice.

My amendment is simple. It reaffirms the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The First Amendment, after all, guarantees the most fundamental right of our Democratic society: ''Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech.''

Our Founding Fathers knew that in order for the American experiment to work, the people must be free: free to participate in the democratic process, free to vote in elections, free to help candidates and causes they believe in, and free to speak up when their elected officials are no longer representing them.

The freedom of speech enshrined in the First Amendment has helped make America the most exceptional country in the history of the world. Unfortunately, H.R. 1 tramples on that very freedom.

Madam Chair, I offer this amendment to express the sense of Congress that the freedom of speech must be preserved and protected because, without it, the American experiment won't ever be the same again.

A vote against this amendment is a vote against free speech. If you don't believe me, ask the ACLU.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chairwoman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, reluctantly, because it is only the last paragraph in the amendment that causes concern.

The amendment expresses a sense of Congress that free speech should be protected. Who can disagree with that? Our Founding Fathers envisioned a robust and open discourse. They did not fathom speech that was unaccountable to anonymous corporations that would drown out the voices of individual Americans.

The concern we have on this amendment is the last paragraph, really, is an attempt to protect the Citizens United decision and the flow of unlimited dark money into our politics and elections.

It is important to note that, under the guise of free speech, some are suggesting that we need to protect anonymous special interests. Nothing stops people or entities from donating to political campaigns or politicians, but they must be transparent about it.

Justice Brandeis indicated, and I think he is very wise, that sunshine is the best disinfectant, and the American people cannot fully exercise their First Amendment rights if they do not have all of the information necessary to react in an informed manner.

We all have the right to know who is trying to influence elections, and it may well change our minds if we know who is saying what. Ultimately, this amendment is flawed because disclosure does not limit speech.

In Citizens United, the Court affirmed holdings in other cases, that disclaimer and disclosure requirements impose no ceiling on campaign-related activities and do not prevent anyone from speaking. Indeed, the Court held the disclosure is ''a less restrictive alternative to more comprehensive regulations.''

Lauded conservatives have long espoused this principle, and the Supreme Court has repeatedly endorsed disclosure because it helps voters hold elected leaders accountable. In fact, eight of the nine Supreme Court Justices upheld disclosure in the Citizens United case as necessary for voters to hold leaders accountable.

Perhaps no one said it better than Justice Antonin Scalia in Doe v. Reed. Justice Scalia said: ''Requiring people to stand up in public for their political acts fosters civic courage, without which democracy is doomed.''

Much has been said about the ACLU, and I appreciate what the ACLU does on many scores, but they have a storied history of litigating constitutional issues that I support. However, we have differed on our approach to campaign finance laws. They have upheld and supported the Citizens United decision and they oppose McCain-Feingold. While I support so much of the good work they do, I think they are mistaken on this issue.

I include in the RECORD a letter from Democracy 21, which is a very thoughtful rebuttal to the ACLU's position.

DEMOCRACY 21,
March 7, 2019.

Re Response to ACLU Letter on H.R. 1.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Democracy 21 strongly supports H.R. 1, the ''For the People Act of 2019,'' and urges you to vote for the legislation, which is the most comprehensive effort to repair our democracy since the post-Watergate reforms of the 1970's.

In particular, the bill contains a series of important reforms to address serious problems with our campaign finance system. The legislation provides a small donor, matching funds system for House and presidential elections that will encourage small donations and remove candidate dependence on wealthy contributors and special interest money. It also contains important improvements to the disclosure laws to address the growing problem of undisclosed ''dark money'' that is being spent to influence federal elections. And it provides effective standards to ensure that supposedly ''independent'' spending is not done in cooperation or coordination with candidates or their agents, thus evading contribution limits.

We want to address constitutional concerns about some of these measures that have been raised by the ACLU in a letter dated March 6, 2019. We note that the ACLU has participated as a plaintiff or amicus to seek invalidation of reform measures in key Supreme Court cases, including *Buckley* v. *Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1 (1976), *McConnell* v. *FEC*, 540 U.S. 93 (2003) and *Citizens United* v. *FEC*, 130 S.Ct. 876 (2010). Many of the ACLU's challenges to campaign finance reform measures, including disclosure requirements, were rejected by the Court in these cases.

ACLU concerns about disclosure provisions

The provisions of the DISCLOSE Act incorporated into H.R. 1 are essential to closing gaping disclosure loopholes through which, in the last four elections, wealthy donors and special interests gave $1 billion in secret, unlimited contributions to nonprofit groups that spent the money to influence federal elections. Unlimited, secret contributions, also known as dark money, are the most dangerous contributions in American politics because there is no way to hold the donor and officeholder accountable for corrupt practices.

In its March 6 letter, the ACLU particularly criticizes the DISCLOSE Act incorporated into H.R. 1. Those provisions require disclosure of the sources of funding used for ''campaign-related disbursements'' that are intended to influence federal elections. Dating back to the *Buckley* case, and as reaffirmed in *Citizens United*, the Supreme Court has consistently upheld disclosure requirements because they serve the important governmental interests of ''providing the electorate with information about the sources of election-related spending'' in order to help citizens ''make informed choices in the political marketplace.'' *Citizens United*, 130 S. Ct. at 914.

As Justice Kennedy wrote for an 8–1 majority in *Citizens United*, disclosure provisions ''impose no ceiling on campaign-related activities'' and ''do not prevent anyone from speaking.'' Id. In *Citizens United*, the Supreme Court upheld disclosure provisions applicable to section 501(c)(4) nonprofit groups.

The ACLU's principal objection is that H.R. 1 requires disclosure of spending that ''reaches beyond the bounds'' of express advocacy. ACLU Ltr. at 12. Yet the Court in *Citizens United* addressed precisely this issue and upheld a disclosure requirement for a broadcast ad that referred to a candidate in the pre-election period, but that did not contain express advocacy.

The Court explicitly stated that ''we reject Citizens United's contention that the disclosure requirement must be limited to speech that is the functional equivalent of express advocacy.'' Id. at 916.

Thus, the principal constitutional argument raised by the ACLU with regard to the

DISCLOSE Act—that disclosure requirements cannot extend beyond express advocacy—has already been squarely and overwhelmingly rejected by an 8 to 1 vote in the Supreme Court. While the ACLU states that it particularly objects to disclosure requirements for ''electioneering communications,'' i.e., non-express advocacy ads that refer to a candidate in the pre-election period, ACLU Ltr. at 13, this is the very issue that the Court addressed in upholding such disclosure requirements in *Citizens United*.

The ACLU also objects to disclosure requirements for money spent on ads that promote, support, attack or oppose (PASO) the election of a candidate, complaining about ''applying vague and subjective standards to regulation of political speech.'' ACLU Ltr. at 14. Yet again, the Supreme Court directly addressed this issue, and rejected an identical criticism of the same test in the *McConnell* case.

In *McConnell*, the Court stated that the words used in the PASO test—promote, attack, support, oppose—are not unconstitutionally vague because they '' 'provide explicit standards for those who apply them' and 'give the person of ordinary intelligence a reasonable opportunity to know what is prohibited.' '' 540 U.S. at 170 n. 64 (internal citations omitted).

The Court further stated that ''any public communication that promotes or attacks a clearly identified federal candidate directly affects the election in which he is participating. The record on this score could scarcely be more abundant.'' Id. at 170. These rulings should put to rest the objections raised by the ACLU about the PASO test.

The ACLU also raises privacy and associational concerns with the disclosure requirements in the legislation. It invokes the Court's decision in *NAACP* v. *Alabama*, 357 U.S. 459 (1958), which protected the associational interests of a civil rights group against disclosure of the group's membership lists when the group was under attack from government officials in the 1950s South. We note that the NAACP today is itself a supporter of H.R. 1, and that the disclosure provisions in H.R. 1 could not be more different from the disclosure requirements addressed by the Court in the 1958 *NAACP* decision.

The DISCLOSE Act provisions in H.R. 1 require disclosure only of donors who give $10,000 or more in a two-year election cycle to a group which engages in campaign-related spending. That high dollar threshold alone will exclude disclosure of the vast majority of donors to, and members of, most membership organizations, and instead will require disclosure only of very large donors to such groups.

Furthermore, the Supreme Court in both *Buckley* and *McConnell* has already rejected the analogy between campaign finance disclosure requirements and the disclosure of membership lists that was struck down in the *NAACP* case. The Court said in *McConnell*, ''In *Buckley*, unlike *NAACP*, we found no evidence that any party had been exposed to economic reprisals or physical threats as a result of the compelled disclosure.'' Id. at 198.

Indeed, H.R. 1 has an explicit safe harbor from disclosure for any donor who may be subject to ''serious threats, harassment or reprisals.'' Sec. 4111(a) adding Sec. 324(a)(3)(C). This again aligns with the Supreme Court's requirements on this issue.

The Court has made clear that disclosure requirements are not invalid because of a generalized or theoretical concern about ''public harassment,'' but instead are invalid only in specific cases where a group can show a ''reasonable probability'' that disclosing the names of its contributors would ''subject them to threats, harassment, or reprisals from either Government officials or private parties.'' *Citizens United*, 130 S.Ct. at 916.

Absent such a showing, campaign finance disclosure requirements are constitutional. And even if there is such a specific showing of a specific threat, the disclosure requirements would be held unconstitutional only for the specific group involved based on the specific showing of harm to that group. The disclosure laws would otherwise remain constitutional.

The ACLU states a concern that the bill would ''require disclosure of an overbroad number of donors,'' ACLU Ltr. at 15, but it fails to acknowledge or to give proper weight to other protections for privacy interests that are contained in the bill. A group can set up a separate bank account for its spending on campaign-related disbursements and then is required to disclose only those donors of $10,000 or more to this separate account. All other donors to the organization would not be disclosed.

In addition, any donor can restrict his or her donation to the organization from being used for campaign-related disbursements. If the group agrees to the restriction and segregates the money, the identity of the donor is not disclosed. By these measures, groups and donors can ensure that donors whose funds are not used for campaign-related expenditures are not subject to any disclosure, thereby respecting any donor's particularized privacy interests.

ACLU concerns about coordination provisions

A second area of concern with H.R. 1 raised by the ACLU is the provisions related to strengthening the coordination rules in the campaign finance laws. These rules play a major role in protecting the integrity and efficacy of contribution limits which are, in turn, the major bulwark against corruption.

While independent spending is not subject to contribution limits, any spending that is coordinated with a candidate or his agents is treated as a contribution and therefore is subject to limits. Because of weak rules and even weaker enforcement by the Federal Election Commission, the existing coordination rules do not effectively restrain campaign-related spending by Super PACs, nonprofit groups and other outside spenders from being functionally coordinated with the candidates supported by the spending.

In this fashion, the rise of individual-candidate Super PACs has played an especially pernicious role. These Super PACs are typically set up with the involvement of the candidate or his or her close associates, and the candidate is often involved in helping to raise unlimited huge contributions for the Super PAC.

This money is then spent, purportedly independently of the candidate, to promote the candidate's election. But because there are not effective rules against coordination, these individual-candidate Super PACs have operated in *de facto* coordination with the candidates they are set up to support. In practice, they have become dedicated soft money campaign accounts for candidates, thus eviscerating the contribution limits which should apply to money raised and spent by federal candidates.

While the use of individual-candidate Super PACs began after *Citizens United* with presidential candidates in 2012, they rapidly have spread to congressional races. By the 2018 election cycle, 259 individual-candidate Super PACs supporting federal officeholders and other candidates had raised $176 million in unlimited contributions.

The coordination provisions in H.R. 1 strengthen existing coordination rules to conform to Supreme Court decisions which require independent spending to be ''totally'' independent of a candidate. *Buckley*, 424 U.S. at 47.

The ACLU tempers its objections to these provisions of the bill, noting that it ''strongly supports stricter enforcement of rules restricting coordination between campaigns and outside groups'' and acknowledging that ''H.R. 1 would make strides in the right direction by clarifying the definition of coordinated expenditures treated as contributions to a campaign.'' ACLU Ltr. at 17. Yet it objects that the definition of coordination could encompass ''communications with the candidate about the public policy issues of the day without a sufficient nexus to the potential corrupting influence of very large expenditures.'' Id. at 18.

In stating this objection, the ACLU fails to give proper weight to an explicit provision in the bill which protects such communications by creating a safe harbor from application of the coordination rules for any person's ''discussions with the candidate or committee, or with any agent of the candidate or committee, regarding that person's position on a legislative or policy matter (including urging the candidate or committee to adopt that person's position) . . .'' Sec. 6102 adding sec. 326(b)(2).

The ACLU acknowledges this safe harbor, Ltr. at 19, but misinterprets it. As set forth in the text of the bill, the safe harbor applies to legislative or policy discussion ''so long as there is no communication between the person and the candidate or committee . . . regarding the candidate's or committee's campaign advertising, message, strategy or policy,'' id. (emphasis added).

The ACLU's concern that ''[d]iscussion of 'message' or 'policy' is integral to discussion of legislative and policy positions,'' id., is already adequately addressed by the safe harbor provision, which permits all legislative message and policy discussion so long as it is not about campaign policy, or the campaign's message.

Raising additional concerns, the ACLU objects to treatment as a coordinated expenditure of a payment by an outside spender for republication of a candidate's own campaign material, although it correctly notes that this same republication provision has long been part of existing law. ACLU Ltr. at 18. It notes that there are regulations issued by the FEC which have interpreted this provision of existing law, and claims those regulations are necessary to the constitutionality of the law. Even if true, there is nothing in H.R. 1 which would prevent the FEC from similarly construing the bill's re-promulgation of the same republication language, which is all that the bill does on this matter.

Finally, the ACLU notes that the coordination provisions of H.R. 1 create a new category of ''coordinated spenders,'' based on certain specified relationships, activities or status between candidates and outside spenders. The bill then provides that certain specified categories of campaign-related spending by such ''coordinated spenders'' will be treated as coordinated. The ACLU questions whether such treatment can be ''based solely upon a speaker's identity.'' ACLU Ltr. at 19.

This is, at best, a half-hearted objection because the ACLU also then ''agrees that a speaker's identity coupled with the contents of the communications can be factors in determining whether a particular communication was coordinated with a candidate such that it should be considered a campaign contribution.'' Id. The ACLU nonetheless questions whether spending can be treated as coordinated ''absent any additional information indicating the speaker acted pursuant to a common plan.'' Id.

But the Court has never limited the definition of coordinated spending only to spending pursuant to an explicit discussion about,

or a ''common plan'' for, a particular expenditure. The Court has instead cast a wide net in demanding that independent spending be ''totally independent,'' *Buckley*, 424 U.S. at 29, and ''not pursuant to any general or particular understanding with a candidate,'' *Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee v. FEC*, 518 U.S. 604, 614 (1996), and ''truly independent'' or ''without any candidate's approval (or wink or nod).'' *FEC v. Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee*, 533 U.S. 431, 442 (2001).

The standards set forth in H.R. 1 look both to certain relationships between the outside spender and the candidate, and certain activities between the outside spender and the candidate, to determine whether the spending meets the standard set by the Court of being ''totally'' and ''truly'' independent. If the relationship between the candidate and spender, or the activities of the candidate on behalf of the spender (such as helping to fundraise for the spender), indicate that they do not meet this high standard for true independence, then the proposed rule would appropriately deem spending by that person to be coordinated.

Conclusion

The reforms contained in H.R. 1 will make essential improvements in the transparency of the money spent to influence federal elections and in shutting down avenues that are currently being exploited to evade and eviscerate candidate contribution limits. The bill is carefully drafted to conform to the Supreme Court's campaign finance rulings, and to appropriately balance constitutionally protected privacy and speech interests with the government's compelling interests in deterring corruption and the appearance of corruption through disclosure and the restoration of effective contribution limits.

Democracy 21 urges you to vote for H.R. 1.

Sincerely,

FRED WERTHEIMER,
President.
DONALD J. SIMON,
Counsel.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I would note, also, that we have just received a letter from The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights expressing their strong support for H.R. 1. This is an organization that no one can fault for their firm leadership on human, civil, and constitutional rights for many decades.

I include in the RECORD a letter from The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE
ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2019.

Support H.R. 1, the For The People Act.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, a coalition of more than 200 national organizations committed to promoting and protecting the civil and human rights of all persons in the United States, and the 50 undersigned organizations, we write in strong support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

H.R. 1 represents a transformative vision for American democracy. It would create a democracy that welcomes every eligible voter's chance to participate in civic life, and a democracy that demands integrity, fairness, and transparency in our nation's elections. For far too long, voter suppression has been a shameful reality in our country—undercutting the power and representation of African Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, Native Americans, and other groups historically excluded from our political process. The ability to meaningfully participate in our democracy is a racial justice issue. It is a civil rights issue. And the need for legislative action is urgent. We commend the 235 House co-sponsors of this critical legislation.

Our nation will soon mark the 54th anniversary of the Bloody Sunday march, where John Lewis and 600 voting rights activists were viciously beaten and attacked on March 7, 1965 on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama. History was made in August 1965 with the passage of the landmark Voting Rights Act (''VRA''), which sought to end racial discrimination at the ballot box. Nearly five decades later, in 2013, five justices of the Supreme Court gutted the VRA's most powerful tool—the preclearance system. That system had enabled the Justice Department and federal courts to block proposed discriminatory voting restrictions in states with well-documented histories of discrimination.

In the aftermath of the Shelby County v. Holder decision, North Carolina, Texas, and other jurisdictions previously covered in whole or part by the VRA preclearance requirement began to implement voter suppression laws. In striking down the North Carolina law in 2016, the Fourth Circuit described the law as ''the most restrictive voting law North Carolina has seen since the era of Jim Crow'' with provisions that ''target African Americans with almost surgical precision.'' There have been findings of intentional discrimination in at least 10 voting rights decisions since Shelby County.

The Trump administration has only made matters worse by damaging our democracy and institutions—from elections to the census to the free press. The administration's assault on voting rights can be seen in the creation of the sham Pence-Kobach commission, a political ploy that was ultimately discredited and disbanded. We also saw it in its defense of Texas's discriminatory photo ID law and Ohio's voter purge efforts. The Trump administration has not filed a single VRA case, despite numerous recent state and local efforts to block access to the ballot in communities of color. Yet the Trump administration cited its need to enforce the VRA as its justification for adding an untested citizenship question to the 2020 Census—a justification that a federal judge recently found to be pretextual and unlawful.

People turned out in record numbers during the 2018 election to reject this assault on voting rights and cast their votes for democracy reform. Not only is this reflected in the most diverse Congress in our nation's history, but voters also cast their ballot to end gerrymandering and make voting more accessible in red and blue states across the country. However, many states continue to create barriers to voting, and that is why H.R. 1 is so critical.

H.R. 1 would enhance and ensure democracy in America by:

Committing to restoring the Voting Rights Act: H.R. 1 contains a commitment to restoring the landmark VRA and updating its preclearance provision, which is crucial to ensuring that our political process functions fairly and equitably. VRA restoration is being pursued on a separate legislative track that will involve investigatory and evidentiary hearings, thus enabling Congress to update the preclearance coverage formula and develop a full record on the continuing problem of racial discrimination in voting. In 2006, the VRA was reauthorized on a unanimous vote in the Senate and a near-unanimous vote in the House. We need the same type of broad and bipartisan support for restoring the VRA today. Safeguarding democracy should not be a partisan issue.

Restoring voting rights for formerly incarcerated people: H.R. 1 would restore voting rights for people with felony convictions, a necessary repudiation of our nation's discriminatory and racially violent past. This would re-enfranchise approximately 4.7 million voters nationwide. Reforming felony disenfranchisement has bipartisan support; last November, 65 percent of Florida voters cast their ballots to restore the right to vote for over 1.4 million people.

Reforming voter registration: In the November 2016 election, nearly 20 percent of people who were eligible but did not vote cited registration hurdles as the main reason for not voting. H.R. 1 would modernize America's voter registration system and improve access to the ballot box by establishing automatic voter registration (''AVR''), same day registration (''SDR''), and online voter registration for voters across the country, and by ensuring that all voter registration systems are inclusive and accessible for people with disabilities. AVR alone could add an estimated 50 million people to the voter rolls and SDR increases voter turnout by roughly 10 percent.

Combating voter purging: H.R. 1 would overturn the Supreme Court's troubling 2018 decision in Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Institute that allowed Ohio to conduct massive purges from its voter rolls based on non-voting in past elections. Such practices disproportionately target and remove traditionally marginalized people from registration rolls. Voting should not be a ''use it or lose it'' right.

Prohibiting deceptive practices and voter intimidation: H.R. 1 would ban the distribution of false information about elections to hinder or discourage voting. This provision is particularly important in an era in which Facebook and other digital platforms have been readily manipulated to spread misinformation about the time, place, and manner of voting to vulnerable communities. The bill would also increase the criminal penalties for intimidating a voter for the purpose of interfering with their right to vote, or causing them to vote for or against a candidate.

Banning voter caging: H.R. 1 would ban voter caging and prevent challenges to voters' eligibility to vote by individuals who are not election officials, unless the challenge is accompanied by an oath under penalty of perjury that the challenger has a good faith factual basis to believe the person is ineligible to vote or register to vote.

Creating a federal holiday and ensuring early voting and polling place notice: H.R. 1 would make Election Day a federal holiday. It would also require at least 15 consecutive days of early voting, including weekends, in federal elections and ensure that early voting polling places are accessible by public transportation. The bill would also require that voters be given a minimum of seven days' notice if the state decides to change their polling place location.

Reforming redistricting: H.R. 1 would be a milestone in the battle against the extreme partisan gerrymandering our country has witnessed in recent years, by requiring states to draw congressional districts using independent redistricting commissions that are bipartisan and reflect the demographic diversity of the region. The bill would establish fair redistricting criteria and ensure compliance with the VRA to safeguard voting rights for communities of color.

Modernizing election administration: H.R. 1 would reauthorize the Election Assistance Commission—an independent, bipartisan commission that plays a vital role in ensuring the reliability and security of voting equipment used in our nation's elections. It would also promote election reliability and

security by requiring voter-verified permanent paper ballots and enhanced poll worker recruitment and training. And H.R. 1 would prohibit state election administrators from taking an active part in a political campaign over which they have supervisory authority.

H.R. 1 would also make significant advances in the areas of campaign finance and ethics reform. It would correct the rampant corruption flowing from the corrosive power of money in our elections. It would replace the current campaign finance system that empowers the super-rich and big corporations with one that relies on small donors and public matching funds. It would end secret election spending and force disclosure of all election-related spending. And it would call for a constitutional amendment to overturn the disturbing Citizens United decision that made it impossible to restrict outside spending by corporations or billionaires. In addition, H.R. 1 addresses our government ethics crisis by, among other things, requiring the development of a code of conduct for Supreme Court Justices to enhance accountability on ethics and recusal issues; overhauling the Office of Government Ethics to strengthen federal ethics oversight; establishing more robust conflict of interest requirements for government officials; prohibiting members of Congress from using taxpayer dollars to settle allegations of employment discrimination; and requiring presidents to disclose their tax returns.

H.R. 1—the For the People Act—provides a North Star for the democracy reform agenda. It is a bold, comprehensive reform package that offers solutions to a broken democracy. Repairing and modernizing our voting system goes hand in hand with reforms that address the rampant corruption flowing from the corrosive power of money in our elections, and reforms that address the myriad ethical problems that plague all three branches of the federal government. The reforms in H.R. 1 are necessary to advance racial justice and ensure that our government works for all people, not just a powerful few. The civil and human rights coalition is strongly committed to expanding the franchise and fixing our democracy, and we urge Congress to pass this historic legislation.

Sincerely,

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; AFL–CIO; African American Ministers In Action; American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees; American Federation of Teachers; Asian Americans Advancing Justice; Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL–CIO; Brennan Center for Justice; Center for Community Self-Help; Center for Constitutional Rights; Center for Responsible Lending; CLASP; Clearinghouse on Women's Issues; Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA); Common Cause.

Council on American-Islamic Relations; Demos; Fair Elections Center; Faith in Public Life; Feminist Majority Foundation; Franciscan Action Network; Hispanic Federation; Human Rights Campaign; Justice for Migrant Women; Juvenile Law Center; Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; League of Conservation Voters; League of Women Voters; U.S. MALDEF; Matthew Shepard Foundation.

Muslim Public Affairs Council; NAACP; NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.; NARAL Pro-Choice America; National Action Network; National Association of Social Workers; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Coalition for the Homeless; National Council of Jewish Women; National Education Association; National Employment Law Project.

National Employment Lawyers Association; National Immigration Law Center; National Organization for Women; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; People For the American Way; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Prison Policy Initiative; Service Employees International Union (SEIU); Sierra Club; UFCW Minority Coalition.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chairwoman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chairwoman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I just want to make a few specific comments in regard to the amendment and how it impacts H.R. 1 in general.

First, there are no special interest protections in this amendment, none whatsoever. I remind my colleagues of what the ACLU actually said about H.R. 1. It places a chill on ''speech essential to our public discourse.''

Further, I would like to stress that the Court has long affirmed the rights of individuals and organizations to have free speech.

With those comments and clarifications, Madam Chairwoman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, we have no additional speakers at this point.

I would just note that—and I understand the gentleman's points one through four. I completely agree. It is number five in your amendment that causes me concern about whether there is actually an undercutting of H.R. 1's disclosure requirements, and that is the concern we have and why I am so sorry that I cannot support the amendment.

I do think that we have a disagreement over disclosure. I don't understand why, because the Supreme Court, including Justice Scalia, recommended that to us, and we never followed up with Justice Scalia's admonition that we should have disclosure as a remedy for concern over unlimited money.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chairwoman, I would just like to read that point five. This is what it actually says: ''Political speech, including the financial contributions to political or issue advocacy campaigns, is a vital part of our Nation's free exchange of ideas and avenues of free expression must be preserved and protected.''

That is all it says, let the American people decide. That is essentially what it says, that free speech should be protected.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I understand, but the concern that has been expressed to me by a number of people who have read this, probably lawyers who spent more time on constitutional cases than I have, is that the concern is that this, as a part of the bill, would undercut the disclosure requirements that are established within it, and that is the reason we cannot come to an agreement.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. In conclusion, Madam Chairwoman, again, as I look at that point five, or paragraph five, supporting the free exchange of ideas and avenues of free expression, I struggle to see where disclosure issues are raised in that paragraph.

But as my colleagues, I have no one else to comment on the bill. I am ready to have the amendment considered, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of subtitle A of title I the following:

PART 8—PROVIDING VOTER REGISTRATION INFORMATION TO SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

SEC. 1081. PILOT PROGRAM FOR PROVIDING VOTER REGISTRATION INFORMATION TO SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS PRIOR TO GRADUATION.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—The Election Assistance Commission (hereafter in this part referred to as the ''Commission'') shall carry out a pilot program under which the Commission shall provide funds during the one-year period beginning after the date of the enactment of this part to eligible local educational agencies for initiatives to provide information on registering to vote in elections for public office to secondary school students in the 12th grade.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—A local educational agency is eligible to receive funds under the pilot program under this part if the agency submits to the Commission, at such time and in such form as the Commission may require, an application containing—

(1) a description of the initiatives the agency intends to carry out with the funds;

(2) an estimate of the costs associated with such initiatives; and

(3) such other information and assurances as the Commission may require.

(c) CONSULTATION WITH ELECTION OFFICIALS.—A local educational agency receiving funds under the pilot program shall consult with the State and local election officials who are responsible for administering elections for public office in the area served by the agency in developing the initiatives the agency will carry out with the funds.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this part, the terms ''local educational agency'' and ''secondary

school'' have the meanings given such terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

SEC. 1082. REPORTS.

(a) REPORTS BY RECIPIENTS OF FUNDS.—Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period which begins on the date of the receipt of the funds, each local educational agency receiving funds under the pilot program under this part shall submit a report to the Commission describing the initiatives carried out with the funds and analyzing their effectiveness.

(b) REPORT BY COMMISSION.—Not later than the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date the Commission receives the final report submitted by a local educational agency under subsection (a), the Commission shall submit a report to Congress on the pilot program under this part.

SEC. 1083. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this part.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I thank the gentle, yet courageous, lady from California for leading this floor discussion debate, if you will. I thank the Rules Committee for allowing this rule, this amendment to be in order, and I also would like to thank my staff for the stellar, outstanding job they have done to help bring this amendment to the floor.

Madam Chairwoman, on November 19, 1863, the 16th President of the United States of America standing near the battlefield at Gettysburg proclaimed that ''government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the Earth.'' That is what our bill, H.R. 1, is all about, government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Madam Chairwoman, you cannot have government of the people, by the people, for the people without the precious right to vote. The right to vote is something that people have fought for in this country. Dr. King marched for it; JOHN LEWIS went to jail for it, the Honorable JOHN LEWIS, a Member of this House; Schwerner, Goodman, Chaney died for it.

The right to vote, H.R. 1, is about protecting the right to vote. This amendment is one that will help us to inculcate new, young people into the voting process. The amendment simply allows those who are in high school to receive voter registration information while they are in school on the school campus.

□ 1315

It does not change the laws related to registration and qualification to vote. It merely allows the principal at a school to go to the young people and provide them with voter registration information so that they may decide. It does not impose upon them a duty to register, but it does give them the opportunity to. This is a good thing in a country where we believe that government of the people and by the people shall not perish from the Earth.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the basis of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I am not opposed to what this amendment does, although I would point out, once again, this is another unfunded mandate. This is another cost that the CBO has already said, from what they can score, this bill is going to cost taxpayers $2.8 billion with a potential for billions more for what they couldn't even offer a congressional budget score for. So I have some issues with that, although I appreciate the direction my colleague is going with this.

I think providing voter registration materials at schools is something that is probably being done now. I would hope that local county clerks—I know mine are—are already doing that. But I am not opposed to that language.

However, I disagree with my colleague from Texas that H.R. 1 is a bill by the people and for the people. Frankly, I believe every single American who is eligible to vote should have their vote counted and they should have their vote protected.

We all, as Americans—Republicans and Democrats—want every vote to count. We want to make sure everyone can get registered to vote. At a time in our country when registration turnout is exceedingly high compared to previous generations, we are doing that.

Make no mistake about it. This bill is not by the people. H.R. 1 is not for the people. H.R. 1 is for the Members of Congress who sit in this institution who are going to eventually get tax dollars to pay for their own campaign ads. That is why this bill is a bad bill. I appreciate the amendment that my colleague is offering, but by no means is H.R. 1 going to ensure that we have the protection to ensure that every eligible American voter has their vote counted and protected.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. This is a splendid amendment. It will do a lot to allow young people to channel their excitement and to understand they are important and they are going to be participating as voters when they turn 18. It works well with the amendment that will be offered by Mr. NEGUSE later that allows for preregistration of 16- and 17-year-olds so that when they turn 18 they will automatically be registered to vote.

I know that there is some concern on both sides of the aisle about the idea of a 16-year-old preregistering, that change in the voting eligibility. We don't know how that amendment will turn out, but certainly these amendments would do much to make sure that young people are thoroughly connected to our government and understand that the government belongs to them and their families.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I close with these words. This is a participatory democracy. If it is to function efficaciously, then the right to vote must be protected.

I join my colleague on the other side in his position that all votes should be counted and that every person who has the right to vote should be in a position to vote. This amendment helps to assure that young people will start to participate in the participatory democracy.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I would like to thank my colleague and friend from Texas (Mr. GREEN). Again, I agree with what Chairperson LOFGREN said about the excitement of students in high schools being able to understand what it means to be able to register to vote and participate in the political process. That is why I visit high schools throughout my district on a regular basis each time we are back from Washington, off this floor and in our districts for our district work period.

I am going to, again, extend the olive branch of bipartisanship to ensure that I am not going to oppose this amendment. I want this amendment to pass through, but I will note to many of my colleagues on the floor, Madam Chairman, we just had two Republican amendments offered, and not one passed. The olive branch of bipartisanship has to work both ways. I am, again, reaching out, and I will continue to do so throughout the day, but it is not without frustration that that olive branch has not yet been returned.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 142, insert after line 3 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

''(g) PERMITTING VOTERS TO RETURN BALLOT TO POLLING PLACE ON DATE OF ELECTION.—The State shall permit an individual to whom a ballot in an election was provided under this section to cast the ballot on the

date of election by delivering the ballot on that date to a polling place.''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chairman, I urge support for the underlying legislation, H.R. 1, which in my mind reaffirms the right to vote and empowers the individual citizens in our democracy and empowers their role in our democracy over the wealthy special interests that has been the trend as of late.

My amendment asks that in the spirit of this bill, which is to protect voting rights, that we protect Americans who opt to vote by mail from unnecessary impediments to voting. Specifically, this amendment requires States to provide voters with an opportunity to return ballots at a polling place on election day.

At its face value, this might not seem like a drastic ask, but it merits consideration, granted efforts by States to shortchange eligible voters from casting their ballot by denying them the right to return the ballot on election day. In Arizona, about 228,000 people dropped off their ballots at the polling places on election day in November of this general election, a majority of which, I should add, were Republican voters.

The reason why I believe that my amendment should be supported is to protect the vote-by-mail process. In 2016, 16 States showed a combined percentage of greater than 50 percent of votes cast early, by mail, or via absentee ballots, including my State of Arizona. As more Americans chose to vote by mail, lawmakers in this Chamber should facilitate rather than hinder the right to vote by mail.

Voting by mail allows voters to take their time examining and researching the candidates and issues that align with their values, thus making that very important informed decision on election day. That only strengthens our democracy and empowers that individual voter.

Voting by mail also allows voters not to be constrained by work, school, family, or other sensitive matters that would hinder their ability to wait at polling places for long periods of time. As you well know, other portions of this legislation outline and address the issue of forcing voters to wait hours to cast their ballots, which is unacceptable. Voting by mail can help reduce these incidents and provide more options that are considerate of a person's lifestyle or their particular needs.

Vote by mail helps alleviate underresourced, consolidated, or distant polling places from having an influx of voters on election day. By ensuring that all polling sites accept vote-by-mail ballots on election day, voters' confidence in the electoral process, I believe, is upheld. Vote by mail is intended to increase voter participation during non-Presidential election years which tend to have overall lower voter turnout rates.

The scope of this legislation is to promote and protect the right to vote that every American citizen is entitled to. For many constituents, voting by mail is the most practical and convenient method to exercise that right. With ongoing efforts at all levels of governance to restrict voting, now more than ever it is important to ensure that regardless of voting in person or by mail that that vote is cast, processed, tabulated, and accepted as valid.

Madam Chair, I would hope that you would join me in ensuring States are not able to place harmful restrictions on voters. States should continue to do their due diligence and protect voters by allowing them to return their ballots on election day. Anything less would be a direct attack on voters' rights and would disenfranchise a growing percentage of nontraditional voters across this Nation.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I have a couple of questions. One question, in particular, is: If the gentleman from Arizona, Chairman GRIJALVA, has this information, I would like to know. This is already the process that we follow in my home State of Illinois.

Are there any States that don't allow this already that the gentleman is aware of?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I think there have been efforts in my home State to begin to restrict the use of election day dropping off of vote-by-mail forms and other discussions, and this is both a preventive and encouraging amendment that prevents any of those actions, and more importantly, to encourage States to apply that fairly.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I will reclaim my time, but let the RECORD show it is not a process, it is illegal in the State, my colleague's home State.

I am not against this process happening because it happens in my home State right now. The problem we have is we don't want somebody who is eligible to cast a ballot, who got that vote-by-mail ballot, and they decided on election day to fill it out. We want them to be able to go to their polling place and not have to wait in line, and we want them to be able to turn it in.

The problem we have on our side of the aisle is it is ballot harvesting. It is the process in North Carolina where a Republican is likely going to jail, if convicted. But that same process that will likely send that person to jail, if convicted, is legal in California. We have a problem with somebody besides that voter taking absentee ballots unwatched, not a bipartisan effort, not any control mechanisms, bringing it to the polling place or to the county clerk on election day or after election day. Those are issues that we are concerned about in the bill.

I don't oppose this amendment because, again, it is already the process we follow in my home State.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), who is the author and leader of the legislation, H.R. 1.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to support this amendment. Again, what we are talking about here with H.R. 1 is increasing confidence, engagement, and participation on behalf of the voters. This opportunity to be able to return mail-in ballots at polling places is a way to further that.

I also want to say that with respect to this idea we have to distinguish between election fraud and voter fraud; what we saw in North Carolina was election fraud by a political operative taking advantage of voters, not voters engaged in fraud. So there is a very important distinction there.

I also really wanted to quickly correct the RECORD for my colleague from the other side of the aisle who mentioned a moment ago that somehow under H.R. 1 taxpayer money would be used to fund candidates' campaigns. Nothing could be further from the truth. The bill provides explicitly that there will be no taxpayer funds going to any kind of candidate committees or candidate campaigns. I just wanted to correct the RECORD. I am happy to continue doing that over the course of the debate.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself the remainder of my time, Madam Chair.

I would remind everybody that this amendment provides the States with flexibility. It is providing convenience, as my colleague mentioned, and as a preventive tool, and no prohibition on voters returning mail ballots would actually occur or slow down the process.

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

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

Madam Chairman, again, I don't oppose the process. It is already in existence in my home State to ensure that every eligible American voter has their vote counted and protected.

There are legitimate concerns about the ballot harvesting process; otherwise somebody might not have to face a trial in North Carolina.

I certainly appreciate the author coming to the floor to, once again, talk

about the bill and some of the changes that were made since it was introduced on January 3, the first day of Congress, cosponsored by every Member of the other side of the aisle, a 571-page bill. I certainly hope everybody had a chance to take a look at that bill before signing their name on the dotted line, because the provision that the author put in place, if he would have reached out to any of the three Republicans on the House Administration Committee, we would have gladly discussed some of our priorities, but there was no olive branch of bipartisanship whatsoever.

□ 1330

The sheer fact that somehow the bill has been changed to now create this fine that is going to be corporate malfeasance dollars, it is never going to be able to get the amount of money in that candidates are going to expect when running for Congress. Candidates, even like the neo-Nazi who ran against my good friend DAN LIPINSKI in the last race, will now be eligible for this corporate malfeasance money.

Everybody on that side of the aisle knows, when candidates for Congress, including Members of Congress on the other side of the aisle, aren't going to get what they expect into their campaigns from this corporate malfeasance fund—which is corporate dollars that we weren't supposed to be able to take as Members of Congress in our campaigns anyway but now somehow it is a good idea to do—you know what is going to happen? They are going to say, ''I don't have the money in my campaign to run a race,'' and they are going to ask the taxpayers to bail it out.

Everybody on that side of the aisle knows that is going to happen, and the shell game they are playing right now is very frustrating.

The CBO couldn't even score this new provision. We don't even know how much this is going to cost beyond the possible $3-plus billion.

This is a bill designed to keep a Democratic majority in this Congress so that we don't have a chance to preside over these hearings anymore.

That is not the way to run elections. That is not what our Constitution wants. That is not what anybody should support.

Madam Chair, again, I am not opposed to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. RODNEY DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), I have an amendment at the desk, amendment No. 28.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 529, line 12, strike ''Not later than'' and insert ''(a) IN GENERAL—Not later than''.

Page 530, after line 3, insert the following:

''(b) CONTENTS.—The code of conduct issued under subsection (a) shall contain requirements that are at least as stringent as the requirements placed on Members of Congress under Rule XXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives (known as the Code of Official Conduct).''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, it is great to have many conversations with you today. This is what is great about the institution: Our forefathers set up a legislative branch to debate, to cast votes, and then to legislate.

We won't always agree on every issue. There are times we will vehemently disagree with each other. But, Madam Chair, after the debate is over, we all move on and look forward to working with each other.

Madam Chair, today, I rise in support of amendment 28 because Members of Congress, all of us in the legislative branch, are, appropriately, held to stringent ethical standards that are designed to prevent financial or material gain for actions taken while we are legislating in this institution. We should ensure all branches of government are held to high ethical standards, too.

This commonsense amendment would require the Judicial Conference of the United States to implement a judicial code that is at least as stringent as the requirements placed on Members of Congress. This amendment would be a step in the right direction for providing transparency in government, which the American people expect and deserve.

Again, I gave the olive branch to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle on the last two amendments, and I certainly hope that that olive branch can be returned on this Republican amendment, and I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, this amendment is well intentioned but riddled with inconsistencies that render it ineffective and unnecessary.

Although judges should be held to high ethical standards, it is a false equivalence to claim that Members of Congress and judges face the same dilemmas. Judges do not accept campaign funds, do not represent constituents, and have no term limits.

Every person who has the privilege to serve in our government should be held to a code of conduct, yet it is a misstep to assume that all branches of government have the same prerogatives and ethical pitfalls.

H.R. 1 already contains a reasonable approach to expanding ethics for the United States Supreme Court, and this amendment would confuse the clarity and enforcement of these standards.

The Judicial Conference of the United States is best suited to issue a code of conduct for the courts of the United States. Judges know best what predicaments judges face and how best to protect the integrity of our courts from corruption and improper conduct.

We should pass H.R. 1 without this amendment so that we can create effective, enforceable ethical standards for our courts.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Georgia for debating this amendment with me.

There are a lot of what I believe are constitutional issues with H.R. 1, legislative overreach that defies the equal branches of government. This one does not. All we are simply doing with this amendment is asking the Judicial Conference of the United States to implement a judicial code up and down the judicial spectrum.

Maybe it will actually help ensure that, as judges go through the confirmation process in the Senate for whatever level of Federal judgeship he or she may be nominated, it might help us understand who these judges are.

This is a very commonsense amendment. We are not saying Congress is going to legislate judicial conduct. We are just saying that we are the lawmakers. Why don't we ask the Judicial Conference to do it for the judges, just like our standards are set by Congress and the executive branch standards should be set by the executive branch.

These are small things that make a big difference in a big bill. Again, I have extended the olive branch of bipartisanship this entire day, yesterday, and I would certainly hope that that would be extended back to us because we have yet, in this entire process of H.R. 1—being a 622-page bill yesterday and added pages upon pages yesterday and today—not one single Republican amendment has been accepted. Not one. Maybe this is it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 111, line 21, after ''such election'', insert the following: ''and provide such individual with any materials that are necessary to register to vote in any such election''.

Page 112, line 23, after ''such election'', insert the following: ''and provide such individual with any materials that are necessary to register to vote in any such election''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 1, the For the People Act, which would, among other provisions, require Federal and State governments to physically provide voting registration materials at the same time they provide notification of a restoration of voting rights under the bill. Voting is the most powerful voice that we have in our democracy.

As a Wisconsinite, I am proud to stand today to fight for everyone's right to vote. Wisconsin has been the petri dish for some of the most pernicious voting suppression efforts, including partisan gerrymandering, all designed to marginalize some votes.

Where our votes are counted, our voices are heard. I am here to say no more—no more—to suppression.

Anyone who works to suppress the vote does not support democracy, Madam Chair. Anyone who limits the ability of all people to express their voice through the ballot does not support democracy.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise this time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I was a strong supporter of the First Step Act, and I continue to support criminal justice reform efforts.

As a matter of fact, just last week, a former czar in the Obama administration, Van Jones, said that, ''The conservative movement in this country, unfortunately,'' from his point of view, ''. . . is now the leader on this issue of reform,'' talking about criminal justice reform.

We need to make sure that we don't have petty drug users spending more time in Federal prison than Jared the Subway guy who was a pedophile, but we have to review this amendment very carefully.

We still haven't figured out the processes and procedures of an amendment that passed, part of H.R. 1 that is in the underlying bill that would allow felons to vote without any determination of whether that felon may be like Jared the Subway guy.

Who is to say he doesn't live near a polling place where his polling place is a school? How in the world can we move forward on getting voter registration materials to felons without understanding who is eligible to go to the exact polling place they are supposed to vote at or not?

I don't want pedophiles, sex offenders, going into a polling place in many rural areas that the only place they have is a school with children.

The provision in the bill needs to be changed, needs to be vetted very carefully. We need to have some certainty here.

I certainly do not support this amendment because I still am not sure that a felon who is not allowed around children won't be forced to cast his or her vote around children.

That is why this bill needs to be put back into our committees of jurisdiction, where almost 40 percent of the jurisdiction was never marked up in the first place.

This is a rush. I don't blame my colleagues who are here today. I think Chairperson LOFGREN and the members of the House Administration Committee have done an excellent job putting a bill that is terrible forward, but the only reason we are here on the floor this week is because Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership team are forcing this issue.

The American people and the American taxpayers aren't going to stand for the provisions that are in this bill.

I don't know why we are rushing it, and I certainly wish there was more bipartisanship. I certainly wish there was clarification on whether or not a former convicted felon who is a sex offender is going to be allowed in a polling place that happens to be a school, where they can't go into or can't get within a certain amount of yardage to, outside of election day.

Madam Chair, I can't support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, may I inquire of the Chair how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, let me commend the gentleman for his active participation in the First Step Act, the criminal justice reform. Let me commend him on his efforts to restore freedom to felons and, as he indicated, murderers and drug dealers and other kinds of criminals who he worked so hard to restore their right to freedom.

This amendment deals with really low-hanging fruit in terms of criminal justice reform. It just says that, when the department has decided that someone has finished their term, when they have finished their sentence, when they are released, they would simply receive those instructions as to how to register to vote.

If there is a pedophile—and I would have welcomed the gentleman's amendment—perhaps it can be part of the rules to say that you must vote by absentee ballot.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), chairwoman of the committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Chair, nothing in H.R. 1 impacts any State law that requires an individual who has been convicted of an offense against a child staying away from a school. Luckily, we have vote-by-mail and early voting at county facilities in the bill, so that is really not a real issue.

□ 1345

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for that clarification.

Democracy demands hard work, and, again, I commend the gentleman for his hard work to put criminals back onto the street.

This is very low-hanging fruit. There have been studies that have indicated that restoring the voting rights of felons really means that they will be more likely to not re-offend because we are bringing them back into the civil discourse of our communities.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I certainly wish that the underlying piece of legislation actually addressed our concerns, which is why I would urge both sides of the aisle to send this back to committee to ensure that, while it doesn't specifically say that State laws can't be followed when it comes to allowing sex offenders into polling places, it also doesn't prevent it. That is the problem with this top-down overreach.

There is nothing in this bill, H.R. 1, that would prevent a sex offender from walking in and demanding his or her right to vote while surrounded by children that he or she is not allowed around because of a previous conviction or a sex offender registration status.

I appreciate my colleague from Wisconsin's work on the First Step Act, also; and I also have to offer a correction.

The First Step Act was actually to get nonviolent offenders out of our prisons, petty drug users who have been put away because maybe they didn't have the information that the assistant U.S. attorney wanted and then, all of a sudden, they are ratcheted into a long jail sentence because of mandatory minimums. These are the issues that have bipartisanship.

By no means does the First Step Act, or any act of criminal justice reform that I support or that anybody else I know would support, want murderers out of prison. That is not the case.

If that is the case, we have some more questions about this amendment and we have some more questions about this bill. We want to make sure those jail cells are reserved for the people who are the most hardened criminals.

We have got to work together on criminal justice reform to take the next step in the First Step Act. We need to make it better, but it is all for nonviolent offenders.

I have some serious concerns when sex offenders get out of prison or maybe they don't even go to prison for that long, like Jared, the Subway guy, because he may have had a lot of money, may have had the ability to hire a good lawyer; but so many petty drug offenders who are going to be the beneficiary of the First Step Act didn't.

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

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, just in closing, I hope that my colleague will support this amendment. It doesn't deal with murderers or pedophiles. It deals with people who are coming out of prison and being notified of their rights and responsibilities with regard to voting.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 90, insert after line 11 the following new section:

SEC. 1103. GAO ANALYSIS AND REPORT ON VOTING ACCESS FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) ANALYSIS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an analysis after each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office with respect to the following:

(1) In relation to polling places located in houses of worship or other facilities that may be exempt from accessibility requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act—

(A) efforts to overcome accessibility challenges posed by such facilities; and

(B) the extent to which such facilities are used as polling places in elections for Federal office.

(2) Assistance provided by the Election Assistance Commission, Department of Justice, or other Federal agencies to help State and local officials improve voting access for individuals with disabilities during elections for Federal office.

(3) When accessible voting machines are available at a polling place, the extent to which such machines—

(A) are located in places that are difficult to access;

(B) malfunction; or

(C) fail to provide sufficient privacy to ensure that the ballot of the individual cannot be seen by another individual.

(4) The process by which Federal, State, and local governments track compliance with accessibility requirements related to voting access, including methods to receive and address complaints.

(5) The extent to which poll workers receive training on how to assist individuals with disabilities, including the receipt by such poll workers of information on legal requirements related to voting rights for individuals with disabilities.

(6) The extent and effectiveness of training provided to poll workers on the operation of accessible voting machines.

(7) The extent to which individuals with a developmental or psychiatric disability experience greater barriers to voting, and whether poll worker training adequately addresses the needs of such individuals.

(8) The extent to which State or local governments employ, or attempt to employ, individuals with disabilities to work at polling sites.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 9 months after the date of a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report with respect to the most recent regularly scheduled general election for Federal office that contains the following:

(A) The analysis required by subsection (a).

(B) Recommendations, as appropriate, to promote the use of best practices used by State and local officials to address barriers to accessibility and privacy concerns for individuals with disabilities in elections for Federal office.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, my amendment simply requires an ongoing evaluation after every Federal election of the efforts to ensure that those with disabilities have successfully been able to exercise their right to vote.

The Government Accountability Office would be charged with assessing polling place accessibility, privacy issues, and the extent of poll worker training on the rights of individuals with disabilities, as well as on accessible voting machines, among other identified barriers. They would provide their recommendations, if any, to Congress.

I recently had a constituent come into my office and speak about the continued challenges faced by those with disabilities when it comes to exercising this fundamental right, such as inaccessible voting machines that were located and situated as to not provide privacy for the voter.

And this is not just an anecdotal evidence of the problem. According to the National Council on Independent Living, over 2 million people with disabilities didn't vote in 2016, and this isn't just an issue of voter apathy. Study after study shows that our voting system is still inaccessible.

What we know is that, even with laws in place, not all polling places are accessible because of physical barriers, unprepared and untrained staff, or accessible equipment that is either not functional or turned off.

Let me be clear: This bill takes steps forward to address those barriers, and I appreciate the addition of those measures.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I am not opposed to this amendment. I think we should work together to ensure that all those who have disabilities have access to be able to cast their vote, and I know my home State of Illinois is doing yeoman's work, our local county clerks are doing yeoman's work to ensure that all those who need reasonable accommodations get them. So I thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin for offering it.

Before I reserve, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Chair, we all agree that Americans should vote and participate in our Republic. We all agree that every American's vote deserves to be counted and protected. But the bill, the underlying bill we consider today, is riddled with problems.

My friends across the aisle call this bill the For the People Act, but it should really be called the ''Protect Professional Politicians Act.''

One of the most egregious parts of this bill is the creation of Federal funding for elections. Taxpayers will pay for politicians' campaigns whether they agree with them or not. Under this bill, if someone gives a politician $200, the Federal Government will send $1,200 of money to that politician.

Those mailers that fill your mailbox, well, under the ''Protect the Professional Politicians Act,'' you will pay for them.

Those attack ads that flood your TV, well, you will pay for them.

Those high-priced political consultants in Washington, D.C., well, you will pay for them, too.

Since when is it a good idea to have taxpayers' hard-earned money shoveled into a trough for a politician's campaign?

Montanans don't want that. At a recent townhall, 97 percent of Montanans told me they oppose taxpayer funding for political campaigns.

Imagine Republicans and Democrats working together on a bipartisan bill that addresses voting and election reforms. We could have done that. We did that with election security in the last Congress.

But that is not what happened with H.R. 1, the ''Protect Professional Politicians Act.'' Maybe that is one of the reasons why diverse groups like the

Montana Chamber of Commerce and the ACLU have opposed this bill.

I join those groups, and I strongly urge a ''no'' vote on H.R. 1, the Protect Professional Politicians Act.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Can the Chair inform me about the time available to both of us?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chair, I just want to support the amendment. Obviously, we want to make voting as accessible as we can to everybody, and this is a very, very important step in terms of supporting that with respect to people with disabilities. I want to thank my colleague for introducing the amendment.

I did, also, just want to correct the RECORD. The last speaker, who may not have been here a few minutes ago, was suggesting that, under H.R. 1, taxpayer money would go to fund political campaigns, candidates' campaigns, and I just want to reiterate that the bill is explicit that that would not happen.

There will be no taxpayer funds used to support candidates' campaigns. We have provided for that. We have come up with another way to support the matching fund that we want to see, to lift up small donors out there and give them a voice in their own democracy.

I know the gentleman who spoke a moment ago might not have been here previously, so I just wanted to make sure I got that on the RECORD.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, again, thank you to my colleague from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE). I support this amendment, and I am going to ensure that we have no opposition over here.

But I do have a problem with the bill, and I appreciate the author of the bill being here. If I had that much time dedicated to authoring a 571-page bill with the help of outside special interest groups that were commended at the opening press conference, I would be here to defend it, too. But there are so many problems, so many unanswered questions.

The sheer fact that the shell game of corporate fines is supposed to fund upwards of billions of dollars to congressional campaigns—my district alone would have been eligible for $6 million-plus just by using the last campaign. Multiply that times 435 and add some extra candidates in there, like the neo-Nazi candidate who would be eligible for this funding who ran against Democrat DAN LIPINSKI. These are issues that we don't have questions answered because the CBO hasn't scored.

CBO has already said $2 billion-plus for sure, possibly another $1 billion to the taxpayers under this fund, but how much is going to be raised from this corporate malfeasance?

And until this day, until this week, I had no idea that the Democratic majority is okay with putting more corporate money into their own campaign coffers. Corporate dollars are not allowed in our campaigns now, as you know, Madam Chair, but we are going to use corporate fines at a level we don't know what it amounts to? We are going to use those to fill campaign coffers of Members of Congress? Seriously? That is why the bill needs to go back to committee.

I would love to work with the author. I am one of the most bipartisan Members of Congress, according to The Lugar Center, but I never got a call. I would love to help write this bill.

We tried to make that bill better. This is another olive branch to the other side on an amendment. I am going to continue to show bipartisanship that has yet to be reciprocated from the author and from the committee.

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

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I just want to thank the gentleman, again, for his support of this amendment.

I think that America's motto, E Pluribus Unum—out of many, one—will really be honored by this reporting requirement which I believe will provide information that will move us closer to an election process that is truly inclusive and accessible for all Americans. That is what makes democracy work.

Madam Chair, I urge a ''yes'' vote on my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 63, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 64, line 7 and insert the following:

(3) The term ''exempt State'' means any of the following States:

(A) A State which, under law which is in effect continuously on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, operates an automatic voter registration program under which an individual is automatically registered to vote in elections for Federal office in the State if the individual provides the motor vehicle authority of the State (or, in the case of a State in which an individual is automatically registered to vote at the time the individual applies for benefits or services with a Permanent Dividend Fund of the State, provides the appropriate official of such Fund) with such identifying information as the State may require.

(B) A State in which the percentage of the aggregate number of individuals who were eligible to vote in the regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office held in the State in November 2018 and who voted in such elections was more than 5 percentage points greater than the percentage of the aggregate number of individuals who were eligible to vote in the regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office held in the State in November 2014 and who voted in such elections.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

□ 1400

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, all too often in Washington, we mistake activity for progress, and in many cases we apply that misguided framework onto the States.

There are few better examples of this than Washington's dabbling in our election laws over the last 2 or 3 decades.

The National Voter Registration Act, our last big partisan bill, aimed at increasing turnout, did not actually achieve that aim. It increased voter registration, but as the Congressional Research Service has said:

Its effect on turnout remains unclear. Its cost and mandates on the States, however, were very clear.

That is exactly what I am talking about in terms of mistaking activity for progress.

The centerpiece of division A's voting section is automatic registration. According to my colleagues on the other side, it covers all sorts of problems: updating the voter rolls, lack of participation, et cetera.

No excuse vote by mail, same-day registration can be important, but is the automatic voter registration section that is hoped for the driver of participation?

This is an aggressive mandate in a bill full of aggressive mandates.

Fifteen States and Washington, D.C., have automatic registration. Only five States do it at every welfare and government agency. Three States require registrants to decline by postcard.

This bill would more or less include all three of these provisions.

This bill would also require the automatic preregistration of 16-year-olds.

If it went into law, it would amount to, at the very least, a top three most aggressive automatic registration program all across the country, but the bill says that if you are in a State where you have already got an automatic registration program on the books, you don't have to comply with all the mandates in the bill.

My amendment would do the same thing, but for outcomes instead of for registration.

The outcome that this bill looks for is turnout.

States that have seen massive increases in turnout should get rewarded, and that is what this amendment does.

It lets States who have achieved increased turnout be rewarded by exemption from the mandates in this bill to continue the success that they have been able to achieve with their own programs.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. HAALAND). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

This amendment aims to exempt States that have taken measures to increase voter turnout that are not subject to additional Federal voter registration mandates, and I think what it really does is undermine the progress that would be made under H.R. 1.

In November of 2016, the general election, nearly one in five people who were eligible to vote but who did not vote cited registration issues as their main reason for not casting a ballot.

H.R. 1 sets a national standard for voter registration and access to the ballot in Federal elections.

Now, an improvement in participation rates is fine, but it doesn't mean that proven programs, such as the automatic voter registration program, aren't necessary.

You know, automatic voter registration is not simply to increase turnout. It serves a more fundamental purpose: to protect the right to vote by removing bureaucracy and obstacles from the process of registering to vote.

Now, nearly every State that has implemented automatic voter registration has seen dramatically increased registration rates. High rates of voter registration are inherently healthy for a democracy.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter that I received just yesterday from Kate Brown, the Governor of Oregon.

STATE OF OREGON,
March 6, 2019.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: I write in strong support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2019, which includes bold and necessary reforms to strengthen our democracy, protect and expand voting rights for all Americans, and improve campaign finance laws. As the Governor of Oregon and former Secretary of State, this is an issue that I—like many Americans—care deeply about, and I urge you to vote in support of this legislation.

Voting is our country's greatest collective responsibility, and we must work continuously to safeguard the sanctity of our elections. Across the country, the fundamental right of voting itself is increasingly at risk. More states are moving to obstruct voting rights than are increasing access to the ballot. It's imperative that Congress take action to bolster our democracy and fight every effort to undermine it by ensuring that, as a country, we are making it easier, not harder, for people to have their voices heard.

Several key provisions in H.R. 1 reflect the work that Oregon has done to lead the way on expanding voter access, including creating a national automatic voter registration system, allowing citizens to register to vote online, and expanding vote-by-mail.

As you know, Oregon was the first state to pass automatic voter registration (AVR) in 2015. This law, combined with our vote-by-mail election system, makes Oregon the most modern, efficient, and secure state to vote in the country. Oregon's AVR program has added nearly 400,000 voters to the state rolls, already significantly increased voter turnout, and has ensured 90 percent of eligible voters in our state are registered.

Across the country, this success is being recognized and replicated. Seventeen states and the District of Columbia have since adopted some form of automatic voter registration. These reforms have been successful in creating a stronger and more inclusive democracy. And here in Oregon, it's supported by both Democrats and Republicans.

Every eligible voter in the U.S. should have equal, easy access to the ballot box, and I commend Congress for their focus on this critical issue. This week, I urge you to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

GOVERNER KATE BROWN.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, Governor Brown notes that Oregon was the first State to have automatic voter registration. It went into effect in 2015 and has added nearly 400,000 voters to the State rolls. Nearly 90 percent of eligible voters are, in fact, registered to vote. What that means is they can participate in our elections, which I think is very important.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, the amendment that I have offered is in keeping with the spirit of the bill. States are balancing the right of everyone to have access to the polls.

Automatic voter registration has allowed so much access to the polls, that it has created challenges for States to be able to comply, even with people who are only supposed to vote legally. They have access to voter registration through Motor Voter and other ways when they are not even residents of the United States, and it puts burdens on States to comply with that.

This would be a one-size-fits-all mandate from the Federal Government that may be needed in some States where access has been challenging and where voter turnout has been low, but in States that have had high voter turnout, that do have effective regimes where you have not just access, but you have participation at levels that have increased by 5 percent or more, to continue on the path of success that they have had without disruption from Federal mandates that would potentially do that.

The Brennan Center says:

Automatic voter registration is gaining momentum across the country.

Currently, 15 States and D.C. have approved the policy, meaning that over a third of Americans live in a jurisdiction that has either passed or implemented automatic voter registration. This policy is winning at the State level and overall push for turnout is also winning.

My amendment is complementary to this bill's enterprise and it would do nothing to undermine the pushes that are already going on at the State level.

It was Madison who said that States are:

. . . best acquainted with the situation of their people.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I appreciate the spirit with which this amendment is offered, but I disagree.

This is about Federal elections. The Constitution says that the Congress has the ability to promulgate laws about Federal elections.

The reason why we are looking at it is there have been States who have gone into AVR, they are grandfathered into the bill, but the problematic States are those States that are trying to suppress the vote, trying to keep people from voting, and we need to do something about that.

Madam Chair, while we are here, I do want to say something about, not the gentleman's comments, but the prior comments of the ranking member about the costs of the bill.

We have a score from CBO, and almost all the money that CBO has scored goes to grants to the States to upgrade their computer systems: $1.5 billion from 2019 to 2024; 750 for other computer assistance; and the other big amount is for making polling places accessible to disabled voters. So it is not about the other provisions in the bill.

I would also like to note, and I put this into the RECORD yesterday, the Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated that the fine and forfeiture fund that will go into the Freedom From Influence Fund is estimated to raise $1.948 billion between 2019 and 2029. They also estimate that it will reduce the deficit by $83 million, which is interesting, because it will deter people from cheating on their taxes. So the comments made about the money were simply incorrect.

I know that the Joint Committee on Taxation material is in the RECORD under general leave. I will make sure that the CBO report is also included.

Madam Chair, I would just end with this: I appreciate the tone of the gentleman's arguments and the intent of his amendment, but I do think it severely undercuts the advances that H.R. 1 would make.

Madam Chair, I urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike subtitle F of title IV.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, I want to quote from a speech delivered by a former SEC, Securities and Exchange Commission, chair:

Certain mandates, which invoke the Securities and Exchange Commission's mandatory disclosure powers, seem more directed at exerting societal pressure on companies to change behavior, rather than to disclose financial information that primarily informs investment decisions.

That is not to say that the goals of such mandates are not laudable. Indeed, most are. Seeking to improve safety in mines for workers or to end horrible human rights atrocities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo are compelling objectives, which, as a citizen, I wholeheartedly share.

But, as Chair of the SEC, I must question, as a policy matter, using the Federal securities laws and the SEC's powers of mandatory disclosure to accomplish these goals.

Those are the words of Mary Jo White, President Obama's SEC Chair. She understood what this body understood when it adopted the rider in the appropriations bill my amendment seeks to protect.

The SEC cannot and should not be used as a tool for social engineering. The disclosure laws cannot be used as a method to compel noneconomic behaviors. The SEC has known this since the 1970s, when it received hundreds of different petitions to add dozens of different disclosure requirements. It stated at the time, ''The Commission's experience over the years in proposing and framing disclosure requirements has not led it to question the basic decision of the Congress that, insofar as investing is concerned, the primary interest of investors is economic. After all, the principal if not the only reason, why people invest their money in securities is to obtain a return. A variety of other motives are probably present in the investment decisions of numerous investors; but the only common thread is the hope for a satisfactory return, and it is to this that a disclosure scheme intended to be useful to all must be primarily addressed.''

Madam Chair, we don't know what each individual investor wants, disclosure requirements have proven very costly, and I urge my colleagues to support the position of the Obama SEC Chair and the SEC since the 1970s, which my amendment seeks to preserve.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to amendment No. 32, which represents an unfortunate attempt to protect the influence of dark corporate money in politics.

I am so proud of the package of bills included in H.R. 1, because I believe that the work we are doing here will transform our democracy.

One of the bills included in H.R. 1 is my Transparency in Corporate Political Spending Act, which will reverse a law that prevents the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, or SEC, from requiring corporations to disclose political spending to their shareholders.

The only reason that the law my measure will reverse is even on the books is that for years, conservatives in Congress have misused the appropriations process to enact anti-transparency measures, contrary to our most fundamental democratic values.

This amendment would keep that anti-transparency law in place.

I cannot for the life of me understand why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem so keen on helping corporations keep their political spending a secret. How is that good for our democracy?

Indeed, Justice Scalia, in another case after Citizens United, wrote: ''Requiring people to stand up in public for their political acts fosters civic courage, without which democracy is doomed.''

The situation could not be simpler. Americans deserve to know which corporate interests are donating money to influence our elected officials.

□ 1415

Corporations should play by the same rules as Michiganders in my district in Macomb and Oakland Counties and that the rest of Americans play by and disclose their political contributions because secret corporate spending poses a threat to our democracy and to investor confidence.

Since the disastrous decision in the Citizens United v. FEC case allowed corporations to make unlimited political contributions, investors and citizens concerned about the future of American democracy have looked to the SEC to require corporate disclosure of political spending. We need to untie the hands of the SEC so that it can move forward with finalizing a crucial rule requiring corporations simply to disclose their political spending.

Requiring public corporations to be honest with their shareholders, customers, and the public about the political donations they make is essential to taking our democracy back from the hands of special interests.

This is why I rise in vehement opposition to this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

Madam Chair, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, companies are already going ahead and disclosing political donations. 196 of the Fortune 500 companies have disclosure policies in place, up from 174 in 2015. More companies are deciding this is the right way to approach their political giving.

But I don't have anything to say against their voluntary decision. I do think it is a mistake to force compliance through disclosure laws at a time when public markets are less attractive than ever for going public.

Capital formation in the United States of America could easily be improved and has, in fact, suffered by a heavyhanded regulatory approach.

Corporations are not treated differently than individuals are. There is nothing that compels an individual to disclose every single dollar they donate and to whom. This would go in the other way.

If you decide to go public in the United States, you are treated differently under the law than a private company or a private individual. The reality is, under the law, you should be treated the same way. In some cases, you are allowed to give a donation privately, and in other cases, you are not. Corporations have to comply with that law. The Federal Election Commission administers that law, not the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chairwoman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chairwoman, I am glad to hear that some corporations are good citizens. However, we cannot leave our basic functioning of our democracy to the whims of individuals.

Some corporations protected the safety of their workers before we had the OSHA laws. Some corporations didn't use child labor before we had our child labor laws. We need fundamental rules to make sure there is sunshine in this area.

Now, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), my friend.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just really wanted to echo what was just said, a couple of things that were said.

First of all to note that, clearly, best practices have emerged with respect to public companies making this kind of information available, but if that best practice has merit, then it ought to be applied across the board, which is the argument that we are making. I thank you for your work and interest in this issue.

The SEC is there to protect shareholders. It is there to protect the public. That is the purpose of that agency. Within the basket of things and measures that it can do to protect the public is to promote this kind of disclosure.

The rider that we are trying to get rid of in this bill that you would strike, that rider is preventing that kind of inquiry and disclosure and protection of the public to occur, and that is why it is so important that that rider be struck. I agree with the gentleman in his opposition to this amendment.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I think there has been a lot of talk about transparency today. We have had a transparent process in the committees, 15 hours of hearings, but this repeals a rider that was privately put on an appropriations bill by Republicans to prevent the SEC from doing something that they want to do.

Let's get real. I mean, this actually just undoes a secret rider on an appropriations bill. This is the way bad law gets made.

We are here in the middle of the day, in public, debating amendments, not secretly putting little riders on appropriations bills that hamstrung the SEC for making sure that there is sunlight on what corporations are doing.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. I wonder, Madam Chairwoman, whether folks opposed to my amendment would be in favor of requiring every single person and corporation to disclose every dollar that they give. That is essentially what you are saying here: We want to treat publicly traded companies differently than we want to treat every other company and every other individual. And we realize that the FEC isn't competent or qualified to do that job, so we want to add another agency to do this.

President Obama's own Chair of the SEC stated: When disclosure gets too complicated or strays from its core purposes, it can lead to information overload, a phenomenon in which ever-increasing amounts of disclosure make it difficult for investors to focus on the information that is material and most relevant to the decisionmaking of investors in the financial markets.

As has been stated, the fiduciary responsibility of the directors of the company, of the shareholders, and of the people making investments is a common denominator. There may be disparate political views in these days—there surely are—and unpopular positions may be at odds with the fiduciary responsibilities of companies.

This should have been debated in a Financial Services Committee—one of the other flaws of this path that we are on today—subrogating all of the authority of the other committees with only a handful of the amount of participation.

Lastly, I would say that a majority of Democrats actually voted for the appropriations bill with the riders that are at the heart of the opposition's objection to my amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike subtitle E of title IV.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, my amendment would uphold an appropriations policy rider included in the FY 2019 appropriations package that this body, on a bipartisan basis, just voted on last month. That provision prevents the IRS from the collection of donor information for 501(c)(4) social welfare organizations.

In 2013, when the IRS attempted to issue rules that would clamp down on these organizations, there was bipartisan pushback from groups as disparate as the ACLU and Tea Party Patriots.

The IRS has a poor track record on the handling of donor information of these organizations. The 2013 IRS scandal of targeting conservative groups is the perfect example of this. The IRS asked groups excruciatingly detailed questions, even as far as for the details of the prayer meetings of pro-life organizations. Government agencies investigating the intimate details of an organization's efforts to participate in issue advocacy creates an unconstitutional chilling effect on free speech.

The IRS is a tax collection agency, not an arbiter of the fitness of an organization's political viewpoint. My amendment is about the fundamental First Amendment rights for citizens and groups to participate in public discourse.

Finally, H.R. 1's needless removal of a bipartisan policy rider does not make sense in the context of this bill's inclusion of the DISCLOSE Act. I oppose the First Amendment privacy issues raised by the DISCLOSE Act provisions, like the ACLU opposes the DISCLOSE Act, but duplicative collection of information, especially through a scandal-ridden agency like the IRS, which has scandalously overstepped its bounds and authority and jurisdiction, highlight what this amendment is all about. It is inappropriate for the IRS to collect this sort of information.

It is my hope that we can maintain the well-considered appropriations rider already included in the package passed just last month.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today in opposition to the amendment.

This amendment would strike a critical provision of H.R. 1 that cracks down on organizations that are flooding our elections with dark money. In the 2018 cycle, $150 million was spent by groups that did not have to disclose their donors. Voters had no idea who was spending this money to influence their vote.

What it does is create a system in Washington that leaves elected officials beholden to mega-donors, rather than the needs of their constituents. This is a direct threat to our democracy, and it is coming from within this Chamber.

This is a problem that is only getting worse. Since Citizens United, dark money spending has gone up by more than 8,000 percent. Part of the problem is the law isn't being enforced. Some so-called social welfare organizations are devoting too much of their time to political activity, yet they are allowed a tax-exempt status and don't have to disclose their donors. And the IRS can't do anything about it.

We must allow the IRS to move forward on the 2013 rule to define acceptable levels of political activity by these organizations. This will create a clear standard. If a group violates this standard, and it fails to adhere to its social welfare mission, then it should lose its tax-exempt status, and it should register as a PAC.

If you are going to spend millions of dollars to influence someone's vote, then you better have the courage to stand behind your words. Instead, mega-donors have taken advantage of a loophole that allows them to donate to a tax-exempt welfare organization while hiding their identity.

All Americans should care about the abuse of social welfare organizations. It undermines the sanctity of so many other valuable and necessary organizations.

Let's be clear about what is happening here. This amendment serves one purpose: to hide mega-donor support for campaigns. Let's pull back the

curtain and let Americans see who is really behind those negative ads.

Madam Chairwoman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, may I inquire of the amount of time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, even the scandal-ridden, 2013-era IRS that targeted conservative groups, overstepping its jurisdiction by trying to shape the speech and conduct of organizations rather than collect their taxes, withdrew the rulemaking process at the heart of what is sought in this H.R. 1 bill. It is a chilling effect.

As we talk about one of our rights, access to the ballot box at the Federal level, and we consider that, I think it is important to remember the founding principles that led to the creation of this country, and they are enshrined in the Federalist Papers.

I include in the RECORD a copy of Federalist Paper No. 59, wherein Madison makes the case that Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution is about the Federal Government's right to defend itself. It is not about Congress being the prime driver of elections.

CONGRESS GETS TO REGULATE ELECTIONS

Federalist No. 59:

It is absolute not the first province of the federal government. This is what Hamilton said in Federalist 59:

They have submitted the regulation of elections for the federal government, in the first instance, to the local administrations; which, in ordinary cases, and when no improper views prevail, may be both more convenient and more satisfactory; but they have reserved to the national authority a right to interpose, whenever extraordinary circumstances might render that interposition necessary to its safety.

Article 1 section 4 is about the federal government's right to defend itself. It is not about Congress being the prime driver of elections.

□ 1430

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. As we look at this, we have the Federal Election Commission. We have bodies of law that require disclosure, and we have organizations that sometimes violate those disclosure laws, and those companies are prosecuted when they do that.

Here, we want to take and add the IRS responsibility of shaping that disclosure, and only for these types of groups and these types of donations. It is intended to have a chilling effect on the speech, and that is at the core of the objection for groups that don't agree on much.

Between the ACLU and the NRA they don't often agree, but they agree that H.R. 1 is bad, and this goes to the heart of their objection.

Madam Chair, I ask unanimous support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, just to note, Congress never intended for 501(c), for social welfare organizations to just be conduits for dark campaign spending.

In exchange for nonprofit status and tax exempt status, the law requires them to engage exclusively in the promotion of social welfare.

Now, how is that defined? The IRS was trying to get a bright line on that, but they were stopped by a secret rider put in an appropriations bill.

Obviously, the appropriation at large got votes from both sides of the aisle because you need to keep the government down. But that is not the way you legislate. That is a sneaky way to change the law.

To repeal this provision of H.R. 1 would be a huge mistake, because what we are doing is setting things right so that people know what they can do and what they can't do.

Yes, you can speak, but don't expect to get a tax break because you are speaking about politics. You get a tax break because you are doing charitable work.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his work in introducing the bill that would repeal this rider that prevents the IRS from the kind of inquiry that should be done.

This is about figuring out who is leaning into the big money game. So it goes with a number of other riders that we have seen that have been put in place over the last few years.

We want to know if Federal contractors are leaning into the big money game. That is why we want the executive branch to have rules of disclosure with respect to what is happening with money and Federal contractors. That is why we wanted to get rid of the rider that would stop that from happening.

We want to know if public companies are leaning into the big money game. That is why we want to get rid of that rider that would stop the SEC, since they are supposed to protect the public from following that disclosure and looking into whether money is coming into that space.

And in this instance, we want to make sure that these entities that are supposed to be tax exempt aren't leaning into the big money game, and the IRS is there as the agency to do that.

Madam Chair, we need to make sure we protect that ability.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, this is more than one simple issue. This is about rule of law; it is about transparency; and it is about the democracy that we must become if we are to return power back to our communities.

This is already the law.

What my colleagues on the other side want to do is prevent the government from enforcing the law.

This is about rule of law and making sure we are enforcing what is already on the books, and we are prohibiting the abuse of social welfare organizations and we are bringing to light dark money.

The voters of this country deserve to know who is spending money, millions of dollars, to influence their vote. It should not be hidden. The people of our communities deserve to know who is spending that money to influence our vote, and that is why I ask folks in this Chamber, my colleagues, to oppose this amendment and let's restore our democracy and return power back to our communities.

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

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, in Alabama v. the NAACP, the courts upheld the right to protect the privacy of donor information.

The right to privacy is fundamental to our Bill of Rights, and it is threatened. It has a chilling effect, as has been enumerated from any number of groups. My colleagues know this.

Just recently, social welfare groups, as defined by 501(c)(4), engaged in social welfare to support infanticide, a bill that could not get a vote to cloture in the Senate.

It would require the IRS, instead of the body of jurisdiction, the Election Commission, to deal with donors.

The IRS should be narrowly focused on collecting tax revenue, not on elections law, and we have seen abuses of their already-limited jurisdiction.

This is the right thing to do. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, and I ask for everyone who can find a way to see through the distortion of information that is being presented here to support our Bill of Rights, protect the right to privacy, and vote for this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. LUJÁN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 285, line 1, insert ''and the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology'' after ''National Science Foundation''.

Page 285, line 7, insert ``, and increase voter participation'' after ``infrastructure''.

Page 285, line 17, insert ``, and on voter participation'' after ``infrastructure''.

Page 285, line 20, strike ``$6,250,000'' and insert ``$20,000,000''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Chair, our democracy is at its best when all voices are heard. Unfortunately, whether due to an antiquated voting system or restrictive voter laws, too many Americans face too many obstacles to participating in our elections.

There is also an immediate need to protect election security. Russia attacked our democracy in 2016 and could do so again. That is why, last Congress, I introduced a Voting Innovation Prize Act, to tap into America's innovative spirit to strengthen our democracy. These are competitive grants.

Today, I am proud to offer an amendment based on that legislation. My amendment will expand the election infrastructure grants to promote voter participation, secure our elections, and increase funding.

Madam Chair, I thank Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON for working with me on this amendment, and I urge adoption of this amendment and the For the People Act.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Chair, although I strongly oppose H.R. 1, I appreciate the intent of Mr. LUJÁN's amendment.

This amendment would improve the election infrastructure innovation grant program established in H.R. 1 by requiring consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

NIST is already working with the Election Assistance Commission to develop voluntary standards and guidelines for voting systems and is well-positioned to support the Department of Homeland Security, the National Science Foundation, and the Commission's election security research efforts.

I would like to note that the amendment does not add the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology as a recipient of the report required by section 321(b).

I am the ranking member of the Research and Technology Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over the DHS Science and Technology Directorate, the NSF, and the NIST, all of which are implicated by section 321.

Although I do not expect H.R. 1 to ever become law, I hope election security is something that we can do on a bipartisan basis in the future. This process has been rushed, and appropriate due diligence to create strong and effective bipartisan election and security reforms has not been done.

Once again, I support the intent of this amendment, but I oppose H.R. 1.

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

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Chair, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the chair of the Committee on House Administration.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I think this amendment improves the bill. It revises the election infrastructure grant program and includes an emphasis on increasing voter participation, in addition to the emphasis on improving election infrastructure that is currently included in H.R. 1.

I am especially pleased that it engages the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, which is really the premier agency to help us on technical issues. So I think it is a very good amendment.

And while I have the floor, I would like to note that I will include in the RECORD a letter from the AFL–CIO and a letter from the American Federation of Teachers urging support of H.R. 1.

AFL–CIO,
Washington, DC, March 5, 2019.

UNITED STATES HOUSE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL–CIO, I am writing to express our strong support for H.R. 1, the ''For the People Act of 2019.'' By expanding access to the ballot box, reducing the influence of big money in politics and strengthening ethics rules for public servants, this legislation includes many of the most important reforms necessary to restore the promise of our democracy.

For years, right-wing groups backed by wealthy donors have been working aggressively to suppress the right of every American citizen to cast a ballot. They have supported laws to make it harder to register and to vote and they have used the corrosive power of money to drown out the voices of working people.

H.R. I would expand the franchise by promoting early voting, same day and online registration. It would create a system of public financing powered by small donations and require super PACS and dark money political organizations to make their donors public. It would restore voting rights for formerly incarcerated individuals and commit Congress to restore the Voting Rights Act to end racial discrimination in voting.

Record wealth inequality, mass incarceration and low voter turnout are all symptoms of a broken political system. AFL–CIO proudly supports H.R. 1 as we continue the fight to fix our democracy and restore the balance of power to working people.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director, Government Affairs Department.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.7 million members of the American Federation of Teachers, I urge you to vote YES on H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2019.

There is no question that we have seen an erosion of voting rights, a loosening or ignoring of ethics rules and conduct, and an ever-increasing presence of big money in elections. All of this undermines America's democracy. That is why passage of H.R. 1 is so important. It represents a historic effort to restore both the rights of working people and the promise of our nation's democracy. It will give power back to the people by limiting the influence of the corrupt and by expanding voting rights for all Americans.

The For the People Act will strengthen the government's ethics laws while imposing much-needed restrictions on campaign finance regulations. For far too long, the influence of money in politics—especially unaccountable ''dark money'' funneled into our system by wealthy individuals and large companies—has been a negative force in elections across our nation. The bill will put an end to anonymous election spending and force disclosure of all election-related spending.

The AFT also strongly supports H.R. 1's call for a constitutional amendment to overturn the disturbing Citizens United decision. This case has had a corrosive effect on our democracy, giving powerful corporations a disproportionate amount of influence in our elections. Since this case was decided, big corporations have been using their record profits to try to silence the voices of hard-working Americans. No donor should be able to hide its identity as it floods the system with hundreds of millions of dollars in an effort to pass an extreme agenda that will gut the salary, healthcare and pensions of workers.

It's time to restore balance and guarantee that a teacher in Cleveland has the same voice in our democracy as a CEO on Wall Street. H.R. 1 moves us in that direction.

The bill's promise to focus on voting is absolutely essential as a civil rights matter and as a democracy issue. It commits to restoring the Voting Rights Act; restoring voting rights for formerly incarcerated people; reforming voter registration; combating voter purging; prohibiting deceptive practices and voter intimidation; creating a federal holiday for Election Day; ensuring early voting and polling place notice; reforming redistricting; and modernizing election administration.

Expanding voting rights in 2019 is vital to our democracy. It's hard to understand how any members of the House of Representatives would vote against it, yet we have seen all too frequently an allegiance to partisan politics rather than to the basic values of civic participation.

Passage of H.R. 1 will help confront the many real threats facing our democracy today. I hope you will vote YES when it comes up for a vote this week in the House.

Sincerely,

RANDI WEINGARTEN,
President.

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment, I urge adoption of H.R. 1, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

After subtitle G of title II, insert the following (and redesignate subtitle H as subtitle I):

Subtitle H—Residence of Incarcerated Individuals

SEC. 2701. RESIDENCE OF INCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS.

Section 141 of title 13, United States Code, is amended

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g)(1) Effective beginning with the 2020 decennial census of population, in taking any tabulation of total population by States under subsection (a) for purposes of the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States, the Secretary shall, with respect to an individual incarcerated in a State, Federal, county, or municipal correctional center as of the date on which such census is taken, attribute such individual to such individual's last place of residence before incarceration.

''(2) In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall consult with each State department of corrections to collect the information necessary to make the determination required under paragraph (1).''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chair, first off, let me thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for this bill and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for all her work on this bill.

This is an important promise that we made to the American people that we would clean up Washington, and I think H.R. 1 is going to go very far in doing that.

This amendment specifically addresses an important aspect of continuing to make the process for democracy stronger in this country. This amendment would end the practice of prison gerrymandering.

Starting this decennial Census, this amendment would require persons who are incarcerated in correctional facilities to be counted as a resident of their last place of residence before incarceration.

There is only one constitutional mandate as it pertains to the Census: The Federal Government must count all persons present in the country at the time of the Census.

We know we will get an accurate count of incarcerated individuals. The only question, then, is: Where do we count them?

If we count incarcerated persons as being present at their last known residence, we know that the right community will receive the appropriate amount of population-based funding it needs to take care of all of their citizens, because the odds are that an incarcerated person will return home after release to the community in which they most recently lived.

If we count incarcerated persons as residents of correctional facilities, more often than not we are simply swelling the population count of communities in which incarcerated individuals do not actually live, participate in civil society, or utilize government services outside prison walls.

Let's stop this charade. Let's stop the dramatic distortion of representation at State and local levels, and let's end the inaccurate creation of community populations that mislead research and planning efforts.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which is also supported by the Brennan Center for Justice, Common Cause, and the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin's interest in redistricting and gerrymandering.

Coming from the State of Illinois, I like the independent redistricting provisions of H.R. 1.

I have some concerns as to why one State's redistricting plan is now part of the bill when it was supposed to be a nationwide approach, but we will get to that later.

□ 1445

Gerrymandering is a process like in my home State of Illinois that can poison the political process. We have Democrat supermajorities in the House of Representatives in Illinois. We have Democrat majorities in the Illinois State Senate, supermajorities. We have a Democrat Governor. I certainly hope we get redistricting reform by the time 2021 rolls around.

But this amendment is about gerrymandering. This amendment is about the census, and my biggest concern goes back to, again, this bill was not even marked up in the Oversight and Reform Committee. This issue was not even brought up during a single hearing that the Oversight and Reform Committee held on H.R. 1.

This amendment also could upend a foundational principle of the census. Since 1790, the census has been counting people at their usual residences on census day. I guess, when Charles Manson was alive out in the 21st District of California, he got counted at the maximum security Federal prison.

All alternatively housed populations are actually counted the same way, or are supposed to be. Who is to say that somebody who lives at Charles Manson's old home, a relative, doesn't write him down on the census form, too. I have some concerns about double counting that this amendment does not address. But prisoners have been counted at their prison, college students have been counted at their dorms. I remember in 1990, I filled out a little census form in Mills Hall at Millikin University in Decatur, Illinois, to be counted as part of the census.

I didn't check with my mom to see if she counted me at home too. Military servicemembers are counted at their U.S. station base. Counting one population differently than other similarly situated populations only serves to decrease the accuracy of the census. The census count is actually about apportionment that State legislatures use to draw new lines, or independent commissions use to draw new congressional lines, State legislative lines. Hopefully, they don't gerrymander. This is not about redistricting.

The Census Bureau works with States to provide detailed data about prison populations that would allow the States to redistrict however the State chooses. That is why I am opposed to your amendment. I do respect you being here to participate in the process. I certainly wish that we could have sat down and maybe worked out a better amendment that would have addressed all of our concerns, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chairwoman, I appreciate the thoughtful comments made by the ranking member, but I do think this is a special situation, and it is why the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund is in support of this amendment.

As the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund has noticed, the practice of counting prison inmates as part of the district where the prison is located has a disproportionate impact on African American and Latino communities. That is because members of those communities, for a variety of other bad reasons, are incarcerated at higher rates and housed at prisons farther from their homes than other communities.

The gentleman from Illinois is correct. You may be counted in the census at your university dorm, but you can also vote from your university dorm. The inmates can't vote.

Actually, they are properly allocated to the communities where they are from. Doing otherwise has the impact of disenfranchising communities of color around the United States, and that is why this amendment is an important one and why the Brennan Center for Justice and the NAACP supports it.

I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chair, I would just like to add, in 2016 when the census in the Federal Register asked for comment on this, 77,000 people did comment. Only four wanted to keep this provision. Everyone else wanted to change this, out of 77,000. That is probably about the percent of people who think Nickelback is their favorite band in this country. It is pretty low.

I think if you look at—if Nickelback is your favorite band, I apologize to the gentleman.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POCAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Why would the gentleman criticize one of the greatest bands of the nineties?

Mr. POCAN. Wow. One more reason why there is a difference between Democrats and Republicans, clearly found on the floor of Congress today.

I would argue, when I look at the small communities in Wisconsin and I would probably argue in Illinois, where there are correctional facilities, those populations really do bloom because of the people who are incarcerated there, but almost no one goes back to that community. So this is a much better and more accurate way to have a census. I hope that it will be supported, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairwoman, I stand here to say that my colleague from Wisconsin, I know he did not mean to offend the many thousands, upon thousands of Nickelback fans in his district in Wisconsin. I will stand here to save you from doing that and having to face the political consequences at the ballot box.

Madam Chair, I enjoyed debating back and forth and it is always good to have some good humor on the floor of the House. And, yes, I actually do have a Nickelback song on my running playlist that I listen to on a regular basis.

I was ridiculed for that when I posted my playlist one time, and I know some in this Chamber—even up at the dais—are still laughing about that.

But this amendment is a bad amendment. I wish we could have worked together on it. I hope we can work together on any gerrymandering in this Nation together as we know it, and I look forward to working with the gentleman in the future.

I do have to recommend a ''no'' vote on this amendment because it does not address the underlying issues with gerrymandering, and the underlying issues that I have with this bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I will just wrap up by saying I appreciate that very brave admission of your fandom for Nickelback. That is very brave and I do recognize that. I didn't think we were going to talk about Nickelback on the floor today. Somehow it came up.

Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In title III of the bill—

(1) redesignate subtitle G as subtitle H (and conform the succeeding subtitle accordingly); and

(2) insert after subtitle F the following new subtitle:

Subtitle G—Use of Voting Machines Manufactured in the United States

SEC. 3601. USE OF VOTING MACHINES MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES.

Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by section 1504, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) VOTING MACHINE REQUIREMENTS.—By not later than the date of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office occurring in November 2022, each State shall seek to ensure that any voting machine used in such election and in any subsequent election for Federal office is manufactured in the United States.''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today to offer an amendment that I think everyone in this Chamber can support. Whenever possible, voting machines used in America should be made in America.

Aside from the obvious that it just makes sense to have the infrastructure of American democracy made in America, this amendment seeks to help safeguard our elections. Manufacturing voting machines in America will ensure that production lines are secure, and that we know without a doubt whether or not our voting machines have been compromised.

Today's amendment simply requires States to seek to ensure that any voting machine used in any election for Federal office is a machine that is made in this country. The deadline for this requirement would be the 2022 election.

Madam Chair, I believe that the intent of this amendment is clear. I anticipate strong support from my colleagues, and for that reason I will stop here, urge the Chamber to vote in favor of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my good friend from Wisconsin. I didn't know if he wanted to mention Creed this time or not, but we can have a great debate on nineties music, if you like. But I do want the gentleman to come over and see my playlist after this is done. We will have some fun.

I am opposed to this amendment because American manufacturing employs more than 12 million men and women, contributes $2.25 trillion to the U.S. economy annually, has the largest economic impact of any major sector, and accounts for more than three-quarters of all private-sector research and development in the Nation. I support American manufacturing wholeheartedly.

However, my good friend's amendment is not about American manufacturing. It is about the many complaints that I have had regarding H.R. 1—and I have already stated—about Federal overreach in mandating States to comply with a requirement that is within their jurisdiction.

This bill continues to burden the American taxpayer by adding programs that would be footed by everyday Americans and would have to be paid for by county governments, by local governments, and municipalities that already have budgets that are stretched too thin. It is another unfunded mandate. It is another unfunded mandate from the Federal Government.

Unnecessary regulations of election equipment also present an undue burden on the States who administer these elections. This requirement gives State and local officials less options. This is ultimately a federalism issue. We believe that our State and local governments can maintain safe, secure elections that allow every one of their constituents, our constituents, to vote, and also ensure that every single American who is eligible to vote has their vote counted and has their vote protected. That is our goal.

H.R. 1 doesn't accomplish this goal, and much to my chagrin, I say to my friend from Wisconsin, I am opposed to this amendment, although I am not opposed to him.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chairwoman, I support this amendment, given the level of foreign interference in the elections in 2016 and 2018 and efforts to penetrate our voting systems. I think it makes sense that we use American-manufactured systems as well as software. But I would note this: this amendment is not proscriptive. It says that ''States shall seek to ensure.'' That is not a mandate to do it. Really, this is saying this is a good thing to do. I think it is a good thing to do.

While I have the microphone, I would like to note that we have just received

a letter from 27 religious institutions, including the Alliance of Baptists, African American Ministers In Action, the National Council of Churches, the NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice and the Presbyterian Church in the United States, in favor of H.R. 1, which I include in the RECORD.

MARCH 6, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As national faith-based advocates and congregations we urge passage of H.R. 1—the For the People Act. Our organizations strive for policies and systems that diminish inequality, support the most vulnerable, nurture human potential, and protect the health and well-being of all members of our society and of creation. We look to our government to reflect those ideals and we support a strong democracy:

. . . where voting is a fundamental right and a civic responsibility.

. . . that serves the people rather than the private interests of public officials and wealthy political donors.

. . . where our influence is based on the force of ideas, not the size of our wallets.

. . . where people know who is trying to gain influence over our representatives, who is trying to influence our votes, and how and why policy is being made.

. . . that works to respond to the needs of all people and their communities, building trust in governance and equity.

A broken democracy has clear and detrimental impacts on the issues important to us. We are faithful advocates who work within the existing political system, yet that system no longer seems capable of contending with the big problems facing our country, our communities, and our congregations. The faith community offers witness to what is obvious to most Americans: our democracy is out of balance.

The current system allows powerful corporate and wealthy interests to regularly defy the foundational principles of fairness, equity, ethics, accountability, and respect for the rule of law. The unfortunate result is that our government has become more responsive and accountable to wealthy political donors than to the public. Today's broken democratic system subjugates deeply held, age-old values to the profit motive.

People of faith know that Washington is not representing their best interests when millions of Americans who are eligible to vote cannot do so because they are not registered, voter ID laws are used as a tool to suppress the vote, millions of Americans are disenfranchised due to a felony conviction, and a number of states are improperly purging eligible voters from the registration rolls.

People of faith know that Washington is not representing their best interests when congressional districts are drawn to achieve highly partisan results at the expense of fair representation for citizens.

People of faith know that Washington is not representing their best interests when ethics rules governing our highest leaders and decision-makers are deeply flawed and are not subject to proper oversight and enforcement.

People of faith know that Washington is more accountable to corporate interests than to the public when they can spend huge sums of money influencing our elections and our government.

People of faith know that we can't fix the issues that the faith community cares about the most—such as poverty, immigration, climate change, racial justice and health care—until we fix our democracy.

To that end, the undersigned national faith organizations support H.R. 1, The For the People Act.

We recognize the historic opportunity our country faces to repair our political system and, as people of faith, we are hopeful in the possibility of renewal.

We applaud efforts to reform our election processes and our governing politics so that the interests of all are served, not just those with money.

We support attempts to restore ethical norms which inhibit self-interested corruption on the part of lawmakers.

We support provisions that enhance the influence of low-income and middle-income people on policy-making through their vote and their engagement in the civic body.

We support campaign finance reforms that sustain and encourage elected officials to serve their constituents and to legislate on behalf of the common good.

We embrace reforms that favor accountability and transparency in our government and in our lawmakers' decision-making.

We urge Congress to seize this moment to pass the comprehensive democracy reform H.R. 1.

Alliance of Baptists; African American Ministers In Action; American Friends Service Committee; Church World Service; Conference of Major Superiors of Men; Congregation of Our Lady of the Good Shepherd, US Provinces; Disciples Center for Public Witness; Ecumenical Poverty Initiative; Faith in Action; Faith in Public Life; Franciscan Action Network; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Islamic Society of North America; Jewish Council for Public Affairs; Leadership Conference of Women Religious.

National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd; National Campaign for a Peace Tax Fund; National Council of Churches; National Council of Jewish Women; National Religious Campaign Against Torture; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; Pax Christi USA; Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.); South East Asian Faith Initiatives; United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; Unitarian Universalist Association; Unitarian Universalists for Social Justice (UUSJ).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairwoman, again, this amendment, I am opposed to because I believe it is Federal overreach, but I do want to address an issue. As we can see, this would require American manufacturers to begin producing even more pieces of equipment that would then have to comply by the standards of this amendment, which is fine.

I am all for creating American jobs, but we also have a problem with the underlying bill. I tried to pass an amendment in the only markup that happened on this now almost-700-page bill. The amendment would have made sure that anyone who helped craft this bill, especially the special interest groups who were recognized on the day this bill was introduced and announced at a press conference, people who helped write this bill should have to sign a document that says that they will not profit from this.

What doesn't happen is, if somebody who helped craft this bill decides to open a manufacturing facility and make money off of the legislation, we need to know that. Because that amendment did not pass during the markup process, we won't know if that happens.

I would love to work with my colleague from Wisconsin to put a provision in place like that, and at that point in time this may be an amendment I could support.

Before we talk about any more nineties music, I am going to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I can assure my colleague, I do not plan on going into the voting machine business so he doesn't have to worry about me anyway. I don't think anyone in this body will.

I do urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1500

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MS. FRANKEL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 264, line 14, strike ''and''.

Page 264, line 19, strike ''office.'' and insert ''office; and''.

Page 264, insert after line 19 the following:

''(3) to implement and model best practices for ballot design, ballot instructions, and the testing of ballots.''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment, which is aimed at ensuring that a voter is not confused or misled by a bad ballot design that could lead to that voter overlooking a race—that is called an undervote—or even voting for the wrong candidate.

I want to explain the problem, Madam Chair, and then what I suggest is the remedy because, unfortunately, I have seen a bad ballot design basically cause chaos in my home State of Florida in two recent past elections.

First, I want to go back to the 2000 Presidential race, Gore v. Bush, where a very—unfortunately, a famous—poorly designed butterfly ballot confused voters in Palm Beach County. Many elderly citizens who thought they were voting for Al Gore actually voted for Pat Buchanan.

Why was this significant? Because we had a Presidential race where 6 million voters voted and it was decided by 500-plus votes, and Pat Buchanan got an unexpected 3,400 votes in a very liberal Palm Beach County.

Then, again, just recently in the 2018 midterms, again, in a very close Senate race, this time a race that was about a 12,000-vote margin, more than 30,000 voters in Broward County did not make

a choice in a U.S. Senate race. It is arguable that this is because the Senate candidates' names were under a set of long instructions, and according to experts, people don't read long instructions, and then they overlooked this Senate race.

So this amendment makes a good attempt to remedy this situation. It would allow States to use the election assistance grants that are now being authorized by H.R. 1 to improve ballot designs. Although our Election Assistance Commission publishes best practices and guidelines how to design a good ballot, these guidelines are voluntary, and local election administrators often face difficulties in trying to translate the best practices into the real world.

So with the funds provided by this amendment, States will be allowed to use their election assistance grants to create programs to train workers, research, model, and implement ballots designed by the best practices. This promises Americans the chance to cast their vote for their intended candidate.

We have seen problems with bad ballots. They are not just theoretical hiccups. They can and will, literally, swing elections.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my friend and colleague from Florida and fellow 2012 election year classmate.

We want to make sure every vote is counted. We want to make sure that every eligible voter in this country is registered, casts their votes, and that their vote is protected.

I have a lot of faith in the American people, and I have a lot of faith in the American voters. I think simple sets of instructions under, above, or below a race may or may not be a consideration in whether or not somebody decides to vote.

I find it ironic that most of the time my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will blame ballot design, but only when they lose. The fact that a Republican won in Florida meant that there is obviously a ballot issue. The fact that a Republican won in the 2000 Presidential race, it has got to be a ballot issue.

Let's address ballot issues throughout the country. Let's make sure that we have the ability to plan ahead, and that is what this bill doesn't do. It doesn't plan ahead and allow us to look at what is the next best, safest voting technology in the future. This bill will require paper marked ballots when we don't know what may or may not be safer in the future, but we are going to limit ourselves now.

Now, my biggest concern with this amendment is it is another example of this bill being rushed. If this were a well-thought-out piece of legislation, then we wouldn't need amendments clarifying the bill's intent.

This amendment in particular shows how we should have taken more time in the markup, and we should have had more committees that had jurisdiction mark this bill up instead of the vague language that is scattered throughout the bill.

If Members had more than 15 minutes of questioning—which I had in the one hearing as the ranking Republican on the committee, the only committee that marked this bill up—then we could have gotten to the bottom of this vague language.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), my colleague.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I just wanted to come down. I was listening to this debate. Some of it is good-hearted because, frankly, you just don't want to get so frustrated with a bill that was so rushed with 600-and-some pages that was not gone through.

I pointed out on the floor yesterday, Madam Chair, that there is a part of this bill that actually does—go back and read it. The chairwoman of this great committee, whom I have a lot of respect for would not have done this, I believe, if she was allowed to have done this, but it actually criminalizes keeping a 4-year-old from voting.

Now, this amendment is fine, but it goes to this issue: Ten committees had jurisdiction. One of the biggest was the Judiciary Committee on which I am the ranking member. We had a hearing, but no markup—don't want to get close to that; Oversight, hearing, no markup. This is what happens when you rush bills to the floor.

This is what happens when your agenda is bigger than the process. This is what happens when you don't care what is on the floor, you just want a talking point.

If we are going to continue this for 2 years, fine. The American people will see through this. But I think my ranking member from committee is correct. You cannot continue to do this and people not figure out we are not sure what is going on anymore.

This is a frustrating point with this because some of this could have been caught. We probably still wouldn't have agreed on much of this. Some of this bill is actually good, Supreme Court ethics and some other things in here we could have worked on.

But when you come to the floor like this and you don't mark it up and you do it like this, this is what you get: the hope of a lot of amendments to clarify, the hope of a lot of amendments to change.

Just do the work of committee. That is what I don't understand.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, Mr. COLLINS is showing, once again, that in the immortal words of the best-selling band of the 2000s, Nickelback, if today was your last day, I would always yield to my good friend from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Vote ''no.''

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

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Chair, I just want to say that this amendment is very simple.

You do not want elections with asterisks. Voters should be able to vote for the candidate they intend to vote for. There should be no confusion because of the ballot.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

This amendment clarifies that the election administration improvement grants that are in the bill may be used by localities or the States to implement and model best practices for ballot design, ballot instructions, and, I will say, testing of ballots, which is very important.

Most of the grants are really oriented towards computer systems, which is also very important, but I have seen some of these ballots where you could see why you could get confused; and, really, if you look at our friends in the tech world, you can design something so you vote yes or no just by the way the design is done.

Now, I think most of the ballot mistakes—there is no evidence it is by intention; it was just error. But you can create something so that people make a mistake.

The last thing we want for the most precious right that we have is for people to make inadvertent errors. We want people to cast their votes for whom they choose and then to have their vote counted for whomever it is they choose. It is that simple.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for the amendment. I think it is a good one.

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Chair, I thank the chairwoman for her comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In part 5 of subtitle A of title I of division A (page 72, beginning line 3), add at the end the following:

SEC. 1052. GRANTS TO STATES FOR ACTIVITIES TO ENCOURAGE INVOLVEMENT OF MINORS IN ELECTION ACTIVITIES.

(a) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Election Assistance Commission (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''Commission'') shall make

grants to eligible States to enable such States to carry out a plan to increase the involvement of individuals under 18 years of age in public election activities in the State.

(2) CONTENTS OF PLANS.—A State's plan under this subsection shall include—

(A) methods to promote the use of the preregistration process implemented under section 8A of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (as added by section 2(a));

(B) modifications to the curriculum of secondary schools in the State to promote civic engagement; and

(C) such other activities to encourage the involvement of young people in the electoral process as the State considers appropriate.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—A State is eligible to receive a grant under this section if the State submits to the Commission, at such time and in such form as the Commission may require, an application containing—

(1) a description of the State's plan under subsection (a);

(2) a description of the performance measures and targets the State will use to determine its success in carrying out the plan; and

(3) such other information and assurances as the Commission may require.

(c) PERIOD OF GRANT; REPORT.—

(1) PERIOD OF GRANT.—A State receiving a grant under this section shall use the funds provided by the grant over a 2-year period agreed to between the State and the Commission.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the end of the 2-year period agreed to under paragraph (1), the State shall submit to the Commission a report on the activities the State carried out with the funds provided by the grant, and shall include in the report an analysis of the extent to which the State met the performance measures and targets included in its application under subsection (b)(2).

(d) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''State'' means each of the several States and the District of Columbia.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under this section $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I am very pleased to be able to offer this amendment with my good friend from the First District of North Carolina, Mr. G. K. BUTTERFIELD.

Madam Chair, I am the father of four, and for the last 40 years I have tried always to take one of my children into the voting booth with me until they got too old, one by one, to come in because I wanted them to see by example how important it was to vote.

I tried to show them that this is a really big deal. Our dinner conversations for these 40 years have been always about the world, the country, inevitably, then about politics and then about government, because nothing is more important to our representative government than this idea of self-determination, that every one of us has the obligation to be part of our political process.

But, sadly, as we all know, way too many young people do not participate in our process. If we get to 10 percent, 11 percent, 12 percent under the age of 29, we are thrilled that they show up. So their voice is lost far too often.

So our amendment simply authorizes $25 million, over the next 2 years, in grant money to be issued to the Election Assistance Commission, and that is for them to give to eligible States money to be used to carry out plans, policies, and programs to increase youth involvement in elections. It does things like encourage States to implement methods to promote the preregistration of young voters.

I know this is probably already part of the bill itself, the requirement for preregistration, but in the 20 States that have it that you can register at age 15 or 16—not vote until you are 18—but if you do that, then you get a much higher voter participation.

It petitions States to modify the curriculum of secondary schools to promote civic engagement and activities to inspire young people to engage.

Madam Chair, I try to accept every invitation that I get from a high school to come be part of their classes. I came to 84 high school graduations when I was Lieutenant Governor because I get so discouraged when not just kids, but even adults don't know the names of their Governor or their U.S. Senators or certainly not their Congressman, and they have no idea how the Constitution works and how valuable it is.

We have to educate them, and this is a small investment in encouraging States to provide those curricula and others that can make it. They need substantive opportunities to participate in our political process and contributing to practical solutions.

Madam Chair, I feel deeply, if you can give good practice to kids, that will lead to good habits, good habits to good character, and as we all know, character is destiny.

So this small, humble amendment simply authorizes the Appropriations Committee to invest $25 in the Election Assistance Commission to help get our kids involved in politics at the best and young ages.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I appreciate my colleague from Virginia offering this amendment. I know he misspoke when he said $25 is being authorized in this amendment. It is actually $25 million that is being authorized.

That is my biggest hang-up with the bill. We have got a lot of pressing things in this country that $25 million can be spent on: infrastructure projects, pediatric cancer research, and putting it towards curing Alzheimer's, ALS, what have you, a lot of other priorities. We don't need a Federal program that is going to potentially cost $25 million to do what States, localities, and local organizations are doing right now.

I commend the gentleman for wanting to get more young people involved. I have got 18-year-olds. I sometimes wish they were a little more interested in what was happening at all levels of government, but that comes with time.

It is interesting the gentleman talks about being around the dinner table with family talking about what it means to serve and what it means to enact policy. That is how I got here.

□ 1515

I am the son of a 16-year-old who walked into a fast-food restaurant and then never left and is going to celebrate 60 years with the same company this year. Because he had a dream to own his own restaurant one day, my dad was able to move us to Illinois and achieve the American Dream.

He and my mom, a high school dropout, taught me around the dinner table how decisions in Washington and in Springfield, Illinois, affected their ability to hire people at their local McDonald's in Taylorville, Illinois.

That is what got me interested in politics. That is what got me interested in government. Much to the chagrin of some on the other side of the aisle and some on my own side of the aisle, that is probably why I am here.

We want to encourage young people, but that encouragement happens around the dinner table. It happens already, and it shouldn't cost $25 million.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I commend Mr. BEYER and Mr. BUTTERFIELD for this amendment providing grants.

Over the period of time that the bill covers, this is actually a pretty small amount of money, and it is subject to appropriations.

I do think it is difficult to put a price on our democracy. We need to make sure that young people are involved from the get-go. We have seen that young people don't necessarily have the tools to become engaged in our democracy.

It is fine if our ranking member gave his instruction to his twins around the dinner table. I commend him for that. But not every person in America has been so fortunate, and we need every American to participate.

I would like to say that this amendment, coupled with Mr. AL GREEN's amendment for the pilot project and Mr. NEGUSE's amendment, which will come later in the proceedings, really does put on the agenda outreach to the young people of America to participate in our democracy.

I know that there are people on both sides of the aisle who have concerns about changing the voting age in this bill and want to study that further. For

those people, these amendments are going to create vigorous outreach to the young people of America so they can be participants, and I commend the gentlemen for offering it.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I appreciate the chairperson offering her support for this amendment. She mentioned it is tough to put a price on democracy. That is exactly what H.R. 1 is doing.

The price of democracy in every single congressional district, for every single candidate running for Congress, is now, according to this bill, $4.5 million in corporate money and, eventually, taxpayer dollars. That is the price of democracy that my Democratic colleagues have put into every Member of Congress' campaign coffers if this bill goes through.

The price of democracy should be the freedoms that we enjoy on the floor of this great institution to be able to debate back and forth. The price of democracy should not be legislated at $4.5 million for each and every Member of Congress who is blessed enough to serve in this institution.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), my good friend.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I appreciate the chair here, and I do want to follow up on that.

I think the price of democracy has actually been paid by the blood, sweat, death, and lives of those who have fought for this country for over 200-something years.

That is the price of democracy. Those of us who have seen it in Iraq and other places, while serving there, understand that.

It is not found in a 600-page bill being rushed to the floor, not going through markup. Let's at least be very honest about that.

I appreciate the gentleman wanting to involve others in that. I appreciate wanting to make sure that we have young people's involvement. But we are also, frankly, as Members of this body, given a great opportunity.

There is not a high school, elementary school, or middle school in this country that would turn us away. We can go anytime we are in our district workweeks and encourage those teachers who are trying every day to teach them reading, writing, and civic responsibility. That is what our jobs give us the ultimate privilege of doing.

I appreciate the chairwoman of the committee saying that we are going to have vigorous outreach. She just said: Well, $25 million spread over the life of this bill is not that much.

It is either a lot of outreach or it is a little bit of money or really, frankly, it is neither. It is just a feel-good to make sure that we are getting people involved, which we should be doing.

I don't think I want to join in an attack on teachers, who are trying their best to instill civics, by saying we are not doing it well enough, and we are going to give a little bit of money spread out very thinly across the country to do something that our teachers strive every day in classrooms to do.

I respect the work of those teachers who are doing that, and I think Members of Congress ought to be able to go in and do what we do, take our office and go to the very ones who we are encouraging to show them that we are human, that we do understand, that we listen, and we answer all their questions, no matter how small or how large those questions are.

It is one of the greatest joys that I have, going to these schools each and every time I can and listening to them and saying: You can do this.

I was once an intern here, and I share that story. When they come to my office, they can see that.

That is what it takes.

I appreciate the gentleman's intent. I have never questioned his intent. I want to see this happen as well. But it also happens many times in this body. We believe money and a little bit of conversation has it.

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

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I want to say that all we are doing is giving the Appropriations Committee the flexibility to do this. We are going to spend over $700 billion on defense for people fighting for our democracy. We can spend a tiny, tiny fraction of that to make sure that American citizens understand what they are fighting for. This is a really important thing.

By the way, it is never an attack on teachers. Every teacher I have talked to would like more resources so they can do their job more effectively.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 136, beginning line 2, strike ", except that" and all that follows through "Sundays".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me first start by thanking Mr. CRIST of Florida for cosponsoring this amendment. I also want to recognize the work of my good friend from Maryland, JOHN SARBANES, on the underlying bill and his efforts to make our democracy work for the people.

My amendment would guarantee access to early voting during every day of the week, including Sundays, to every American.

Early voting makes voting more convenient by providing Americans with greater flexibility and opportunity to cast a ballot. More and more Americans are taking advantage of early voting, with more than 40 million citizens casting ballots before election day last year.

But guaranteeing fair and flexible early voting on Sundays is not just a matter of convenience. It is critical for minority voters who disproportionately take advantage of Sunday early voting and often face higher barriers and disparate burdens when deciding to cast a ballot: lost pay, childcare expenses, transit costs.

In my State and in States across the country, churches promote "take your souls to the polls" programs that take church parishioners from Sunday services to the voting booth. So cuts to Sunday early voting, as we have witnessed across this country, have had a negative impact, especially on communities of color.

Six States have cut back on early voting, and even more have tried but were blocked by the courts.

In North Carolina, lawmakers deliberately cut Sunday voting, saying 6 days of voting in one week is enough. But this action was struck down because, as the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals noted, it targeted African Americans with almost surgical precision.

Our democracy doesn't work if we don't give people the fullest opportunity to make their voices heard. We should make it easier for people to vote, not harder, and this amendment does exactly that.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, personally, Sunday mornings are sacred for me and my family and for a lot of other people, too, including those public servants who work the polls on early voting.

But this isn't about Sunday or any other day. It is about my colleagues dictating to States and local officials on how they should run their elections.

State and local election officials know their voters best and what works for them. This amendment is yet another example of the Federal Government trying to push a one-size-fits-all standard on States and localities.

I don't believe the Federal Government should be mandating to States how to run their elections, even to the minute details such as polling hours, especially because, I guess, in my home State, it already happens.

When you look at my district, they have early voting hours on Sundays, so I don't know how widespread the problem is since it already happens in Illinois. It seems like another top-down approach that could adversely affect some communities, especially rural communities, that may not be able to afford to have a polling place open on Sundays.

It is a problem with the entire bill. The costs keep going up and up and up on our local officials without a lot of certainty that funds are going to flow to help them with that.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, in an ideal world, perhaps, we don't mandate from the Federal Government, but when the Fourth Circuit determines that the North Carolina Legislature did it to target African Americans with almost surgical precision in eliminating Sunday voting, it is time for action at the Federal level so we can ensure every American has the right to vote.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST), my friend and a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. CRIST. Madam Chair, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN), for his leadership on this issue.

Souls to the Polls is a bedrock of Florida elections. For my colleagues who may be unfamiliar, minority communities, particularly African American and Latino, use Sunday early voting to energize their communities to make their voices heard. For those without reliable transportation or with unpredictable work schedules, Sunday voting is critical and sacred.

This is how a healthy democracy should work, communities organizing themselves to increase participation, doing their civic duty. Higher turnout and greater participation strengthen our democracy, giving elected leaders a stronger, more representative voice.

Unfortunately, some States have targeted Sunday Souls to the Polls voting. My own State tried to shut it down in 2012.

This amendment would block States from using voter suppression tactics against Souls to the Polls.

I urge my colleagues to support the Brown-Crist amendment and let the underlying bill pass.

Let's refresh our democracy, for the people.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I have kind of said all I need to say about this amendment, so while I have a few extra minutes, I understand the chairperson has received an estimate from a joint committee regarding how much this new corporate funding program for congressional campaigns will bring into the Federal Government over the next 10 years.

First, I would love to see a copy of that, now that we are only 1 day away from voting on this bill. This is eerily similar to the games that my colleagues across the aisle played with the Congressional Budget Office score. I will remind them once again that we still don't have a figure of how much this section of H.R. 1 will cost American taxpayers.

Second, if we look at the potential cost of the 6-to-1 government match program and the Presidential campaign matching program, these together could represent billions and billions of dollars every election cycle.

Now, what you will hear from the other side is that, if they don't have the funds for these programs, the caps for these programs would uniformly be lowered. What that means is that either the programs will die or my counterparts across the aisle are going to turn to taxpayer dollars to ask us to fulfill what they have claimed as absolutely necessary programs.

What does this sound like to you, a well-thought-out public policy proposal or a shell game with American tax dollars?

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the chairwoman of the Committee on House Administration.

□ 1530

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, first, I would like to thank Congressmen BROWN and CRIST for an excellent amendment that improves the bill considerably.

On the point just raised by the ranking member, the report given by the Joint Committee on Taxation was put into the RECORD yesterday, and it is their estimate of how much will be raised, and their estimate that we will reduce the deficit by $83 million.

We are waiting; the CBO is crunching numbers, which is hard to do because each amendment has to be crunched as we go along.

But I will say this: During the markup in the House Administration Committee, we did outline the vessel for the Freedom From Influence Fund. We didn't have the jurisdiction to do the assessment on criminal wrongdoing by corporations and tax cheats, but we did create the Freedom From Influence Fund, and we did create the step-down on the program if there is insufficient funding. So this is not a new thing.

I think it is sound policy.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, how much time do I have left, if I may inquire?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, this is another clear example of why this bill needs to be voted down or put back, preferably put back to committee.

I am the ranking member of the House Administration Committee, and I stood across this floor from my colleagues who now use the excuse and say, Well, it was submitted into the RECORD yesterday.

There has been a lack of communication, a lack of bipartisan outreach from the Democratic side of the aisle, and this is another example of the ''Keystone-coppish'' behavior of the folks that have introduced now an upwards of 700-page bill that has not been marked up, has not been discussed, debated by 40 percent of the committees that have—by nine other committees that have jurisdiction over 40 percent of the bill.

So when I hear the chairperson talk about jurisdictional issues as to why she couldn't discuss this with me in our markup process, I am wondering why she couldn't turn and tap me on the shoulder, since I was about 6 inches away, and say, Hey, we don't have jurisdiction, but here is what we estimate this is going to cost.

It just goes to show that this is a shell game. This is a game that is going to cost taxpayers billions. This is a game that we, and the American taxpayers, are going to have to pay for; and it is offensive that we have zero communication.

I have shown time and time again—we Republicans have offered and supported bipartisan—supported Democrat amendments. We have offered the olive branch of bipartisanship throughout this process to try and make this bill better, and we have been shut down by the Democrats every single time we have and every step of the way.

This bill is not going to guarantee that every single American voter who is eligible to vote has their vote counted and has their vote protected. What this is going to guarantee is that this bill is going to be rammed through on a partisan roll call tomorrow.

This bill is going to cost taxpayers billions, and we are not going to have the price tag because the Democrat majority, who is trying to enrich themselves and their own campaigns, the Democratic majority, who is trying to keep themselves in a permanent majority, are going to obfuscate, put new programs, and plans, and charades, and shell games in place, that are going to end up costing taxpayers, put more corporate money into congressional campaigns and, in turn, break the American taxpayers under the guise of election reforms.

Madam Chair, this process is not what the Democratic majority promised when they took over. This process has been riddled with a lack of bipartisanship, a lack of transparency, and special interests helping write this

mammoth, now 700-page bill that is going to nationalize our election systems and put billions of dollars into the campaign coffers of Congressmen and Congresswomen throughout this Nation.

That is not what the taxpayers of this country want. That is not what we are demanding. And it is an affront. I hope everybody votes ''no'' on this amendment and this bill.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 168, line 7, strike ''before the date of the election;'' and insert ''before the date of the election or the first day of an early voting period (whichever occurs first);''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified with the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 47 offered by Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

The amendment is modified to read as follows:

Page 168, line 3, strike ''before the date of the election;'' and insert ''before the date of the election or the first day of an early voting period (whichever occurs first);''.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, my amendment would require States to notify voters of polling location changes no later than 7 days prior to the first day of early voting, providing every voter as much time as possible to plan how and when they will vote, and avoiding last minute polling place changes that, more often than not, discourage people from exercising their right to vote.

Research shows that the most important factor that impacts whether someone votes or not is the location of the polling place and the effort it takes to get there.

A 2011 study in the American Political Science Review said changing a location of a polling place can significantly lower voter turnout.

Unfortunately, since 2008, and further accelerated in 2013, when the Supreme Court struck down key parts of the Voting Rights Act, nearly 15,000 polling places have been closed across the country; many of them are located in southern Black communities.

Polling places have been used as political tools to shape the outcome of elections for generations, and it continues to happen today.

Before the 2018 elections, States and local election boards closed polling places at colleges and universities, consolidated polling places in predominantly-minority neighborhoods to save money, and moved polling locations away from public transportation.

These changes discourage participation in our democracy, and make our system of government weaker. That is why Congress must take action to protect the rights of the people, to have a government by the people, for the people.

By providing sufficient notice, every voter can decide whether to cast a vote on Election Day or, as this bill provides, take advantage of early voting or no-excuse absentee voting.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I am proud to be a champion for open and fair elections, and encouraging all American citizens to participate in their fundamental right to cast their vote.

My challenge to this amendment is similar to my larger challenges to the underlying bill. What this amendment seeks to do is already a Federal requirement and is updating its specific requirement.

This is a great example of when the Federal Government steps into legislating something that is outside of its jurisdiction, and is forced to update its own legislation.

State and local election officials are charged with determining how to best administer fair elections and open elections for all of their citizens. This includes notifying them of their polling place, and of any changes. Federally mandating details is unnecessary and, really, not the role of the Federal Government.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Sadly, Madam Chair, in this country there are far too many States and/or local election officials that are not committed to fair and open elections. And as we have seen by decisions in courts at every level, rolling back actions by State legislatures to change polling sites, to take away early voting opportunities, there are some times in the history of this Nation, and this is one of them, when it comes to protecting voting rights, where it is a Federal responsibility to do so.

In an optimal world, in an optimal situation, where we had truly free and fair and open elections, perhaps this amendment and perhaps even this legislation wouldn't be required. That is not the world we live in today, although it is an aspirational place to be.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I again thank my friend and colleague from the great State of Maryland for offering the amendment. Unfortunately, I have to be opposed to this amendment for the variety of reasons I mentioned.

I believe in the greatness of America. I believe we have a great system where other countries from around this globe only wish they could choose their own leaders, like Americans get the opportunity to do so.

We have a system of federalism. We have a system that, I believe, works best from the bottom up; and I believe a top-down approach, that this 700-page mammoth bill will provide for our local election officials, will hinder them, and cost them, and stop them from being able to administer the best, most open elections they possibly can.

I have a lot of faith in the county election officials that are operating in my district, in central and southwestern Illinois. I believe they run a very fair election process. I want to give them the tools and the flexibility to meet the needs of my constituents and our constituents; and the Federal Government doesn't need to be the voice to do so. Our local officials can do that better.

I am ready to close, so I will just reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the chair of the House Administration Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I just want to say how much I appreciate the amendment offered by Mr. BROWN. It improves the bill by making sure that voters are notified, not just 7 days before the poll is moved, but before early voting begins, maximizing the opportunity to actually get to the poll.

Many Americans, right now, have a single day to vote, and if you are a working person, you may not even have time off, you may not even be able to get to the polling place. That is what H.R. 1 is all about.

And just getting to the federalism issue. Article I, section 4 explicitly says, ''Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations'' about Federal elections. That is what we are doing here.

We need to do more because there are jurisdictions in our country that are specifically trying to prevent people from voting based on race. That is why we have got the Voting Rights Act that

is going to be coming later. We are compiling the evidentiary record for the Voting Rights Act right now.

But this bill just relates to Federal elections which we have jurisdiction to do. We need to make sure that the efforts to keep people from exercising their right to vote in Federal elections are defeated. That is what H.R. 1 is about. That is what Mr. BROWN's amendment is about, and I am grateful to him for offering it.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I will close by just encouraging all my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 136, line 3, strike ''and''.

Page 136, line 5, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 136, insert after line 5 the following:

''(3) allow such voting to be held for some period of time prior to 9:00 a.m (local time) and some period of time after 5:00 p.m. (local time).''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment would require a portion of early voting hours to occur outside of normal business hours. This simple, yet effective amendment would ensure that every working individual has the opportunity to cast their ballot without taking time off from work, having to find child care, or risking being reprimanded by their employer.

□ 1545

While early voting has become increasingly commonplace, States and localities continue to change and restrict hours every election, sometimes closing as early as 4 p.m., making it problematic for those whose workdays may have irregular schedules or are unable to take time away from work.

Despite State laws guaranteeing many workers time off to go vote, too many Americans have neither the luxury of an employer that will give them time off to vote nor the financial freedom to risk losing a few hours' wages in order to participate in our democracy. That is why early voting is so important.

But holding early voting during business hours is just another way citizens have been impeded from exercising their right to vote, particularly middle-class working Americans in the service, manufacturing, and other blue-collar industries. These Americans often rely on a 9 to 5 schedule and don't have the same opportunity to vote.

To ensure everyone's voice can be heard and early voting is convenient for every American, locations should remain open well after the traditional close of business.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I have said the same thing about previous amendments. I think this is an overreach issue. I don't think the Federal Government should be involved in the minute details of early voting hours.

States aren't asking us to set our hours here in Congress; we shouldn't, as the Federal Government, ask our State and local election officials who know better how to run free, fair, and a lot less costly election processes.

We have got a problem in this country, Madam Chair, with a shortage of election day workers. We have got a problem with poll workers.

In my home State of Illinois, every other year it is a holiday. It hasn't helped us get more election workers. It hasn't helped us get more poll workers. What it has done is it has created a holiday and a day off where many people can come vote or they can enjoy the already open early voting processes that States like mine have in place and the opportunities to cast their votes in a wide variety of ways.

This is another example of a Federal top-down approach that obviously shows there is a distinct difference between my Democrat colleagues and me and all of us on this side of the aisle. We believe in a bottom-up approach of governing; they believe in a top-down approach.

The bottom-up approach, I believe, leads to more efficiencies, leads to fairer and better and freer elections, and a top-down approach is nothing but costly to the taxpayers in unfunded mandates.

One thing that really frustrates me is, if you are going to impose Federal mandates, you cannot leave States open to the potential liability because the mandate is so broad. And that is exactly what this bill does. That is exactly why I am opposed to this amendment.

Madam Chair, I am ready to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, keeping the same terminology of ''bottom-up'' and ''top-down,'' I think the Founders contemplated both, that when it comes to Federal elections, it would be both a bottom-up and a top-down.

As my friend from Illinois was reminded during the last debate, Article I, Section 4 says, and I will read it in its entirety: ''The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof''—that sounds like bottom-up to me—''but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.''

I think that is what you would refer to as a top-down, contemplated by the Founders, implemented and embraced here in H.R. 1. Why? So that we can protect, expand, promote, and defend the right for every single American to vote and to make sure it is as convenient and accessible to every American regardless of race, color, creed, gender, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

Madam Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Maryland.

You know, like some of the legislation we pass here, it has to go through the rulemaking process later. That is no different than our forefathers and our Founders of the Constitution.

If you read Alexander Hamilton, he responds to the concerns that the power of the national government to determine the time, places, and manner of elections of the Representatives of the House might actually, at that time, result in the elevation of the wealthy over the mass of citizens.

The fear seems to have been that the national government may conspire to hold elections in only parts of the States populated by the wealthy. That would presumably prevent lower income citizens from voting.

Hamilton rejected that fear on several grounds, including the fact that such places do not exist, but that the rich are scattered throughout the States.

Hamilton argued that every member of this country should have the right to vote, but the Federal overreach should not be something we are actually encouraging right now.

Let's look at what our forefathers actually said about the provisions in the Constitution, just not using them to put forth a political agenda.

Madam Chair, I am urging a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 182, line 21, strike the semicolon and insert the following: '', together with a description of any actions taken in response to such instances of voter intimidation or suppression;''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This amendment will require States to include in their biannual report to Congress on the voter information hotline statistics to include a description of any actions taken in response to reports of voter intimidation or suppression.

Discouraging voter participation through intimidation or suppression tactics runs against the very foundation of our democracy, but these tactics continue to play an unfortunate role in our elections today.

When I ran for Lieutenant Governor of Maryland in 2010, my opponent hired a consultant who advised my opponent that ''. . . the first and most desired outcome is voter suppression'' by having ''African American voters stay home.''

To that end, my opponent made thousands of election day robocalls to Democrat voters telling them that Democrats had won; although, in fact, the polls were still open for 2 more hours.

The call told voters: Relax. Everything is fine. The only thing left is to watch it on TV tonight.

It reached 112,000 voters in majority African American areas.

This is just one example of the despicable tactics that have become commonplace in our elections.

We have the responsibility to confront these attempts to target individuals and influence whether or not they vote.

In 2019, too many Americans are still being harassed, threatened, and barred from exercising their right to vote. My amendment will ensure election officials do their job by helping voters who don't know where to vote, why their polling place is closed, or why they are being turned away.

This is an essential element to make our elections more free, more fair, and will help safeguard the integrity of our elections by holding election officials accountable for protecting every citizen's right to vote.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, this amendment would have the effect of the Federal Government compiling statistics without context and without vetting on very serious criminal matters. Unless there was some sort of follow-up on the reports, it could actually do more harm than good.

I am also afraid that certain partisan organizations could take advantage of this. So bear with me. Let's talk through this and let's see how this would work.

People call into this hotline, submit allegations of serious crimes, and then it is sent to the State and now the Federal Government. Partisan groups who helped author this bill would then use statistics from the hotline to then bring unverified lawsuits under the new third-party actions that are allowed in this bill.

This is a recipe for disaster. The stated purpose of H.R. 1 is to increase transparency in politics, but instead, unfortunately, this provision would only invite corruption.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, turning back to the amendment, what the amendment does is it simply holds local election officials accountable and to be responsive to the claims, the calls, the concerns that are raised to them regarding voter intimidation, voter suppression, ensuring that when they are collecting that information, that they also report on what the response is to the claims that are made.

Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), chair of the House Administration Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I would like to commend the gentleman for this amendment.

When you make a phone call in to complain about harassment or intimidation, that information may or may not ever become known, so this is really a pro-transparency measure.

The amendment says: ''together with a description of actions taken in response to such instances of voter intimidation or suppression.''

The State legislatures may not know, we may not know how many efforts are being made. We should know that to see whether what we have done here is sufficient, whether the Voting Rights Act that will be following along this bill later in the spring needs to address this.

Madam Chair, this is an excellent amendment.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I believe the EAC, Election Assistance Commission, is supposed to track this information.

The key point, too, that I made earlier is that there is no verification, and that is a problem with this amendment. It is a problem with the bill. There are no protections for bad behavior.

This is why we tried to get rid of ballot harvesting. It was why the amendment was offered in committee. I mean, we have already seen what bad actors can do.

It cost taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars in North Carolina, and they have to run a new special election, but that is okay because that may not have been a crime in California. But that is all right. The Democrats didn't want to accept that because they might like the process somewhere else.

I think what is wrong is wrong and we ought to be able to have protections. I am not convinced that the American people have the protections that they need and that they deserve to stop what happened in North Carolina from happening somewhere else.

This is another example of overreach, another example of something already happening, already existing agencies that should be compiling this information; and there are no safeguards and there will be no verification of allegations, and that is unfortunate.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, the issue raised by the gentleman from Illinois is neither helped nor harmed by this amendment. He raises an issue that we can take up perhaps another day.

But what this bill simply does is it requires that local elected officials be responsive and report on the responses they take to claims of intimidation and suppression.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, we would love to take up ballot harvesting today, too, but, unfortunately, we are not given the chance to. The Democrats voted it down in the only markup that we had, the smallest committee in Congress, 5 hours last week, with 40 percent of the bill not going through regular order, not going through the committee process.

This is not a process that has been open. It is not a process that has been transparent. It is not a process that has been bipartisan.

Clearly, we have accepted many Democrat amendments on our side. Not one single Republican amendment has been accepted by the Democrat side.

Madam Chair, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) having assumed the chair, Ms. HAALAND, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1600

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on any postponed question at a later time.

CONDEMNING ANTI-SEMITISM AND ANTI-MUSLIM DISCRIMINATION

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 183) condemning anti-Semitism as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values and aspirations that define the people of the United States and condemning anti-Muslim discrimination and bigotry against minorities as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contrary to the values and aspirations of the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 183

Whereas the first amendment to the Constitution established the United States as a country committed to the principles of tolerance and religious freedom, and the 14th amendment to the Constitution established equal protection of the laws as the heart of justice in the United States;

Whereas adherence to these principles is vital to the progress of the American people and the diverse communities and religious groups of the United States;

Whereas whether from the political right, center, or left, bigotry, discrimination, oppression, racism, and imputations of dual loyalty threaten American democracy and have no place in American political discourse;

Whereas white supremacists in the United States have exploited and continue to exploit bigotry and weaponize hate for political gain, targeting traditionally persecuted peoples, including African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and other people of color, Jews, Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs, the LGBTQ community, immigrants, and others with verbal attacks, incitement, and violence;

Whereas the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., taught that persecution of any American is an assault on the rights and freedoms of all Americans;

Whereas on August 11 and 12, 2017, self-identified neo-Confederates, white nationalists, neo-Nazis, and Ku Klux Klansmen held white supremacist events in Charlottesville, Virginia, where they marched on a synagogue under the Nazi swastika, engaged in racist and anti-Semitic demonstrations and committed brutal and deadly violence against peaceful Americans;

Whereas a white nationalist murdered nine African American worshipers at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, on the evening of June 17, 2015, in the hopes of igniting a nationwide race war;

Whereas on October 27, 2018, the perpetrator of the deadliest attack on Jewish people in the history of the United States killed 11 worshippers at the Tree of Life Synagogue building in Pittsburgh and reportedly stated that he ''wanted all Jews to die'';

Whereas anti-Semitism is the centuries-old bigotry and form of racism faced by Jewish people simply because they are Jews;

Whereas in 2017 the Federal Bureau of Investigation reported a 37 percent increase in hate crimes against Jews or Jewish institutions and found that attacks against Jews or Jewish institutions made up 58.1 percent of all religious-based hate crimes;

Whereas there is an urgent need to ensure the safety and security of Jewish communities, including synagogues, schools, cemeteries, and other institutions;

Whereas Jews are the targets of anti-Semitic violence at even higher rates in many other countries than they are in the United States;

Whereas it is a foreign policy priority of the United States to monitor and combat anti-Semitism abroad;

Whereas anti-Semitism includes blaming Jews as Jews when things go wrong; calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or extremist view of religion; or making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotyped allegations about Jews;

Whereas Jewish people are subject in the media and political campaigns to numerous other dangerous anti-Semitic myths as well, including that Jews control the United States Government or seek global, political, and financial domination and that Jews are obsessed with money;

Whereas scapegoating and targeting of Jews in the United States have persisted for many years, including by the Ku Klux Klan, the America First Committee, and by modern neo-Nazis;

Whereas accusing Jews of being more loyal to Israel or to the Jewish community than to the United States constitutes anti-Semitism because it suggests that Jewish citizens cannot be patriotic Americans and trusted neighbors, when Jews have loyally served our Nation every day since its founding, whether in public or community life or military service;

Whereas accusations of dual loyalty generally have an insidious and pernicious history, including—

(1) the discriminatory incarceration of Americans of Japanese descent during World War II on their basis of race and alleged dual loyalty;

(2) the Dreyfus affair, when Alfred Dreyfus, a Jewish French artillery captain, was falsely convicted of passing secrets to Germany based on his Jewish background;

(3) when the loyalty of President John F. Kennedy was questioned because of his Catholic faith; and

(4) the post-9/11 conditions faced by Muslim-Americans in the United States, including Islamophobia and false and vicious attacks on and threats to Muslim-Americans for alleged association with terrorism;

Whereas anti-Muslim bigotry entails prejudicial attitudes towards Muslims and people who are perceived to be Muslim, including the irrational belief that Muslims are inherently violent, disloyal, and foreign;

Whereas Muslims and people perceived to be Muslim are subjected to false and dangerous stereotypes and myths including unfair allegations that they sympathize with individuals who engage in violence or terror or support the oppression of women, Jews, and other vulnerable communities;

Whereas in 2017, mosques were bombed in Bloomington, Minnesota, and burned in Austin, Texas, Victoria, Texas, Bellevue, Washington, and Thonotosassa, Florida, and mass attacks on Muslim communities were planned against communities in Islamberg, New York, in 2019, Jacksonville, Florida, in 2017, and Garden City, Kansas, in 2016;

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation reported that hate crimes against Muslims or Muslim institutions in the United States increased by over 99 percent between 2014 and 2016;

Whereas attacks motivated by bigotry against those who are Muslim or perceived to be Muslim have substantially increased since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks;

Whereas the violation of an individual's civil rights based on his or her actual or perceived membership in a particular religious group clearly violates the Constitution and laws of the United States; and

Whereas all Americans, including Jews, Muslims, and Christians and people of all faiths and no faith, have a stake in fighting anti-Semitism, as all Americans have a stake in fighting every form of bigotry and hatred against people based on religion, race, or place of birth and origin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) rejects the perpetuation of anti-Semitic stereotypes in the United States and around the world, including the pernicious myth of dual loyalty and foreign allegiance, especially in the context of support for the United States-Israel alliance;

(2) condemns anti-Semitic acts and statements as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values that define the people of the United States;

(3) reaffirms its support for the mandate of the United States Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism as part of the broader policy priority of fostering international religious freedom and protecting human rights all over the world;

(4) rejects attempts to justify hatred or violent attacks as an acceptable expression of disapproval or frustration over political events in the Middle East or elsewhere;

(5) acknowledges the harm suffered by Muslims and others from the harassment, discrimination, and violence that result from anti-Muslim bigotry;

(6) condemns anti-Muslim discrimination and bigotry against all minorities as contrary to the values of the United States;

(7) condemns the death threats received by Jewish and Muslim Members of Congress, including in recent weeks;

(8) encourages law enforcement and government officials to avoid conduct that raises the specter of unconstitutional profiling against anyone because of their