

Messrs. SWALWELL of California, BRADY, MEUSER, WEBER of Texas, BABIN, and GROTHMAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1735

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 Mr. PETERS (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 49 printed in part B of House Report 116-16 offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116-16 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. RASKIN of Maryland.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 24 by Ms. PRESSLEY of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 25 by Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

Amendment No. 33 by Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. RASKIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 215, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

AYES—219

Adams	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez	Casten (IL)	Hudson	Roby
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Omar	Chabot	Huizenga	Rodgers (WA)
Allred	Green (TX)	Pallone	Cheney	Hunter	Roe, David P.
Axne	Grijalva	Panetta	Cline	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Barragán	Haaland	Pappas	Cloud	Johnson (LA)	Rooney (FL)
Bass	Harder (CA)	Pascrill	Cole	Johnson (OH)	Rose, John W.
Beatty	Hastings	Payne	Collins (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Rouzer
Bera	Hayes	Perlmutter	Comer	Jordan	Roy
Beyer	Heck	Peters	Conaway	Joyce (OH)	Rutherford
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Phillips	Cook	Joyce (PA)	Scalise
Blunt Rochester	Hill (CA)	Pingree	Crawford	Katko	Schneider
Bonamici	Himes	Plaskett	Crenshaw	Kelly (MS)	Schrader
Boyle, Brendan F.	Horn, Kendra S. Horsford	Pocan	Cuellar	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Brown (MD)	Houlahan	Porter	Davids (KS)	King (IA)	Scott, Austin
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Pressley	Davidson (OH)	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Bustos	Huffman	Price (NC)	Davis, Rodney	Kinzinger	Shimkus
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Quigley	DesJarlais	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson
Carbajal	Jayapal	Raskin	Emmer	LaHood	Slotkin
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rice (NY)	Estes	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Richmond	Ferguson	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Cartwright	Johnson (TX)	Rose (NY)	Fitzpatrick	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Case	Kaptur	Rouda	Fleischmann	Marchant	Smucker
Castor (FL)	Keating	Royal-Allard	Flores	Marshall	Stewart
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz	Fortenberry	Massie	Stivers
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Ruppersberger	Gohmert	Foxx (NC)	Stuaber
Cicilline	Khanna	Rush	Gonzalez	Mast	Stefanik
Cisneros	Kildee	Ryan	González-Colón	McAdams	Taylor
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Sablan	Gaetz	McBath	Thompson (PA)
Clarke (NY)	Kim	Sánchez	Gallagher	McCarthy	Thornberry
Cleaver	Kind	Barbanes	Gianforte	McCaull	Timmons
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Scanlon	Gibbs	McClintock	Tipton
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky	Gohmert	McHenry	Torres Small
Connolly	Kuster (NH)	Schiff	Gonzalez (OH)	McKinley	(NM)
Cooper	Lamb	Schrier	González-Colón	Meadows	Trone
Correa	Langevin	Scott (VA)	Gaetz	Meuser	Turner
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David	Gallagher	Miller	Walorski
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Serrano	Gianforte	McCarthy	Upton
Cox (CA)	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)	Gibbs	McCaull	Wade
Craig	Lawson (FL)	Shalala	Griffith	McClintock	Waltz
Crist	Lee (CA)	Sherman	Gohmert	McHenry	Tipton
Crow	Levin (CA)	Sherrill	Gonzalez (OH)	McKinley	Torres Small
Cummings	Levin (MI)	Sires	González-Colón	Meadows	(NM)
Cunningham	Lewis	Smith (WA)	Graves (GA)	Trone	Trone
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Soto	Graves (LA)	Turner	Turner
Davis, Danny K.	Lipinski	Spanberger	Graves (MO)	Newhouse	Walorski
Dean	Loebssack	Speier	Green (TN)	Waltz	Waltz
DeFazio	Lofgren	Stanton	Griffith	Norman	Watkins
DeGette	Lowenthal	Stevens	Hagedorn	Nunes	Watkins
DeLauro	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)	Hagedorn	Olson	Weber (TX)
DelBene	Luján	Takano	Hagedorn	Palazzo	Webster (FL)
Delgado	Luria	Thompson (CA)	Hagedorn	Palmer	Wenstrup
Demings	Lynch	Thompson (MS)	Hern, Kevin	Pence	Westerman
DeSaulnier	Malinowski	Titus	Possey	Perry	Williams
Deutch	Maloney,	Malone, Carolyn B.	Herrera Beutler	Peterson	Wilson (SC)
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Matsui	Radewagen	Womack	Wittman
Doggett	McCollum	McEachin	Hice (GA)	Ratcliffe	Woodall
Doyle, Michael F.	McGovern	McNerney	Higgins (LA)	Reed	Wright
Engel	Meeks	Meeks	Hill (AR)	Reschenthaler	Yoho
Escarbar	Meng	Velázquez	Holding	Rice (SC)	Young
Eshoo	Moore	Visclosky	Hollingsworth	Riggleman	Zeldin
Espaillet	Morelle	Wasserman	NOT VOTING—3		
Finkenauer	Moutlon	Schultz	Clay	Rogers (AL)	San Nicolas
Fletcher	Mucarsel-Powell	Waters			
Foster	Nadler	Watson Coleman	□ 1742		
Frankel	Napolitano	Welch	So the amendment was agreed to.		
Fudge	Neal	Wexton	The result of the vote was announced		
Gabbard	Neal	Wild	as above recorded.		
Gallego	Neguse	Wilson (FL)			
Garamendi	Norcross	Yarmuth	AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. COLE		
Garcia (IL)	Norton		The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished		
Garcia (TX)	O’Halloran		business is the demand for a recorded		
Golden			vote on the amendment offered by the		
			gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE)		
			on which further proceedings were		
			postponed and on which the noes pre-		
			vailed by voice vote.		
			The Clerk will redesignate the		
			amendment.		
			The Clerk redesignated the amend-		
			ment.		
			RECORDED VOTE		
			The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote		
			has been demanded.		
			A recorded vote was ordered.		
			The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-		
			minute vote.		
			The vote was taken by electronic de-		
			vice, and there were—ayes 199, noes 235,		
			not voting 3, as follows:		

[Roll No. 110]		Gottheimer Green (TX)		Malinowski Maloney,		Sablan Sánchez		[Roll No. 111]	
AYES—199		Grijalva Haaland		Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean		Scanlon Schakowsky		Adams Barragán	
Abraham	González-Colón	Nunes	Haaland	Maloney, Sean	Scanlon	Adams	Gabbard	Pallone	
Aderholt	(PR)	Olson	Harder (CA)	Matsui	Schakowsky	Barragán	Gallego	Payne	
Allen	Gooden	Palazzo	Hastings	McAdams	Schiff	Bass	Gonzalez (TX)	Pingree	
Amash	Gosar	Palmer	Heck	McCullom	Schneider	Beatty	Green (TX)	Plaskett	
Amodei	Granger	Pence	Higgins (NY)	McEachin	Schrader	Beyer	Grijalva	Pocan	
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Perry	Hill (CA)	McGovern	Schrier	Bishop (GA)	Haaland	Pressley	
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Posey	Himes	McNerney	Scott (VA)	Blumenauer	Hastings	Price (NC)	
Babin	Graves (MO)	Radwagen	Horn, Kendra S.	Meeks	Scott, David	Blunt Rochester	Hayes	Raskin	
Bacon	Green (TN)	Ratcliffe	Horsford	Meng	Serrano	Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Rice (NY)	
Baird	Griffith	Reed	Houahan	Moore	Shalala	Boyle, Brendan	Hill (CA)	Richmond	
Balderson	Grothman	Reschenthaler	Hoyer	Morelle	Sherman	F.	Horn, Kendra S.	Rose (NY)	
Banks	Guest	Rice (SC)	Huffman	Moulton	Sherrill	Brown (MD)	Horsford	Rouda	
Barr	Guthrie	Riggleman	Jackson Lee	Mucarsel-Powell	Sires	Brownley (CA)	Jackson Lee	Royal-Allard	
Bergman	Hagedorn	Roby	Jayapal	Murphy	Slotkin	Burgess	Jayapal	Ruiz	
Biggs	Harris	Rodgers (WA)	Jeffries	Nadler	Smith (WA)	Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Ruppertsberger	
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Roe, David P.	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Soto	Johnson (TX)	Johnson (TX)	Rush	
Bishop (UT)	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (KY)	Johnson (TX)	Neal	Spanberger	Casten (IL)	Kennedy	Ryan	
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Rooney (FL)	Kaptur	Neguse	Speier	Castor (FL)	Khanna	Sablan	
Brady	Hice (GA)	Rose, John W.	Keating	Norcross	Castro (TX)	Kildee	Schakowsky		
Brooks (AL)	Higgins (LA)	Rouzer	Kelly (IL)	Norton	Stanton	Chu, Judy	Kilmer		
Brooks (IN)	Hill (AR)	Roy	Kennedy	O'Halleran	Stevens	Cicilline	Kirkpatrick		
Buchanan	Holding	Rutherford	Khanna	Ocasio-Cortez	Suozzi	Clark (MA)	Serrano		
Buck	Hollingsworth	Scalise	Kildee	Omar	Swalwell (CA)	Clarke (NY)	Sewell (AL)		
Bucshon	Hudson	Schweikert	Kilmer	Pallone	Thompson (CA)	Takano	Shalala		
Budd	Huizenga	Scott, Austin	Kim	Panetta	Thompson (MS)	Clyburn	Lee (NV)		
Burchett	Hunter	Sensenbrenner	Kind	Pappas	Titus	Correa	Levin (CA)		
Burgess	Hurd (TX)	Shimkus	Kirkpatrick	Pascarella	Cummings	Levin (MI)	Soto		
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Simpson	Kirkpatrick	Payne	Tlaib	Lewis	Spanberger		
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Smith (MO)	Kuster (NH)	Perlmutter	Tonko	Davis (CA)	Speier		
Carter (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Smith (NE)	Lamb	Peters	Torres (CA)	DeFazio	Stanton		
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Smith (NJ)	Langevin	Peterson	Torres Small	Davis, Danny K.	Lowenthal		
Chabot	Joyce (OH)	Smucker	Larsen (WA)	Phillips	Titus	Levin (CA)	Lowey		
Cheney	Joyce (PA)	Spano	Larson (CT)	Trahan	DeBenedictis	Luján	Swalwell (CA)		
Cline	Katko	Stauber	Lawrence	DeSaulnier	Malinowski	Takano	Takano		
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Stefanik	Plaskett	Malone, Sean	Malinowski	Luján			
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Steil	Lawson (FL)	DeSaulnier	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Steube	Pocan	DeSaulnier	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Stewart	Porter	DeSaulnier	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Comer	Kinzinger	Stewart	Lee (CA)	Pressley	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Conaway	Kustoff (TN)	Stivers	Lee (NV)	Veasey	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Connolly	LaHood	Taylor	Levin (CA)	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Cook	LaMalfa	Thompson (PA)	Levin (MI)	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Crawford	Lamborn	Thornberry	Lewis	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Crenshaw	Latta	Timmons	Raskin	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Curtis	Lesko	Tipton	Lieu, Ted	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Davidson (OH)	Long	Turner	Rice (NY)	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Upton	Lipinski	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
DesJarlais	Lucas	Wagner	Richmond	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Walberg	Rush	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Duffy	Marchant	Walden	Lynch	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Duncan	Marshall	Walker	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Dunn	Massie	Walorski	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Emmer	Mast	Waltz	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Estes	McCarthy	Watkins	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Ferguson	McCaul	Weber (TX)	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Webster (FL)	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Fleischmann	McHenry	Wenstrup	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Flores	McKinley	Westerman	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Fortenberry	Meadows	Williams	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Foxx (NC)	Meuser	Wittman	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Fulcher	Miller	Wittman	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Gaetz	Mitchell	Womack	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Woodall	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Wright	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Gibbs	Mullin	Yoho	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Gohmert	Newhouse	Young	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
Gonzalez (OH)	Norman	Zeldin	Rodriguez	Velazquez	Malone, Sean	Takano			
NOES—235		NOT VOTING—3		ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR		NOT VOTING—305		[Roll No. 111]	
Adams	Castro (TX)	DelBene	Lowenthal	Clay	Rogers (AL)	San Nicolas	Conaway	González-Colón	
Aguilar	Chu, Judy	Delgado	Ruiz	Rogers (AL)	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Connelly	(PR)	
Allred	Cicilline	Demings	Ruppersberger	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Cook	Gooden	
Axne	Cisneros	DeSaulnier	Ruppersberger	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Cooper	Gosar	
Barragán	Clark (MA)	Deutch	Rush	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Costa	Gottheimer	
Bass	Clarke (NY)	Dingell	Ryan	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Courtney	Granger	
Beatty	Cleaver	Doggett	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Amodei	Cox (CA)	
Bera	Clyburn	Doyle, Michael	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Armstrong	Arrington	
Beyer	Cohen	F.	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Axne	Crawford	
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Engel	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Babin	Crenshaw	
Blumenauer	Correa	Escobar	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Bacon	Green (TN)	
Blunt Rochester	Costa	Eshoo	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Cuellar	Griffith	
Bonamici	Courtney	Espaillat	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Balderson	Grothman	
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cox (CA)	Evans	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Banks	Guest	
Brindisi	Craig	Finkenauer	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Barr	Guthrie	
Brown (MD)	Crist	Fletcher	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Balderson	Cunningham	
Brownley (CA)	Crow	Foster	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Banks	Curtis	
Bustos	Cummings	Fudge	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Barr	Davids (KS)	
Butterfield	Cunningham	Gabbard	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Bera	Davidson (OH)	
Carbajal	Davids (KS)	Gallego	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Bergman	Harder (CA)	
Cárdenas	Davis (CA)	Garamendi	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Biggs	Harris	
Carson (IN)	Davis, Danny K.	García (IL)	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	DeGette	Hartzler	
Cartwright	Dean	García (TX)	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Bilirakis	Hern, Kevin	
Case	DeFazio	Golden	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	
Casten (IL)	DeGette	Gomez	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Bost	Demings	
Castor (FL)	DeLauro	Gonzalez (TX)	Rodriguez	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Malone, Sean	Brady	DesJarlais	
RECORDED VOTE		The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.		The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.	
AYES—126		The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.		The Clerk redesignated the amendment.		The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.		The Clerk redesignated the amendment.	
NOES—305		The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.		The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.		The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.		The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.	
AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.	
NOT VOTING—3		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.	
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.	
NOT VOTING—305		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.	
The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.	
The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.	
The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.	
The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.	
The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.	
The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.	
The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.	
The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.	
The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.	
The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.		The Acting CHAIR. The demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further			

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 238, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

AYES—194

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

NOES—238

Davis, Danny K.	Kind	Quigley
Dean	Kirkpatrick	Raskin
DeFazio	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
DeGette	Kuster (NH)	Richmond
DeLauro	Lamb	Rose (NY)
DelBene	Langevin	Rouda
Delgado	Larsen (WA)	Royal-Allard
Demings	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Ruppersberger
Deutch	Lawson (FL)	Rush
Dingell	Lee (CA)	Ryan
Doggett	Lee (NV)	Sablan
Doyle, Michael F.	Levin (CA)	Sánchez
Engel	Levin (MI)	Sarbanes
Escobar	Lewis	Scanlon
Eshoo	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky
Espsaillat	Lipinski	Schiff
Evans	Loebssack	Schneider
Finkenauer	Lofgren	Schrader
Fitzpatrick	Lowenthal	Schrier
Fletcher	Luján	Scott (VA)
Foster	Luria	Scott, David
Frankel	Lynch	Serrano
Fudge	Malinowski	Shalala
Gabbard	Maloney,	Sherman
Gallego	Carolyn B.	Sherrill
Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Sires
García (IL)	Matsui	Slotkin
García (TX)	McAdams	Smith (WA)
Gohmert	McBath	Soto
Golden	McCollum	Spanberger
Gomez	McEachin	Speier
Gonzalez (TX)	McGovern	Stanton
Gottheimer	McNerney	Stevens
Green (TX)	Meeks	Suozzi
Grijalva	Meng	Swalwell (CA)
Haaland	Moore	Takano
Harder (CA)	Morelle	Thompson (CA)
Hastings	Moulton	Thompson (MS)
Hayes	Mucarsel-Powell	Titus
Heck	Murphy	Tlaib
Higgins (NY)	Nadler	Tonko
Hill (CA)	Napolitano	Torres (CA)
Himes	Neal	Torres Small
Horn, Kendra S.	Neguse	(NM)
Horsford	Norcross	Trahan
Houlahan	Norton	Trone
Hoyer	Ocasio-Cortez	Underwood
Huffman	Pallone	Van Drew
Jackson Lee	Panetta	Vargas
Jayapal	Pappas	Veasey
Jeffries	Pascrall	Vela
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Velázquez
Johnson (TX)	Perlmutter	Visclosky
Kaptur	Peters	Wasserman
Katko	Peterson	Schultz
Keating	Phillips	Waters
Kelly (IL)	Pingree	Watson Colema
Kennedy	Plaskett	Welch
Khanna	Pocan	Wexton
Kildee	Porter	Wild
Kilmer	Pressley	Wilson (FL)
Kim	Price (NC)	Yarmuth
NOT VOTING—5		
Clay	Omar	San Nicolas
O'Halleran	Rogers (AL)	
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR		
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote)		
There is 1 minute remaining.		
□ 1804		
Mr. COLLINS of Georgia changed his vote from "no" to "aye."		
So the amendment was rejected.		
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.		
AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON OF OHIO		
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.		
The Clerk will redesignate the		

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 237, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

AYES—195

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

NOES—237

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON
OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a record vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

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

David (KS)	Kirkpatrick	Quigley
Davis (CA)	Krishnamoorthi	Raskin
Davis, Danny K.	Kuster (NH)	Rice (NY)
Dean	Lamb	Richmond
DeFazio	Langevin	Rose (NY)
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Rouda
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Royal-Allard
DelBene	Lawrence	Ruiz
Delgado	Lawson (FL)	Ruppersberger
Demings	Lee (CA)	Rush
DeSaulnier	Lee (NV)	Ryan
Deutch	Levin (CA)	Sablan
Dingell	Levin (MI)	Sánchez
Doggett	Lewis	Sarbanes
Doyle, Michael F.	Lieu, Ted	Scanlon
Engel	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Escobar	Loebssack	Schiff
Eshoo	Lofgren	Schneider
Espalliat	Lowenthal	Schrader
Evans	Lowey	Schriner
Finkenauer	Luján	Scott (VA)
Fitzpatrick	Luria	Scott, David
Fletcher	Lynch	Serrano
Foster	Malinowski	Sewell (AL)
Frankel	Maloney,	Shalala
Fudge	Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean	Sherman
Gabbard	Matsui	Sherrill
Gallego	McAdams	Sires
Garamendi	McBath	Slotkin
Garcia (IL)	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Garcia (TX)	McEachin	Soto
Golden	McGovern	Spanberger
Gomez	McNerney	Speier
Gonzalez (TX)	Meeks	Stanton
Gottheimer	Meng	Stevens
Green (TX)	Moore	Suozzi
Grijalva	Morelle	Swalwell (CA)
Haaland	Moulton	Takano
Harder (CA)	Mucarsel-Powell	Thompson (CA)
Hastings	Murphy	Thompson (MS)
Hayes	Nadler	Titus
Heck	Napolitano	Tlaib
Higgins (NY)	Neal	Tonko
Hill (CA)	Neguse	Torres (CA)
Himes	Norcross	Torres Small (NM)
Horn, Kendra S.	Norton	Trahan
Horsford	O'Halleran	Trone
Houlahan	Ocasio-Cortez	Underwood
Hoyer	Omar	Van Drew
Huffman	Pallone	Vargas
Jackson Lee	Panetta	Veasey
Jayapal	Pappas	Vela
Jeffries	Pascrill	Velázquez
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Visclosky
Johnson (TX)	Perlmutter	Wasserman
Kaptur	Peters	Schultz
Keating	Peterson	Waters
Kelly (IL)	Phillips	Watson Coleman
Kennedy	Pingree	Welch
Khanna	Plaskett	Wexton
Kildee	Pocan	Wild
Kilmer	Porter	Wilson (FL)
Kim	Pressley	Yarmuth
Kind	Price (NC)	

NOT VOTING—5

Clay	Rodgers (WA)	San Nicolas
Cole	Rogers (AL)	

□ 1809

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. BRINDISI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 54 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chairman, 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 184, insert after line 2 the following:
SEC. 1908. LIMITING VARIATIONS ON NUMBER OF HOURS OF OPERATION FOR POLLING PLACES WITHIN A STATE.

(a) LIMITING VARIATIONS.—Subtitle A of title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.), as amended by section 1031(a), section 1101(a), section 1611(a), and section 1621(a), is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 308 and 309 as sections 309 and 310; and

(2) by inserting after section 307 the following new section:

“SEC. 308. LIMITING VARIATIONS ON NUMBER OF HOURS OF OPERATION OF POLLING PLACES WITHIN A STATE.

“(a) LIMITATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (b), each State shall establish hours of operation for all polling places in the State on the date of any election for Federal office held in the State such that the polling place with the greatest number of hours of operation on such date is not in operation for more than 2 hours longer than the polling place with the fewest number of hours of operation on such date.

“(2) PERMITTING VARIANCE ON BASIS OF POPULATION.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to the extent that the State establishes variations in the hours of operation of polling places on the basis of the overall population or the voting age population (as the State may select) of the unit of local government in which such polling places are located.

“(b) EXCEPTIONS FOR POLLING PLACES WITH HOURS ESTABLISHED BY UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—Subsection (a) does not apply in the case of a polling place—

“(1) whose hours of operation are established, in accordance with State law, by the unit of local government in which the polling place is located; or

“(2) which is required pursuant to an order by a court to extend its hours of operation beyond the hours otherwise established.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act, as amended by section 1031(c), section 1101(d), section 1611(c), and section 1621(c), is amended—

(1) by redesignating the items relating to sections 308 and 309 as relating to sections 309 and 310; and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 307 the following new item:

“Sec. 308. Limiting variations on number of hours of operation of polling places with a State.”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank the gentleman from Maryland for his work on this important topic, and I also want to thank him for his willingness to work with Members of this body to address our concerns regarding the finance of this bill.

Thanks to the changes that I supported and pushed for, we have ensured that no taxpayer dollars will go towards financing political campaigns. It is a testament to what we can accomplish when we work together and compromise.

This bill has many important provisions which will make it easier for working families to have their voices heard. My amendment would extend these wins to the people of upstate New York who have been treated unfairly for years by arbitrary restrictions on polling hours.

In New York State, voters in New York City and neighboring downstate counties have 6 more hours to vote in Federal primary elections compared to voters in my district. A voter in New York City can vote on their way to

work when the polls open at 6 a.m. A voter in Binghamton, on the other hand, can't vote in that very same election until their polls open at noon.

My amendment would fix this situation and institute some basic rules to prevent States from reducing polling hours for people based solely on where they live. This is an important step to ensure that all voters across the State are treated fairly.

I urge adoption of my amendment, and I again thank the gentleman from Maryland for his leadership on this bill, and I urge our colleagues to pass the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, as we look at H.R. 1, at least the limited amount of time that we have had to actually consider H.R. 1 as it has been rushed through the committee process and it has been rushed to the House floor—it grew from 571 pages when we had the opportunity to briefly review it on one day for 5 hours when it was before the House Administration Committee. It has significantly grown since then before it even came to the floor.

But as those who do take a look at it realize, yes, there may be some good ideas in H.R. 1. And what is interesting, those good ideas that are in H.R. 1 are things that are already in States. They are ideas that States have implemented.

This amendment, when you look at it, it sounds like a good idea. Well, let's put all of the polling places on the same timeframe.

I submit to my good colleague from New York, if there is an issue in New York, then the gentleman ought to lobby his State legislature to make that change because the Constitution gives that power to the State legislatures.

Mr. Chairman, as I was coming to Washington again this week, I left my home early on Tuesday morning, and I went to the State capitol in Georgia where I had the opportunity to address both the statehouse and the State legislature, which I served in both of those bodies.

What was amazing, as I talked about this bill, there was bipartisan opposition to this bill. Why? Because this bill strips away the authority of States to actually set their own laws regarding elections.

Some may think it is a good idea to centralize that power here in Washington, D.C., but the problem is the landscape of America is diverse. The geography of America is diverse, and the States are more well-suited to actually meet the constituencies' needs of that State.

Some would say that the Federal Government is more powerful; we can actually enforce this across the board.

Well, the one-size-fits-all doesn't work, and besides that, we don't do very much very efficiently.

As I was looking at the State legislature, there is one thing that I know: Their session in Georgia is going to end in a few days, and by the end of that session, they will have passed a budget and appropriations to fund the State of Georgia for the next year, and it will balance.

Mr. Chairman, do you know the last time that we did that by our deadline? Newt Gingrich was Speaker of the House. We can't even pass our own appropriations here. We are not even following our own laws, but we want to take on more laws and force the States to follow what we think is a good idea?

Early voting, we established that in Georgia years ago, and it has worked well, and we have worked to perfect that.

Mr. Chairman, while this amendment may sound good and it may be well-needed in New York, I would submit to my colleague that this is something that the New York Legislature should take up. This is not something that should be under the purview of Congress.

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

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chairman, I again urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, again, I love this country. I love what this country has stood for. I love the idea of our Founding Fathers, who made this Nation the greatest Nation in the history of the entire world. It is unique because our Founders understood that a government that is closest to the people is the most effective and the most efficient. This bill will undo 220-plus years of States setting their own voting requirements, running their own voter laws.

As I have stated, there is little that we do efficiently here, and we have already uncovered that there are a lot of unintended consequences in this bill. If the States make mistakes, they are much faster, much quicker, and more responsive to correct those mistakes than we would be here.

I encourage my colleagues to vote against this amendment and vote against the underlying measure.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRINDISI).

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

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. 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 New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. CASE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 56 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, 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 453, line 16, strike "(5)" and insert "(6)".

Page 453, line 19, strike "(5)" and insert "(6)".

Page 493, insert after line 8 the following new subtitle (and redesignate the succeeding subtitle accordingly):

Subtitle E—Empowering Small Dollar Donations

SEC. 5401. PERMITTING POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES TO PROVIDE ENHANCED SUPPORT FOR CANDIDATES THROUGH USE OF SEPARATE SMALL DOLLAR ACCOUNTS.

(a) INCREASE IN LIMIT ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES.—Section 315(a)(2)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30116(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “exceed \$5,000” and inserting “exceed \$5,000 or, in the case of a contribution made by a national committee of a political party from an account described in paragraph (11), exceed \$10,000”.

(b) ELIMINATION OF LIMIT ON COORDINATED EXPENDITURES.—Section 315(d)(5) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30116(d)(5)) is amended by striking “subsection (a)(9)” and inserting “subsection (a)(9) or subsection (a)(11)”.

(c) ACCOUNTS DESCRIBED.—Section 315(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30116(a)), as amended by section 512(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(11) An account described in this paragraph is a separate, segregated account of a national committee of a political party (including a national congressional campaign committee of a political party) consisting exclusively of contributions made during a calendar year by individuals whose aggregate contributions to the committee during the year do not exceed \$200.”.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in favor of my proposed amendment.

This amendment will empower small dollar donors to participate in our elections process and focus the attention of candidates and political parties on earning financial support from a broader base of voters.

All across our political spectrum, we decry the historically low esteem in which Congress is now held, as well as the utter absence of many, if not most, of our fellow citizens from their government, as if the two were unrelated. For, of course, low esteem breeds absence, and absence breeds low esteem. Most Americans simply feel left out, without a voice, unvested, unwanted, and, thus, the downward cycle.

Nor is this just about low esteem and absence. For the vast majority of Americans are not vested in our government, and if our government is only supported and is only representative of

the very few, mostly moneyed and influential, interests of our country, then that does not lead to representative decisions and erodes the consent of the governed, the political and social consensus on which our democracy is based.

As just one manifestation of this dangerous and worsening syndrome, the Center for Responsive Politics reviewed 2018 election-cycle contributions and found that, still again: “Only a tiny fraction of Americans actually give campaign contributions to political candidates, parties, or PACs. The ones who give contributions large enough to be itemized, over \$200, is even smaller. The impact of these donations, however, is huge.”

In fact, according to the center, while less than a half percent of the population contributed \$200 or more, their contributions totaled 71 percent of all individual contributions in 2018 to candidates, PACs, parties, and outside groups.

The clear corollary is that the vast majority of Americans do not participate in our elections with their financial support and that, of those who do contribute, their voices are drowned out in a sea of larger contributions from a precariously narrow interest base.

This is why leading reform groups such as Issue One and its ReFormers Caucus, a fully bipartisan group of now over 200 former Members of Congress, Governors, and Cabinet members committed to nonpartisan solutions to fixing our broken system, cites increased and broadened voter participation in the election process through means such as amplifying the voices of small donors as key to returning our government to the people.

My amendment would take one small but meaningful step in that direction by authorizing national political party committees of any party to contribute up to \$10,000 to a candidate, twice the amount currently authorized, if the amount consists solely of individual contributions of less than \$200, and by making corresponding changes in the limit on coordinated expenses.

By permitting such committees to provide enhanced support to their candidates through use of separate, small dollar amounts, this change would incentivize greater attention by committees of all parties to small dollar donors, greater participation by such donors in the political process, and representation of a broader and more representative America by those elected.

I urge support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER), my good friend, one of our newest Members, and a great guy.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1.

The people have a right to know what this bill truly is: a Big Government, central command takeover of our elections by the new House majority. This bill should be called the Democratic Politician Protection Act.

This legislation is virtually a complete takeover by the Federal Government of State and local voting jurisdictions. It imposes new mandates, including more than 2 weeks of mandatory early voting and same-day registration, and diminishes the process of election day voting by expanding absentee voting and allowing both current and newly registered voters to cast their ballot by mail, with no additional safeguards to that process.

The bill also allows felons to vote, violating our Constitution by usurping the 14th Amendment ability of States to determine whether felons may vote or not.

An example of its impracticality can be seen in Lenhartsville Borough, Berks County, in my district, a small borough with a polling place that averages 60 voters each election. This bill would mandate that Lenhartsville open and operate a polling place for 15 days of early voting. That is absurd.

Astonishingly, this bill also includes a 6-to-1 match of public funds to the campaign of a candidate that individual taxpayers may not even support on contributions up to \$200. That is a possible \$1,200 match of public funds going to fund political campaigns for each contribution.

□ 1830

This legislation is not for the people. It is for partisan power. H.R. 1 isn't just terrible policy, it is an attempt to rewrite the rules of the political process itself and change the rules to favor one side.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose it, and I hope they will stand with me in defending the Constitution and the sanctity of our elections. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the comments of my colleague, but I did not detect in his comments any objection to the amendment, and I hope that that means that he would agree that a much broader and more representative group of Americans should, in fact, be incentivized to participate in the political process.

I hope he would agree that one of the basic problems we have in this country today is the disincentivization and the disenfranchizement of too many people who just simply don't feel a heart and zone of participation. I hope he would agree that this amendment, at least, is one way to accomplish that.

Speaking also to the broader purpose, he made reference to the fact that this was a partisan bill, and I would refer him to Issue One, which I referenced in my comments, and to the ReFormers

Caucus, which is about 100 each, Republicans and Democrats, Members that he would recognize, leaders of both parties, now retired, who have looked back on their service in this Congress and have concluded that many of the provisions in this bill are the right way to go, not just this amendment, but many, many of those provisions, and I hope he would reference those leaders of the party for guidance going forward with respect to the intent of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for participating in the process, and I would like to ask the gentleman a question about the amendment.

I know you have been here before. We haven't had the chance to really meet, but congratulations. I look forward to working with you.

Is this just raising the limit that political parties can give from \$5,000 to \$10,000?

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CASE. No, that is not correct. It provides that if contributions are received from donors of \$200 or less, those may effectively be pooled into a segregated account by either political party and then contributed to candidates in an amount over and above the amount allowed for contributions of over \$200. So, therefore, you will see that that would incentivize both parties to start to think a little more seriously about getting contributions from donors at less than \$200.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the clarification. I appreciate that.

I am still opposed to the amendment because, unfortunately, these incentivization programs that are code word incentivized are part of H.R. 1, and instead I think they are going to be gamed by many of the same people who are gaming the system right now.

Many of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle said they want to get money out of politics, and we are talking about putting more in. The amendment here is just a small part of a big problem of what this bill is about.

Mr. MEUSER talked about how bad this bill is going to be about getting money back into politics. If the goal is to take money out of politics, then H.R. 1 clearly is not the answer. This amendment, while great intentions to my colleague from Hawaii trying to do what we can, I would love to sit down with the gentleman in a bipartisan way to talk about how we can make campaign finance reforms work.

But the clear fact is we have been shown zero consideration as Republicans over here to try and work out solutions in this bill. We weren't asked to even be considered to help write provisions in this bill. No one was even

called, none of us, no one on our side. As a matter of fact, I guess we didn't know the special interest groups who helped write this bill and who were touted in the press conference when this bill was announced.

We got zero Republican amendments passed during our markup in only one committee, which left 40 percent of the bill out from being marked up. That is not the regular order that the Democrats promised when you took the majority. That is what we get.

Today, the olive branch has been extended numerous times. I have accepted Democrat amendments, and do you know what? Not a single Republican amendment has passed, even one during the last round of votes that all it did was give a sense of Congress that we like free speech.

Seriously? You have got to be kidding me. You couldn't even accept that amendment? How partisan can this new Democrat majority be?

This is why this bill is terrible. It is the biggest terrible bill I have ever seen in my time here in Congress.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, first of all, to my colleague, I accept the gentleman's offer to work in a bipartisan way to fix some of these major problems. I look forward to it, number one.

Number two, the gentleman referenced that special interest groups had drafted this amendment. If there is a special interest group, it is the ReFormers Caucus, on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Real quick, I was not referring to the amendment. It was the bill itself.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MS. HOULAHAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 57 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 136, line 1, strike "4 hours" and insert "10 hours".

Page 136, line 3, strike "4 hours" and insert "10 hours".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I was sent to Congress by the Sixth District of Pennsylvania

to fix the broken culture in Washington. H.R. 1 will help to reduce the role of money in politics and address the culture of corruption in Congress. I rise today to support my amendment, No. 57.

This bill also takes key steps to expand voting access to eligible voters. Currently, my constituents in Pennsylvania have no access to early voting and have severe absentee restrictions on voting by mail. This bill will introduce early voting and vote by mail to all 50 States, which will greatly help working families who may have trouble voting around their working schedules on election day.

I am introducing an amendment to further expand this early voting provision to mandate at least 10 hours of early voting each day for the final 15 days before election.

Expanding access to early voting, especially in Pennsylvania, is a key component to bringing the government back to the people by helping people with inflexible hours or people who work shift work to exercise their right to vote. This ensures that their voice is heard and that they are represented in our government.

This week, with H.R. 1, we are taking a big step to returning us to government of, by, and for the people.

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

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is great to have you in the chair again tonight.

I rise to oppose this amendment; although, again, I want to compliment my new colleague, Ms. HOULAHAN, for coming down here and being a participant in the legislative process. It has been great to get to know the gentlewoman and work with her, and I look forward to working together on a bipartisan basis as we move forward during this term.

I have got to oppose this amendment because I have opposed others that are just like it.

We want every American to be able to cast their vote, to be registered to vote, and to be able to have their vote counted and their vote protected. My issue is with a top-down approach from the Federal Government versus the State and local governments. This amendment, though well-intentioned, just, again, infringes on our State and local officials' ability to determine how best to run their elections.

Additionally, this mandate increases the cost of all election offices, as it is tasked to recruit, train, and deploy additional poll workers, where we already know we have a shortage.

I would love to work with my colleague, Ms. HOULAHAN, moving forward to address many issues involving elec-

tion reform. Unfortunately, I just don't think H.R. 1 is the answer, and I don't think it is going to be passed into law, so there are going to be opportunities for us to work together. Again, my bipartisan olive branch is reaching out, once again, to the gentlewoman's side, and I certainly hope we can do so.

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

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the bipartisan spirit and the olive branch that the gentleman has reached out to me.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SAR-BANES).

Mr. SAR-BANES. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding her time, and I want to commend her on this amendment.

I want to respond to this idea of this kind of top-down federalization of our voting. That is not what is happening here. The States are going to continue to have the authority to put together how elections operate. What we are doing is we are collecting best practices and then making a policy decision at the Federal level that those best practices ought to extend across the country.

If you think about it, Mr. Chairman, that is our role as Federal legislators. Our purpose here is to gather up wisdom from all parts of the country, figure out what things work and what things don't work, and if it rises to a level of being a good policy suggestion, then putting that into legislation. That is what we are doing, and that is what this particular change would do, and it would make it much easier for people to access the ballot box.

So, again, I want to thank Congresswoman HOULAHAN for this amendment, and I support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from the author of this bill. He and I have had some spirited discussions over the last day and a half, but I appreciate his willingness to want to address issues. I just don't think this bill is the answer.

To respond to the author of the bill, there is a big difference between offering best practices to our State and local officials about how best to run their elections, there is a big difference between best practices and suggestions versus mandates, and that is clearly what H.R. 1 is. It is going to be a mandate.

It is so nebulous. We get answers one day that change the next. There is zero bipartisanship. We haven't been included. All of a sudden, we get a new shell game: Move over; we are going to fund it by doing this and put corporate money now into congressional campaigns, which is illegal now, but I guess it is a solution for getting money out of politics to the majority.

I don't understand this. This has got to be one of the most discombobulated

processes that I have ever been a part of. I can't help myself to think there is no way that every Democrat who co-sponsored this bill on day one thinking they were going to talk about election reform had any idea of so many of the terrible, terrible provisions for taxpayers that are in this bill.

Again, Mr. Chairman, if you vote for this bill, you are putting corporate cash into congressional campaigns. There is no way the billions upon billions of promises that are made to congressional candidates and incumbents are going to be able to be fulfilled with this new, nebulous corporate malfeasance fund that we haven't even had scored by the CBO.

Billions of dollars of taxpayer money are going to fund a revamp of how public money goes into congressional campaigns. This is the worst of the worst of the worst of what the D.C. swamp is all about.

I am going to lightly oppose this amendment because I really respect Ms. HOULAHAN and her efforts. I just have a big problem with the bill, as I think you can tell.

Mr. Chairman, I will give Ms. HOULAHAN, likely, the last word. I reserve my right to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, again, I urge the adoption of my amendment and also the adoption of H.R. 1 so that we can once again restore the faith of the people and focus on the working Americans of today.

Mr. Chairman, if you do a shift or even if you have a 9 to 5 job, it is very, very hard to get to the polls, particularly in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I think every American who is eligible to vote deserves to have the right to vote, to have their vote counted, and to have their vote be protected.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1845

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. PHILLIPS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 58 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 514, insert after line 17 the following new section (and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly):

SECTION 6008. CLARIFYING AUTHORITY OF FEC ATTORNEYS TO REPRESENT FEC IN SUPREME COURT.

(a) CLARIFYING AUTHORITY.—Section 306(f)(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30106(f)(4)) is amended

by striking “any action instituted under this Act, either (A) by attorneys” and inserting “any action instituted under this Act, including an action before the Supreme Court of the United States, either (A) by the General Counsel of the Commission and other attorneys”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to actions instituted before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer my amendment that would allow the Federal Election Commission to represent itself in actions before the United States Supreme Court so that it may fulfill its role as the people’s top election watchdog.

Under current law, the FEC is almost always represented by the solicitor general when it has business before the U.S. Supreme Court, effectively removing the FEC attorneys from the process and centralizing litigation within the Department of Justice.

It is a revelation that troubles me and many and should worry us all.

Unfortunately, we have seen the President use the Department of Justice and its appointees not to promote truth and accountability, but as a political tool with which to suppress those who challenge his unilateral approach to campaigning and governing.

The identity, priorities, skills, and role of lawyers representing the government play a significant role in determining the nature and outcome of litigation.

These cases are often charged with partisan politics, and the American people need an advocate who operates with a degree of separation from a particular party or administration and can faithfully execute the unique mandate bestowed upon the FEC.

As the people’s last line of election oversight, the FEC must have the power to act independently in its business before the courts so that it may hold this administration, and all administrations to come, accountable to the people, the law, and the Constitution.

My amendment would ensure that it can.

At a time when campaign finance law has become increasingly complex and dangers of direct conflicts of interest have become more prevalent, my amendment will strengthen the FEC’s enforcement powers and help the court navigate the increasingly blurry boundaries of what is and what is not legal during Federal elections by having a subject matter expert empowered to present arguments.

Mr. Chair, I respectfully urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, once again, I claim time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, the language of the amendment is pretty innocuous. The problem I have is the portion of the bill that it is amending, the sheer fact that, in this now almost 700-page, mammoth bill that anyone thinks it is a good idea to weaponize the FEC by making it partisan. It is the furthest thing from where we should be as an institution.

This amendment is going to do nothing to address this partisan FEC that the bill establishes.

The biggest threat to our elections is actually partisanship, and a partisan FEC will undermine the neutrality that voters expect of an agency that oversees Federal elections, especially when the billions upon billions upon billions of new dollars come in from the programs that are created in this bill.

A partisan FEC is going to give enhanced powers to the chairman to make decisions on behalf of the commission that have been reserved for years for the full commission.

I fully expect a lower standard of protection of free speech to be embraced by a partisan FEC.

As a former chairman of our own Franking Commission here in the House of Representatives, I think bipartisan agencies can work together, bipartisan commissions can work together.

Heck, we are not even allowed to send a bulk mail piece out of this institution without Republicans and Democrats signing off on it. If we can’t send bulk mail out without it being bipartisan, why in the world would we want to make the FEC partisan?

Do the Democrats really want the Trump administration to have a partisan FEC? I don’t want any party to have a partisan FEC. I want it to remain an institution where it takes bipartisanship to get results.

I would urge my good friend, Mr. PHILLIPS, if he hasn’t, to sit down with some of the FEC commissioners and talk to them about their opinion of why the FEC is bipartisan, and I would urge the gentleman to work with them.

This bill is not going to pass. The amendment, likely, will get ruled by the chairman to be a part of this bill. The bill is not going to become law. It is going to go die in the Senate. But I would urge the gentleman to work with the FEC, talk with them on the reason why, why it is bipartisan.

We don’t want our Ethics Committee here in the House to have a partisan edge. We don’t want our Franking Commission to have a partisan edge.

Why in the world do we want the FEC to have a partisan edge?

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Illinois.

However, to say that this weaponizes the FEC I do take exception to because, indeed, it is just the opposite.

It empowers the FEC to actually do its job, which is to look out for voters. That is quite simple and quite apparent to me.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, it is a good amendment because it allows the FEC to be represented in an effective way.

As to the underlying bill, I can’t think of another agency of the Federal Government, commission, where you have an even number. Most have an uneven number so you don’t have deadlocks.

We are deadlocked at the FEC. They are dead in the water.

Is it because of bipartisanship? Right now there are two Republican commissioners, one Democratic commissioner, one independent commissioner, and two vacancies. They can’t make a decision.

There are backlogged cases that go on for years. This is really a disservice to America to not be able to play that cop on the beat, because it is a completely dysfunctional agency.

We need to change that. And that is what the underlying bill does. It allows a nonpartisan career staff to make initial fundings. It provides that there can be no more than two commissioners in the same party, so we are not going to have a partisan takeover. And then it allows the commission to overrule the nonpartisan staff, if necessary.

We need reform at the FEC. This amendment is part of it, and I credit the gentleman for offering it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Representative SARBANES for his tireless work in bringing this important legislation to the floor and Chairman McGOVERN for making my amendment in order.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, again, I have a problem with the underlying bill and the FEC issue.

It is not that hard to be bipartisan when we send bulk mail in the House. It may take a little longer. It may be a little more difficult. But, you know what, bipartisanship works. There is a reason for it here.

Frankly, if the FEC isn’t working, if the FEC is such an agency that has zero credibility in the mind of the majority right now, then why in the world are we spending time marking up a 700-page, mammoth bill in the House Administration Committee when we ought to just reauthorize the FEC?

I certainly hope that our committee can work toward making that happen. And that is something that has not been done that we should be able to get bipartisanship on. I look forward to working with Chairperson LOFGREN when that day comes over the next 2 years.

Mr. Chair, I am going to oppose the amendment because of the underlying language regarding the FEC.

I commend Mr. PHILLIPS for being here to legislate. I welcome the gentleman to Congress, and I look forward to working with him and appreciate his opportunity to be a part of the process. I thank the gentleman for letting me be a part of it with him.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 61 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 220, insert after line 16 the following:

(E) The individual or (in the case of the covered periods described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3)) an immediate family member of the individual paid a civil money penalty or criminal fine, or was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, for violating any provision of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

This historic package of democracy and anticorruption reforms will put power back in the hands of the people and restore the American people's faith that government works for the public interest, not the special interests.

I am pleased that my bill, the Transparency in Corporate Political Spending Act, is included in H.R. 1. I am also proud today to present an amendment to prohibit violators of our Federal election campaign laws from serving on critically important redistricting commissions in the States.

Our democracy has been under attack from foreign interference, gerrymandering, hidden corporate money, and voter suppression. Today, the time has come to reform our system and restore faith in our political process.

I believe we have a duty to transform our democracy from a spectator sport into a true dialogue in which we all participate to debate the issues, defend our interests, and demand our rights.

By passing H.R. 1, we will move one step closer to that transformation by breaking the grip of special interests and ensuring that the American people come first in our democracy.

Among its many important provisions, this historic democracy reform package includes my Transparency in Corporate Political Spending Act, which will eliminate the policy rider that lets corporations keep their unlimited political spending secret.

In addition, I look forward to this Chamber's consideration of my amendment to H.R. 1. This amendment would protect our democracy by prohibiting campaign finance law violators and their immediate family members from serving on redistricting commissions.

Congress needs to ensure that we set out commonsense minimum criteria for people who will serve on redistricting commissions in States across the country. My amendment will ensure that redistricting commissions nationwide are free of individuals and immediate relatives of individuals who have knowingly and willfully committed a violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act.

In November 2018, the people of Michigan overwhelmingly passed Voters Not Politicians, a ballot initiative that sets up a nonpartisan redistricting commission to create State legislative and congressional districts after the 2020 census. About seven or eight States have already done this, and more are considering it.

If we are going to transform our democracy, we need to do it right. I could not be more proud to vote to end the dominance of big money in our political system, to guarantee free and fair elections that are open to all, and to ensure public officials work for the public interest.

I would like to thank Congressman SARBANES and the members of the Democracy Reform Task Force for their unrelenting efforts to reclaim our democracy as one for and by the people.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the For the People Act and to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am going to rise in opposition to this amendment, although I am not opposed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am not opposed to this amendment.

I just want to take the time to welcome our new colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), and I would like the gentleman to give my utmost thanks to his dad, who we stood on this floor, with these same microphones, and I was able to work in a bipartisan way with him to pass the EACH Act that allowed for a religious exemption from the individual mandates of ObamaCare, of the Affordable Care Act.

That is now law, and that is a sign of bipartisanship that I hope to be able to continue while we work together.

Give him my best. The Christian Scientists that are in my district at Principia College, one of the largest Christian Science institutions in the Nation, are very thankful that they are not now being penalized by the Tax Code for a religious exemption from seeking medical care from doctors and medical professionals.

So my thanks to the gentleman's father, and I thank the gentleman for being here.

Mr. Chair, I am not going to oppose this amendment. I will reserve just in case somebody wants to come up and talk about something else and I can rebut them, but I am ready to close if the gentleman is.

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I deeply appreciate the gentleman from Illinois' kind remarks. I will absolutely give my dad his regards. I will call him tonight and tell him, seriously, that the gentleman said that.

I really appreciate the incredible honor and opportunity to be here working with the gentleman to do the people's business.

I really hope we will get a chance to work together on any number of bills to perfect and expand our democracy.

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

□ 1900

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am going to be bipartisan once again. I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MRS. TRAHAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 62 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 220, insert after line 16 the following:

(E) The individual or (in the case of the covered periods described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3)) an immediate family member of the individual is an agent of a foreign principal under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend my friend, the Congressman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for offering one of the most significant reforms to our election system in a generation. I am particularly pleased that H.R. 1 puts redistricting in the hands of independent commissions, where it belongs.

Under the bill, each State will create 15-person independent redistricting commissions that represent the public's interests first and foremost, without consideration of political party advantage.

However, to prevent the real or perceived risk of bias, H.R. 1 excludes several categories of people from serving

on these commissions, including political candidates or officeholders, campaign officials, big donors, and lobbyists.

My amendment would simply add to this list those individuals who are registered agents under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, FARA.

FARA has been in law since the 1930s. It requires disclosure when an individual is acting as a political representative of foreign governments.

As with H.R. 1's current exclusions, adding foreign agents will help ensure that those serving on the independent redistricting commissions are not at risk of actual or perceived conflicts of interest.

Coming from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which gave our Nation the term "gerrymander," I am pleased that H.R. 1 will put an end to this device by allowing voters to choose their representatives rather than the other way around.

My amendment aims to close a loophole by ensuring that registered foreign agents, like lobbyists and big donors, may not serve on redistricting commissions.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts. It is great to see her, and I thank her for putting this amendment forward.

I have a problem with the underlying provisions of the bill. I actually support redistricting reforms.

I am from Illinois. I am a Republican. We are not going to have a single say in how the Democrats in the super-majority Illinois House and the super-majority Illinois Senate, and our newly elected Democratic Governor, we are not going to have a say in how these maps are drawn.

I certainly hope we can get an independent redistricting commission because, since this bill is not going to pass the Senate, it is not going to become law. I certainly hope that we could come together and work on some independent redistricting issues.

Mr. Chair, I will, again, not oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for simply an excellent amendment. This strengthens the provisions in the underlying bill to make sure that agents of foreign principals would have no role in these commissions.

I think it is important that we understand that the citizens who serve on

these commissions have no agenda, not for one party or the other, and certainly not for some foreign country.

It is really a very good amendment. I am so glad that she offered it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am highly concerned with the redistricting provisions in this bill now. It seems that now, as part of the bill, that one State is going to be exempted out.

At what point, then, do we not question why everyone doesn't have the same ability to opt out of provisions of this bill, just like the State of Iowa has done in an amendment that was accepted.

The sheer fact that if Iowa's independent redistricting commission is better and, thus, we shouldn't have to apply the same standards as the other 49 States in this great Nation, then why don't we use Iowa's independent redistricting commission standards for everyone? Why don't we make the whole bill about Iowa?

I mean, I have been talking about federalism and States having to follow top-down Federal mandates, in most cases, that are going to be unfunded or nebulously funded because we really don't know how they are going to get those funds to our States and localities. But the sheer fact that we are debating a bill that has a provision about independent redistricting that could have been very, very bipartisan, now we have exempted one State out, it basically tells all of us that is a better commission.

I hope that when we come back, after this bill passes the House, unfortunately for many of my colleagues who are going to vote for it on the other side of the aisle, I hope we can come together and have the debate on whether Iowa's commission is better than what was proposed in this bill.

You cannot have a 700-page bill that talks about how gloriously good for the people it is, for all of the provisions that are this top-down approach, and then, all of a sudden, you exempt one State out of what could have been one of the most bipartisan provisions, and that is independent redistricting.

If you are serious about governing, the majority ought to offer an amendment, ought to offer a change, to make Iowa's independent commission the language of this bill. Make it work in States, even where they have independent commissions.

I would sure like it to work in Illinois. Maybe California would want to use Iowa's commission because clearly it is better than what you have in the bill, or we wouldn't have had to take an amendment on it.

Well, I think I got my point across.

I say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN), your amendment is a good amendment. I apologize I had to use this time to address an issue that is very frustrating, but the gentlewoman is talking about redistricting.

I appreciate what she has done. I welcome her to the floor of the House, and I look forward to working with her.

Again, my offer to the gentlewoman is the same as others. When this bill fails in the Senate, let's come together on some provisions. I will continue to throw the bipartisan olive branch out toward that side of the aisle, and I look forward to working with the gentlewoman. Congratulations. I won't oppose the amendment.

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

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I also look forward to working in a bipartisan way to restore our government to the people.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment. I urge a "yes" on H.R. 1. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MRS. TRAHAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 63 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In subtitle J of title I, insert after section 1704 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provision accordingly):

SEC. 1705. EXTENDING GUARANTEE OF RESIDENCY FOR VOTING PURPOSES TO FAMILY MEMBERS OF ABSENT MILITARY PERSONNEL.

Section 102 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20302) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(j) GUARANTEE OF RESIDENCY FOR SPOUSES AND DEPENDENTS OF ABSENT MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICE.—For the purposes of voting for in any election for any Federal office or any State or local office, a spouse or dependent of an individual who is an absent uniformed services voter described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 107(1) shall not, solely by reason of that individual's absence and without regard to whether or not such spouse or dependent is accompanying that individual—

"(1) be deemed to have lost a residence or domicile in that State, without regard to whether or not that individual intends to return to that State;

"(2) be deemed to have acquired a residence or domicile in any other State; or

"(3) be deemed to have become a resident in or a resident of any other State."

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, under current law, our brave men and women serving our country in uniform are able to maintain their residency status for the purposes of voting during deployment. Current law also protects voting residency status if a spouse of a servicemember is absent from their State in order to accompany the servicemember on a deployment.

However, current law does not protect the residency status of a spouse if he or she is absent but without accompanying the deployed servicemember.

My amendment fixes this loophole. It will ensure that these spouses may maintain their voting residency status, regardless of whether they accompany their spouse. Moreover, my amendment would extend the same protection to voting-age dependents.

The absence of a servicemember who is deployed can be an enormous hardship on a family. It means a caregiver is no longer at home to share in parenting duties. In these cases, it is natural to rely upon friends and family, even those in another State, for support. However, these families should not lose the right to vote in their home district if they are absent while their spouse is deployed. Furthermore, my amendment extends those same protections to voting-age children.

This is an amendment about ensuring those who sacrifice the most for the defense of our Nation are treated fairly and that they have a voice and a vote in our elections.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is a great amendment. I commend Mrs. TRAHAN because it is vitally important that we protect the families of our Nation's military. It is very important we remember those who sacrifice everything to serve us, and we should ensure that they are able to weigh in to whomever represents them in government.

I am going to vote "yes" on this amendment, again, an olive branch to the other side of the aisle.

I appreciate the gentlewoman's willingness to legislate. It is great to work with her, and I will be supporting this amendment.

Since I see the chair up, in case she says something I have to rebut, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say what a smart amendment this is, and I am so grateful that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has taken the time to put this together.

We all care about our men and women in the armed services, to make sure they are treated fairly. But over the years we have been here, none of us came up with this amendment before this evening.

I really thank the gentlewoman. Great kudos to her. We are lucky that she is a Member of our House of Representatives.

Like the ranking member, I will be happy to vote "aye" on this amend-

ment. I think it is very important, and I am grateful to the gentlewoman for offering it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let the RECORD show that I liked the amendment first. I liked it before the chairperson.

Listen, it is a great amendment, and I look forward to voting for it.

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

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Illinois once again. I thank the gentlewoman from California. She made this easy on me, and I appreciate that.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1915

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. KIM

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 64 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In subtitle F of title I of the bill—

(1) redesignate section 1505 as section 1506; and

(2) insert after section 1504 the following new section:

SEC. 1505. PAPER BALLOT PRINTING REQUIREMENTS.

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) PRINTING REQUIREMENTS FOR BALLOTS.—All paper ballots used in an election for Federal office shall be printed in the United States on paper manufactured in the United States."

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer my amendment to H.R. 1.

Mr. Chair, our democracy isn't working for the majority of Americans. This is a simple message I hear from the people in my district every single day: there are too many barriers to participate in our democracy; there is too much dark money influencing our politics; there are too many loopholes for bad actors to skirt our ethics laws and use the revolving door of politics to enrich themselves instead of empowering the American people.

H.R. 1 isn't just a step in the right direction, it is a massive shift that takes power and puts it back in the hands of our constituents. It is legislation that reminds us that our government must be for the people, but just as importantly, our democracy must be by the people.

That is why I rise today to offer this amendment to H.R. 1, which will require Federal election ballots to be made in America.

In short, this is a win-win for the American people. It will help protect and create American jobs by ensuring that manufacturing stays right here in America. It will help protect the integrity of our Federal elections, which are increasingly under attack by foreign powers.

We have an opportunity today to not only help clean up our government, but create jobs and secure our elections.

I hope that my colleagues from both sides of the aisle will come together to make the democracy we swore to protect truly of, by, and for the people.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense made-in-America amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I don't know if I have had a chance to formally meet Mr. KIM. I welcome him and thank him for being here to participate in the process.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I would like to have some details on what percentage of ballots that are used in the United States right now are not printed in the U.S.

The issue I have is not with United-States-made printing materials, it is with the sheer fact that we are having a top-down approach once again.

I mean, there is always going to be extenuating circumstances. Some of our territories may raise the cost of importing paper to be able to now live up to the paper ballot marking whatever requirements that are in this 700-page bill.

We can work together on these provisions, but we also might want to work together as this bill fails in the Senate.

Mr. Chair, if this is something Mr. KIM wants to work on together, I am willing to work on it with him, but let's have some room in there for some exceptions.

I mean, let's say it is almost election day, you have got wildfires roaring all over California and there is a paper shortage in the country. We can't stop the election, so maybe we need some exceptions. We can't stop the election, maybe we need an exception.

So let's work together, let's do something like that so that nobody loses a chance to be able to cast their vote on election day, to have their vote counted, and even just as importantly, to have their vote protected.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his amendment. I have got to oppose this, because there are no exceptions in here, but I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to work together after this is done.

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

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chair, I just want to start by saying that I am very much looking forward to being able to continue to work with the gentleman from Illinois throughout my time here. I appreciate his welcome to me here on the House floor.

Mr. Chair, for me, as we go about this, it is essential that we understand that our ballots are the most fundamental form of our democracy that citizens here are engaged in, that we understand them as a tangible manifestation of that participation that each and every voter plays.

So this is a manifestation of our value, our collective value that with this most important symbol of our democracy, this tangible form that our voters take, that this should be something of, by, and for the American people.

That is something that I think would be an important signal from the United States Congress across this country that we recognize the importance of that and we want to hold and commit to making sure that this tangible piece of our democracy is something that is made in America.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Look, I am all for increasing American manufacturing, I am all for building new paper plants, but I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to remember they are probably going to burn more fossil fuels. You know, if we are going to have to cut down more trees, maybe we will get some bipartisanship when it comes to deforestation, which could help cut down on forest fires that may cause the problems that would need the exceptions that we talked about earlier.

So I certainly hope this fits into the New Green Deal provisions that are going to be voted on in the Senate.

There is a lot of talk about paper in this bill. And in this bill, actually the paper keeps growing. It is upwards of 700 pages now.

Mr. Chair, I just got a very important piece of paper with the new CBO score, so I assume we are going to be talking about that soon.

Ms. LOFGREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I would remind the gentleman of the recycled ballot amendment that had passed earlier today relative to the issue of cutting down trees.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am all for more paper production. Those paper plants that exist in my district, you know, they use recycled materials, too. I am more than happy to have more trees be deforested out of areas that are caught up in wildfires on an annual basis.

If we could have the paper that is going to work, if the other side is okay

with burning more fossil fuels to make this happen, hey, maybe we won't need those exceptions I talked about, maybe we will have enough American manufacturing and paper jobs. Some of the best paying jobs in my district are at the paper mills.

Mr. Chair, I am certainly looking forward to working with the gentleman when this bill fails. Especially after seeing some of the preliminary numbers out of this new CBO score. I don't know how many cosponsors of this bill are going to actually be able to cast a vote for it, but I will reserve judgment until I see the board tomorrow.

Mr. Chair, I am ready to close, but since I have the right to close, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the perspective on the other end, and I understand our common value that, of course, we would want to see things made in America, and I want to make sure that I constantly, as I will every time on this House floor, seek bipartisanship as we move forward.

I reiterate that this is a common-sense amendment that is simply good policy. My amendment would give a leg up to domestic supply chains and ensure that taxpayer dollars are used to support local middle-class jobs and boost our economy.

Amendments like mine also ensure that when Federal agencies buy products to carry out their responsibilities, that they put American manufacturers first.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KIM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MS. SPANBERGER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 291, insert after line 20 the following:

SEC. 3106. PRE-ELECTION THREAT ASSESSMENTS.

(a) SUBMISSION OF ASSESSMENT BY DNI.—

Not later than 180 days before the date of each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit an assessment of the full scope of threats to election infrastructure, including cybersecurity threats posed by state actors and terrorist groups, and recommendations to address or mitigate the threats, as developed by the Secretary and Chairman, to—

(1) the chief State election official of each State;

(2) the Committees on Homeland Security and House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and Rules and Administration of the Senate; and

(3) any other appropriate congressional committees.

(b) UPDATES TO INITIAL ASSESSMENTS.—If, at any time after submitting an assessment with respect to an election under subsection (a), the Director of National Intelligence determines that the assessment should be updated to reflect new information regarding the threats involved, the Director shall submit a revised assessment under such subsection.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) The term “Chairman” means the chair of the Election Assistance Commission.

(2) The term “chief State election official” means, with respect to a State, the individual designated by the State under section 10 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20509) to be responsible for coordination of the State's responsibilities under such Act.

(3) The term “election infrastructure” means storage facilities, polling places, and centralized vote tabulation locations used to support the administration of elections for public office, as well as related information and communications technology, including voter registration databases, voting machines, electronic mail and other communications systems (including electronic mail and other systems of vendors who have entered into contracts with election agencies to support the administration of elections, manage the election process, and report and display election results), and other systems used to manage the election process and to report and display election results on behalf of an election agency.

(4) The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(5) The term “State” has the meaning given such term in section 901 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21141).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall apply with respect to the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2020 and each succeeding regularly scheduled general election for Federal office.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1.

This week, we are focused on fighting for the public interest, fighting for transparency, and fighting for accountability. We have a rare opportunity to restore faith and trust in our system of government.

Mr. Chair, I thank all those who have fought to bring us to this point and for our upcoming major historic vote on H.R. 1.

As we speak, I am working under a mandate from the people of central Virginia. They expect me to fight back against a broken Washington and to work to protect our democracy, whether from special interests, barriers to voting, or foreign influence.

Right now, we are seeing an uptick in hostile attacks against election systems across the globe, with the rise of the internet, anonymous hackers, non-state actors, and foreign intelligence operatives, as they rise as formidable and dangerous adversaries.

Our elections are the bedrock of our democracy.

If our voting infrastructure is compromised or attacked, the entire integrity of our electoral system could come into question.

This was especially clear following Russia's interference in the 2016 election, and it is almost certain that nefarious actors will continue their deliberate attempts to attack our elections or put in doubt the outcome of those elections.

During this time, it is critical that the U.S. election officials have accurate and up-to-date information about where our election security systems are most vulnerable.

This amendment pushes back against foreign attempts to interfere in our electoral process and helps identify any potential threats that may exist.

This amendment would use the invaluable expertise of public servants in the intelligence community and Department of Homeland Security to strengthen the security of Federal and State election systems.

My amendment would require a Federal assessment of the scope of potential threats to the security of America's election system, including cyber, terror, and state actor threats.

This assessment would happen 180 days prior to every general election to allow the States the opportunity to respond and strengthen their voting system.

Additionally, this legislation would direct the Director of National Intelligence and DHS to update Federal and State officials on possible vulnerabilities and to provide assessments on how best to stop these threats.

As a former CIA case officer, I greatly appreciate the objective and non-partisan work of the national security and intelligence communities. With their help, we can fight back against foreign interference, we can safeguard our elections.

The dedicated men and women of our national security agencies and of our intelligence agencies have demonstrated their ability to collect information on foreign actors' intentions and provide election security assessments that are intellectually rigorous, objective, timely, and useful to the States they would provide them to.

As we are having an important discussion about safeguarding the integrity of the vote, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to H.R. 1.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it. I think this is a darn good amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am going to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, it is great to work with Ms. SPANBERGER, and I thank her for her service as an intelligence officer

for our great Nation. This is an issue that she knows better than me and she knows better than most of us here in this institution. I look forward to supporting this amendment, and I welcome the gentlewoman to the U.S. House of Representatives and look forward to working with her.

Mr. Chair, I would love to work with the gentlewoman on issues like this when this bill does not pass the Senate and is signed into law and we can work together in a bipartisan way. I will continue to show bipartisanship. I congratulate and welcome the gentlewoman.

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for his comments and for his support of this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my colleague.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, this just goes to show how lucky we are that someone with the background of Congresswoman SPANBERGER has been elected to the House. With her background in the CIA, we gain a special expertise on issues of national security.

You know, States don't have a CIA, they don't have an NSA, and if foreign actors are attacking us, they are not in a position to find that out.

I think that the gentlewoman from Virginia understands the workings of our national security agencies and the importance of giving them metrics on what to do and with whom so that we are completely safe.

Mr. Chair, I am so delighted that she has offered this very smart amendment, and I look forward to approving it, and I thank her so much for the wisdom that she brings to the House.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1930

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, again, let the RECORD show I was for the amendment once again before the chairperson. I should get kudos.

Listen, this is a good amendment. I congratulate the gentlewoman on her election, being a Member of Congress, and helping to legislate and participate.

I also want to use a few seconds to really highlight the work of our intelligence officials in the administration and our Department of Homeland Security, especially Secretary Nielsen and her team, working with our local officials in Illinois before the last election to ensure that there was no nefarious activity that could have come about in our home State.

Our home State election officials got a lot of accolades from the Department of Homeland Security, and I think the Department of Homeland Security and their team, especially Secretary Nielsen, deserve the accolades, also.

So, with that, I am ready to close. I congratulate Ms. SPANBERGER.

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I am ready to close, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman yields back.

Ms. SPANBERGER. May I reclaim my time, Mr. Chair?

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. May I reclaim my time?

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois and the gentlewoman from Virginia both reclaim their time.

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Virginia is recognized.

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Actually, I want to echo the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois and the remarks of the gentlewoman from California in congratulating Congresswoman SPANBERGER on this excellent amendment and emphasizing, as they did, how lucky we are to have the benefit of the expertise that is brought to this Chamber by Congresswoman SPANBERGER, based on her national security experience. We need to maximize what people can offer here, and this amendment is a perfect example of that.

There is increasing anxiety out there among the populace about these attempts to hack into our election infrastructure. This measure will make sure that we are all on alert to that. I thank the gentlewoman for the amendment.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I am ready to close, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have left?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am having a lot of fun down here, but I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MS. SLOTKIN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 69 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 323, insert after line 6 the following:
SEC. 4103. DISBURSEMENTS AND ACTIVITIES SUBJECT TO FOREIGN MONEY BAN.

(a) DISBURSEMENTS DESCRIBED.—Section 319(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign

Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(2) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) an expenditure;

“(D) an independent expenditure;

“(E) a disbursement for an electioneering communication (within the meaning of section 304(f)(3));

“(F) a disbursement for a paid internet or paid digital communication that refers to a clearly identified candidate for election for Federal office and is disseminated within 60 days before a general, special or runoff election for the office sought by the candidate or 30 days before a primary or preference election, or a convention or caucus of a political party that has authority to nominate a candidate for the office sought by the candidate;

“(G) a disbursement for a broadcast, cable or satellite communication, or for a paid internet or paid digital communication, that promotes, supports, attacks or opposes the election of a clearly identified candidate for Federal, State, or local office (regardless of whether the communication contains express advocacy or the functional equivalent of express advocacy); or

“(H) a disbursement for a broadcast, cable, or satellite communication, or for a paid internet or paid digital communication, that discusses a national legislative issue of public importance in year in which a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office is held and is made for the purpose of influencing an election held during that year, but only if the disbursement is made by a foreign principal who is a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party or an agent of such a foreign principal under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.”.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, the legislation before us today, the For the People Act of 2019, represents a major step forward toward improving government transparency and accountability, expanding voting rights, and draining the corrosive influence of money in our politics.

These are the very issues I hear about over and over again as I travel across my district in mid-Michigan, and these are the issues that my constituents sent me to Washington to address.

Simply put, people in Michigan and across the country know in their bones that the current system isn’t working and want a return to honesty and decency in our politics. Passing H.R. 1 is a huge step forward in increasing confidence in our system.

Mr. Chair, my amendment today would add important provisions to close a loophole in our current campaign finance laws that allows foreign governments and foreign nationals to influence American elections through campaign ads. Right now, a foreign entity can legally buy an ad through so-

cial media that supports or attacks a candidate. Right now, a foreign entity can legally purchase an ad that focuses on an issue of legislative importance.

My amendment would close this loophole by implementing new requirements to ensure that foreign governments don’t influence our elections.

The amendment specifically would prohibit a foreign entity from buying a campaign ad, on digital media or on TV, that supports or attacks a candidate or an ad that focuses on an issue that is meant to divide us rather than unite us.

Mr. Chair, I am a former CIA officer, a former Pentagon official. I have spent my life preventing homeland attacks and preserving the democratic system that we all love. I am introducing this amendment because the attempts by Russia to interfere in the 2016 elections targeted vulnerable voters and took advantage of the lack of disclosure in our laws. During the 2016 election in my home State of Michigan, we were specifically targeted and witnessed disturbing evidence of Russian interference in our elections.

It is important to remember what we are talking about. These ads, which I have a bunch printed out over here, purposely divide us. They sow discord. They target ethnic groups. And they generally attempt to influence American elections.

Some may say that these ads were a relatively small number of the ads in our elections and that it is a relatively meager investment. As defenders of American interests and our national security, we must ensure that our laws do not allow this to happen at any level.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing: Support preservation of the American democracy. Reject foreign influence in our elections.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition, although I am going to do the right thing and not oppose this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I know our time together tonight is winding down. This, I think, is the last amendment we are going to debate tonight.

I thank Ms. SLOTKIN for her amendment and thank her for her service to our country. It is a pleasure to be able to serve in this great institution with the gentlewoman.

As I said, I am not going to oppose the gentlewoman’s amendment. Congratulations. I certainly wish this would be part of something that could go into law, because this bill is not going to go into law. I certainly look forward to working with her to address these issues as we move forward.

Congratulations, and I thank the gentlewoman again for her service here now.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding her time, and I also congratulate her on this amendment and her service here in the House and contributing her expertise, again, as I said a moment ago with respect to our other colleague. Providing her insight and her experience here in shaping these amendments and making our legislation stronger is absolutely valuable. We need to make our democracy more resilient.

The gentlewoman made the point that too often now these foreign adversaries can get into our politics and sow discord. The way we push back at that is by putting our antenna out, our radar, making sure we are keeping that kind of spending out of our politics. That is exactly what the gentlewoman’s amendment does. I thank her for it. I support it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Well, I would be remiss to not thank my colleague from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for being a cosponsor of this amendment. We have had some lively discussions back and forth. My apologies. I thank the gentleman for his efforts on this amendment, too.

I am ready to close, but congratulations once again to Ms. SLOTKIN.

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

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I look forward to working across the aisle on this important amendment. I think it is not a partisan issue. It is an American issue. I look forward to talking with my Republican colleagues about how we can break this thing off and turn it into law.

Ms. LOFGREN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLOTKIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I join in the celebration of the new Members of this House of Representatives. The gentlewoman from Michigan has experience in preserving our national security. Not everyone who is here serving has done what she has done, and the gentlewoman who preceded her.

Our body is richer because of the experience that they have brought to this Congress, and I think this excellent amendment really is a product of the expertise that she brings to this institution.

I am grateful for her amendment. I look forward to joining the ranking member in approving it and in celebrating her service to our country here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a list of groups such as the Hispanic Leadership Fund, The LIBRE Initiative, Americans for Tax Reform, Coalition to Reduce Spending, the National Right to Life, Heritage Action for America, and the Chamber of Commerce and several

letters in opposition to H.R. 1, obviously, or I don't think I would be entering them into the RECORD.

The following organizations oppose H.R. 1:

ACLU

U.S. Chamber of Commerce along with over 300 Chamber's of Commerce and industry groups

Freedom Works

National Right to Life

Heritage Action for America

Republican National Lawyers Association

March for Life Action

Conservative Action Project

Club for Growth

Americans for Tax Reform

National Taxpayers Union

Coalition to Reduce Spending

Americans for Prosperity

The LIBRE Initiative

Concerned Veterans for America

Faith and Freedom Coalition

Hispanic Leadership Fund

National Association for Gun Rights

Goldwater Institute

American Bankers Association

Agricultural Retailers Association

American Petroleum Institute

National Grocers Association

Associated Builders and Contractors

National Association of Manufacturers

Insurance Associates, Inc.

Airlines for America

NATIONAL RIGHT TO LIFE

COMMITTEE, INC.

Washington, DC, March 5, 2019.

Re H.R. 1, the so-called "For the People Act of 2019".

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The National Right to Life Committee (NRLC), representing state right-to-life organizations nationwide, urges you to oppose the so-called "For the People Act of 2019" (H.R. 1), introduced by Rep. John Sarbanes.

This legislation has been carefully crafted to maximize short-term political benefits for the dominant faction of one political party, while running roughshod over the First Amendment protections for political speech that have been clearly and forcefully articulated by the U.S. Supreme Court in a series of landmark First Amendment rulings, culminating in *FEC v. Wisconsin Right to Life*, 551 U.S. 449 (2007) and *Citizens United v. Federal Election Com'n*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010).

Because this legislation would severely impede the exercise of our organization's constitutional rights, and the rights and privacy of our donors and supporters, NRLC intends to include any roll call that occurs on H.R. 1 in our scorecard of key roll calls of the 116th Congress:

Enactment of H.R. 1 would not be a curb on corruption, but is itself a type of corruption—an abuse of the lawmaking power, by which incumbent lawmakers employ the threat of criminal sanctions, among other deterrents, to reduce the amount of private speech regarding the actions of the lawmakers themselves. Further, this legislation would add a commissioner to the Federal Election Commission (FEC), causing a partisan takeover by significantly increasing the likelihood that the agency could make decisions benefiting the political party in power.

THE TRUE PURPOSES OF H.R. 1

Our organization's name and contact information always appear on our public communications, and we openly proclaim the public policies that we advocate. But there is very little in this bill, despite the pretenses, that is actually intended to provide useful or necessary information to the public. The overriding purpose is precisely the opposite: To

discourage, as much as possible, disfavored groups (such as National Right to Life) from communicating about officeholders, by exposing citizens who support such efforts to harassment and intimidation, and by smothering organizations in layer on layer of record keeping and reporting requirements, all backed by the threat of civil and criminal sanctions.

SPEECH-RESTRICTIVE PROVISIONS OF H.R. 1

The bill would codify, in Section 324, a vague and expansive definition of "the functional equivalent of express advocacy," that applies to communications that "when taken as a whole, it can be interpreted by a reasonable person only as advocating the election or defeat of a candidate for election for Federal office." There is little that an organization could say by way of commentary on the votes or positions taken by an incumbent member of Congress that would not fall within this expansive definition, in the eyes of some "reasonable person"—most often, an annoyed incumbent lawmaker or his operatives.

The time periods over which the government would have authority to regulate speech about those who hold or seek federal office—so-called "electioneering communications"—would be dramatically expanded under H.R. 1.

H.R. 1 also contains additional provisions that would place an unacceptable burden on the exercise of First Amendment rights. H.R. 1 mandates burdensome disclaimers on television, radio, and online advertisements that are likely to bury the substantive message and make some advertising, especially online, functionally impossible.

PARTISAN TAKEOVER OF THE FEC

In title VI, H.R. 1 would destroy the FEC's long-standing bipartisan structure. Proponents claim that the provision is aimed at ending "frequent deadlocks," but this is a sham argument leading down a dangerous road.

In the excellent piece by the Institute for Free Speech (IFS), titled "Establishing a Campaign Speech Czar and Enabling Partisan Enforcement: An Altered FEC Structure Poses Risks to First Amendment Speech Rights" issued on January 31, Brad Smith comments,

But, in fact, tie votes have always been a small percentage of FEC votes. Historically, they have totaled approximately one percent to four percent of Commission votes on enforcement matters. . . . Although critics claim that tie-votes sap the FEC's ability to enforce campaign finance laws, in fact, it is assuredly the opposite. The only reason that the FEC has any legitimacy is its bipartisan makeup. Particularly in the current environment, it is inconceivable that an agency empowered to make prosecutorial decisions about the legality of campaign tactics, communications, funding, and activities on a straight party-line vote would have any legitimacy.

DISCLOSURE OF DONORS

Our members and supporters have a right to support our public advocacy about important and controversial issues without having their identifying information posted online, exposing them to harassment or retribution by those who may disagree with their beliefs.

In an additional piece from the IFS, titled "For the People Act" Replete with Provisions for the Politicians, by Eric Wang, issued on January 23 he writes,

The right to associate oneself with a non-profit group's mission and to support the group financially in private is a bedrock principle of the First Amendment that the government may not abridge casually. This is particularly true when the cause is con-

tentious, such as abortion, gun control, LGBTQ rights, or civil rights, and association with either side on any of these issues may subject a member or donor to retaliation, harassment, threats, and even physical attack, as recent events have tragically reminded us. The potential divisiveness of these issues does not diminish their social importance and the need to hash out these debates in public while preserving donors' privacy.

It should be self-evident that the real purpose of such burdensome requirements is not to inform the public, but to deter potential donors from financially supporting the work of groups such as National Right to Life in the first place.

We strongly urge you to oppose this pernicious, unprincipled, and constitutionally defective legislation. In our scorecard and advocacy materials, the legislation will be accurately characterized as a blatant political attack on the First Amendment rights of National Right to Life, our state affiliates, and our members and donors.

Sincerely,

CAROL TOBIAS,

President.

DAVID N. O'STEEN, PH.D.,

Executive Director.

JENNIFER POPIK, J.D.,

Legislative Director.

— MARCH 5, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of March for Life Action and the millions of pro-life Americans who march to end abortion, I am writing to voice our opposition to H.R. 1, the misnomered "For the People Act of 2019." Many aspects of the bill seek to put an undue burden on organizations and individuals who speak out for the unborn—discouraging these people from participating in the political process. When H.R. 1 reaches the House floor March for Life Action will score a "yes" vote negatively in our scorecard for the First Session of the 116th Congress.

H.R. 1 would regulate a new category of speech—communications that "promote," "attack," "support," or "oppose" ("PASO") federal candidates and elected officials. Under this broad and vague standard, groups that merely speak about federal legislation or policy issues could be forced to file FEC reports that they did not have to file before. This is conflicting to Supreme Court precedent limiting the regulation of speech to communications that could have no reasonable meaning other than to advocate the election or defeat of a candidate.

The main beneficiaries of H.R. 1 would be incumbent politicians and campaign finance attorneys while those who would suffer most would be grassroots activists. The legislation would greatly increase the already onerous legal and administrative compliance costs, liability risk, and costs to donor and associational privacy for public groups that help inform citizens speak about policy issues and politicians. Instead of being able to inform the public organizations will have to divert resources away from their advocacy activities to pay for compliance staff and lawyers. Some groups will not be able to afford these costs or will violate the law unwittingly. Less speech by private citizens and organizations means politicians will be able to act with less accountability to public opinion and criticism.

When our great nation's founders articulated the rights of Americans, they not only included the right to life but also the right to free speech. As those who speak up for the unborn, we uniquely combine those two rights. H.R. 1 would take away one of those rights, the freedom of speech, making it almost impossible for us to speak up for those

who cannot speak for themselves. For these reasons, March for Life Action will score against the legislation our annual scorecard for the First Session of the 116th Congress.

Sincerely,

THOMAS MCCLUSKY,
President, March for Life Action.

HERITAGE ACTION FOR AMERICA,
March 6, 2019.

KEY VOTE: "NO" ON THE "FOR THE PEOPLE ACT" (H.R. 1)

Heritage Action opposes the For The People Act (H.R. 1) and will include it as a key vote on our legislative scorecard.

This week, the House will vote on H.R. 1, the "For The People Act." Lawmakers should not let this legislation's misleading name fool them—it is comprised of unconstitutional and ill-advised policy mandates that the Democratic Party would use to hijack America's election processes. H.R. 1 is a very long, complex bill that is a liberal wish list of "reforms" ranging from voter registration and elections to campaign finance, lobbying, and judicial ethics.

Free and fair elections are the bedrock of American government. They are fundamental to our way of life and confidence in our representative system. H.R. 1 cloaks itself in the guise of transparency and fairness but in reality is a partisan scheme to choke off dissent and squelch Republican candidates and conservative political voices. This bill is aptly "renamed" by Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell as the "Democrat Politician Protection Act." It is an unprecedented attempt to seize control of elections through federal government power.

This fundamentally flawed legislation establishes a new taxpayer-funded bailout of political campaigns, weaponizes the Federal Elections Commission by destroying the current bipartisan makeup, and creates a new, subjective category of "campaign-related" speech that is regulated by Washington bureaucrats who are empowered to enforce these regulations with penalties and censorship.

According to The Heritage Foundation, H.R. 1 would implement the following changes:

1. Makes it easier to commit fraud and promotes chaos at the polls through same-day registration, as election officials have no time to verify the accuracy of voter registration information and cannot anticipate the number of voters, ballots, and precinct workers that will be needed to ensure a safe and secure election process.

2. Degrades the accuracy of registration lists by automatically registering individuals from state databases, such as DMV and welfare offices, which provides an opportunity to register large numbers of ineligible voters, including aliens as well as multiple or duplicate registrations of the same individuals.

3. Constitutes a recipe for massive voter registration fraud by hackers and cyber criminals through online voter registration not tied to an existing state record, such as a driver's license.

4. Requires states to count ballots cast by voters outside of their assigned precinct, overriding the precinct system used by almost all states that allows election officials to monitor votes, staff polling places, provide enough ballots, and prevent election fraud.

5. Prevents election officials from checking the eligibility and qualifications of voters and from removing ineligible voters. This includes restrictions on using the U.S. Postal Service's national change-of-address system to verify the address of registered voters; participating in state programs that com-

pare voter registration lists to detect individuals registered in multiple states; or ever removing registrants due to a failure to vote.

6. Cripples the effectiveness of state voter ID laws by allowing individuals to vote without an ID and to merely sign a statement in which they claim they are who they say they are.

7. Expands regulation and government censorship of campaigns and political activity and speech, including online and policy-related speech. H.R. 1 imposes onerous legal and administrative compliance burdens and costs on candidates, citizens, civic groups, unions, corporations, and nonprofit organizations.

8. Requires states to unconstitutionally restore the ability of felons to vote the moment they are out of prison. Section 2 of the 14th Amendment gives states the constitutional authority to decide when felons who committed crimes against their fellow citizens may vote again. Congress cannot override a constitutional amendment with a statute.

9. Transfers the right to draw congressional districts from state legislatures to "independent" commissions whose members are unaccountable to voters. H.R. 1 makes it a violation of federal law to engage in "partisan" redistricting and mandates inclusion of alien population, both legal and illegal, in all redistricting. This is an anti-democratic, unconstitutional measure that takes away the ability of the citizens of a state to make their own decision about redistricting.

10. Violates separation of powers and directly interfere with the President's constitutional duties. H.R. 1 bans his political appointees, such as the Attorney General, from participating in, directing the defense of, or assisting in any matter (including lawsuits against a President's policies, programs, executive orders, or his enforcement of the law) in which the President is named as a party."

Although Democrats are promoting H.R. 1 as a bill that would "strengthen our democracy and return political power to the people", it is an anti-democratic bill that would wreak havoc on our election system by manipulating election rules in favor of Democrats. It is nothing but a progressive power grab and Heritage Action urges all House Members to vote against it.

Heritage Action opposes the For The People Act (H.R. 1) and will include it as a key vote on our legislative scorecard.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I am not going to oppose this amendment, and it has been great debating with the other side tonight. I look forward to a livelier debate tomorrow.

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

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the spirit of the gentleman from Illinois and look forward to working with everyone.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. HILL of California) having assumed the chair, Mr. CUELLAR, 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.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, for the sake of innocent lives, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT DIRECTOR, THE HONORABLE JACKIE SPEIER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Brian Perkins, District Director, the Honorable JACKIE SPEIER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 4, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of San Mateo, in a criminal proceeding involving an alleged threat of violence against our office personnel.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

BRIAN PERKINS,
District Director.

□ 1945

COMMUNICATION FROM CASE-WORKER AND FIELD REPRESENTATIVE, THE HONORABLE JACKIE SPEIER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Sera Alptekin, Case-worker and Field Representative, the