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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. 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. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I urge the Speaker and Majority Leader to immediately schedule a vote to protect born-alive infants of failed abortions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2722, SECURING AMERICA'S FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT; WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3351, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 460 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 460

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2722) to protect elections for public office by providing financial support and enhanced security for the infrastructure used to carry out such elections, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-20, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of June 27, 2019, relating to a measure making appropriations.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3351) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or clause 5(a) of rule XXI are waived.

SEC. 4. (a) No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 5 of this resolution, and pro forma amendments described in section 6 of this resolution.

(b) Each amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 6 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 5 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 6 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 6. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 5 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

SEC. 7. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. In the case of sundry amendments reported from the Committee, the question of their adoption shall be put to the House en gros and without division of the question. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on Monday night, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 460. It provides for consideration of H.R. 3351 under a structured rule that makes 46 amendments in order, with 1 hour of general debate controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

It also provides for consideration of H.R. 2722 under a closed rule with 1 hour of general debate provided, controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. It also provides same-day authority through the legislative day of Thursday, June 27, 2019, relating to appropriations measures.

Madam Speaker, this underlying package of bills is proof that this Democratic majority is committed to getting its work done both for routine matters like appropriations and emergency priorities facing our Nation.

Take the first measure, H.R. 3351, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act. This builds on our efforts to fund the government for fiscal year 2020 in a timely way. Instead of hollowing out important investments like past Republican majorities have done, this Democratic majority is investing in our future.

This legislation not only ensures both the executive and judicial branches can continue to operate for the American people, there is also language here to protect consumers from dangerous products and help small businesses thrive, especially in distressed communities.

Most notably, Madam Speaker, this bill provides hundreds of millions in grants to strengthen the integrity of our election system. This is especially important since, if left to his own devices, I don't think our President would even acknowledge that there is a crisis of confidence in our elections following Russia's meddling in 2016, let alone act so it never happens again. He seems content to welcome future interference rather than prevent it, so it is especially important that this Congress takes the lead to protect our democracy.

That is why we are also moving here to consider H.R. 2722, the Securing America's Federal Elections Act. The Mueller report made clear that Russia waged an all-out attack on our elections. Putin put his thumb on the scale for President Trump, and intelligence officials have made clear that he and others are trying to attack us again in the next election.

I want to repeat that, Madam Speaker, in case the President happens to be watching. Our very democracy is under attack. No troops have been sent into combat. No guns have been fired, but a foreign adversary is turning the internet and the ballot box into battlefields with the integrity of the vote at stake.

It is beyond me why this President has not acted as if this is a national emergency. Instead, he said the other day that he thinks he would take campaign dirt about an opponent from a foreign government. You can't make this stuff up, Madam Speaker. That is like leaving the front door wide open when you know there is a burglar in town. He is not preventing future acts, he is encouraging them.

Before my friends on the other side chalk this up to a slip of the tongue, let me remind them that his own former communications director, Hope Hicks, testified recently that she believes he is serious about accepting information from a foreign source.

This President may not be stepping up to secure our elections, but this Democratic majority is. This bill would enact things like verified paper ballots, cybersecurity upgrades, and State grants to secure voting systems.

This majority passed H.R. 1 in the opening months of this Congress. That package includes reforms to fix our democracy. But under Leader MCCONNELL, the Senate did with it what it seems to do best: nothing.

He refused to even bring H.R. 1 up for a vote. Now, I don't know why Leader MCCONNELL is ignoring the warnings from our intelligence officials or why he seems content with weaknesses in our election systems. Maybe he is unwilling to ever break from Donald Trump on anything, even something this important, which really is quite sad. But I hope this time he will try something radical for the Senate: have a vote. Bring this bill up so the American people can see whose side you are on.

Lastly, Madam Speaker, this bill also gives us flexibility to deal with an emergency of a different kind—the one this President is creating on our southern border. President Trump's policies have led to children sleeping on concrete floors, dirty and hungry with no access to soap or even a toothbrush, sometimes left to be cared for by children just a few years older than they are. It is hard to believe that this is happening in the United States of America today.

This House will act, and I hope the Senate does the same thing. I encourage all my colleagues to vote for this rule and the underlying legislation, so we can do our jobs and act on these important issues.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Chairman MCGOVERN, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, we are here today on two very different pieces of legislation. Last night at the Rules Committee, I noted that these unrelated bills have only one thing in common, and that is their place in the Democratic majority's partisan, going-nowhere agenda. Unfortunately, I believe today's rule is only going to compound that recurring problem of the Democrats, frankly, not even trying to work with Republicans to actually legislate in divided government.

Our first bill today is H.R. 3351, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act of 2020. This is the 10th of 12 appropriations bills to come to the floor. As we have worked through these bills, I have raised several concerns that are applicable to this bill as well.

Like the previous appropriations bills this Congress, H.R. 3351 is marked to a high allocation figure that has no basis in reality. Remember, the House and Senate have not agreed to an overall budget for fiscal year 2020, which the Congressional Budget Act mandates be done by April 15.

□ 1230

Without a budget agreement, the budget cap numbers contained in the Budget Control Act will automatically take effect, leading to an 11 percent cut in defense spending and a 9 percent cut in nondefense spending.

Instead of working with Republicans in the Senate to reach a deal before marking and reporting funding bills, the majority has, instead, gone ahead and pushed through their own partisan appropriations bills that are marked to fake and unrealistic numbers.

The 12 appropriations bills the majority has proposed have several flaws in common. They reflect the idea that any increase in defense spending must be matched by an even greater increase in nondefense spending, which simply isn't a realistic assessment of our national priorities.

What is worse, these bills actually underfund defense and homeland security, coming in below the numbers that the President requested in order to ensure our military can adequately defend our Nation.

The FSGG bill we are considering today contains an 8 percent increase over fiscal year 2019, which makes little sense when we are simultaneously underfunding our national security.

Like the previous bills brought by my Democratic friends, the Financial Services appropriations bill also contains several partisan provisions that must be removed before a bipartisan, bicameral agreement can be reached on spending.

The majority has removed longstanding pro-life protections, such as a rider that prohibits the District of Columbia from using government funds to provide for abortions except in cases of rape, incest, or health of the mother.

The majority has also cut out a longstanding provision that I originally sponsored several years ago barring government contractors from being forced to disclose political campaign contributions. Since I originally sponsored this provision several years ago, I find it surprising that the majority would eliminate this provision, which provides important protections for government contractors and prevents contracts from being awarded on the basis of contributions.

Of course, there was an opportunity to work through and fix these problems through the amendment process. But instead of making things better, the majority has chosen, once again, to leave out minority voices.

I want to reiterate a point I made the last time I was on the floor for a rule. During the last Congress, when Republicans were in the majority, our record shows that we allowed more amendments sponsored solely by Democrats than we did amendments sponsored solely by Republicans.

The current majority has a much sorrier record. As of yesterday, of all amendments made in order this Congress, 67 percent were sponsored by Democrats, 19 percent by Republicans, and 13 percent were bipartisan.

Today's rule is right in line with that record. Sixty-seven percent of the amendments made in order are sponsored by Democrats, 24 percent by Republicans, and 9 percent are bipartisan.

Madam Speaker, this record of partisanship is a far cry from what the majority promised at the start of this Congress. There was an opportunity to move forward with fulfilling the majority's promises with today's rule. Instead, we see few Republican amendments and many Democratic amendments, resulting in a final product that will fail to achieve the bipartisan support needed to become law.

The second bill included in this rule is H.R. 2722, which the majority is promoting as a bill that provides security for elections. The reality is that this bill, like its partisan predecessor H.R. 1 that passed the House earlier this Congress, amounts to nothing less than a complete Federal takeover of elections.

Traditionally, elections are left to the States and local governments to conduct as they see fit. Localities can respond to local conditions; election officials can innovate; and elections can be operated in a way that best suits the unique needs of each community.

H.R. 2722 turns all that on its head. The bill will force all elections to be conducted using paper ballots, even if the local officials prefer more advanced technology. It will require costly recounts with no apparent purpose. It

will impose significant and wasteful spending on taxpayers.

Instead of affirming States as the laboratories of democracy, when it comes to elections, H.R. 2722 will impose a one-size-fits-all regulatory regime directed from Washington on communities across the country.

Madam Speaker, this state of affairs could and should have been avoided. Instead of pushing these partisan bills this week, the majority could have chosen to work with Republicans to craft bipartisan bills to address all of these problems.

Even if that did not come to pass, the majority at the Rules Committee still could have worked with the minority to make more minority amendments in order and give all Members the opportunity to fix these flawed bills on the floor. That they did not is yet another indication of where the majority's priorities lie: with pushing partisan bills to score political points and avoiding the bipartisan work of actually making law.

There is still a chance to change, Madam Speaker. In order to do so, the majority needs to decide whether they are here to score political points or if they are here to make law.

Before I conclude, I would be remiss if I did not highlight what is missing in today's rule. We should have been considering three bills today, not two. The missing bill is the supplemental appropriations bill providing funding for the humanitarian crisis on the southern border.

Each week, this crisis grows worse. Our facilities for holding new arrivals, particularly children and vulnerable unaccompanied minors, are already at the breaking point. Simply put, we need more resources, and we need them today.

To be fair to the President, he has been asking Congress to do that since May 1. The failure to bring forward a supplemental appropriations bill for this purpose is a major failure of governance by the majority.

All of us here, Republicans and Democrats alike, agree that we need to provide funding for this crisis. Time is wasting while we wait.

Back in 2014, when President Obama asked us for $3.7 billion in supplemental resources for precisely the same purpose, the House acted to give him the resources he needed in 24 days. As of today, almost 2 months have gone by with the majority failing to act.

Many of my friends on the other side rightfully express concern that unaccompanied minors backing up at border stations is not appropriate nor in the best interests of the children. I couldn't agree more. The Border Patrol couldn't agree more.

By failing to bring forward a supplemental appropriations bill, the path the majority is taking us on leads only to this outcome: hurting the children I know we all want to help.

Congress has given HHS the mandate to care for unaccompanied minors. Congress now needs to write the check so that HHS can do what Congress has mandated.

I remind my friends across the aisle that Republicans are ready and willing to work with them to pass a bipartisan supplemental appropriations package that provides needed funding for housing, for the Department of Defense, and especially for children who find themselves in an unfathomable situation at the border.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I would like to say for the record that when it comes to this piece of legislation, the Financial Services appropriations bill, Democrats actually did much better than the Republicans did when they were in charge.

In fact, we made more amendments in order. We made more minority amendments in order than the Republicans did when they were in charge. In fact, there is a 57 percent increase, in terms of minority amendments being made in order compared to what they did.

Let me also point out for the record that my Republican friends, I think, tend to be a little redundant in the amendments that they offer.

For example, I think they submitted three amendments on the wall. We make one amendment. Do we have to debate the wall three different times?

On spending reductions, four amendments were submitted. We make two in order, which is probably two too many. We should have made one in order.

The bottom line is, there is a habit of just offering the same old, same old, again and again and again. Quite frankly, the minority will get its opportunity to debate these issues but not over and over and over again.

Let's also get to the substance here. The gentleman said these are two unrelated bills. Well, I disagree. The Financial Services appropriations bill actually funds the Election Assistance Commission, and the other bill we are considering, the SAFE Act, authorizes the Election Assistance Commission at the same amount that is in the appropriations bill. They are very much intertwined.

Let me also say, I expect that, before the day is out, we will do a supplemental emergency bill to deal with the crisis that this President has created at the border.

Let me also be clear that what we want to make sure is that, when we provide the funding, this cruel treatment of children at the border comes to an end.

This administration's deliberate policy of separating children from their parents, of allowing children, almost infants, to sleep on cold floors, to be denied basic necessities like soap and toothpaste and toothbrushes, I mean, it is child abuse. It is unconscionable, so we want to demand that this administration stop it.

This is the United States of America. I think the American people are horrified at the inhumanity that they are reading about that is occurring to these little children at our border.

It is unbelievable. I never thought that we would ever be on the House floor talking about how children who have fled some of the worst conditions imaginable are being so mistreated at the border.

So, yes, we will have a supplemental appropriations bill to deal with it, but we are going to demand that the cruel policies of this administration stop and stop now.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, there is a crisis at the southern border. That is true. This past month, 140,000 people showed up seeking asylum: 84,000 families, 11,000 children.

But everything—every single thing—that the Trump administration is doing, led by President Trump himself, is making a very dire situation worse.

First, start with the definition that our President gives for what is going on. It is the arrival of rapists, of criminals, of gang members, when every single one of us who has been on that heartbreaking trip to the southern border knows it is children, women, and families who are fleeing violence, who are fleeing gang members, and who are fleeing destitution and grinding poverty.

Those are the people arriving at the border. Their crime, made criminal by the administration, is to seek help, to knock on America's door and ask for help.

We may not be able to do all that we would like, but is it a crime for a person to ask for assistance?

Second, by defining the crisis as an invasion of criminals—the Trump definition—the Trump policy is to treat these people worse than criminals, first starting with the family separation policy where children, literally, were yanked out of the arms of their parents.

Many of those children still don't know where their father or their mother is. That is being done in your name and mine, with the full authority of the American Government and the widespread opposition of the American people.

Then, when these people are in our custody, it is the imposition of cruel and brutal conditions on children and innocent people whose crime is to seek some assistance.

We had a Trump attorney, in Federal court, arguing that when it came to fulfilling the duty that we had of holding in custody children, it was okay to deny them toothbrushes, soap, access to showers, and sanitary conditions, and to have them sleeping on cement floors in frigid conditions.

This is shocking. It is unnecessary. It is inhumane. In short, it is a policy of calculated cruelty, family separation, and affliction of wholesale suffering.

It must end. We must immediately return all children to their parents and provide humane, sanitary, and safe conditions for those seeking asylum.

We must work with El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala to improve conditions in those countries to address humanitarian conditions.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. We must not withdraw hundreds of millions of dollars in aid, as the President decrees.

Mr. President, the response to this crisis must not be cruelty.

Enforce our laws, yes. Work with Central American governments, yes. But treat all who seek America's help with respect and dignity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1245

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

I want to remind my friends that it took them weeks, if not longer, to even acknowledge there was a crisis at the border. As a matter of fact, they were accusing the President of manufacturing the crisis a few weeks ago. Now, fortunately, they have come around to the idea that hundreds of thousands of people arriving over a 3-month period of time is a crisis.

Secondly, I want to remind them, they have still yet to act in the face of the crisis. They have had the ability to pass legislation. The President asked for it almost 60 days ago. We still haven't seen anything in terms of legislation reaching this floor.

Madam Speaker, I also want to point out that, frankly, it shouldn't take this long to respond. We can disagree over a lot of things. And I have no doubt about the sincerity of my friends when it comes to being concerned about the well-being of these children; none whatsoever.

But we know that part of this crisis is created because we haven't given the President the emergency funds he needs to quickly move people out of facilities where they were never designed to be, into influx facilities that we are trying to stand up, literally, right now. One of these is going to be in my district.

We dealt with this, by the way, in 2014. We did it with President Obama; supported it; gave him the funds he needed; a Republican House, a Democratic Senate, and the President. He got that money in 24 days. One of those facilities was set up in my district.

Again, we don't like using military bases in this way; don't approve of it; but we understand that President Obama faced an emergency situation, and we gave him the tools and the resources he needed to deal with that. That needs to happen now.

Frankly, what we are seeing in the House is quite a contrast to the Senate, which has a bill in the Appropriations Committee that was reported out 30–1. It is bipartisan. It is a bill the President has expressed a willingness to sign. We ought to be working with that vehicle, if my friends can't get something to the floor to deal with this urgent crisis now.

Madam Speaker, I would also, if I may, like to inform the Chair that if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately bring up Congressman DAVIS' Election Security Assistance Act for consideration under an open rule.

This bill provides targeted and crucially needed resources to State and local election administrators to help secure America's voting infrastructure. Unlike the majority's partisan bill that takes over all election operations and replaces local authority with a one-size-fits-all mandate from Washington, the Republican alternative provides needed resources without stepping on the toes of State and local election administrators.

It provides grants to States to update aging and at-risk election infrastructure; provides security clearances to election officials to facilitate the sharing of information about threats with frontline officials; increases resources available to States and local governments; and provides for hands-on assistance, as needed.

Madam Speaker, we all agree that our elections need to be protected, and we all agree that more resources and more assets are necessary to accomplish that goal. But rather than pushing a complicated mandate from Washington that wastes taxpayer dollars and eliminates the tradition of State and local control over the election operations, we can do better by providing resources for security improvements and reinforcements for local officials with the minimum additional regulation.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), my good friend, the author of the legislation in question.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so the House may consider election security legislation that actually has a chance at becoming law.

As I explained last night during debate of H.R. 2722 at the Rules Committee, there is no place for partisanship when it comes to securing our elections.

H.R. 2722, the SAFE Act, is simply another partisan bill by the majority aimed at federally mandating election standards; like mandating that States exclusively use paper ballots, effectively banning any type of direct recording electronic voting machines which have been proven safe and efficient.

Madam Speaker, keep this in mind; that if this legislation passes, if one of our local election officials had just worked to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars purchasing new, digital electronic machines with a paper backup, those machines and that investment of their hard-earned tax dollars would be obsolete in the year 2022, 3 years from now. That is not right.

Mandating the exclusive use of paper ballots will create longer lines at polling places, and can be lost, destroyed, or manipulated far easier than electronic voting machines with a paper trail backup.

I want to highlight the fact that there is no evidence of voting machines being hacked in 2016, 2018, or ever. So why are we forcing States to get rid of what they have deemed as safe technology?

We should work together to safeguard technology. Safeguard technology not abandon it. We don't know in this institution what technology is going to look like when it comes to voting machines in the next five to 10 years. Why are we requiring a certain type of ballot process that is only going to be processed by five companies that maybe produce it today? That is not what we should be doing here in Washington.

Additionally, the SAFE Act federally mandates hand recounts, which will result in drawn-out elections that will become unnecessarily expensive.

The majority's bill also contains irresponsible funding commitments. The funding of elections is the primary responsibility of our States. Democrats are committing $1.3 billion over 10 years, with zero funding match requirements from States.

Congress has a responsibility to be good stewards of taxpayer dollars. Funds should be given based on need, not a guess of what might be needed a decade down the road.

I want the record to be clear. Many of the provisions in the SAFE Act are inconsistent with what we have heard from experts in election administration. But the majority is ignoring their requests.

As my colleagues across the aisle know, I believe there are areas on election security where Republicans and Democrats can find and have found common ground. There is a role for Congress in election security, which is why, me and my fellow members on the House Administration Committee, introduced H.R. 3412, the Election Security Assistance Act.

I want to thank my colleagues on the committee, MARK WALKER and BARRY LOUDERMILK, for joining me in this effort, and the others who have cosponsored it since its introduction. This realistic legislation provides $380 million in Federal grants to States to update their aging and at-risk election infrastructure, while requiring a 25 percent match from States.

If it is good for transportation projects; if it is good for DHS projects, DOJ projects, USDA projects, why don't we have locals and States have some skin in the game?

In addition, our bill creates the first-ever Election Cyber Assistance Unit. It is aimed at connecting State and local election officials with leading election administration and cybersecurity experts from across the Nation.

Our bill empowers State officials by providing security clearances to election officials to better facilitate the sharing of information and requiring the Department of Homeland Security to notify State election officials of cyberattacks and any foreign threats within the State. Keep in mind, the majority bill does not address this.

If DHS hacked a local election official's election system, if they saw a hack in, let's say, central Nevada, DHS would not be able to notify your local election official because he or she may not have security clearance. The majority bill doesn't address this. Our bill does.

To sum it up, our solution provides much-needed election security improvements and reinforcements for local election officials without overstepping the State's authority to maintain their elections. The Election Security Assistance Act, our bill, is the only proposal being discussed today that has a realistic chance of becoming law.

If the previous question is defeated, it will be the first step in putting forth election security legislation that has a chance of helping States improve their security ahead of the 2020 election.

I thank Ranking Member COLE for giving me the opportunity to speak on behalf of this important issue.

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

I always enjoy listening to my Republican colleagues debate on the floor. And I always love listening to the gentleman from Illinois when he is on the House floor.

But I can't help but think of the fact that the Russians attacked our elections in 2016. The 2 years after that, the House was controlled by Republicans. The Senate was controlled by Republicans. Donald Trump, a Republican, was in the White House. They had a unified government; the House, the Senate, and the Presidency.

And all of our intelligence agencies said that Russia interfered in our elections; they attacked our democracy; not only the Obama administration's intelligence officials, but the Trump administration's intelligence officials.

And what did my Republican friends do in the aftermath of this attack on our democracy by a foreign adversary? Nothing. Nothing.

We hear all these great ideas, but while they had a unified government, while they were in control of everything, they did nothing. In fact, I recall sitting here on the House floor and listening to Republican after Republican after Republican basically say that this was much ado about nothing; in fact, trying to deny that Russia attacked our elections.

Now the evidence is so overwhelming you can't deny it anymore. But yet, they had this opportunity. And now they say we all want to protect our elections.

Well, 2 years prior to this, I don't know where you were, but you weren't working trying to protect our elections. People were working, instead, to try to cover up for what a foreign adversary did to our elections.

So here we are, coming forward with a bill that we believe will provide security for our elections so that people believe that the elections have integrity, they believe the results. And we are told well, we disagree with you, and we have better ideas; on and on and on.

Bottom line is we are acting. My friends had 2 years to act. They did nothing.

Our Democratic majority went through regular order on this. The Committee on House Administration held three hearings on election security. In case anyone forgot, they were on February 14, May 8, and May 21.

In addition to those hearings, the Subcommittee on Elections conducted field hearings in six States, while the Committees on Oversight, Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence held hearings on the subject.

So experts testified. People offered their viewpoints. And after all of that, the House Administration Committee marked up this bill last Friday, on June 21, and here we are on the House floor.

So, I mean, give me a break. I get it. Some of my Republicans friends may be ''Johnny-come-latelies'' when it comes to the issue of election security. We welcome you on board, because our elections are important, and we need to protect them from interference from foreign adversaries like Russia.

But you had 2 years of unified government in which my friends did nothing, nothing.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, to quote my friend, ''give me a break.'' The last Republican Congress appropriated roughly $300 million for election security, point 1.

Point 2, we have no evidence anybody hacked any election machines, as my friend, Mr. DAVIS pointed out in 2016 or 2018. If you want to respond to the Russians, you probably ought to respond to what they did, not to what they didn't do or didn't succeed in doing.

I would actually argue this administration did a lot more than the last administration. You have got a larger military today, partly because of what the Russians did. You have a reinvigorated NATO today. You have a President who actually sent lethal aid to Ukraine today.

You want to get the Russians' attention? That is the way you get it. When you lay down a red line in Syria, you enforce the red line. This administration has been a lot tougher on Russia than the last administration, which, by the way, knew this was going on, did almost nothing to alert anybody or to stop anybody; and now, are trying to blame it on the person that was actually involved in the election, our current President, for their lapse when they were actually in power in the executive branch.

So this idea that nobody wants to defend our elections is not true. And, frankly, I will take some offense because I have never said that the Russians didn't matter, or that our elections weren't serious or weren't threatened. I used to be a State election board secretary. I used to sit on the Board of Directors for the election board secretaries around the country, and the oldest public body that there is, or the oldest association of public officials there is in this country; very bipartisan, by the way, extraordinarily well-run. They don't agree with this bill.

I would just ask every Member to call their local Secretary of State or election administrator, whatever they have, and go through the bill and say, did you want to cede this much authority to the Congress of the United States; or do you think you do a pretty good job of running your own election?

□ 1300

I know in my State, we do a very good job of running our elections, and that has been true under Democrats and true under Republicans. I think that is true around the country.

The other thing is if you want to actually do something before the 2020 election, then whether you like it or not, you are going to have to do something that is bipartisan, because this will not get through the Senate and this will not become law, and that makes it a rather pointless exercise.

Sometimes in the legislative process, you sit down, and in Mr. DAVIS, I will tell you, you have a willing partner and a person who has a reputation in this body that I think is exceptionally bipartisan and who is working, I think, in good faith on this very problem, and you work through the problem.

But if it is going to be a partisan my-way-or-the-highway approach—remember, this is coming under a closed rule, there is not even an amendment made in order here—then it is not likely to get out of this Chamber.

So if you are serious about trying to protect the elections, you would. You may not get everything you want, but

in divided government, you have to work together to get things done.

That is the problem with almost every major initiative that our Democratic friends have brought to the floor since they have been in the majority.

Sorry. The Constitution is pretty clear. The Senate gets to decide whether or not they are going to accept what we do over here or do something different. The President has a part in this process.

We had to endure this when we first became the majority. We had a Republican House, we had a Democratic Senate, we had a Democratic President.

I don't have any problem with my friends bringing their agenda to the floor. I applaud them for doing it. They ran on it. It is perfectly appropriate.

A lot of times we bring that agenda to the floor knowing we can get it across this Chamber, but we are not going to probably get it all the way through the process unless we change it some.

What we haven't seen yet is any evidence that the new majority has any ability to work with the current majority or the current President. And if that is what they want to do for 18 months, score political points as opposed to actually legislate something in a compromise manner, they are free to do that, too, but it is not going to work.

If the aim here is to make our elections more secure, then I wouldn't bring a bill with a closed rule. I would work with the other side, knowing that their very concerns are probably going to be similar to the concerns expressed in the United States Senate and by the President of the United States.

So, you know, that is an unsolicited piece of personal and political advice to my friends, but I think if they follow it, they will actually have some success legislatively and will actually get some things done.

We are going to disagree about a lot of things. The American people will sort that out in rather short order, about 18 months, but we ought to try to get the things we can do today done.

This is an area I think we could work together in if we approached it in a different manner.

I would also hope we could do the same thing on the southern border, Madam Speaker. That is an impending emergency right now. We are going to run out of money right now. So let's get that at least taken care of while we sort out our differences in other areas.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the gentleman was talking about appropriations that were approved in the last Congress.

A lot of the ideas that we are talking about here today, including some of the ideas that Mr. DAVIS raised, are authorizations, and so they can't be taken care of in an appropriations bill, and that is why we are doing a separate bill in addition to the appropriations bill.

The gentleman talks about the $300 million that were approved under the previous leadership. Well, we are asking for $600 million. We are doubling that because we know how serious it is.

And just forgive us if we are a little bit concerned, because we have a President who continues not to acknowledge that the Russians interfered in our election. He continues to refer it to as a Russian hoax. He took Vladimir Putin's word for it rather than the word of our intelligence agencies.

So when we express concern about our election process and about the lack of attention given to this, we are responding to what the President of the United States, Donald Trump, says on a weekly, if not daily basis.

The fact of the matter is Russia interfered in our election. Everybody knows that. The only person who is in denial is at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. So we need to respond, and we need to respond appropriately.

Madam Speaker, I say this to my friend again, that we expect, hopefully today, to bring up a supplemental appropriations bill to be able to deal with what I would call the Donald Trump-created crisis on the border.

And, by the way, as we provide funding, which I believe we will do to deal with some of the issues on the border, let us be clear: there is absolutely no excuse at all for how this administration has allowed children to be treated in such an inhumane fashion under our custody, children being denied soap, children being denied toothpaste or toothbrushes, children so young and separated from any adult who are being cared for by children only a couple of years older.

I mean, everybody should be horrified by that. There is no excuse, none at all, for that to be happening.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman, Mr. MCGOVERN, for his extraordinary leadership on H.R. 2722, the Securing America's Federal Elections Act, the SAFE Act.

Madam Speaker, we were attacked as a country in 2016. We were not attacked as Democrats or Republicans or Independents. Our Nation was attacked.

Special Counsel Mueller found that Russia conducted a sweeping and systematic campaign to subvert and undermine the U.S. election on behalf of one party and one candidate as opposed to another party or another candidate, but you know what, that should make no difference to us today. It could have been the reverse.

I would hope that all of us would be standing together as Americans to reject foreign interference in our elections.

What did the Russians do? Well, they conducted cyber surveillance and espionage and sabotage at the Democratic National Committee, at the Democratic National Campaign Committee, and at Hillary Clinton's headquarters. They injected racial and ethnic propaganda and poison into our body politic through Facebook, through Twitter, through social media, and then they directly entered into the websites of 30 different State boards of election across the country, with varying degrees of success, according to how well prepared the different election boards were.

Now, in response to all of this, what do we get from the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces? What we get is denunciation of what he calls the Russian hoax. He rejects the evidence offered to him by his own intelligence agencies and leaders. He rejects all of the evidence compiled by Special Counsel Robert Mueller. He rejects the conclusion that there was a sweeping and systematic effort to undermine our election.

H.R. 2722 says we need to protect our election in 2020. It is precious. Our democracy is precious to us, so we will promote accuracy, integrity, and security through voter-verified permanent paper ballots, and provide grants to the States to carry out the security improvements that we need. It will establish cybersecurity requirements for voting systems and require testing of the existing hardware and software to make sure there is not malware in there, to make sure that it is not being manipulated, and it will implement risk-limiting audits to ensure the accuracy of vote tallies in an efficient manner.

Madam Speaker, we have a philosophical difference with our friends. It is not just that the President denied the existence of the attack, but the Republican-controlled Senate did nothing, they offered us no plan. They controlled the House and the Senate in the last Congress. They did nothing. They offered us no plan for securing our elections against foreign attack in 2020, which is why we have come forward with an attempt to prevent the attack in 2020.

Now, we have a philosophical difference with them, because when we say that America needs to act, they say federalism, let every State work it out on their own.

I heard one of my colleagues say they are doing a great job at the local level running the elections. But we are not talking about running the elections, we are talking about protecting the security of our elections against a foreign attack.

It is like we are saying we need to defend the country, and they say, well, we have got great local police forces all across the America. The police forces may be great, but we still need a national defense.

The election boards might be doing a good job in some places, maybe less so in others, running the local elections,

but we still need to protect all of our elections against the foreign attack that was described in detail by Special Counsel Mueller.

There is a constitutional basis and imperative for doing this. I direct my friends to Article IV of the Constitution, the Republican Guarantee Clause, which my good friend from Illinois suggested may have been the Republican Party guarantee clause. I know he was kidding when he said it. It is not the Republican Party guarantee clause; it is a guarantee of a republican form of government.

''The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion''.

That is a constitutional command that we must protect every State in the union's republican form of government.

Well, what is a republican form of government? A republican form of government is a representative form of government where the voters vote for their leaders. It is republican only if the will of the people is properly expressed through an election, we get the will through an election, and it has integrity and accuracy and safety. That is what this bill is about.

Madam Speaker, I urge everybody to support H.R. 2722.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make a quick point, and then I want to move to my friend from Illinois.

Madam Speaker, I don't argue about constitutional power, but I argue about process.

Look, I seriously doubt my friends have spent very much time talking to election board secretaries and election administration officials around the country. Had they done so, they would have heard, I am sure, uniformly that they don't want a one-size-fits-all made system from Washington, D.C. They don't want to throw away equipment that they think is better than what we are offering them or that they have already invested millions of dollars in.

They are happy to work with us. They are happy to inform us and testify. That is not what is happening here.

This is the idea: all wisdom is in this Chamber, evidently, because it is not going to get through the Senate, it is not going to get signed by the President. We haven't talked to the people that actually are the front-line people in defending us in this process, and that is the folks at the State and the local level.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I am always glad to be here with my good friend from the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN). And he was right in committee during the markup of this bill that was posted late last week, and we marked it up earlier this week after the rules notice was already posted. It just shows you how rushed this process is.

The gentleman erroneously, and I know, because I had made a quick joke about it afterwards, mentioned we ought to have a mandated republican government or something like that. I said, ''You know what? That is one mandate I can be for in our State and local authorities,'' but I knew what he was talking about.

He knows what he is talking about when it comes to what we all have the same interest in doing, and that is protecting our election security.

My colleague mentioned about standing together. Well, we were trying to stand together, Madam Speaker. We were working in a bipartisan way to put together a bipartisan election security bill, and the Democrat majority walked away. They forced this vote.

These are areas that we can come together and find common ground.

I have been asked, what did the Republicans do when we were in the majority? Well, we not only did $300 million in election security upgrades and cybersecurity protections, we did $380 million. And what was great was we were working over the last 2 years with DHS officials and our local election officials to ensure that 2018 did not suffer the same consequences as 2016. And it worked, even in an extensively high midterm turnout.

Then they said, well, what else did you do over the 2 years? Well, you know what we did? We waited for the $35-million Mueller report to come out and tell us what else we could do.

Now we are here today. We are here today to ensure that we put together an election security bill, not one that the Democrats want, not one that is going to be a top-down approach. It is not what our local secretaries of state want, it is not what our local election officials want, and they are on the ground. Let's listen to them, but let's make sure that we don't take away our ability to address cybersecurity concerns.

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

□ 1315

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. It has been mentioned that the Russians used social media to strike at our election process in this country. That is true. This bill does nothing to address that problem. The majority's bill does absolutely nothing to address this problem. That is something that we still need to take care of in Congress.

Let's not confuse the issue, and let's not listen to the 30,000-foot rhetoric that somehow one party over the other is more defensive or wants to be more offensive against nefarious actors. We are all Americans. We are all elected to serve this great country and this great institution.

None of us, Republicans or Democrats, want anyone to attack this country, let alone attack our election process, but the answer to making sure that our elections are safe are in our bill, the previous question.

We are the ones who ensure that DHS can talk to local election officials. Their bill does not do that.

We are the ones that make sure that we create a cybersecurity unit and the ability to address ongoing threats. Their bill does not do that.

That is why I would urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question. Let's come back to the table. Let's get something done.

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

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman trying to articulate the best he can all that the Republicans did on this issue when they were in the majority, but I will be very honest with him: I am unimpressed, and so are the American people.

The bottom line is my friends had unified government, Republican control of the House, Senate, and the White House for 2 years, and basically they did nothing.

The President, the leader of their party, routinely and continues to do so today, refers to Russian interference in our election as a Russian hoax. The leader of our country says that it is a hoax.

So I understand why there was inaction for the previous 2 years, but that ends because Democrats, Republicans, Independents, people of all political persuasions deserve to have an election system that has some integrity.

I look forward to passing this bill, and I am urging the Senate to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, could I inquire, I am prepared to close whenever my friend is. If he has additional speakers, I will just reserve.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close.

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

Madam Speaker, I would like to begin by just submitting for the RECORD the views of the National Disability Rights Network, which actually came out against this legislation because they believe it will make it more difficult for people with physical impairments to actually get to the polls and vote. I know that is not the intention of my friend on the other side, but that is the effect of one-size-fits-all voting.

NATIONAL DISABILITY RIGHTS NETWORK,
June 25, 2019.

Hon. ZOE LOFGREN,
Chairwoman, House Administration Committee, Washington, DC.
Hon. RODNEY DAVIS,
Ranking Member, House Administration Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN LOFGREN AND RANKING MEMBER DAVIS: The National Disability Rights Network (NDRN) writes today to express our concerns with the impact of H.R. 2722, the Securing America's Federal Election (SAFE) Act, on voters with disabilities. While improvements have been made to the legislation as it has moved through the legislative process, we continue to remain concerned that, taken as a whole, the bill will negatively impact voters with disabilities.

NDRN is the voluntary membership association for Protection and Advocacy (P&A) and Client Assistance Program (CAP) agencies. The P&A and CAP agencies are a nationwide network of congressionally mandated, cross disability organizations operating in every state in the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Territories (American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, and the US Virgin Islands). There is also a P&A and CAP affiliated with the Native American Consortium which includes the Hopi, Navajo, and San Juan Southern Paiute Nations located in the Four Corners region of the Southwest.

The P&A/CAP Network has the authority to provide legally based advocacy services and legal representation to all people with disabilities. P&As and CAPs pursue legal, administrative, and other appropriate remedies under all applicable federal and state laws to protect and advocate for the rights of people with disabilities. Through the Protection and Advocacy for Voter Access (PAVA) program, P&As provide advocacy to voters with disabilities on all facets of the election system. Collectively, the P&A/CAP Network is the largest provider of legally based advocacy services to people with disabilities in the United States.

Following a contentious presidential election and investigation into foreign interference with the electoral process, the national public discourse on American democracy has understandably turned to voting security. NDRN believes that action to protect the security of our votes is necessary to ensure the health of our electoral system. However, the need to create accurate and secure elections must be balanced with protecting access to the vote for all eligible Americans. Voting systems that rely on an electorate capable of independently marking and verifying a paper ballot have become a preferred solution to protecting vote security. Understandably, if all voters are able to mark their ballots privately and independently, and visually verify that the completed paper ballot is correct, elections officials could routinely audit election results that are verified to have captured voter intent. Yet, the ability to privately and independently mark, and visually verify, and then cast a paper ballot is simply not an option for all voters.

We have three concerns with the latest version of the SAFE Act. First, by mandating that only voters with disabilities can use ballot marking devices (BMDs) you are segregating voters with disabilities away from the entire pool of voters by making them the only group of people that use a particular type of voting machine. Federally mandated segregation is problematic alone. Additionally, this increases the likelihood that poll workers will not be properly trained on the machine, the machine not working, and if the one machine breaks, there will be no alternative option. It will also saddle poll workers with determining who is ''disabled enough'' to use the BMD, a decision for which they have no qualifications or legal right.

Second, by not requiring that the ballot marked with a BMD be identical to the hand marked ballot, you are removing the right of the voter with a disability to cast a private ballot. It is possible that some smaller precincts may only have one person with a disability that votes, making it extremely easy to identify how the person voted. But even where there might be tens or hundreds of people with disabilities voting, elections personnel should not be able to look at the ballots and know how people with disabilities voted.

Third, assuming BMDs fully solved the accessibility issues around marking a ballot (which they do not for all voters with a disability) the so called solution continues to ignore the accessibility issues around verification and the casting of the ballot, two necessary steps in the voting process. While some may argue that the BMDs address accessibility, there is nothing that addresses the ability of a person with a disability to independently and privately verify and ultimately cast their ballot. BMDs are not the accessibility panacea that makes federally mandated paper based voting work for people with disabilities.

Security of our elections is an issue that is crucial to the health of our democracy and must not be taken lightly. Likewise, a private and independent vote is the law of the land, and an electoral system that knowingly denies the right to vote to any of its eligible citizens to appease others is simply not a democracy. NDRN firmly believes that all Americans, including people with disabilities, want secure, accurate, and fair elections, but not at the expense of the right to vote for people with disabilities. The SAFE Act is an important first step in this national discourse, but the concerns expressed above must be addressed before this legislation can become the law of the land.

Thank you for your work on this important topic, and should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Eric Buehlmann, Deputy Executive Director for Public Policy.

Sincerely,

CURT DECKER,
Executive Director.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, my friend is not impressed, and that is a fair statement, and I don't question my friend ever, but I am not impressed with legislation that can't become law because it is futile. We come down here with a lot of sound and fury, but we don't get anything done.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I urge opposition to this rule. This rule will make in order for consideration two bills: H.R. 3351 and H.R. 2722.

The first is a partisan appropriations bill that is marked to an unrealistic number that does not reflect agreement with Republicans or the Senate and that includes partisan policy riders that must come out before this bill can become law.

Not to be outdone, H.R. 2722 is even more partisan, throwing out the traditional ability of States and localities to manage their own election procedures and, instead, imposing a one-size-fits-all regulatory regime direct from Washington, D.C. like H.R. 1 before it, this bill was produced without Republican input and, instead, reflects only the partisan motivations of the current majority.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question, ''no'' on the rule, and ''no'' on the underlying measures.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I urge, obviously, support for this rule and the underlying bills that will be debated.

As we are sitting here debating, we just got some news that Acting Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection Agency John Sanders has submitted his resignation. I guess the public pressure is so great that it is untenable for him to continue in that position, and I am sure the President will replace him with somebody else.

The problem is the President keeps on replacing individuals with people who continue to enforce policies that are cruel, policies that separate children from their parents at the border, and policies that treat children worse than animals in our custody, but I thought it would be interesting for my colleagues to note this breaking news.

Madam Speaker, it is true that we have an ambitious agenda before us this week, and we believe in doing our job and holding the administration accountable. We aren't going to leave the threat of another shutdown for another day. Maybe that is what my Republican friends did when they were in charge, but that is how we ended up in one shutdown after another.

And, yes, we wish we had an agreement on the caps, but it is not for lack of trying. We have been trying to negotiate with the Senate since we took control of the House of Representatives. We have been trying to negotiate with the President since we took control of the House of Representatives. But every time we sit down with the President, he has a temper tantrum or he behaves in an erratic way and leaves the room. We can't wait, so we are going to lead, and hopefully they will follow.

And we are not going to ignore the threats posed by Russia and others to our elections. The President wants to cozy up to Putin instead of defending this Nation, but this majority doesn't believe in prioritizing the egos of dictators. We believe in accountability and restoring the integrity of the vote.

My friend says, well, this isn't going anywhere. Well, look, we are happy to negotiate with Republicans in the Senate, but where is their bill? Basically, the Republicans in the Senate are following the lead of the Republicans in the House and the previous Congress in doing nothing.

We don't believe in doing nothing. We think our elections are important, that they are worth defending, so we are acting. These are serious matters, Madam Speaker, and this is why we

were sent here, and this is what we intend to tackle.

I urge all my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the previous question. I urge them to vote ''yes'' on the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 460

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 8. That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3412) to protect the administration of Federal elections against cybersecurity threats. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 9. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3412.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TITUS) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 460; and

Adoption of House Resolution 460, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2722, SECURING AMERICA'S FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT; WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3351, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 460) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2722) to protect elections for public office by providing financial support and enhanced security for the infrastructure used to carry out such elections, and for other purposes; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3351) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 188, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 403]

YEAS—228

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—188

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie