abuse control program at the Department of Health and Human Services (75–8393–0–7–571), then the adjustment shall be the amount of additional new budget authority specified in such measure for such program for fiscal year 2027, but shall not exceed $658,000,000.

(2) DEFINITION.—As used in this subsection, the term ''additional new budget authority'' means the amount provided for fiscal year 2027, in excess of $311,000,000, in a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making discretionary appropriations and specified to pay for the costs of the health care fraud and abuse control program.

(d) ADJUSTMENT FOR CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND REDETERMINATIONS.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution as follows:

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2027 specifies an amount for continuing disability reviews under titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq., 1381 et seq.), for the cost associated with conducting redeterminations of eligibility under title XVI of the Social Security Act, for the cost of co-operative disability investigation units, and for the cost associated with the prosecution of fraud in the programs and operations of the Social Security Administration by Special Assistant United States Attorneys, then the adjustment shall be the additional new budget authority specified in such measure for such expenses for fiscal year 2027, but shall not exceed $2,124,000,000.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subsection—

(A) the term ''continuing disability reviews'' means continuing disability reviews under sections 221(i) and 1614(a)(4) of the Social Security Act, including work-related continuing disability reviews to determine whether earnings derived from services demonstrate an individual's ability to engage in substantial gainful activity;

(B) the term ''redetermination'' means redetermination of eligibility under sections 1611(c)(1) and 1614(a)(3)(H) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1382(c)(1), 1382c(a)(3)(H)); and

(C) the term ''additional new budget authority'' means the amount provided for fiscal year 2027, in excess of $273,000,000, in a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report and specified to pay for the costs of continuing disability reviews, redeterminations, co-operative disability investigation units, and fraud prosecutions under the heading ''Limitation on Administrative Expenses'' for the Social Security Administration.

(e) ADJUSTMENT FOR REEMPLOYMENT SERVICES AND ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENTS.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution as follows:

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2027 specifies an amount for grants to States under section 306 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 506) for claimants of regular compensation, as defined in such section, including those who are profiled as most likely to exhaust their benefits, then the adjustment shall be the additional new budget authority specified in such measure for such grants for fiscal year 2027, but shall not exceed $400,000,000.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subsection, the term ''additional new budget authority'' means the amount provided for fiscal year 2027, in excess of $117,000,000, in a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making discretionary appropriations and specified to pay for grants to States under section 306 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 506) for claimants of regular compensation, as defined in such section, including those who are profiled as most likely to exhaust their benefits.

SEC. 408. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either the Senate or the House of Representatives to change those rules (insofar as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate or House of Representatives.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRAWFORD) having assumed the chair, Mr. ALFORD, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 113) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2027 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2028 through 2036, and, pursuant to House Resolution 1438, he reported the concurrent resolution, as amended by that resolution, back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

STOP INSIDER TRADING ACT

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1438, I call up the bill (H.R. 7008) to amend chapter 131 of title 5 to require certain restrictions on stocks for Members of Congress and their spouses and dependents, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1438, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119–38, modified by the amendment printed in part B of House Report 119–755, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 7008

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Stop Insider Trading Act''.

SEC. 2. RESTRICTIONS ON COVERED INVESTMENTS.

(a) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SUBCHAPTER IV—RESTRICTIONS ON COVERED INVESTMENTS

''13151. Definitions.
''13152. Restrictions on covered investments.
''13153. Enforcement.''.

(b) RESTRICTIONS.—Chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end a new subchapter:

''SUBCHAPTER IV—RESTRICTIONS ON COVERED INVESTMENTS

''§ 13151. Definitions

''In this subchapter:

''(1) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'covered individual' means any of the following:

''(A) A Member of Congress, as defined in section 13101.

''(B) A dependent child (as defined in section 13101) or a spouse of a Member of Congress.

''(2) COVERED INVESTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered investment' means a security issued by a publicly traded company or any comparable economic interest acquired through synthetic means, such as the use of a derivative, including an option, warrant, or other similar means.

''(B) EXCLUSION.—The term 'covered investment' does not include—

''(i) an excepted investment fund (as described in section 13104(f)(8));

''(ii) any other fund that would be an excepted investment fund but for the fact that the fund does not meet the diversification requirement solely because the fund is concentrated in—

''(I) the United States; or

''(II) the State, territory, or District of residence of the covered individual who owns the fund;

''(iii) an interest in a small business concern as defined under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632); or

''(iv) investments held in a trust if no covered individual has any authority over a trustee of the trust, including the authority to appoint, replace, or direct the actions of such a trustee, and the trustee is not the spouse, child, parent, or sibling of a Member of Congress.

''(3) PUBLICLY TRADED COMPANY.—The term 'publicly traded company' means an issuer that has a class of securities registered under section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78l).

''(4) SECURITY.—The term 'security' has the meaning given the term in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

''(5) SUPERVISING ETHICS OFFICE.—The term 'supervising ethics office' has the meaning given the term in section 13101.

''§ 13152. Restrictions on covered investments

''(a) CONDUCT DURING FEDERAL SERVICE.—Except as described in subsection (c), no covered individual may purchase a covered investment.

''(b) ADVANCED NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No covered individual shall sell a covered investment, unless a notice of intent to sell the covered investment is made by the Member of Congress and publicly disclosed at least 7 calendar days, and no more than 14 calendar days, prior to the sale in accordance with the requirements of this subsection.

''(2) CONTENTS OF NOTICE.—The notice under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

''(A) The projected date of sale of a covered investment.

''(B) A description of such sale.

''(C) The number of shares in such sale.

''(3) WITHDRAWAL.—The notice under paragraph (1) shall be withdrawn by the Member of Congress who filed it, prior to the close of the expiration of the notice, if the covered individual determines not to sell the covered investment.

''(4) FILING.—A Member of Congress shall file the notice under paragraph (1) for each intended sale by the Member, or the spouse or dependent child of the Member, with—

''(A) the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the case of a Representative in Congress, a Delegate to Congress, or the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico; or

''(B) the Secretary of the Senate, in the case of a Senator.

''(5) PUBLICATION.—The notice under paragraph (1) and the withdrawal under paragraph (3) shall, upon receipt, be made publicly available on a website controlled by the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate, as applicable.

''(c) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(1) OCCUPATIONAL EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), a spouse or dependent child of a Member of Congress may trade any covered investment if such covered investment is—

''(A) not owned by a covered individual and if such trade is performed as a function of the primary occupation of the spouse or dependent child; or

''(B) made as a part of compensation from an employer of such individual or in furtherance of any fiduciary or occupational obligations of such individual.''.

''(2) DIVIDEND REINVESTMENTS EXCEPTION.—The requirements of subsection (a) shall not apply to a covered individual with respect to a transaction for the purpose of reinvesting dividends received from a covered investment into the same covered investment automatically or without delay.

''§ 13153. Enforcement

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Any covered individual who violates the restrictions in section 13152 with respect to a covered investment, shall, at the direction of the supervising ethics office—

''(1) incur a fee, as calculated in subsection (b), to be paid by the Member of Congress who—

''(A) caused the violation; or

''(B) is the spouse or parent of a covered individual who caused the violation; and

''(2) in the case of a purchase of a covered investment, be required to sell a covered investment purchased in violation of section 13152(a).

''(b) CALCULATION OF FEES.—The fee required under subsection (a) shall be equal to the sum of—

''(1) $2,000 or ten percent of the value of the transaction in the covered investment which violates section 13152, whichever is greater; and

''(2) the net gain realized, if any, from the covered investment during the period beginning on the most recent date on which the individual became a covered individual and ending on the date of disposition of the covered investment, as determined by the supervising ethics office.

''(c) PAYMENT RESTRICTIONS.—A Member of Congress may not pay any of the fees under this section by using amounts from the following sources:

''(1) The Members' Representational Allowance.

''(2) The Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account.

''(3) Any contribution (as defined in section 301(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(8))) accepted as a candidate, and any other donation received as support for activities of the individual as a holder of Federal office.

''(d) MISCELLANEOUS RECEIPTS.—Any amounts collected in fees authorized by this section shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts in accordance with section 3302(b) of title 31.

''(e) REFERRAL.—The supervising ethics office has the authority to refer a former Member of Congress to the Department of Justice and section 13106 shall be applied in the same manner and to the same extent as a violation under such section if such former Member resigns or retires before paying the fee under this section.

''(f) INTERPRETATIVE GUIDANCE.—Each supervising ethics office may issue interpretative guidance on this subchapter and in issuing such guidance, may consider mitigating or aggravating circumstances.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. REQUIRING VOTERS TO PROVIDE PHOTO IDENTIFICATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE PHOTO IDENTIFICATION AS CONDITION OF CASTING BALLOT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 303 the following new section:

''SEC. 303A. PHOTO IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

''(a) PROVISION OF IDENTIFICATION REQUIRED AS CONDITION OF CASTING BALLOT.—

''(1) INDIVIDUALS VOTING IN PERSON.—

''(A) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE IDENTIFICATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in subparagraph (B), the appropriate State or local election official may not provide a ballot for an election for Federal office to an individual who desires to vote in person unless the individual presents to the official a valid physical photo identification.

''(B) AVAILABILITY OF PROVISIONAL BALLOT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If an individual does not present the identification required under subparagraph (A), the individual shall be permitted to cast a provisional ballot with respect to the election under section 302(a), except that the appropriate State or local election official may not make a determination under section 302(a)(4) that the individual is eligible under State law to vote in the election unless, not later than 3 days after casting the provisional ballot, the individual presents to the official—

''(I) the identification required under subparagraph (A); or

''(II) an affidavit developed and made available to the individual by the State attesting that the individual does not possess the identification required under subparagraph (A) because the individual has a religious objection to being photographed.

''(ii) NO EFFECT ON OTHER PROVISIONAL BALLOTING RULES.—Nothing in clause (i) may be construed to apply to the casting of a provisional ballot pursuant to section 302(a) or any State law for reasons other than the failure to present the identification required under subparagraph (A).

''(2) INDIVIDUALS VOTING OTHER THAN IN PERSON.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in subparagraph (B), the appropriate State or local election official may not accept any ballot for an election for Federal office provided by an individual who votes other than in person unless the individual—

''(i) submits with the ballot a copy of a valid photo identification;

''(ii) submits with the ballot the last four digits of the individual's Social Security number and an affidavit developed and made available to the individual by the State attesting that the individual is unable to obtain a copy of a valid photo identification after making reasonable efforts to obtain such a copy; or

''(iii) includes a notarization by a notary public attesting that the individual has personally marked the ballot.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Subparagraph (A) does not apply with respect to a ballot provided by—

''(i) an absent uniformed services voter, as defined in section 107(1) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20310(1)); or

''(ii) an individual provided the right to vote otherwise than in person under section 3(b)(2)(B)(ii) of the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act (52 U.S.C. 20102(b)(2)(B)(ii)).

''(b) PROVIDING PUBLIC ACCESS TO DIGITAL IMAGING DEVICES.—With respect to each State, the appropriate State or local government official of the State shall ensure, to the extent practicable, public access to a digital imaging device, which shall include a printer, copier, image scanner, or multifunction machine, at State and local government buildings in the State, including courts, libraries, and police stations, for the purpose of allowing individuals to use such a device at no cost to the individual to make a copy of a valid photo identification.

''(c) NOTIFICATION OF IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT TO APPLICANTS FOR VOTER REGISTRATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall ensure that, at the time an individual applies to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State, the appropriate State or local election official notifies the individual of the photo identification requirements of this section.

''(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR INDIVIDUALS APPLYING TO REGISTER TO VOTE ONLINE.—Each State shall ensure that, in the case of an individual who applies to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State online, the online voter registration system notifies the individual of the photo identification requirements of this section before the individual completes the online registration process.

''(d) VALID PHOTO IDENTIFICATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, a 'valid photo identification' means, with respect to an individual who seeks to vote in an election for Federal office, any of the following:

''(1) A valid State-issued motor vehicle driver's license that includes a photo of the individual and an expiration date.

''(2) A valid State-issued identification card that includes a photo of the individual and an expiration date issued by a State motor vehicle authority.

''(3) A valid United States passport for the individual.

''(4) A valid photo identification card for the individual issued by the Department of Defense or the Department of Veterans Affairs.

''(5) A valid identification document issued by a Tribal government that includes a photo of the individual and an expiration date.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following new item:

''Sec. 303A. Photo identification requirements.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO VOLUNTARY GUIDANCE BY ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.—Section 311(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21101(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) in the case of the recommendations with respect to section 303A, the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO ENFORCEMENT.—Section 401 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21111) is amended by striking ''sections 301, 302, 303, and 304'' and inserting ''subtitle A of title III''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include additional materials on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Stop Insider Trading Act. There is a lot of talk in this town about draining the swamp and cleaning up Washington. Today, the rubber hits the road. Good governance matters, and the Committee on House Administration is leading the way.

Under current law, Members of Congress are required to publicly disclose their stock trades. The disclosures lack details and are often filed months after a transaction.

This lack of transparency and the continued practice of Members purchasing stock is fueling public frustration. It is time we ban Members of Congress from being able to buy individual companies' shares of stock. Doing so removes even the appearance of impropriety.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to pass transformational congressional ethics reform. This is the first congressional stock trading ban to receive a vote on the floor of the House. Today, every American will know where their Member stands.

If you want to day trade, there is a place for that. It is called Wall Street. If you want to come to Washington, you should be working on behalf of the American people.

In addition, this bill also includes a commonsense proposal that we have advanced through committee on voter ID. Voter ID strengthens election integrity and is nonpartisan and common sense. In this country, you have to show a photo ID to fly, to open a bank account, to buy a beer, and, more recently, to enjoy a never-ending pasta bowl at Olive Garden.

You don't have to show an ID to vote in States like Minnesota, Illinois, California, and others, which are literally not doing the job of securing our elections, when the easy task of photo ID is in front of us.

Mr. Speaker, it is a simple concept: To vote in a Federal election, you need to show a photo ID. Twenty-four States already require a form of photo ID to vote. This bill, of course, allows provisional voting if someone forgets their ID when they go to the polls—again, common sense.

That is why it is so popular with the American people. They understand it. They know the need for this commonsense reform. Photo ID will help strengthen election integrity, bolster voter confidence, and increase participation. That is a good thing for our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, these two proposals will clean up Washington and strengthen the integrity of our elections.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, what we are considering here today is a remarkable display of cynicism, even for this institution, even for this Republican leadership team.

The American people are desperate for us to clean up the culture of corruption that pervades Washington. Americans see their elected leaders on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue enriching themselves, some to the tune of billions and billions of dollars. Headline after headline: Members of Congress tipping off insiders to reap huge payouts from prediction markets, and Members of Congress buying up private stocks just days before Pentagon announcements that will balloon their financial portfolios.

What are Speaker JOHNSON and House Republicans doing about this? They are pretending here on the floor today to address the issue. They are pushing the so-called Stop Insider Trading Act, a name meant entirely to trick the American people.

This bill, quite simply, is a sham. The bill allows Members of the Congress to continue owning and trading stocks. That is right. The so-called Stop Insider Trading Act actually allows Members of Congress to own and trade stocks.

Even this half measure—or should I say quarter measure—goes too far for Republican leadership. How do we know? What is the tell? How do we know that the Republican posturing is all performative and that Republicans do not want a stock trading bill ban to become law? They have added a poison pill to this bill. They have added provisions that have absolutely nothing to do with stock trading and everything to do with their obsession with the 2020 election.

That is right, the SAVE America Act is back, yet again. The American people keep cutting the head off this bill, flooding phone lines of their Members and Senators, demanding we block this anti-voter bill. So far, their voices are being heard. The resistance is working.

Like the Hydra, these heads keep growing back: the SAVE Act, the SAVE Act again, the SAVE America Act. They have attached it to CRs, continuing resolutions. They attach it to a spending bill, funding the State Department and other completely unrelated agencies.

The President tried to force it on the American people through illegal executive orders blocked by the courts. Now, Republicans come limping back from a losing fight. Sometimes you should just stop.

Let's acknowledge the reality of what we are doing here: Republicans have corrupted their so-called stock trading bill with a decaying piece of the SAVE America Act corpse.

The bill we are considering today would force voters in America to surrender photocopies of their photo IDs in their mail ballot envelopes. This isn't just a voter ID bill. It is a bill to destroy vote by mail, something the President routinely rails against, despite the fact that the President routinely uses mail-in voting himself, the kind of double standard Americans have come to particularly enjoy from this President.

It is a bill that would dispatch millions of American voters to Kinko's—some of us are old enough to remember Kinko's; I guess it is now FedEx—or Staples or the public library to scan and print their IDs, to shove those IDs into their mail ballots, risking their constitutional right to a secret ballot if not packaged properly, to send their ID copies off to election offices in the hopes that the ballot will be counted, that the ballot won't be discarded on the counting room floor.

□ 1420

Some might ask why these ballots would be at risk of being thrown out. It is because the bill would explicitly exclude forms of voter ID that millions of Americans are accustomed to using today.

You use your student ID, your ballot will be thrown out. Your concealed carry permit: Ballot thrown out. Your employer ID: Ballot thrown out. Your Tribal ID without an expiration date on it, which is common on Tribal IDs, you get the picture: Ballot thrown out. I could go on and on.

Those sitting at home watching this might think they know that Washington, D.C., is a dysfunctional place, but they can't be that irrational, can they? Surely, election officials and voters would have time to prepare for this seismic shift in American elections, right?

Sorry to say, they would be overestimating how much House Republicans care about voters, about election officials, about elections themselves because this bill would take effect in 90 days.

When is 90 days from today? Well, it is October 20, 2026, 2 weeks before the midterm elections. That is right, Republicans are trying to force a massive change to American voting law—eradicating mail voting as we know it—right in the middle of the final month of an election, 2 weeks before election day.

We still have a system where the time, manner, and places of elections are run by State legislatures, State officials. By October 20, those State officials, State legislatures, will have already mailed out millions of ballots to voters. Voters will have already returned some of these ballots.

What are election officials to do? Count the ballots cast with student IDs on October 19 and shred the ones that arrive after that, on October 20? Is that what they are going to do? Who is going to train election officials about what IDs to accept, what to do with mail ballots missing photocopies, and when will they do it?

There will be chaos, complete shambles. This bill is plain absurdity, written in ink printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Lest we forget, confusion is the point, chaos is the point. Republicans know that they will lose in November. They know that people strongly, strongly object to their handling of the economy, the war in Iran, and the immigration fiasco, which has resulted in the death of American citizens. They know the verdict in November will not be kind to them and shouldn't be, so they have one hope at winning—disruption, disarray, subversion.

That is why they have redrawn congressional maps from coast to coast in the middle of this year, of this term, the middle of this decade. That is why they keep trying again and again to change the rules in the middle of the game.

If they want to force States to make massive, extreme, last-minute changes just days before the midterm elections—States forced to retrain staffs, reprint ballots and ballot envelopes, and the process—with what time, what money?

Some might ask who is going to pay for all this. This is a seismic change. It won't be Washington, not House Republicans. They are too busy trying to pay for an unconscionable war in Iran, a war that has led to the tragic deaths of 18 American servicemembers, a war that no one asked for and certainly no Americans want.

Republicans will send American taxpayer money to the Middle East but not to local election offices. They simply don't care about them. They don't care about the price of their gas, the price of their groceries, the sanctity of their ballot. They do not care.

Again, I ask, who will pay for this? Sorry to break it to the viewers watching this, but they will. Their family, town, city, county, State, local election administrator, Republican and Democrat, are required to bear the burden of this change.

This is an unfunded mandate, plain and simple. I remember hearing for years from my Republican friends: no unfunded mandates. This is the mother of all unfunded mandates, 2 weeks before an election, costing tens of billions of dollars. They are going to get stuck with the bill.

This is a fiat from a Washington awash in corruption telling Americans how to run their elections. Do you know who else will pay for this? America's democracy.

I say again, this bill is not about voter ID. It is about ending a voter's ability to cast a free and fair ballot. For the sake of American elections, I strongly, strongly urge the House to reject this zombie bill.

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

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER), a member of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Chairman STEIL's bill, H.R. 7008, the Stop Insider Trading Act, of which I am a proud cosponsor.

As Members of the United States Congress, it is our job to preserve the integrity of this institution and take seriously the responsibility placed on us by our constituents.

This legislation will bring about a more transparent and accountable Congress and will be a strong measure to restore the American people's trust in this institution.

While older laws have prohibited Members from using nonpublic information when trading, they did not go far enough. More robust measures should be put in place, and that is exactly what this bill does.

As the American people have seen, Members of this body have become extremely wealthy from trading the stock market while in office, and it is precisely because of this that the American people have lost faith in Congress and in government.

We are elected to this office as a privilege to serve in this Chamber, not a right, and we should not be using our positions for our own personal and financial gain.

The American people need to be reminded that we are working for them, that we have taken a solemn oath to protect and defend the Constitution, not our own bottom line.

My colleague claimed that this bill is a poison pill because the SAVE America Act is included, which we have passed multiple times out of this House, with not any support from the Democrats.

The Democrats are opposed to voter ID and proof of citizenship. They cannot win elections based on their own bad ideas. They have to continue with the fraud and cheating.

We know that our voter rolls are outrageously dirty, that there are millions of ineligible voters on the rolls. I personally here in D.C. have received four ballots in the mail, of which I have not solicited anyone.

We have chaos because they will not vote for the SAVE America Act.

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

Before I yield to my friend, I didn't say this in my opening comments, but it is remarkable, if we are working so hard and endeavoring to convince the American people that they can have faith in what we do as it relates to insider information and moving markets, I find it extraordinary that we would not include the President, Vice President, or members of the Cabinet or the Supreme Court in a bill to make sure that they are not participating.

In fact, this is well known, and it has been well reported: Since Inauguration Day of last year, President Trump has had more trades individually than have all the Members of the United States House and Senate. That is 535 Members, and do you know who out-traded them all combined? President Trump. He is not in this bill. He is not in it. The Vice President is not in it. The Supreme Court is not in it.

In fact, the President, Truth Social, is about to enter into selling access through an app that people will pay for that will give them information on market moves.

It is extraordinary that we would somehow suggest that we are protecting the public's interest, that we care deeply about restoring faith in Washington, when there is a hole that you can drive many semi-trucks through if we are really trying to clean up this country and restore faith with the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), my colleague from the Appropriations Committee.

□ 1430

Mr. POCAN. As a Member of Congress, I don't own any individual stocks because, as a byproduct of my job, I get inside information on many publicly traded companies.

We don't let people with insider information buy stock because it impacts markets and threatens public trust in a system that so many of our retirement dollars are in.

However, this bill before us puts Members of Congress above the law. It is not a real congressional stock trading ban like other bipartisan measures. This is a weak alternative. It is like Velveeta to real Wisconsin cheese.

It has been said that this bill has loopholes so big a Qatari jet could go through them. It still allows Members to hold stock. It still allows Members to buy stocks with dividends. It still allows family members to buy stocks for others for any reason. It is basically the opposite of a real stock trading ban for Members of Congress, a wolf in sheep's clothing.

This bill continues the corruption of what marks too much of what is done in Washington. Mr. Speaker, please don't support this Velveeta and weak bill.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to a comment that was just made by my colleague, in particular, what we refer to as the spousal exception. It is very important to know.

The legislation before us on the Stop Insider Trading Act applies to a Member, a Member's spouse, and the dependent children of that Member. There is what we call the spousal working exception, so if a Member's spouse works in a capacity that engages in stock, think of a life insurance salesman, maybe your spouse is selling life insurance, Mr. Speaker, we want to make sure that individual can continue their work. Of course, they would be banned under this legislation from buying individual company's shares of stock. I think it would be incorrect if we didn't correct the record where it was not accurately stated that there are no restrictions on family members. This bill, specifically, takes that into account. It includes Members, their spouses, and dependent children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD).

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman STEIL for his dedicated hard work on getting this bill to the floor. It wasn't easy.

Mr. Speaker, public service is a privilege. It is not a pathway to personal profit. Yet, too many Americans look at us here in Congress and wonder if that line has been blurred, not proven, not assumed, but simply questioned. That question alone is a problem.

Mr. Speaker, that is because when lawmakers consistently outperform Wall Street, then people start asking questions. They start doubting. They stop trusting in us.

For example, Mr. Speaker, there is even a Member here in our body who entered Congress years ago with a net worth in the thousands, and yet now has a net worth of well more than $200 million. That is exactly why this matters, Mr. Speaker.

When I came to Congress, I made it quite clear: We should not be trading individual stocks while we are making decisions that shape our economy. That is why I introduced the PELOSI Act to draw a bright, unmistakable line, no stock trading, no gray area, and no doubt, to be above the appearance of impropriety as Chairman STEIL said.

The very legislation we are debating today from my friend, Chairman STEIL, advances that same principle. It says that if you have the privilege of serving in this body and serving your constituents, Mr. Speaker, then you don't get to personally profit from the markets that you help influence.

This isn't complicated. The American people shouldn't have to wonder if their Representative is working for them or watching their stock portfolio on their phones here on the House Chamber. Let's remove that doubt. Let's restore trust to this body. Let's raise the standard of each and every one of us here in this body today.

If I wanted to, I could have made a lot of money in the last 3½ years I was here trading stock and probably would be able to afford an apartment somewhere in D.C. However, I don't, and like a lot of Members who don't trade stocks, I sleep on my couch in my office.

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker?

I sleep well. I sleep well knowing that I am doing the right thing.

In closing, I grew up in the Church of Christ down in Baytown, Texas. I worked for a while in West Palm Beach. There was a preacher there named Dan Jenkins who used to say all the time: It is always right to do right. It is always wrong to do wrong. It is never right to do wrong, and it is never wrong to do right.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the right thing to do, not just for the American people, but for our body to restore trust to us.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the gentleman from Missouri ought to read the bill before the House because everything he just said would not be cured by what he just talked about.

In fact, you may still, under this bill if it became law, and thankfully it will not, you could still own stock, Mr. Speaker.

Let's say you own Boeing stock and you happen to be on the Armed Services Committee or a Defense appropriator, Mr. Speaker, and you sort of say to Pentagon officials: Boy, I really like this equipment that Boeing is producing or Northrop Grumman if you happen to own them, or other companies, great companies, but you may own stock in the company.

There are many ways for you, Mr. Speaker, to drive up that stock price and wait as the owner of that stock to manipulate the situation until the stock price rises and then you sell it. That is a trade. That is ownership of stock. Mr. Speaker, that is the ability to influence stockholdings you have when you come to Congress.

This doesn't divest it.

The gentleman made a great speech, and I really appreciate it. Unfortunately, it doesn't have anything to do with what the bill does.

Besides, Mr. Speaker, you can have private stock. There are reports that people have purchased private stock in companies that then became public that then were sold to public companies and made windfalls here.

Mr. Speaker, you could still do that under this bill. You can engage in crypto, Mr. Speaker. You can buy commodities, and you can participate in the prediction markets.

The notion that somehow Americans should see this bill pass and relax and suddenly feel as if the people making public policy decisions in Washington suddenly won't be doing anything in their self-interest but will, instead, be doing it in the interest of the American people—it is a word I used earlier—I contend, is exactly what this is. It is a sham.

This will not fix anything, and that is what it is intended to do, to not fix anything, but to make people believe that we have addressed it. We haven't addressed anything.

That is not what this bill is.

Mr. Speaker, when you add the element of really trying to subvert this election, there is nothing that argues for this bill. This isn't even a partial way of getting it done. This is a diversion, and it is intended to get people to feel better about something when they shouldn't feel better at all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, two things can be true at the same time. I can support voter ID requirements, which I do, and I can support banning Members of Congress from trading stocks, which I do, and I am in compliance.

I can also oppose this bill because it is not an honest attempt to do either.

This bill's stock-trading provisions do not go nearly far enough. In this bill, Members can retain their investments that they already own, preserving the very conflicts of interest that a real ban would eliminate.

Instead, also in this bill, Republicans are attaching new barriers for Americans to vote by mail, requiring photocopies of a very narrow set of acceptable IDs, more narrow than those required in the State of Texas. They are so narrow that a very similar bill was vetoed by a Republican Governor in the State of Ohio. They put more burdens upon voters without access to copiers and more strain on election officials.

If Republicans really wanted to ban Member stock trading, then bring us a really clean bill, and I will vote for it. In fact, I offered amendments to this bill, and Republicans rejected them all.

Additionally, congressional ethics cannot become a Trojan horse for voter suppression.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), who has been a champion of this topic. We would not be here on the floor of the House of Representatives with an opportunity to pass this stock trading ban without his work.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Wisconsin, Chairman STEIL, for his incredible work on this, his leadership, his friendship, and making sure that we are here today and getting this done. It has been a partnership I have been happy to engage in.

I am proud of the legislation that we put forward.

Let me say that again to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: I am proud of the legislation that we put forward. It is, in fact, good legislation.

Let's back up 1 minute and talk about the problem. Right here, according to data I have got right now, 11,000 trades totaling between $600 million and $900 million of legislators over the last year.

We have got one Member, a Democrat, $79 million of 406 trades; one man, a Republican, $75 million on 1,000 trades. A Democrat, $55 million on 3,923 trades.

I could keep going on a bipartisan basis. I want to make clear that it is a bipartisan problem.

I want to take a minute to say that we should recognize the bipartisan nature of the work that it took to get here, even though there is some disagreement here now.

I have got friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. MORELLE, SETH MAGAZINER, and others I have been working with closely to try to advance this cause, and I want to thank them because they have worked in good faith to try to address this issue.

□ 1440

I want to be clear to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I have often heard excuses. It says: I have a right to trade equities. I have a right to trade stocks. Let me be very clear: You do not have that right. There is no such right guaranteed in the Constitution.

It is a privilege to serve in the United States Congress. When you come to Congress, you are supposed to set that aside. You are supposed to come here and serve. You come here for 2 years, 4 years, 6 years, 8 years—preferably not 40. You set down your personal interests, and you serve.

Unfortunately, a lot of Members have been violating the spirit of that. That is why we are here today. We passed legislation in 2012 that made a lot of this transparent.

Today, we have legislation on the floor that I am proud of, that would stop the ability of Members of Congress to acquire equities and would have significant transparency and presale requirements before you can sell equities you hold.

Yes, I had legislation that would have required divestiture. I prefer that approach, but you have to build a coalition in a body. I think this is a giant step forward.

I wish my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and my colleagues on this side of the aisle would recognize that and praise it. If we did that, it would be night and day in this body if people were not allowed to acquire Microsoft while you are voting on technology; acquire Lockheed when you are voting on Defense; acquire pharma or Big Insurance when you are voting on healthcare policies when you are supposed to be focusing on the American people and not focusing on your portfolio. That is where we should be as a body.

I am proud that we are bringing this legislation forward today. I hope that everybody will support it, regardless of which side of the aisle you are on.

Obviously, I am the lead author also of the SAVE America Act. That legislation has been offered on the back of this bill. I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle should support it. I don't think they are supporting it for a lot of political reasons. I am not going to debate that here because right now we are talking about this bill addressing stock trading.

I will say one thing that I think merits being said: I think we should be having a straight up-or-down vote on this stock trading bill. That is what I think. I think my friends who worked in good faith to do that deserve that on both sides of the aisle. I am going to end up voting for this because I support both measures. I am not done this year demanding that we have a straight up-or-down vote on stock trading. You can't, whether you are on this or that side of the aisle, hide behind the SAVE America Act for your opposition to what we need to do to change the culture of this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman STEIL and my friends who I worked with on this.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ROY, whom I have had a chance to be in a number of meetings with on this issue, about restoring faith and trust in America. Recognize, I came to Congress and sold all of the stock that my wife and I owned. At the time, as I recall—it has been many years—Microsoft, Google, Alpha, a number of technology stocks. If I had come here under this bill, should this become law, I would be able to continue to hold onto all of them. Honestly, depending on what committees I serve, I can do a great deal to make sure that my investments were guarded, that they were protected, that they were furthered.

It is not supposed to be the way this functions. That is not what we have been talking about. Holding on to stock when you are in a position to affect markets is wrong. Simply put, it is wrong. We should end it. Require the divestiture of stock by Members of Congress, the President, the Vice President, and members of the courts. That is what we should be doing.

Anything less than that, particularly when you continue to hold stock, continue to trade by selling stock, when it is appropriate for you and your portfolio, and even to be able to take dividends from stock you own and reinvest and buy more stock—that is allowed under this bill, as well.

Others have pointed out Democratic Members and recognized them. There are glaring examples here. However, to reiterate the point, this bill would not prevent insider trading. It would just trick the American people into thinking we are trying to do something about corruption when we are not.

Take one glaring example. In December of last year, a Member of the House Republican leadership purchased up to $250,000 in private shares of Elon Musk's xAI. Within days, the Department of Defense announced an expanded partnership with xAI to provide Grok AI tools. Convenient timing, no doubt. I am sure most Americans would love to have participated in such convenient timing.

This Republican Member of leadership, who sits on the Armed Services Committee, including on the subcommittee on Cyber, Information Technologies, and Innovation, just happened to buy xAI stock shortly before the Department of Defense's announcement. They sure did. That is what they did.

It gets worse. Earlier this year, Elon Musk's SpaceX acquired xAI soon thereafter. SpaceX launched an initial public offering, and the value of the xAI shares this Member of Congress had acquired skyrocketed. In fact, the Member may have made as much as a 60 percent return on the Member's investment, if liquidated at the right time, potentially a $150,000 profit on a $250,000 initial investment. That is extraordinary.

Yet, this bill that the Republicans are purporting would restore trust in America would not have in any way impeded the ability of a Member to do that. If that isn't extraordinary, if that is not an indictment on what is happening here, I don't know what is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI), my dear friend.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7008.

Mr. Speaker, I have helped lead bipartisan efforts to ban stock trading by Members of Congress, and I am deeply frustrated that the majority refuses to take the issue seriously enough at this crucial time when Congress' stock is at an all-time low.

We should not be playing partisan games on this. The Republican majority is pushing a bill that still allows Members of Congress to hold, sell, and even buy certain individual stocks. They have paired it with the SAVE America Act, a voter suppression measure, that would make it harder, not easier, for Americans to participate in our elections.

I agree with Congressman ROY on this particular point that we should have an up-or-down vote on the bipartisan Restore Trust in Congress Act, which we have all supported, which has over 200 signatures, I believe, as a discharge petition. It finally bans trading by Members of Congress, their spouses, and dependent children.

Mr. Speaker, Congress is not a casino, and it is time we proved it.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) to speak on the bill.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership and his dogged determination to bring this to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am a proud original cosponsor of not only this bill but every other bipartisan bill that is not here. The record for me is clear on this.

Last year alone, Members made, according to my count, over 13,000 trades, totaling over $600 million with 202 representatives and 56 senators trading, both Republican and Democrat. Every single year, at some point, somebody publishes a list of the Members that were most successful in trading.

You will never see my name on there because I don't own any stock, no commodities, no crypto, none of it, because, Mr. Speaker, I came here to serve. If you know anything about service, you know service is about sacrifice. Service isn't about what you can get. It is about what you can give.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the sponsor, the chairman, the author of this bill, for his dogged determination. I am glad we are going to vote on it, and everybody is going to see.

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

Mr. Speaker, I go back to a comment I made earlier in my opening about the timing of this bill and the effective date. Ninety days from now is October 20, 2 weeks before election day. There will be millions of ballots, mail-in ballots, absentee ballots. Several years ago, this Congress passed the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act. For uniformed and overseas persons who are eligible to vote, UOCAVA ballots will already be en route to voters.

□ 1450

Voters will have already cast ballots, perhaps in the millions, by that time.

How are election administrators across the United States supposed to comply with this new Federal law dropped right in the middle of the final weeks of the 2026 midterm elections? It is effectively election malpractice.

It is creating discord. It will create countless questions. I don't know who is going to pay for the retraining. I don't even know how one would do the retraining. Election workers are going to be stuck, as I envision it, with envelopes which will need to have not only photocopies—by the way, I don't know where any of this information gets stored after the fact.

Is it going to be in a vault somewhere? Is a voter's driver's license or proper ID going to be kept somewhere? By the way, how will they make sure that when someone, as they will no doubt do, puts their ID in their ballot, eliminating any chance that they have secrecy of their ballot—who is managing that? The local election administrators?

They are going to train all their workers within 2 weeks of election day on a brand-new system that has never been done anywhere in this country. I went through this in the Rules Committee. Most of the IDs in most of our States, even the most conservative States in America, have broader ID requirements than this.

Student IDs are not allowed. Most States allow it. All kinds of IDs that people have, they won't be able to use them anymore. Texas won't be in compliance. Florida won't be in compliance. The Governor of Ohio just vetoed a bill like this, which effectively criticized the intent of the bill and said it wouldn't do anything for voter security.

How does this all happen? The purpose of the change is to throw election administration into disarray. I don't know how we can see it otherwise. At the very least, if you were thinking about this, you would make it effective next year or the year after to give local administrators time to prepare and probably give them some resources so they could do all manner of things necessary to comply with admittedly a bad law. But at least it would be something you could say with a straight face was serious or an attempt to be serious.

This isn't serious. This is creating discord. It is reckless. It is irresponsible and ultimately will, once again, put the question in front of American voters of: Are they really sure they should have confidence in our system? I think it is clear some people want Americans to doubt our system, which, by the way, they should have confidence in.

These election administrators, Democrats and Republicans, at the local level care deeply about their work. They see this as a sacred trust. People are getting in and voting, and there is no design to have all manner of things that they suggest happen. It is simply not true.

That is why people will look at this and will look at January 6, 2021, and will look at all these things and conclude rightly that all we want to do is create discord and subversion of this democratic system.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), my colleague, friend, and partner on the Committee on House Administration.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to expose this package for what it truly is: a protection plan for powerful insiders disguised as a crackdown on insider trading.

The so-called Stop Insider Trading Act does not ban congressional stock trading. It leaves major loopholes open, including trading in private companies and other markets.

During committee markup, I offered a simple amendment to close these loopholes, freeze existing portfolios and stop dividend reinvestments, but my Republican colleagues rejected it. They chose protecting themselves over accountability and transparency.

Now, they have attached this watered-down stock trading bill to legislation that makes it even harder for Americans to vote, especially women in traditional marriages like mine where I changed my name and took on my husband's name.

The voter ID act eliminates trusted registration methods, restricts acceptable IDs, and creates unnecessary barriers between American citizens and the ballot box.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN).

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Members of Congress should serve the public, not profit from public office.

That is why I strongly support the Stop Insider Trading Act, which would prohibit Members of Congress, their spouses, and dependent children from purchasing individual stocks.

I have worked to lead by example by placing all of my investable assets into a blind structure that is managed by independent professionals. I do not direct, influence, or participate in any investment decisions, and every transaction occurs without my input, without my prior knowledge, and without my direction.

That approach goes above and beyond current House ethics rules. It is past time that this entire body be held to that higher standard.

Public service is a public trust. I urge every Republican and every Democrat to vote ''yes'' and to hold every Member of Congress to that high standard that the American people deserve.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SUBRAMANYAM), my friend.

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have lost trust in this institution, and banning stock trading in Congress and in the administration is actually one way to fix that.

In 2025, Members of Congress and their families executed over 13,000 trades. President Trump's own family trading has helped add billions to their net worth.

That is why we should be debating a real stock trading ban like the Restore Trust in Government Act, one that would ban Members of Congress, the administration, and their families from owning, buying, or selling individual stocks.

Instead, House Republicans only allow us to vote on a toothless, watered-down stock trading bill. Plus, to make sure that this fake stock trading ban doesn't move in the Senate, they throw in the SAVE America Act, which would disenfranchise millions of Americans.

I ask: Why are we afraid to put a comprehensive stock trading ban on the floor and have it apply to the President, too?

Let's vote on a real stock trading ban and vote ''no'' on this fake ban with voter suppression.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM).

Mrs. KIM. Mr. Speaker, over 80 percent of Americans believe Members of Congress shouldn't be trading stocks and benefiting off insider information. Yet, while Americans have made their position clear, some Members of Congress and their families made more than 13,000 stock trades worth more than $600 million last year.

Americans deserve to know they have honest representation that puts their interests first in Washington, not career politicians looking to get rich.

That is why I am proud to rise in strong support of this Stop Insider Trading Act to restore trust in Congress and bring accountability that the American people are asking for.

Congress is not a VIP club for lifelong insiders to enrich themselves. We are here to serve the American people, and the American people have given us a clear mandate.

This is not partisan. It is not controversial. Stopping insider trading should be the easiest decision we make this week. Let's get this done.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER), a leader in this fight and my dear friend.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his leadership and partnership.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are pushing a voter suppression bill that would severely restrict the mail ballots that seniors, rural Americans, and so many others rely on, and would throw our elections into chaos late in the cycle while people are already casting their ballots.

They are doing this at the behest of Donald Trump, who continues to obsess over his 2020 election loss and promote election conspiracy theories.

They are trying to trick us into supporting their voter suppression bill by calling it the Stop Insider Trading Act and including watered down language that would still allow Members of Congress to own stocks and to trade stocks with only some new restrictions.

Make no mistake, this is a trap. This bill is to make it harder for eligible Americans to vote. The Republican leadership is trying to trick us into supporting it by calling it a congressional stock trading ban, even though it doesn't actually fully ban congressional stock trading.

This bill also does nothing to stop the biggest stock trader in Washington, President Trump, who has made millions of dollars trading stocks for the companies that he regulates—tech companies, healthcare companies, defense companies, and more.

□ 1500

The American people are sick of corruption. The American people are sick of politicians getting rich off of inside information while working people struggle. The American people want a real stock trading ban for politicians in Washington.

Last year, I worked with reformers on both sides of the aisle, including Mr. ROY, whose partnership I very much appreciated. Republicans and Democrats wrote a strong bill that will actually ban congressional stock trading with no loopholes and no gimmicks. That is what the American people want.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason and at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee.

If the House rules permitted it, I would have offered that motion with an important amendment to this bill. My amendment would replace this Republican voter suppression bill with the Restore Trust in Government Act, our bill to fully ban stock trading in Congress and the Oval Office. Mr. Speaker, 190 Members have signed on to support this bill, and it is time to bring it to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD immediately prior to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting it.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUNN), my friend and colleague, to speak on the bill.

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman STEIL for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are now 200 million good reasons to vote for this bill, because that is exactly how much Members of Congress made in trading stock, most of it insider information contributing to their $200 million in take home.

Now, here is the reality. Most Members of Congress are not trading stock on the job. Most of them are not day traders. They are in their districts.

The reality is true; 35 Members of Congress beat the S&P 500 last year. As my colleague on the other side of the aisle just highlighted, one of the biggest stock trader wins in this is an app called Autopilot that tracks the trades of NANCY PELOSI and her husband.

In the last 3 years alone, their stock trades have gone up more than 200 percent. Nobody believes that this is just Washington being smarter than Wall Street. Everyone recognizes that somebody here is getting ahead while the rest of America is falling behind.

Let's talk about real solutions to hold Members accountable. Republicans wish to end insider trading happening in Washington, and it starts by legislation that Republicans are leading today.

One of the first bills that I led on the floor was to make sure that we could stop this level of stock trading. When I came to Congress, I had very little stock to begin with—with 20 years serving in the military—but I sold it all because I think it is important that Members of Congress prioritize oversight and prioritize their constituents, not get rich while serving.

For the first time, there is a bill before us that bans congressional stock trading, and it has reached the House floor with a lot of hard work on both sides of the aisle.

To my colleagues back in Iowa, watch this vote. Watch who talks about ending stock trading and who delivers on ending stock trading. Watch who is committed beyond the rhetoric to holding Washington accountable. Together, Republicans are working to clean up Congress and working to secure our elections.

These are two easy votes on the floor today. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER), my colleague and friend.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 7008, the Stop Insider Trading Act, to end stock trading by Members of Congress, because trust in our democracy cannot be a luxury item. It must be the everyday expectation of every American.

For too long, the public has watched the headlines that read like a civic lesson gone wrong: elected officials buying and selling stocks in industries they regulate, profiting from information the public will never see. That is not merely unseemly, it is corrosive. It eats away at confidence in this institution, and confidence once lost is not easily rebuilt.

Banning congressional stock trading is a simple proposition. If someone serves the public, they serve only the public. They don't get to play the market with one hand while writing the rules with the other. They don't get to benefit from the power the people have loaned them.

This reform is about fairness—for the teacher saving for retirement, the nurse investing in her future, the small business owner trying to build something that lasts. They play by the rules. They deserve a Congress that does the same.

Mr. Speaker, this is our chance to say clearly: Public service is a public trust. Let us honor it.

The fact is this bill bans stock trading. And, yes, it requires photo ID, something 80 percent of Americans agree with. People just saw what came out yesterday by one of our former colleagues, the Governor of New Jersey, Mikie Sherrill, announcing that 6,600 non-U.S. citizens were added to the voter rolls in New Jersey and nearly 400 of them voted in the election. Voter ID ensures the sanctity of our elections and ensures confidence by the American people in our elections.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we pass this legislation, and the American people should watch how every single Member votes on this bill.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying this. The bill before us is a crude combination of two completely unrelated bills—the so-called Stop Insider Trading Act and the Voter ID Act.

The Voter ID Act is, of course, already a crude reformulation of the SAVE America Act.

I have addressed both parts of the bill individually. Neither of them deserves passage. Frankly, neither of them deserves much serious debate.

The first, the so-called Stop Insider Trading Act, is not a stock trading ban. Despite what everyone has said today, it simply is not. Get the bill. Download it. Read it. It doesn't require people to sell stock that they own.

The bill is a vote to allow Members of Congress to continue to own and trade individual stocks. I don't know how to be clearer than that.

The bill would let Members of Congress keep every single share of stock they own.

The bill would allow Members to liquidate their holdings at any time, obviously when it is profitable for them. There is no divestiture required in this bill.

The bill does nothing to rein in the unprecedented, absurd, and deeply offensive corruption currently taking place in the White House. The bill is silent on the President.

I would note again that so far this year, the President has traded more securities than the entire Congress combined, all 535 Members of the House and Senate. Does anyone believe for a minute that the President has less influence on the markets than individual Members of Congress? Judge that for yourself.

Then there is the second fully distinct part of this bill: voter suppression provisions taken right from the SAVE America Act.

House Democrats support voter identification. Democrats have included responsible ID provisions in the Freedom to Vote Act and have offered amendments at committee making this point crystal clear.

The bill before us, however, would create a more restrictive regime than any currently in use in this country. It is more restrictive than Florida and more restrictive than Texas. The bill would eviscerate mail voting as we know it, forcing voters to include photocopies of their ID every time they mail a ballot.

This measure is so extreme the Republican Governor of Ohio, Governor DeWine, vetoed a similar statewide measure because it would burden voters without preventing fraud.

This bill would throw our elections into chaos, the effective date being October 20 of 2026, 90 days from today, right in the middle of this midterm election. In 90 days, tens of millions of Americans will have already cast their ballots by person and by mail. This bill would upend the November midterms, and that is exactly the point. That is exactly the goal.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rehash again of the President's top legislative priority: the SAVE Act. I urge its defeat.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as we close out today, I begin by thanking leadership for giving us this opportunity. Congress has not had a bill on the House floor on this topic with this opportunity before.

I thank Speaker JOHNSON, Leader SCALISE, Whip EMMER for their work on this. I also thank the Members of this body who have doggedly worked on this issue, in particular Congressman CHIP ROY, as well as BRIAN FITZPATRICK, TIM BURCHETT, ANNA PAULINA LUNA, and others for their feedback and work throughout the process to get to this point.

□ 1510

Before us is the Stop Insider Trading Act.

Mr. Speaker, I will touch on a handful of things that came up today about what is in and what is not in the bill. I think this is important for the American people to know.

Some of the arguments made today are what I call a Goldilocks argument: The bill doesn't do enough. The bill does too much.

Let's take this moment to take a real and substantive step forward. I will begin as I close by discussing what is in the bill. The bill ensures that Members and lawmakers cannot use their positions to profit off of insider information.

Mr. Speaker, insider trading is already illegal, and individuals who engage in it should be held accountable by the full force of the law. However, as we know, prosecuting insider trading is actually quite difficult. It is why this bill is so important to provide a bright-line rule to remove even the appearance of impropriety that someone has leveraged their position for financial gain.

Under this bill, Members, their spouses, and their dependent children are prevented from purchasing individual companies' shares of stock, period, full stop.

The question then becomes: What if a Member arrives in Congress with stock in their portfolio? Say they are saving up for their retirement or their children's college education. We provide an opportunity with 7 days advance notice to be able to make that sale. That 7 days of advance notice tells the American people what is going on in advance rather than current law, which allows a 30-day filing after the fact.

This prevents Members from being able to profit off of any insider information they may gain in this institution.

Mr. Speaker, the violations and penalties associated with this bill are steep: a fine equal to $2,000 or 10 percent of the transaction, as well as a disgorgement of profits. Violators would be forfeiting any gain realized if they fail to comply with this legislation.

The legislation is critical in restoring trust in this institution. One of the challenges we face is that this institution 15 years ago passed the STOCK Act, publicly disclosing any trade a Member of this institution makes. However, the disclosure rules lack detail and are filed a month after the transaction.

When you couple that with the increased attention to Member trades, in particular, through social media accounts, it has fueled public frustration. I believe this is our opportunity where we can simply stop Members of Congress from trading individual stocks, period, full stop.

Doing so removes even the appearance of wrongdoing. Americans should be confident that individuals working here are working on their behalf, not on behalf of their own financial interests.

This bill is coupled with the Voter ID Act. In jurisdictions across this country, States that neighbor mine, like Illinois or Minnesota, or as far away as California or New York, voters can go to the polls on election day and cast a ballot without providing proof of their identity.

Our Voter ID Act implements commonsense election integrity measures by requiring voters to show photo ID when casting a ballot in Federal elections.

Mr. Speaker, 24 States already require some form of photo ID to vote. The bill simply takes this standard and makes it nationwide.

Both of these provisions are commonsense reforms, but, in particular, the Stop Insider Trading Act is a moment when we can take a tremendous step forward in the ethics here in the House of Representatives, in the Senate, and in this institution.

At a period of time when Americans are struggling to gain confidence in Congress, this legislation before us gives us that opportunity to begin restoring the trust.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues in this body today to vote in favor of the legislation before us, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Magaziner of Rhode Island moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7008 to the Committee on House Administration.

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

Mr. Magaziner moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7008 to the Committee on House Administration with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following the amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Restore Trust in Government Act''.

SEC. 2. RESTRICTIONS ON TRADE AND OWNERSHIP OF COVERED INVESTMENTS.

(a) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

SUBCHAPTER IV. RESTRICTIONS ON TRADE AND OWNERSHIP OF COVERED INVESTMENTS

13151. Definitions.
13152. Trade and ownership of covered investments.
13153. Penalties.

(b) RESTRICTIONS.—Chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end a new subchapter:

''SUBCHAPTER IV—RESTRICTIONS ON TRADE AND OWNERSHIP OF COVERED INVESTMENTS

''§ 13151. Definitions

''In this subchapter:

''(1) COMMODITY.—The term 'commodity'—

''(A) has the meaning given the term in section 1a of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a); and

''(B) does not include a precious metal (as defined in section 1027.100 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations).

''(2) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'covered individual' means any of the following:

''(A) A Member of Congress, as defined in section 13101.

''(B) A dependent child (as defined in section 13101) or a spouse of a Member of Congress.

''(C) A trustee of a trust in which an individual described in subparagraph (A) or (B) has a beneficial interest in the principal or income of the trust as described in section 1403(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(D) The President, or the spouse or a dependent child (as defined in section 13101) of the President.

''(E) The Vice President, or the spouse or a dependent child (as defined in section 13101) of the Vice President.

''(3) COVERED INVESTMENT.—The term 'covered investment'—

''(A) means an investment in a security, a commodity, a future, or any comparable economic interest acquired through synthetic means, such as the use of a derivative, including an option, warrant, or other similar means; and

''(B) does not include—

''(i) a widely held investment fund described in section 13104(f)(8) that is diversified and publicly traded on a national or regional stock exchange;

''(ii) a United States Treasury bill, note, or bond;

''(iii) a State or municipal government bill, note, or bond;

''(iv) any compensation received by a spouse or a dependent child described in paragraph (2) from an employer of the spouse or dependent child;

''(v) an interest in a small business concern and, in the case of an investment in a family farm or ranch that qualifies as an interest in a small business concern, a future or commodity directly related to the farming activities and products of the farm or ranch;

''(vi) an interest in a limited liability company created for the sole purpose of purchasing or holding real estate that serves as the personal residences of the Member of Congress;

''(vii) any share of Settlement Common Stock issued under section 7(g)(1)(A) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1606(g)(1)(A)); or

''(viii) any share of Settlement Common Stock, as defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602).

''(4) DIVERSIFIED.—The term 'diversified', with respect to an investment fund, means such fund does not have a stated policy of concentrating its investments in any industry, business, single country other than the United States, or bonds of a single State within the United States except for the State in which the Member of Congress resides.

''(5) FUTURE.—The term 'future' means a financial contract obligating the buyer to purchase an asset or the seller to sell an asset, such as a physical commodity or a financial investment, at a predetermined future date and price.

''(6) SECURITY.—The term 'security' has the meaning given the term in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

''(7) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—The term 'small business concern' has the meaning given that term under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

''(8) SUPERVISING ETHICS OFFICE.—The term 'supervising ethics office' has the meaning given the term in section 13101.

''§ 13152. Trade and ownership of covered investments

''(a) CONDUCT DURING FEDERAL SERVICE.—Except as described in subsection (b)(1)(B) and subsections (e) through (g), no covered individual may, directly or indirectly, own or trade a covered investment.

''(b) COMPLIANCE.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT.—To comply with subsection (a)—

''(A) a covered individual may not purchase a covered investment; and

''(B) a covered individual shall divest of any covered investment by the effective date established in paragraph (2) at fair market value.

''(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The effective date is established as follows:

''(A) 180 days for an individual who is a covered individual on the date of enactment of the Restore Trust in Government Act.

''(B) 90 days within the date on which an individual becomes a covered individual if such date occurs after the date of enactment of the Restore Trust in Government Act.

''(c) CERTIFICATES OF DIVESTITURE.—

''(1) APPLICATION OF CERTIFICATE OF DIVESTITURE PROGRAM.—For purposes of section 1043 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

''(A) this section shall be treated as a Federal conflict of interest statute;

''(B) any covered individual described in section 13151(2)(A) shall be treated as an eligible person described in section 1043(b)(1)(A) of such Code; and

''(C) any spouse or dependent child described in section 13151(2)(B) shall be treated as an eligible person described in section 1043(b)(1)(B) of such Code.

''(2) ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF DIVESTITURE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each supervising ethics office shall issue a certificate of divestiture to each covered individual required to divest under this subchapter upon submission of proof of compliance by such individual with the requirements to divest or any extensions granted by the supervising ethics office.

''(B) ELIGIBILITY.—Such certificate shall include an identification of each specific property eligible for the application of the certificate of divestiture program as determined by the supervising ethics office.

''(d) INCOME TAX.—A loss from a transaction or holding involving a covered financial instrument that is conducted in violation of this section may not be deducted from the amount of income tax owed by the covered individual.

''(e) OCCUPATIONAL EXCEPTION.—A spouse or dependent child of a covered individual as described in section 13151(2)(B) may trade any covered investment if such covered investment is not owned by a covered individual and if such trade is performed as a function of the primary occupation of the spouse or dependent child.

''(f) TRUSTS.—

''(1) QUALIFIED BLIND TRUST.—Any covered investment held in a qualified blind trust as defined in section 13104(f)(3) shall be divested in accordance with subsection (b)(1)(B) by the effective date established in subsection (b)(2).

''(2) FAMILY TRUST.—A supervising ethics office may grant an exemption for covered investments held in a family trust only if—

''(A) no covered individual—

''(i) is a grantor of the family trust;

''(ii) contributed any covered investment to the family trust; or

''(iii) has any authority over a trustee of the family trust, including the authority to appoint, replace, or direct the actions of such a trustee; and

''(B) the grantor of the family trust is or was a family member of the covered individual.

''(3) REQUESTS.—A covered individual seeking an exemption under paragraph (2) shall submit to the applicable supervising ethics office a request for the exemption, in writing, certifying that the conditions described in that paragraph are met.

''(g) ASSETS ACQUIRED IN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.—In the event that a covered individual acquires a covered investment after the date of enactment of the Restore Trust in Government Act other than by purchase (such as by marriage, inheritance, divorce settlement, or other circumstance), the covered individual shall have 90 days from the date on which such investment was acquired to divest such covered investment at fair market value.

''(h) EXTENSION.—A supervising ethics office may grant a covered individual an extension of time to comply with a divestment deadline under this subchapter if a covered investment cannot be divested by such deadline due to low liquidity, vesting schedules, or contractual restrictions.

''(i) INTERPRETATIVE GUIDANCE.—The supervising ethics office shall issue interpretive guidance on any relevant term not defined in this subchapter.

''§ 13153. Penalties

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) PENALTIES.—Any covered individual who violates the restrictions on trading or ownership of covered investments in section 13152 shall, at the direction of the supervising ethics office—

''(A) pay a fee equal to ten percent of the value of the covered investment; and

''(B) disgorge the profits of any transaction that violates the provisions of this subchapter.

''(2) PAYMENT OF PENALTY TO TREASURY.—A penalty imposed under paragraph (1)(B) shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States.

''(b) PAYMENT RESTRICTIONS.—A Member of Congress may not pay any of the penalties under this section by using amounts from the following sources:

''(1) The Members' Representational Allowance.

''(2) The Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account.

''(3) Any contribution (as defined in section 301(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(8))) accepted as a candidate, and any other donation received as support for activities of the individual as a holder of Federal office.

''(c) PUBLICATION.—Each supervising ethics office shall publish on a publicly available website a description of—

''(1) each fine assessed by the supervising ethics office pursuant to this section;

''(2) the reason why each such fine was assessed; and

''(3) the result of each assessment.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. STEIL. Mr. 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 are 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 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1530

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VAN EPPS) at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2027

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VAN EPPS). Pursuant to House Resolution 1438 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. 8800.

Will the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. STRONG) kindly take the chair.

□ 1531

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. 8800) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2027 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. STRONG in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 316, printed in part A of House Report 119–755, offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) had been postponed.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 119–755, on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 28 by Mr. SELF of Texas.

Amendment No. 30 by Mr. ISSA of California.

Amendment No. 44 by Mr. HARRIGAN of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 316 by Mr. GROTHMAN of Wisconsin.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. SELF

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 28, printed in part A of House Report 119–755, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF), 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 210, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 273]

AYES—221

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxx
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Fuller
Gallagher
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gimenez
Goldman (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Graves
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
King-Hinds
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Moylan
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perez
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOES—210

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Hernández
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Mejia
Menefee
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone