

strategies that disproportionately target communities of color.

The VRA is one of our nation's most important civil rights laws. It is central to any effort to build a representative democracy where citizens can exercise their most basic right to vote. I strongly urge you to support H.R. 4 when it comes before the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,

Director of Federal Government of Affairs.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,  
December 6, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than 1.7 million members of the American Federation of Teachers, I write in strong support of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019.

This important bill is a commonsense approach that responds to the Supreme Court's 2013 decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, which struck down a long-standing key provision of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

For nearly 50 years, the Voting Rights Act enshrined the right to free and fair elections in our country. But in 2013, the Supreme Court weakened the "preclearance requirement" of the Voting Rights Act, deeming it no longer justified to address the racial and geographic disparities it sought to remedy when enacted. As a result, laws restricting voting rights throughout the United States surged. In fact, an analysis by the Brennan Center for Justice found that between 2016 and 2018, counties with a history of voter discrimination purged voters from the rolls at much higher rates than other counties. This trend is a direct consequence of the Supreme Court's ruling in *Shelby County v. Holder*.

It is an understatement to say that the Supreme Court's decision ignored the real-life and ongoing efforts to suppress voting rights across our nation. Today, the renewed disenfranchisement tactics of old include, but are not limited to, restrictive voter ID laws, outcome-driven redistricting, limited voting hours and opportunities, and misinformation about polling places and times. And let's be clear, these tactics are all engineered to disproportionately affect the voting rights of African American, Latinx, immigrant and low-income voters, as well as students and seniors.

It is imperative that Congress take new action to ensure the efficacy of the Voting Rights Act. We do not want future generations of students to read in their history lessons that the Supreme Court in 2013 turned the clock back on decades of progress in voting rights and that that was the final word.

Passage of H.R. 4 is a critical step toward fulfilling our aspirations for a stronger democracy, where all voters can exercise their fundamental rights. The long-term damage of not doing so is unacceptable.

To this end, I encourage you to fulfill your civic duty by ensuring all Americans have their most fundamental of civil rights protected by voting YES on H.R. 4.

Thank you for considering our views on this important matter.

Sincerely,

RANDI WEINGARTEN,

President.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF  
JEWISH WOMEN,  
December 4, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW) urges you to vote for the Voting Rights Advancement Act (H.R. 4) when it comes to the floor this week and vote against any Motion to Recommit.

NCJW is a grassroots organization of volunteers and advocates who turn progressive ideals into action. Throughout its history, NCJW has educated and engaged our members and supporters to drive voter turnout and expand voting rights, including advocating for women's suffrage and the historic Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA). This work is in pursuit of *tzedek*, or justice—a core value of Judaism an inspiration for our advocacy. Today, we work for election laws, policies, and practices that ensure easy and equitable access and eliminate obstacles to the electoral process so that every vote counts and can be verified.

H.R. 4 would restore the Voting Rights Act to its former strength. The 2013 *Shelby* decision effectively ended the federal government's ability, granted by the VRA, to preclear changes to state and local election laws before they went into effect. In his decision, Chief Justice Roberts urged Congress to update the formula that determines which jurisdictions need to participate in preclearance. H.R. 4 does exactly that by creating a new coverage formula based on the preceding 25 years.

Voter suppression most harms already marginalized communities. Since *Shelby*, dozens of laws have passed across the country making it easier to suppress the vote. These laws disproportionately impact communities of color, minority-language speakers, low-income voters, elderly and young voters, women, and transgender individuals.

Voting is a fundamental right, protective of all other rights. Congress has the power and responsibility to ensure that every eligible person can cast a ballot by passing H.R. 4.

Sincerely,

JODY RABHAN,

Chief Policy Officer.

PUBLIC CITIZEN,  
December 5, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Tomorrow, the House of Representatives will vote on the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019 (H.R. 4). This is an historic moment to cure an historic injustice. Public Citizen strongly urges you to vote for H.R. 4.

The principle of "one person, one vote" is critical to our constitutional democracy—but for too much of our history it was honored in the breach. The passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA) is one of the proudest moments in American history, as it affirmed this principle and corrected the shameful denial and suppression of votes to African Americans and other people of color.

Shamefully, however, the U.S. Supreme Court in *Shelby County v. Holder* stripped away Section 5 of the VRA, a cornerstone of the law's protections. Since the *Shelby* ruling, 23 states have enacted laws that disenfranchise individuals and groups by restricting their ability to vote. These sorts of repressive voter suppression tactics are precisely the sort of draconian, discriminatory measures the VRA was enacted to prevent.

It is essential that H.R. 4 be enacted into law to repair the damage done by the *Shelby* decision. This legislation would modernize the VRA and restore protections necessary to prevent racial voter discrimination, voter purges and voter suppression.

The heroes of the civil rights movement fought for the VRA's original passage in 1965 amidst harsh Jim Crow-era disenfranchisement laws and in the face of violent opposition. It is utterly unconscionable that our nation has backtracked on the voting rights progress achieved after passage of the Voting Rights Act. Our country is better than this.

Public Citizen urges in the strongest terms that you to vote in favor of H.R. 4 and oppose

any efforts that could weaken or undermine the legislation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT WEISSMAN,

President.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 741, 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 4 is postponed.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING UNITED STATES EFFORTS TO RESOLVE THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT THROUGH A NEGOTIATED TWO-STATE SOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 326) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 188, answered "present" 2, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 652]  
YEAS—226

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

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

NAYS—188

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

Walden	Wenstrup	Woodall
Walker	Westerman	Wright
Walorski	Williams	Yoho
Waltz	Wilson (SC)	Young
Weber (TX)	Wittman	Zeldin
Webster (FL)	Womack	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

García (IL)	McCollum
-------------	----------

NOT VOTING—14

Barr	Gabbard	Norman
Bass	Gosar	Porter
Byrne	Hunter	Serrano
Cartwright	Kinzinger	Shimkus
Emmer	Marchant	

□ 1209

Mr. WESTERMAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Davis moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 39, after line 9, insert the following:  
**SEC. 11. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act may be construed to allow fines or other amounts paid to the United States in connection with a violation of title I of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), including any amount paid pursuant to a settlement agreement (including a plea agreement, deferred prosecution agreement, or non-prosecution agreement), to be used to make a payment in support of a campaign for election for the office of Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Il-

linois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4 is the fourth partisan attempt by this majority to federalize our elections. One thing all four of these partisan bills in common is they all have good titles.

In October, the majority jammed through H.R. 4617, the SHIELD Act, an attempt to federally hijack campaign finance law in this country. In June, the majority jammed through H.R. 2722, the SAFE Act, an attempt to federally hijack election infrastructure in this country. And in February, the majority jammed through H.R. 1, the For the People Act, a piece of legislation that, as introduced, would fund all of our campaigns with tax dollars from hardworking Americans.

Catchy titles can't hide the facts, and the facts are that these four bills are bad partisan policy that would negatively affect the American people.

When the Democrats proposed public financing of campaigns in H.R. 1, I could hardly believe it. The 6-to-1 small-dollar campaign match program would create a mandatory donation from the American taxpayer to a political candidate.

For every \$200 donated by hardworking Americans to any political campaign of all of us in this institution, the Federal Government, on the backs of the taxpayers, would give \$1,200 to that same politician's campaign.

This program would do nothing but fill the swamp, and any Member who voted for it was voting to fill their own pockets and the pockets of political operatives nationwide.

At Rules Committee, though, this was changed. The shell game now includes a fund which is supposedly financed through fines and settlements. But we have now seen the CBO score, and this fund does not support itself.

So what happens when it fails? I will tell you. It will ultimately fall to the taxpayers in this country to support this Democratic policy.

But fines and settlements take us back to the legislation we hope to recommit to the committee today. There are Members who would have you believe that there are currently no existing laws protecting the right for every American to vote or that the Voting Rights Act is no longer in place. However, the Voting Rights Act is in effect today and protecting every American's right to vote, and it includes many important provisions:

Title I of the Voting Rights Act, 52 United States Code 10501(a) says: No citizen shall be denied, because of his failure to comply with any test or device, the right to vote in any election.

That is still in effect today, without H.R. 4, and it comes with a \$5,000 fine if you don't follow that.

Section 307(a): No person shall prevent another who is entitled to vote, from voting. Still in effect, \$5,000 fine.

Section 308(b): No person shall destroy, deface, or alter official voting ballots. Still in effect, \$5,000 fine.