

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	Suozi
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
Amodei	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.

307(c): No person shall provide false information in registering to vote, or in voting. Still in effect, \$10,000 fine.

307(e): No person shall vote more than once. Still in effect, \$10,000 fine.

307(d): No person shall falsify or conceal material facts. Still in effect, \$10,000 fine.

307(b): No person shall intimidate, threaten, or coerce any person for voting or attempting to vote. Still in effect.

Do not let anyone tell you the Voting Rights Act is not alive and well in this country. What we have debated today is not a reauthorization of this important, historically bipartisan legislation that has prevented discrimination at the ballot box, because it does not need reauthorization.

Sections 2 and 3 of the VRA that are currently in effect are continuing to help safeguard the public from discrimination at the ballot box. Every eligible American who wants to vote in our country's elections should be able to cast their vote.

This bill is only about preclearance and the Democrat majority giving the Department of Justice and the Federal Government control over all election activity.

Jurisdictions under preclearance cannot move a polling location, expand vote-by-mail efforts, nor properly maintain their voting rolls without a partisan Department of Justice clearing everything they do. This is about control and taking power away from State and local election officials who they don't like and putting it in the hands of the Federal Government.

This bill does not reauthorize the Voting Rights Act. What does it do? It opens the doors for fines and settlements in this country, including under this act, to be hijacked once again by my colleagues for their own political campaigns if they get their way.

My motion to recommit is simple: Make it clear to your constituents that fines and settlements under the VRA will not be going to your own campaign coffers.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this amendment because it is a mere distraction. It is an attempt to politicize the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by interjecting campaign finance and settlement terms into civil rights legislation.

If Republicans were really serious about voting rights—about voting rights—they would actually be willing to come to the table and talk about how we can fully restore section 4 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Leave it up to our colleagues across the aisle to interject money and finance into civil rights law. What has been lost today in this debate is the

very heart of this bill; it is the central meaning of the bill.

Let's not forget the brave patriots of the civil rights and voting rights movement who marched, prayed, and died for the right to vote. These foot soldiers for equality, like our very own JOHN LEWIS, were ordinary citizens who dared to achieve extraordinary social change by forcing this Nation to live up to its ideals of equality and justice for all.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that the price of freedom is not free. It has been bought and paid for by those brave foot soldiers so that, one day, a little Black girl from Selma, Alabama, could sit in this august body.

I know I am not the only Black and Brown colleague of ours who owes our very presence in this Chamber to the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Mr. Speaker, old battles have become new again. We fight for the same equity that these foot soldiers fought for in Selma.

Progress is elusive. Every generation must fight to maintain the progress that we have had and to seek to advance it.

Since the Supreme Court's decision in 2013 in *Shelby v. Holder*, States across this country have enacted harsh measures that make it more difficult to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I dare say that Selma is now. Since the Shelby decision, 25 States have put in place new voting restrictions.

Selma is still now, because, since the Shelby decision, 12 States have laws making it harder for citizens to register and stay registered.

Selma is now. Since the Shelby decision, 10 more States have made early and absentee voting more difficult.

While today there are no poll taxes or literacy tests, these modern-day barriers to voting are no less discriminatory or suppressive than those old practices.

Voting rights should be a non-partisan issue, and the fact that, in this amendment, they would try to politicize voting rights, we should all—be appalled by that.

Voting rights have been, always, very nonpartisan, and it used to be that the Voting Rights Acts passed overwhelmingly with Republicans and Democrats. In fact, the VRA was reauthorized five times—yes—under Republican and Democratic Presidents. So what has changed?

I ask my colleagues across the aisle: What are you afraid of? Why are you afraid to let more Americans vote?

Is it because your own political interests are only realized when you limit access to the ballot box?

I say: Shame on you. Shame on you.

Could it be that what we need more than anything else is to look at our North Star; that is, JOHN LEWIS. Mr. LEWIS, we are all honored, every day, to be able to call you "colleague," and the reality is that what happened on that bridge in Selma, Alabama, in 1965 is still occurring today.

If one person who is an American and who is a voter is not allowed to vote, it goes to the very heart of the integrity of all of our elections. We should all want to make sure that every American can vote.

So, let us make sure that we remember what Elijah Cummings would say. He would say: We are better than this.

We are better than this. Having an amendment that deals with politicizing the Voting Rights Act is appalling.

I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment and to remember the words of another civil rights activist, Amelia Boynton Robinson, who also was bludgeoned on that bridge with JOHN LEWIS in 1965, who came to this Chamber in 2015, as my special guest, for the State of the Union. Many of you on both sides of the aisle were willing to host her.

I say to you what she said. When people said: "I stand on your shoulders," she said, "Get off my shoulders. Do your own work."

I say now: Miss Amelia, we are doing our own work because we are voting to restore the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

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

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

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 215, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 653]

AYES—200

Abraham	Buck	Diaz-Balart
Aderholt	Bucshon	Duncan
Allen	Budd	Dunn
Amash	Burchett	Estes
Amodei	Burgess	Ferguson
Armstrong	Calvert	Finkenauer
Arrington	Carter (GA)	Fitzpatrick
Axne	Carter (TX)	Fleischmann
Babin	Chabot	Flores
Bacon	Cheney	Fortenberry
Baird	Cline	Foxx (NC)
Balderson	Cloud	Fulcher
Banks	Cole	Gaetz
Bergman	Collins (GA)	Gallagher
Biggs	Comer	Gianforte
Bilirakis	Conaway	Gibbs
Bishop (NC)	Cook	Gohmert
Bishop (UT)	Crawford	Gonzalez (OH)
Bost	Crenshaw	Gooden
Brady	Cunningham	Gotthelmer
Brindisi	Curtis	Granger
Brooks (AL)	Davidson (OH)	Graves (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Graves (LA)
Buchanan	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)

NOT VOTING—16

Barr	Gosar	Norman
Bass	Hunter	Porter
Byrne	Kinzinger	Serrano
Cartwright	Larson (CT)	Shimkus
Emmer	Marchant	
Gabbard	McHenry	

□ 1239

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, December 6, 2019, I was unfortunately not present for roll call votes 653 through 654, in order to attend a funeral. If I had been present for these votes, I would have voted:

Nay on roll call vote 653 on the motion to recommit with instructions.

Yea on roll call vote 654 on the passage of H.R. 4.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PRESSLEY). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

□ 1245

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come, and I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my colleague and friend.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I apologize for a little bit of lateness here.

On Monday, Madam Speaker, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Members are advised that votes on Thursday could occur later than usual. It is now approximately 12:30 when Members could get out. I want to make it clear that next Thursday we may go later than the usual time that Members are expecting to leave.

We will consider several bills, Madam Speaker, under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

The House will consider H.R. 3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs

Now Act. This legislation would lower prescription drug costs for every American, as well as level the playing field for American patients and taxpayers. Last year, House Democrats promised to lower healthcare costs by lowering the price of prescription drugs for the people, and we are proud to deliver on that promise this coming week.

In addition, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 729, the Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act. This bill is a package of bipartisan legislation that protects vulnerable coastal and Great Lakes communities impacted by the climate crisis.

Lastly, it is possible the House will consider the NDAA conference report. Other legislation is possible, as well, as we come to the close of this first session of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask—I know there are a lot of good-faith negotiations that continue on the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement, USMCA. We have been having productive conversations, meetings, some potential changes that I know we are negotiating with the other countries involved, as well. Does the gentleman have any idea if we may be close to bringing USMCA to the floor for a vote?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, the answer is, I hope so. As the gentleman probably knows, we have made some proposals back. Mr. NEAL has talked to representatives from the Mexican Government about this and representatives of the Canadian Government about the enforcement issue, which has been somewhat the holdup.

As the gentleman knows, both the Speaker and I voted for NAFTA. We believe that what is being worked on now is an improvement to NAFTA, but it is only an improvement if you can enforce its provisions. As the gentleman knows, over the last two decades plus, there has been no successful enforcement action issued under the present NAFTA. When the Speaker and I voted for NAFTA, we voted for it on the theory that it could be enforced, and there was a side-bar agreement. Unfortunately, as the gentleman also knows, the side-bar agreement did not lead to effective enforcement.

As a result, I know that enforcement is being discussed by Mr. Lighthizer. And I want to say that we perceive Mr. Lighthizer as representing the administration and negotiating in good faith and as an honest broker. We are appreciative of that fact.

But we are now, as I understand it, and don't hold me to this, but as I understand it, we are in discussions with the Mexican Government as to whether or not they will agree to some of the enforcement actions, which implies there is a general agreement between the administration and ourselves on what should be or could be included to effect enforcement.

But in answer specifically to the gentleman's question, I will be very happy if we can get agreement and bring this bill to the floor as early as next week, if it is ready to come.

Now, the problem is, as the gentleman knows, there is a process that needs to be effected, but I will tell the gentleman that the Speaker and I both would like to see this legislation pass as soon as possible, if, and in the context, we have effective enforcement included.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I share the gentleman's interest in getting this passed as soon as possible. Clearly, the job benefits to our country, over 160,000 new jobs will come, and better trading relationships with Mexico and Canada when we pass USMCA, as well as the message it sends to our friends around the world.

There are other countries, Japan, United Kingdom and others who would love to negotiate better trade deals with us, but this has to come first for us to prove that we can get trade deals done.

I appreciate that the gentleman and your side have been working with Ambassador Lighthizer. I don't think there is anybody who has worked harder and in more good faith than Ambassador Lighthizer. And I am glad that those talks continue with the Mexican Government, and, hopefully, we can get a final agreement that we can then bring to this floor. And we stand ready to help deliver the votes to pass that legislation, hopefully, as soon as possible, so our country can get those benefits.

I do want to shift gears to talk about where we are with impeachment, but specifically, something that came to light just the other day when the report from Chairman SCHIFF came out. There were, of course, multiple hearings, public hearings, some in secret, but at no time did it come up that the chairman was spying on people, using phone records and subpoenaing phone records, that wasn't discussed in those conversations in the hearings, and yet, in the final report, it seemed like there was very selective targeting of certain people by the chairman in this listing of phone records that he had been subpoenaing.

From what I have heard, Chairman SCHIFF has over 3,500 pages of surveillance on people, whether it is members of the press—which he did spy on members of the press—Members of Congress, and who knows who else? It is a real concern. It is a real concern that we don't know what he is doing with this, why he is doing this. Is it being used for political retribution? Which is a serious concern.

But my question to the gentlemen is—I am not sure if you are aware of how much data there is out there. I have heard reports of 3,500 pages of phone records. How many members of the press are being spied on by Chairman SCHIFF? How many other Members of Congress are being spied on? And