United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2019 *No. 195*

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, December 9, 2019, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2019

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Maryland).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 6, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANTHONY G. BROWN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, thank You for giving us another day.

We thank You on this day for the example of St. Nicholas, who fed the hungry, brought hope to the imprisoned, gave comfort to the lost, and taught the truth to all.

May all who work here in the people's House strive to imitate him by putting You first in all we do.

Give us the courage, love, and strength of St. Nicholas so that, like him, we may serve You through our service to all our brothers and sisters.

On this eve of December 7, may we be mindful of the great sacrifices of many of our ancestors who gave their last full measure while serving in our Armed Forces in defense of our Nation. We ask You, O Lord, to bless those who serve now and keep them from harm.

May all that we do be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONGRATULATING HARRIS COUNTY JUDGE LINA HIDALGO

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I want to congratulate our very own Lina Hidalgo, the county judge and chief executive of Harris County, for being named to the Forbes 30 Under 30.

A proud immigrant, born in Colombia, and the product of Houston-area public schools, Lina was the first in her family to graduate from college.

Lina went on to serve as a medical interpreter at the Texas Medical Center and has supported immigrants throughout her career.

Last year, Lina became the first woman and the first minority ever elected county judge in Harris County.

Lina is an inspiration to everyone in the community and has dedicated her life to serving the public and promoting equality.

Lina is an example of how immigrants make America great, with her hard work and contributions to her county and her country. She is the product of the American Dream, an American value we must preserve so that everyone who turns to America for an opportunity to achieve a better life can achieve it.

I am so proud to congratulate my friend, Harris County Judge Lina Hidalgo.

''Felicidades y si se puede.'' Congratulations, and, yes, you can.

SUPPORTING OUR VETERANS DURING DEPLOYMENT AND WHEN THEY RETURN HOME

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise to support H.R. 5314, the Veterans in Effective Apprenticeships Act, with my colleague, Congresswoman KATHERINE CLARK.

Our Nation's veterans deserve our support while they are deployed and when they return home, and one of the best ways to do that is to prepare them for the workforce outside of the military.

Our servicemembers have attained incredible skills during their service. Sadly, when they return to civilian life, finding a good-paying, family-sustaining job may be difficult.

H.R. 5314 helps streamline the process of attaining apprenticeships and reduces roadblocks for our veterans. The bill does four major things:

H.R. 5314 ensures programs are equipped to complete the expedited VA process for registered apprenticeships.

It clarifies that veterans are eligible for advanced placement and commensurate wage increases;

The bill instructs apprenticeship programs to account for a participant's competencies and prior experiences, including those gained during military service; and

H.R. 5314 aims to improve coordination between the Department of Labor and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I am proud to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

DEMOCRATS ARE WORKING FOR THE PEOPLE

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, when we go home, our constituents ask us: What is the Congress doing? What has the Congress done?

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise proudly to let the American people know that Democrats are fighting for the people. In 2019, alone, we have passed nearly 400 bills, over 275 of which were bipartisan.

To name a few: a once-in-a-generation gun violence prevention bill, raising the minimum wage, protecting people with preexisting healthcare conditions, and keeping the United States in the Paris climate agreement.

I am proud that I have authored two bills that have passed the House: one to make home buying more affordable—we have a problem with affordable housing—another to make the financial system more diverse and inclusive, H.R. 281. In addition, I have three bills that were adopted as amendments into legislation.

Unfortunately, 300 bills are over there with Mr. MCCONNELL. Let's get them out of the graveyard so they don't die on the vine.

SOUND THE ALARM ABOUT THE SALT DEDUCTION CAP

(Mr. GOTTHEIMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to sound the alarm about an issue that is badly impacting my constituents in the Fifth District of New Jersey every single day: the cap on the State and local tax deduction, which led to a major tax hike on my district imposed by the ''moocher States.''

Right now, as congressional leadership considers year-end legislation in these last days of the year, why would they not fix the biggest tax problem of them all: the State and local tax deduction?

It is time to end double taxation.

I released this report last week on the impact of the SALT cap on the Garden State. It is clear, taxes in north Jersey are through the roof. People are leaving the State in droves, and our home values are plummeting because of the end of the State and local tax deduction.

It is time to end that cap, and I am calling on Congress—Democrats and Republicans—to come together, to reinstate the SALT deduction this year and give a real tax cut to north Jersey.

This Congress, I introduced bipartisan legislation to fully reinstate SALT, and I helped lead not one, but two bipartisan resolutions overturning the harmful Treasury regulations that kept us from deducting charitable contributions on our Federal taxes.

We have to fix this and reinstate SALT this year and cut taxes for New Jersey families, first responders, and small businesses that are the backbone of our community. We simply can't afford to delay and prop up the moocher States anymore.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LEONCIO VEGA CORREA

(Mr. CORREA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Leoncio Vega Correa, son of Luis Correa Sotelo and Magdalena Correa. He passed away November 24, surrounded by his loved ones.

Leo was the hardworking child of immigrants. He was born in Watts, California, on April 24, 1926, but his family spent much of his childhood living in Zacatecas, Mexico.

Leo lived a hard life but an honest life. The devastation of the Great Depression followed him and his family from the United States to Mexico.

He never received a formal education. He worked as a migrant farmworker across the country, following harvests.

Despite all his hardships, Leo was a gentle giant and never met a stranger. He was always ready to give a hug, a smile, a dollar, a meal, or even the shirt off of his back. He would always tell me: ''Good deeds always come back to you.'' And he was known by his saying, ''pura vida.''

Leo lived a hard, great life. We celebrate his life today, and he will be missed by the community and his family.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 741, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 741, the amendments to the resolution and the preamble recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, printed in the resolution, modified by the amendments printed in part B of House Report 116–322, are adopted and the resolution, as amended, is considered read.

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

H. RES. 326

Whereas the special relationship between the United States and Israel is rooted in shared national security interests and shared values of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law;

Whereas the United States has worked for decades to strengthen Israel's security through assistance and cooperation on defense and intelligence matters in order to enhance the safety of United States and Israeli citizens; including by finalizing in 2016 under the Obama Administration, a 10-year Memorandum of Understanding, reaffirming the United States' commitment to annual military assistance and cooperative missile defense programs, which is in the national interests of both countries;

Whereas the United States remains unwavering in its commitment to help Israel address the myriad challenges it faces, including terrorism, regional instability, horrifying violence in neighboring states, and hostile regimes that call for its destruction;

Whereas the United States, under Presidents of both parties, has provided bilateral and multilateral foreign assistance to promote the security, stability, and the humanitarian well-being of Palestinians;

Whereas the United States has long sought a just, stable, and lasting solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that recognizes the Palestinian right to self-determination and offers Israel long-term security and full normalization with its neighbors;

Whereas for more than 20 years, Presidents of the United States from both political parties and Israeli Prime Ministers have supported reaching a two-state solution that establishes a Palestinian state coexisting side by side with Israel in peace and security;

Whereas for more than 20 years, Presidents of the United States from both political parties

have opposed settlement expansion, moves toward unilateral annexation of territory, and efforts to achieve Palestinian statehood status outside the framework of negotiations with Israel;

Whereas United States administrations from both political parties have put forward proposals to provide a framework for negotiations toward a two-state solution, including the parameters put forward by President Bill Clinton in December 2000, the Road Map proposed by President George W. Bush in April 2003, and the principles set forth by President Barack Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry in December 2016;

Whereas ending the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is vital to the interests of both parties and the leadership of both parties must negotiate in good faith in order to achieve peace; and

Whereas delays to a political solution to the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians pose a threat to the ability to maintain a Jewish and democratic state of Israel and the establishment of a viable, democratic Palestinian state: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) only the outcome of a two-state solution that enhances stability and security for Israel, Palestinians, and their neighbors can both ensure the state of Israel's survival as a Jewish and democratic state and fulfill the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people for a state of their own;

(2) while the United States remains indispensable to any viable effort to achieve that goal, only the Israelis and the Palestinians can make the difficult choices necessary to end their conflict;

(3) it is in the enduring United States' national interest to continue to stand by its ironclad commitments under the 2016 United States-Israel Memorandum of Understanding, which seeks to help Israel defend itself against a wide range of threats;

(4) the United States, with the support of regional and international partners, can play a constructive role toward ending the Israeli-Palestinian conflict by putting forward a proposal for achieving a two-state solution that is consistent with previous United States proposals to resolve the conflict's final status issues in ways that recognize the Palestinian right to self-determination and enhance Israel's long-term security and normalization with its neighbors;

(5) it is in the United States' interest to continue promoting the security, stability, and humanitarian well-being of Palestanians and their neighbors by resuming the provision of foreign assistance pursuant to United States law; and

(6) a United States proposal to achieve a just, stable, and lasting solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict should expressly endorse a two-state solution as its objective and discourage steps by either side that would put a peaceful end to the conflict further out of reach, including unilateral annexation of territory or efforts to achieve Palestinian statehood status outside the framework of negotiations with Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

□ 0915

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 326, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the measure we are considering today is something that ought to be straightforward. It is essentially a reiteration of our support for the consensus view that has prevailed for two decades on resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, a two-state solution.

This measure emphasizes that presidents of both parties and Israeli Prime Ministers have supported reaching the two-state solution that establishes a Palestinian state living side by side in peace and security with Israel. President George W. Bush said clearly, ''My vision is two states living side by side in peace and security.'' And President Obama agreed that, ''There is little secret about where they must lead, two states for two peoples.'' Prime Minister Netanyahu has said, ''Israel remains fully committed to peace and the possibility of two states for two people.''

There are reasons, Mr. Speaker, so many of us have supported this approach for so long. A two-state solution would go a long way to ensure Israel's survival as a secure Jewish and democratic state, and it would fulfill the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people for a state of their own.

The resolution we are considering underscores that a two-state solution puts us on the path toward these outcomes. It makes clear that any proposal to achieve a just, stable, and lasting solution to this conflict should likewise endorse a two-state solution.

This is what we have been talking about for decades, Mr. Speaker, here on the House floor and at international gatherings, across administrations of both parties and Congresses, and premierships and Knessets of every stripe. This isn't controversial. At least it shouldn't be. This is nothing radical. We all know two states won't spontaneously appear tomorrow. The parties have a lot of work ahead of them, but every day we seem farther away from the goal.

Some of the reasons are plain as can be. Violence and terrorism continue to come in waves. Hamas has rained down hundreds of rockets at populations across Israel, and there seems to be no end in sight. Palestinian leaders have not embraced their role as peacemaker. How can Israel sit down with people who pay off terrorists?

But no one said peace was easy. To paraphrase the late Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, ''You don't make peace with your friends. You make peace with your enemies.''

I haven't lost hope, but the minute America abandons its leadership role in the two-state solution, that hope dwindles. We cannot get to the point where Israel's role as a Jewish and democratic state is at risk. So that is why we need to get back to what has rooted American policy toward the conflict for so long, what has guided our efforts.

Now, let's look at the history, because a little bit of history is important.

Back in 1947, the U.N. Security Council came up with Resolution 181, which partitioned the land into what they called a Jewish state and an Arab state. The Jews accepted it. And the Palestinians, the Arabs, rejected it and tried to push Israel and the Jews into the sea. It didn't work.

The war of independence happened. In 1948 Israel was declared a democracy and a nation state. And so we fast forward and we see what happened each time the Arab states rejected the right of the Jewish people to have a homeland on their land for many years.

So when one side says, oh, we are being mistreated. I think they have to go back and look at how they reacted. Because, again, back in 1967, back in 1973, there was no so-called occupation, there was nothing that the Arabs object to today, and yet, they refused to make peace with Israel. So I think that we have to look at both sides and we have to say, you know, people who are protesting now and saying that there is no peace really should look at what their actions have been for these past years.

Unfortunately, there has not been the leadership, in my opinion, in the Arab world to be able to make peace. That is why it is so important that this Congress do it. That is why it is so important that we put our heads together and try to say that constant war is not going to solve anything, but a two-state solution probably ultimately will.

So that is why we need to get back to what has rooted American policy toward the conflict for so long, what has guided our efforts.

Do you know what a one-state solution means? It means a state where Jews could become the minority in their own country. It means one Palestinian state with no determination for the Jewish people or for the Palestinians. Israel's right to exist as a state that is both Jewish and democratic is incompatible with a one-state solution, period.

I would caution all Members to bear in mind that before making charges in this debate about who supports Israel and who doesn't, about who is turning this issue into a political football, there is no Member of this body who is a stronger supporter than I am of the U.S.-Israel relationship, of Israel's right to exist and defend itself.

That is why I support this legislation, because I want to see peace between Israelis and Palestinians. I want Israel to have a secure and prosperous future. And I want to see American leadership brought to bear on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 326.

I have great respect for the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), who has been a long-time champion of the U.S.-Israel relationship. And as I was listening to his opening remarks, there is a lot that he said that I strongly agreed with. And it kind of pained me realizing that he didn't write this actual resolution that is before us, because I know it would have been worded differently and it would have received support.

Unfortunately, many of the opening remarks which I strongly agreed with are deliberately not in this resolution. It is a great opening for another resolution, not this one.

Last summer we came to the House floor and we almost unanimously passed a resolution to strongly oppose BDS. That resolution included a lot of what this resolution tries to do. It is a watered-down version of what we did last summer. When we woke up the next day, many Members in this House said, okay, now what are we going to do about it?

S. 1 was a bill that passed at the beginning of this year in the Senate with strong bipartisan support with under 80 Senators voting for it. It has a companion bill, H.R. 336, by lead Republican MICHAEL MCCAUL of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. There is a discharge petition that has almost 200 signatures on it led by Congressman BRIAN MAST to bring S. 1–H.R. 336 to the floor.

So we made a strong statement last summer, and we woke up the next day, and are motivated to do something about it. We can actually, right now, with this time that we are debating and with the vote that we are about to have, we can actually be passing a bill with teeth that would go to the President's desk and would be signed into law.

And that is where our focus should have been. This resolution before us today is deeply flawed, it is highly partisan, it is ill-timed, and it is poorly crafted.

In the last 2 years, Israel has been hit by over 2,600 rockets and mortars. In the past year alone, 1,500 of those rockets were fired from the Gaza Strip into Israel.

Filing this resolution squarely into the category of worst timing possible, H. Res. 326 comes to the floor just 1 week after Israel was bombarded with over 450 rockets. In all of the pages of this resolution, guess where it mentions Palestinian terrorism? Nowhere.

This resolution fails to not only recognize these latest attacks, but all of the persistent assaults on innocent Israelis by Palestinian terrorists.

Guess what else this resolution fails to mention? It is silent on fundamental facts that shape the way Israel has dealt with a constant threat on its border, as the chair so eloquently observed when he referenced Hamas rockets raining into Israel and Palestinians paying off terrorists, and the need for a Jewish and democratic state. It makes no reference to Hamas firing rockets. It makes no reference to Palestinians paying off terrorists. It makes no reference to recognizing Israel as a Jewish state.

During the March of Return, every single week protestors gather along the border of Israel in Gaza to throw Molotov cocktails and burning tires at IDF soldiers. Just this week, Hamas passed out leaflets calling on the public to join these protests in response to Israel defending itself against the Palestinian Islamic jihad. You won't find this in this resolution. Or that Hamas uses innocent women as human shields, that they call jihad an obligation, inciting violence. And that list goes on.

And maybe worst of all, this resolution completely fails to mention that Israel has made repeated attempts to offer peace proposals to the Palestinian Authority. After the Camp David talks in 2000, Israel offered to withdraw from 90 percent of Judea and Samaria, parts of East Jerusalem and Gaza. That same year, though, the Palestinians started the Second Intifada, and more than 1,000 innocent Israeli civilians were killed in a Palestinian campaign of suicide bombings and shootings.

In 2008, Israel offered to withdraw from 93 percent of Judea and Samaria, but time and again, the Palestinian Authority rejected peace proposals while continuing to refuse to this day, both publicly and privately, to accept Israel as a Jewish state.

In this vein, the Palestinian Authority continues to incite violence and financially rewards terrorism through its Pay for Slay program, which included the murder of an American, United States military academy graduate, Army veteran Taylor Force.

Yet, House Democrats added language to this resolution at the last minute to support the Palestinians, despite the fact that the Palestinian Authority refuses to suspend this Pay for Slay program to this day.

This resolution imposes a solution for Israel, stating specific Palestinian Authority demands and deliberately leaving out critical Israeli preconditions necessary to maintain security.

If you are going to engage in naming specific preconditions like the way this resolution puts those preconditions on Israel, the Palestinian Authority demands, well then try to balance it all out, but this resolution doesn't even make any reference to Palestinian terrorism. It is silent about providing assurances for Israel's safety and security through a demilitarized zone, but that didn't stop the resolution's authors from including Palestinian demands of Israel.

The timing of this vote is no coincidence either. This resolution, by the authors' own admission, is a clear rebuke to the Trump administration's recent reversal of the Obama administration's targeting of Israel with U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334. The timing is no coincidence.

The resolution references President Obama's policy toward Israel after the November 2016 election, but does not mention the Trump administration's efforts. One of the worst lines in this resolution references support for ''the principles set forth by President Obama in December 2016.'' After the Obama administration abstained from U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334, the House, along with many of my Democratic colleagues here today, voted in favor of a resolution to forcefully condemn U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

This resolution, H. Res. 326, is a reversal on that point, pointing to that December 2016 moment in time as if it was something that should be applauded. This resolution chooses to reference President Obama's policy while intentionally leaving out the Trump administration's policy, ensuring a partisan outcome to this resolution.

The resolution doesn't mention the long list of victories that we have had in this administration to strengthen our support and security and stability of Israel, to strengthen the U.S.-Israel relationship, like moving our embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, to signing the Taylor Force Act, and recognizing Israeli sovereignty over the Golan Heights.

This partisan resolution creates a totally unnecessary schism in what has otherwise been a longstanding history of strong, bipartisan support for the U.S.-Israel relationship, which included the resolution that passed last summer.

There are other great bipartisan bills that support Israel and fight anti-Semitism at home. We should be spending our time debating and passing bills like S. 1 and H.R. 336 sponsored by MICHAEL MCCAUL, the Never Again Education Act or the Peace and Tolerance in Palestinian Education Act.

□ 0930

The House already passed, almost unanimously, that resolution, H. Res. 246, last summer that opposed BDS and supported peace between the Israelis and Palestinians. Now, we are bringing a watered-down, partisan, and weakened version of what has already passed in the House.

House Democrats should bring bipartisan legislation forward with teeth that will support Israel and fight the BDS movement. But rather than move forward and build on our longstanding history of bipartisan support of the U.S.-Israeli alliance, House Democrats have decided to play partisan politics with what is a powder keg.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL), the author of this resolution.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to join me in voting to affirm a longstanding, bipartisan, and fundamental principle of American foreign policy. I believe we should pass this resolution today because it states facts which have been true for decades and which are true today.

A two-state solution represents the only path to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, and it is the only way to safeguard Israel as a secure Jewish and democratic state while also upholding the rights and the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people.

We will never compromise on Israel's security, and we will not turn our backs on the Palestinian people's desire for dignity and justice.

Some ask why Congress should speak out now or in this way. To them, I say this: When peace appears most remote, our voices become more critical, not less. The ongoing conflict can only inflict more suffering on innocent people on both sides.

We cannot let the possibility of a just peace slip away, and we cannot accept any action that undermines a two-state solution.

We must speak out against policies that could put peace out of reach: unilateral annexation, unilateral pushes for statehood, violence, or settlement expansion.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank many of my colleagues who have worked tirelessly to bring this legislation to the floor, including Congresswoman BASS and Congressman CONNOLLY, Congressman PRICE and Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY, Chairman ENGEL, Congressman POCAN and Congresswoman LEE, Congressman DEUTCH and Congressman GOTTHEIMER, the 192 cosponsors who supported this important effort, and Leader HOYER and Speaker PELOSI.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank another one of my colleagues, Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB. We spoke yesterday, and although she is not a supporter of H. Res. 326, I left our meeting feeling optimistic.

If a Jewish American from Queens and a Palestinian American from Detroit, both proud Americans, can find common ground about the need for all people, regardless of whether they are Californians or Michiganians, regardless of whether they are Jewish or Muslim, Israeli or Palestinian, if we can find common ground to live in peace and security with the same rights to self-determination and dignity, that fills me with hope.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, that fills me with hope.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution affirms the principles that have guided our foreign policy under Democratic and Republican administrations. We know that a two-state solution is the only path to a just peace.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan bill. I urge my Republican colleagues to join me in voting to pass H. Res. 326.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and as a former chairman of the Middle East and South Asia Subcommittee, I rise today in opposition to H. Res. 326, legislation that I believe is biased against Israel.

To understand this resolution, it must be taken in context. In July, this House overwhelmingly passed H. Res. 246, which condemned efforts to delegitimize Israel. It also reaffirmed our support for a two-state solution.

A mere 5 months later, we are considering this redundant legislation when we should be talking about the National Defense Authorization Act, funding the government, prescription drug prices, the opioid epidemic, so many other things. Instead, House Democrats find it more important to rebuke the Trump administration because it took the position that Jewish settlements in the West Bank are not illegal.

What is really happening here is this resolution is meant to paper over a deep division within the Democratic Party between responsible voices who understand the importance of our relationship with Israel, and many of those are here today speaking, and a campus radical left that pushes BDS, welcomes anti-Semitic attacks on Israel, and believes that Israel is the problem while the Palestinians are just helpless victims.

Forceful, principled Democratic leadership would take seriously their responsibility to educate the public and clear up these misbegotten notions. Instead, they have opted to cover over this serious problem with their flawed legislation today. That is most unfortunate.

Further, the resolution itself is fatally deficient in a number of ways. Again, context is critical. The resolution completely ignores the reason why the two-state solution has never gotten off the ground: venomous voices among the Palestinians don't want two states. They want one, a Palestinian state.

The blame falls squarely on these pernicious forces. Just look at the recent round of rocket attacks from Gaza.

That is why we shouldn't rule out other options by saying two states is the only possible solution, as this resolution does. It gives the Palestinians a vote over Israel's future, and we shouldn't let that happen.

Additionally, by raising the issues of settlements and annexation without serious criticism of Palestinian terrorism and intransigence, which far outweighs anything that Israel has done, this resolution buys into the narrative of the campus left that Israel is the perpetrator and the Palestinians are just victims, an anti-Semitic narrative.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I oppose this resolution, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) for his leadership on this.

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

Mr. Speaker, one point to clarify about this resolution, as the bill's author, my friend from Queens, we should say, even though he has a new district these days, talks about this not being a partisan resolution, this debate and this vote, the reality is this resolution is going to end up being, and is, the most partisan resolution that this House has ever taken up on Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to an opportunity to work with the bill's author. I believe strongly in the need to strengthen the U.S.-Israel relationship. I also feel strongly in my opposition to this bill, as many of my colleagues do as well, but it actually is quite partisan with regard to the text, the debate, and the ultimate vote.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a distinguished member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my good friend, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 326.

''Mirabile dictu.'' Wondrous to relate.

Mr. Speaker, it is finally on the floor.

I just heard a revision of history from my friend from Ohio. We were prepared to bring this resolution up on the floor in July. This has nothing to do with it. It wouldn't have even mentioned President Trump and Secretary Pompeo's strange acknowledgment of settlements that are recognized as illegal in international law.

This resolution is not, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) would have you believe, lacking in a recitation of all the grievances and incidents that continue to plague Israel and the Palestinian people. This is a prescription for a solution, which apparently my friend from New York is not interested in.

A two-state solution has been the policy of Republican and Democratic administrations. If you want to call it partisan, you take the blame, because you on the other side of the aisle are the ones who have blocked it.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my good friend, for yielding.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, it is the Republicans who steadfastly have refused even to entertain being engaged in the drafting of this resolution. So, yes, if you want to call it partisan, you own it. It is your partisanship, not ours.

This is a restatement of United States policy. This is a prescription for a solution, a path toward a solution that would bring peace to both Israel and the Palestinian people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge its adoption.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, for the sake of time, I will save some of my thoughts on what was just said. That was a very alternate version of reality that we look forward to addressing over the course of this debate. Hopefully, my friend from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) sticks around.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) very much for yielding, and I very much appreciate his work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank the Republican Foreign Affairs Committee staff and Ranking Member MCCAUL for their tireless defense of Israel.

Furthermore, I want to state that I have a long history of working in a bipartisan fashion with my dear friend, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, ELIOT ENGEL. That is why it pains me to be here today debating a partisan resolution, a resolution that purports to defend a negotiated two-state solution for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but that is simply not what this resolution is about. If it were, it would be bipartisan.

This is a partisan resolution because it makes pointed criticisms of the Israeli Government on delicate, divisive, internal issues. It does so at a time when our Israeli counterparts struggle through the democratic process of forming a new government.

House Democrats would only move this unconstructive resolution to the floor if it achieved aims of radical leftists in scoring points against the Trump administration.

But, Mr. Speaker, I ask this majority, at what cost? At what cost are we voting on this?

Moving forward to this vote risks the bipartisan support that a negotiated settlement leading to a sustainable two-state solution has enjoyed for decades.

That is why I offered an alternative resolution at the Rules Committee, one that would support the peace process without alienating our major strategic partner and ally of the United States, the nation of Israel.

If there is any imperative for Congress, it should be to hold the Palestinian Authority to account for its efforts to bypass negotiations and unilaterally declare a Palestinian state.

For decades, the Palestinian Authority has undermined the peace process by appealing to the United Nations and other international organizations to impose its own solution and impose parameters for negotiations with Israel.

In 2000, Israel offered them full statehood on territory that included roughly 92 percent of the West Bank and all of Gaza, along with a capital in Jerusalem. The Palestinian Authority rejected it.

If there is any story that deserves more attention from this Congress, it is that Israel has made numerous concessions in the pursuit of peace while seeking only the right to exist, and this despite the continued efforts by Palestinian leadership to evade direct negotiations for peace.

That is the story this House should be telling, and that is why I oppose this partisan resolution that politicizes and, therefore, jeopardizes the sacred issue of Congress' support for Israel.

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

□ 0945

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a distinguished Member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 326, the Lowenthal resolution, to support a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

I thank my good friend, ALAN LOWENTHAL, for the hard work he has done to support the State of Israel and to bring this resolution to the floor today.

This resolution strongly reaffirms longstanding, bipartisan U.S. policy regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This includes support for a two-state solution and expresses opposition to efforts that undermine the prospects for a lasting peace.

I, like so many in this Congress, have been a longtime and passionate supporter of Israel and the U.S.-Israeli relationship. We know that a strong Israel is good for America.

But I have been increasingly concerned that this administration's decision to unilaterally change American policies towards Israel outside of any negotiation are detrimental to the long-term prospects for peace. This resolution makes clear that the best and only real solution to achieving peace is the two-state solution.

And, again, I thank Mr. LOWENTHAL and Chairman ENGEL for bringing this resolution to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the body that, 2 years ago today, President Trump said this in the Diplomatic Room in the White House: ''Today, we finally acknowledge the obvious: that Jerusalem is Israel's capital. This is nothing more, or less, than a recognition of reality. It is also the right thing to do. It's something that has to be done.''

Since that time, the Embassy was moved. I was privileged to join many of my colleagues to visit the new Embassy in Jerusalem this past August.

There, we stood, Democrats and Republicans, this August, looking at a border with Lebanon where Hezbollah has 150,000 rockets pointing at Jerusalem and at Tel Aviv.

We went near, but not too near, to Gaza, where rockets are being fired at Israel and balloons are being sent over to burn fields, despite Israel's good faith voluntary withdrawal from there in 2005.

But thank the Lord that America stands with Israel. Standing with Israel yields results for our national security and for the benefit of the great people of Israel, a true ally and democracy in which Jews, Muslims, and Christians live together with rights protected, and they live peaceably.

Following our example, Guatemala has moved its Embassy to Jerusalem. Honduras announced recognition of Jerusalem just a few months ago.

Just this week.

For the first time, Germany, the Czech Republic, Austria, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Lithuania, Netherlands, Romania, Slovakia, Brazil, and Colombia voted against the annual resolution supporting the Division for Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat, which oversees the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. These countries previously abstained on the vote.

We are changing the world and recognizing Israel because we stand with Israel, and standing with Israel works.

But rather than standing with Israel on a bipartisan basis, today, our Democrat colleagues are pushing H. Res. 326. This is a liberal, progressive retreat from standing with Israel and a move to have our Nation tell Israel what to do.

This resolution spells out specific Palestinian Authority demands without listing critical Israeli preconditions, such as acknowledging Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state with an undivided Jerusalem as Israel's capital and providing assurances for Israel's safety and security through a demilitarized zone.

The resolution chooses to reference President Obama's policy announced after the November 2016 election, while intentionally leaving out the Trump administration's policy, designing the resolution to be hyperpartisan.

This resolution is a politically motivated exercise designed to undermine the policy of the Trump administration, the right policy, announced in November, that settlements in Judea and Samaria not be considered a violation of international law.

This resolution disproportionately criticizes the Israeli Government, while failing to recognize the dangerous actions targeting innocent Israelis that further remove the possibility of peace.

This resolution binds the U.S. Government and calls for Israel to only pursue a two-state solution.

This is wrong. We should not bind ourselves and our ally, a sovereign nation with equal standing before the United Nations, to only one solution.

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. And, moreover, to one solution that has been a failed battle cry because Palestinians have perpetually failed to come to the negotiating table to pursue it in good faith.

How peace is reached in the Middle East begins and ends with actual and complete recognition of Israel's right to exist—and it is up to Israel to decide how and in what way a solution might be reached, whether that is two states or otherwise.

The rich history of Israel is increasingly known and celebrated by the world. It is a great and vibrant nation.

As we head into this celebratory season of our respective faiths, let us celebrate Israel, together, its greatness, and remember that America stands with Israel.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a valued member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, last month, I visited Israel and the West Bank. I talked to Israeli Defense Forces leaders; Israeli settlers; members of the Knesset from many parties; U.S. Ambassador Friedman; Palestinians' top negotiator, Dr. Saeb Erakat; human rights activists; and ordinary Israelis and Palestinians.

My trip left me more committed than ever to seeing, in my lifetime, a two-state solution: a democratic Jewish state living in peace alongside a democratic Palestine. That is why I am here today.

My colleagues have spoken a lot about the need to safeguard Israel's security, and that is also why I am here today. We are at a moment when the prospects for a peaceful two-state solution—something that has long had overwhelming bipartisan support in this country and from Presidents from both parties—could be fading. If we let them fade, prospects for lasting security in Israel will fade as well.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Because, make no mistake, without a two-state solution, Israel's future as a secure democratic homeland for the Jewish people will be in jeopardy. And Israelis, like the ones I visited in Netiv HaAsara, will continue to live in fear of rocket fire that gives them 8 seconds to reach a bomb shelter.

We need to express our support for a two-state solution, and I thank the chairman and my colleagues, Representatives Lowenthal, Bass, and Connolly, for their leadership.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this is an Article I moment. The President has sowed doubt about this country's historic commitment to two-state diplomacy, diplomacy that aims at a secure, democratic, and Jewish future for Israel, and that aims at a state of their own and self-determination for the Palestinian people.

It is extremely important for this Congress to assert itself as a coequal branch of government at a time when this historic American commitment is being questioned and undermined.

This resolution makes clear that Israeli settlement expansion is unhelpful and that unilateral annexation of the territory is destructive of the prospects for peace. The resolution also reaffirms U.S. support for the security of Israel. And it makes clear that it is unacceptable for the President to cut off Palestinian aid, as he unilaterally has done, despite this aid being duly appropriated by this body.

This is unacceptable. We need to assert ourselves as an institution and reaffirm support for the two-state solution, which is really the only reliable path forward.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I am listening to different colleagues on the other side of the aisle speaking about this resolution, some are claiming that this is not partisan and that the timing doesn't have anything to do with the Trump administration, and then others are coming and speaking that this is about rebuking the Trump administration. So I am unclear as far as that messaging.

I do know that there have been multiple quotes that have been put out by Democrats in this Chamber that the timing is no coincidence. This was brought up after an announcement was made recently by Secretary Pompeo with regards to reversing President Obama's policy that was announced after the November 2016 election.

So, where my friends on the other side of the aisle speak about longstanding U.S. policy, I guess it is important for a quick recap of that longstanding U.S. policy over recent years.

At the end of 2016, after the November 2016 election, the Obama administration helped get through the United Nations U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 with regards to the view of activity in Judea, Samaria, and parts of east Jerusalem; and, for the first time, the U.N. Security Council was saying that that was a violation of international law.

This Chamber, with more Democrats voting in favor of the resolution than against, voted for a resolution to condemn U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334. This Chamber had a problem on a large, bipartisan basis and came together to condemn U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

That is what this resolution specifically references when it says the Obama administration's policy from December 2016. That was great when we all came together like that because we had a problem with reversing longstanding U.S. policy with that U.N. Security Council resolution.

Then this Chamber came together again this past summer, almost unanimously, passing a resolution—a strong, bipartisan resolution—strongly condemning BDS and talking about the need for peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians.

This resolution today is, unfortunately, a debate. It is a draft, and it is a vote that is going to be very partisan. But the inconsistency and the arguments on the other side of the aisle—some are saying this has nothing to do with President Trump and his policies and others are saying that it does. And some are saying that timing is no coincidence and others have made specific comments that it is absolutely a result of the Trump administration's recent announcements. Those inconsistencies are being noticed by all.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, who on this floor would stand with me for peace, and who on this floor would stand against our position and against peace?

It is well known that the United States, all of my life, has been a strong supporter of Israel, rooted in shared national security interests, democracy, human rights, and the rule of law.

I have sent to Israel young people, through the Mickey Leland Kibbutzim program, from my district for 25 years—almost 25 years—to develop the understanding and friendship that we continue to promote for the values of what Israel stands for.

The United States has worked for decades to strengthen our assistance. We are intertwined through national security. And, in essence, this two-state solution is a solution toward peace.

I have been to Palestine and met the Palestinians and their leaders over the years that I have served in the United States Congress. Presidents Bush, Clinton, and Obama stood with Israel, as we all stand today. But we stand with peace and the understanding of the two-state solution. Let us stand united.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I invite my Republican friends to join on the resolution, H. Res. 326. Do not read into it anything more than a pathway to peace, discussion, and dialogue, recognizing the dignity of all people.

I join my friends, my Jewish friends, my friends from Palestine, and I join Americans in wanting a two-state solution.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1000

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), who is the chairwoman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 326, a resolution that reaffirms the House of Representatives' longstanding support for a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Throughout my life and my 31 years serving in this great body, I have never lost hope that there will one day be two states for two peoples—a democratic Jewish state of Israel and a democratic Palestinian state living side by side in peace, security, and mutual recognition.

We cannot be naive. This will not be easy. Gaza continues to be run by Hamas, a terrorist organization responsible for attacks on Israel and the suffering of Palestinians in their borders. The Palestinian Authority has been a poor partner for peace, walking away from reasonable peace plans and the negotiating table altogether. And rhetoric from the Israeli Government officials about unilateral annexation pushes a future, negotiated solution farther from reality.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from New York an additional 15 seconds.

Mrs. LOWEY. But we cannot and we must not lose hope. Simply put, a two-state solution for Israelis and Palestinians is the only means to ensure Israel's long-term security and enable Palestinian aspirations for their own state.

I thank my colleagues whose hard work brought this important resolution to the floor, and I urge immediate passage.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the majority leader of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there are few alliances as critical to America's national security, to global stability, and to our Nation's values as the U.S.-Israel relationship. Israel and America share common values and together are committed to the principles of democracy and individual freedom. The United States will always stand by our ally, Israel, period.

Let me be clear. Military assistance to Israel is critical to America's national security. It is an investment in our security as well as Israel's. That is why I am opposed to imposing conditions on that assistance.

Since even before its independence in 1948, Israel has sought to achieve a secure peace with its neighbors on the basis of the principle of self-determination for both the Jewish people and for the Palestinian people. The Jewish people deserve to live in peace and security in their ancestral homeland, and Palestinians deserve the opportunity to chart their own future of peace and opportunity in a land of their own. That was the foundation of the peace process in the 1990s and subsequent efforts by Israeli Governments to achieve peace with security.

It makes clear in this resolution that both parties ought to take meaningful steps to end mistrust and avoid obstacles to peace. This includes encouraging both sides not to take any steps that make the pursuit of peace harder. Unfortunately, that has not always been the case, and the attacks on Israel undermine daily—and if not daily, too often—the ability to achieve an agreement helpful to the Palestinians as well as the Israelis.

I want to thank my friend and leader of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Chairman ENGEL, Representatives LOWENTHAL, POCAN, DEUTCH, PRICE, SCHAKOWSKY, and GOTTHEIMER, representing a broad spectrum of feelings about how we deal with and support our ally, Israel. But they have come together, as well as all of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, to work hard to ensure that this resolution reaffirms Congress' strong support for the U.S.-Israel relationship, while contributing positively to helping Israel achieve the peace and security it seeks with the Palestinians.

The resolution says that settlements and annexation are inconsistent with that objective. I hope Members will support this resolution. I disagree with my friend from New York, that this is not policy that has been adopted by Republican administrations as well as Democratic administrations. To say this is an Obama policy that we are overturning—which is apparently much of what the focus of this administration is, overturning the policies of their predecessor—is incorrect. George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush believed that a contrary policy would undermine the realization of peace between two peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will on a bipartisan basis overwhelmingly support the restatement of America's policy.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we should not split hairs. We need to reaffirm our policy with this resolution because Congress in the past has not been clear enough. In my visits to Israel I have been struck how young people, Palestinian and Jews alike, believe passionately in a two-state solution, but, increasingly, they doubt that it is possible.

Unfortunately, the Trump administration's reckless policies are increasing that doubt. The latest is giving a green light to the destructive settlement policy and its expansion. Make no mistake: Trump and Netanyahu are currently careening towards a one-state solution, one that will challenge the ability of Israel to be both a democracy and a Jewish state.

Jimmy Carter said in his book that we are choosing between democracy and apartheid. This resolution suggests that we choose for democracy a negotiated solution; and reaffirming our longstanding goals, correct the ambiguity, get us back on track, and give hope to those young people in Israel, both Jew and Palestinian.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 326 which I am proud to cosponsor. It really is an important resolution affirming the United States' support for a two-state solution, which has been longstanding bipartisan consensus for decades. It also makes clear that Congress opposes any action by the White House to encourage unilateral annexation of the West Bank.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is not only needed but it is incredibly timely. The Trump administration is actively working against a two-state solution and lasting peace at every step, from support for unilateral annexation of the West Bank to reversal of U.S. policy toward illegal Israeli settlement expansion which jeopardizes Israeli security.

This resolution reaffirms the United States' commitment to a lasting peace in the region which can only be achieved through a negotiated two-state solution for both Israelis and Palestinians.

For the first time, this resolution includes clear language that the United States should resume assistance to the Palestinians.

I thank Chairman PRICE. Let me just say it is an incredibly important step. I thank Congressman LOWENTHAL and Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB for taking a bold step and seeking common ground.

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

The majority are tying themselves up in knots.

With all due respect to the majority leader, who said there was not a departure in policy towards the end of the Obama administration and that I was incorrect; I would like to point him to H. Res. 11 from January 2017, that he voted in favor of as well as most House Democrats, which included: ''Whereas on December 23, 2016, the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations disregarded H.Con. Res. 165 and departed from longstanding United States policy by abstaining and permitting United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to be adopted under Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter.''

That is from a resolution that the majority leader voted in favor of, where he personally, and many others in this Chamber on both sides of the aisle, took strong exception with that departure from longstanding U.S. policy with U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334, now reversing that, once again, with the text of this resolution that is giving a shout-out to that December 2016 Obama administration policy as if it is something to be applauded.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 326.

It is critical that we take serious steps to reiterate the United States commitment towards a just two-state solution to the conflict that allows both Israelis and Palestinians to live in peace side by side.

Unfortunately, recent developments have put this vision, which remains the only viable framework for a lasting peace in the region, further out of reach.

Settlement activity in the West Bank has increasingly threatened the viability of a future Palestinian state in the region, and there is now open talk of Israeli annexation of the Jordan Valley. Settlements erode any possibility of a continuous, viable Palestinian state.

Additionally, the Trump administration's recent move to overturn decades of U.S. policy and legitimize the settlement activity represents a body blow to future peace and prosperity. In addition, the Trump administration's policies have discredited valid Palestinian claims to also have their capital in Jerusalem. We also cannot forget the humanitarian situation in Gaza which is untenable.

Mr. Speaker, this demands a response, and that is why we need a two-state solution to deal with it.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud granddaughter of a strong, loving Palestinian woman, my sity. For me to stand up for her human dignity, I must oppose H. Res. 326.

This resolution not only endorses an unrealistic, unattainable solution, one that Israel has made impossible, but also one that legitimizes inequality, ethnic discrimination and inhuman conditions.

Prime Minister Netanyahu and the Likud party have actively fought against a two-state solution and took steps to ensure its demise. They increased their illegal taking of Palestinian homes, imprisoned more Palestinian children than ever before, and are building walls right now to annex the West Bank and other Palestinian villages.

Moreover, Israel's nation-state law, which states that only Jews have the right to self-determination, has eliminated the political rights of the Palestinian people and effectively made them second-class citizens.

Separate but equal didn't work in our country, and I can't see that it is possible in other countries. Given our Nation's history of segregation, we should recognize when such injustices are occurring. We cannot be honest brokers for peace if we refuse to use the words: illegal occupation by Israel.

Our country and the United States Congress must condemn these undemocratic actions. We must take bolder actions to ensure that human rights are upheld in Israel and that Palestinians and Black Israelis are treated with equality every human being deserves.

To honor my Sity Mufteih who lives in the occupied West Bank, Palestine, I am unable to support this resolution today. She deserves better.

□ 1015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), a distinguished member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ENGEL, and I rise in support of a resolution that speaks to a two-state solution that enhances the security and stability of Israel, a two-state solution that recognizes the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people for a state of their own and one that will come about only through the direct negotiations of Israelis and Palestinians.

The words in this resolution matter. The words that reaffirm that it is in the national interest to continue to stand by our ironclad commitments under the MOU, which seeks to help Israel defend itself against a wide range of threats, is a critical statement at this moment in our Nation's history.

Those are the words that are the language of this resolution. That is why I support it.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. I encourage all of my colleagues to oppose it as well.

It is no coincidence that this resolution is being brought now. It is an attempted rebuke of the Trump administration.

I think that this Chamber should be coming together and praising the decision to move the U.S. Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, that this Chamber should be coming together and praising the decision to recognize Israeli sovereignty over the Golan Heights. We all should be coming together on a bipartisan basis with regard to the implementation of the Taylor Force Act.

The Palestinian Authority has a policy not just to incite violence but to financially reward terrorism. If you murder an innocent American or Israeli, by policy—this is no secret; it is documented; it is their own admission—they will pay you money.

Now, as far as this Chamber goes, we are stewards of U.S. tax dollars. To send money to the Palestinian Authority, as long as they have a policy where they are going to pay someone for murdering an American, that is something that this Chamber should be coming together on, on a bipartisan basis, with regard to the implementation of the Taylor Force Act and how to do even better.

This resolution attempts to get into that world of what preconditions need to be met in order to have an agreement between Israelis and Palestinians. It chooses to stay silent with regard to any of the Israeli preconditions on the Palestinians, but this resolution chooses not to be silent on the preconditions of the Palestinians toward the Israelis. Not just in the text of the resolution but today in the debate, the goal is to place pressure on the Israelis, on what they need to make concessions on, by not saying anything at all with regard to Palestinians committing acts of terror and being financially rewarded for it, saying nothing about Hamas.

Hamas literally put in their charter that jihad is an obligation. I wonder where Hamas stands.

If the Palestinian Authority sat down with Israelis and right now agreed, I don't know if whoever would sign that document on behalf of the Palestinian Authority would be assassinated within days. But I will say that he can't in good faith deliver all of his people because not only are the ranks of the Palestinian Authority filled with the likes of terrorist groups like Hamas—and Hamas is a designated foreign terrorist organization of the United States—not only can they not deliver their people, Hamas doesn't just refute the argument that Israel has a right to exist as a Jewish state, Hamas refutes the argument that Israel has a right to exist.

How are we silent about a resolution? If you want to get into preconditions, how do we not get into any acts of Hamas denying access to humanitarian aid to its own people or the fact that they use women and children as human shields, that Hamas will pay someone

to get shot? A kid goes to a checkpoint, gets shot, and gets paid $500.

Right now, as we are here—I mean, literally, as the decision is being made to bring this resolution to the floor, Israel is getting showered by rockets from a terrorist group in Gaza, hundreds of rockets targeting innocent Israelis, kids who are going to school or are worshiping or are at home or are running to bomb shelters because they have rockets being launched at them, trying to kill them.

That is the issue with getting into that world of preconditions, only talking about the preconditions that the Palestinians want to place on the Israelis, and then to double down and triple down during floor debate and to be silent entirely with regard to any of the preconditions toward peace.

December 2016 is specifically referenced in this resolution. This House came together and condemned that December 2016 policy. After the November 2016 election, this House came together in January on a huge bipartisan basis and condemned that change of policy in December 2016.

The reversal here in this resolution is now this resolution is specifically referencing the December 2016 policy as if it is something to be celebrated.

What we should be doing right now is passing legislation with teeth—by the way, a whole lot of legislation with teeth: passing USMCA; lowering the cost of prescription drugs, a bipartisan agreement that passed out of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce; passing S.1/H.R. 336, legislation with teeth to stop BDS, to help support Israel with teeth; authorizing funding to support Jordan; legislation with teeth to increase sanctions on Assad in Syria.

This bill has already passed the Senate with all of these different Republicans and Democrats, almost 80 Senators passing it.

Bill numbers are set based on what is important. What is important to the Senate? That was S.1.

We made a strong statement last summer, almost unanimously passing a resolution condemning BDS, including language toward peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians. We should have woken up the next day united to now do something about it.

It is one thing to make a statement about anything that anyone in this Chamber is passionate about, and I respect the different passions and backgrounds of all of my colleagues. There are people who have different opinions on just about anything that comes for a vote in this Chamber.

When we choose to make statements of something that we feel strongly about, it is important to wake up the next day and say: ''Okay, well, what are we going to do about it?'' That is why, while I am so proud of my colleagues for voting almost unanimously for that resolution, we should be passing S.1/H.R. 336.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for all of my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close debate on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to no one, no one in this Chamber, when it comes to support for Israel. I supported moving the Embassy to Jerusalem, the eternal capital of the Jewish people. I am happy to have an honest debate about the Middle East so long as that debate is on the policy, on the merits. That is true when it comes to my friends on the other side and with Members of my own party. That is why we are here, and that is what the House of Representatives is all about.

I want also to point out that this resolution, an important part of this resolution, says that there are to be no conditions on U.S. aid to Israel. That is something that is very important, and I think it is very important that we state that.

The debate on foreign policy turns toxic when the issue is tainted by party politics, when support for Israel is politicized through motions to recommit or poison pill amendments. Politics should stop at the water's edge, and that is what normally guides our work on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

What happens when we ignore that? What happens is that decisions about our own security and leadership on the world stage are trumped by decisions about our own political interests. That makes us less safe. What happens is that decisions about how we treat our friends and partners around the world are trumped by decisions about what may be more appealing to our political base or political supporters. That makes our friends and partners less safe, less trusting, less confident in America.

If we allow partisan politics to contaminate our foreign policy, we do so at our peril and the peril of many others around the world. We cannot allow that to happen when it comes to Israel, our most important ally in the Middle East.

For two decades, support for a two-state solution has won bipartisan support. Even when they disagreed on many policy issues, Presidents George W. Bush and Barack Obama agreed on this.

Of course, no one said anywhere along the line that it would be easy to achieve, but that doesn't mean we give up. It means we dig in and keep pushing and working to change minds. That is what American leadership is all about.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues don't walk away from that. Those of us who are strong supporters of Israel understand that Israel is best served by a two-state solution, that a two-state solution is not good for only Palestinians but also good for Jews, also good for Israelis, also good for all people in the Middle East. That is what we are trying to do.

My commitment to the U.S.-Israel relationship is second to none, to nobody. That is why I do believe, by passing this resolution today, we are attempting to bring the parties together, attempting to state U.S. policy, acknowledging the fact that U.S. and Israel are unshakeable allies.

This is simply saying that there is a dispute, that there are two peoples, two states for two peoples. That seems fair to me, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my thoughts on H. Res. 326, which expresses the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the Israeli–Palestinian conflict.

While I am a firm believer in the Israeli–Palestinian peace process and the two-state solution, I am disappointed that the version of the resolution brought to the Floor did not reflect the language as introduced, language that I and 191 of my colleagues cosponsored.

It remains my firm belief that the United States must continue to call for an end to Israeli settlement expansion and oppose Israel's unilateral annexation of territory. Furthermore, the United States must do more to uphold human rights and ensure that democratic ideals are preserved as part of the process.

All humankind deserves to live a productive life without fear of threat to their safety. That is why I remain committed to the peace process and welcome the opportunity to work with my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to achieve that aim.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 326, a resolution I drafted with Congressman ALAN LOWENTHAL and Congressman GERRY CONNOLLY to express the support of Congress regarding efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution.

For more than 20 years, U.S. Presidents from both political parties and Israeli Prime Ministers have supported reaching a two-state solution that establishes a Palestinian state living side by side with Israel in peace and security. I am proud to have assisted in drafting this important resolution, which affirms that commitment.

Our government's established decades-worth of commitment to a two-state solution in order to enhance stability and security in the Middle East and to ensure the state of Israel's survival while addressing the legitimate desires of the Palestinian people for a state of their own reflects our fundamental dedication to promote peace.

This resolution builds on our ongoing commitment and our historic alliance with Israel. I strongly support it.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 326. This resolution expresses this chamber's strong support for the longstanding belief that a two-state solution to the Israel-Palestine conflict is the best option to ensure Palestinian autonomy and Israel's survival as a Jewish democratic state.

During my time in this chamber, I have been a firm supporter of a negotiated two-state solution between Israel and Palestine. While I believe both parties will have to make difficult decisions to ensure a long-lasting peace, I believe it can be done in a way that ensures that

the human rights of Palestinians are respected while also securing the safety of our closest ally in the region.

This administration's capitulation to Benjamin Netanyahu and his allies on the extreme right in Israeli domestic politics has severely damaged the ability of the United States to be considered a fair neutral party in this conflict. It has made Israel less safe in the long term and has only driven Palestinians into the arms of bad actors in the region like Hamas.

In May 2018, this administration chose to abandon our European allies by announcing the withdrawal of the United States from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, commonly known as the Iran Nuclear Deal. Shortly thereafter, the Administration relocated the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem while subsequently eliminating the Consulate General office in Jerusalem, which served as a key diplomatic line to the Palestinian Authority.

Additionally, this administration has stripped funding from the United Nations Relief and Work Agency. This agency has worked tirelessly to help Palestinian refugees in Gaza, the West Bank, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan, by providing food, housing, education, and other necessities. Eliminating these funds jeopardizes the ability of the UNRWA to help these individuals live as normal a life as possible. It also threatens the security of the Israeli people by ensuring more of these people turn to terrorist organizations like Hamas when their basic needs fail to be met.

Last month, Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo, announced that Israeli settlements in the occupied West Bank did not violate international law. This drastic change in policy on the issue of Israeli settlements essentially gives the green light to the Israeli government to unilaterally annex portions of this region. Any form of annexation would essentially kill the idea of a two-state solution.

Mr. Speaker, we are voting on this resolution today to show the international community that regardless of this administration's reckless actions, the United States can play a constructive role in resolving this conflict that has lasted for more than 70 years. I urge all my colleagues to swiftly pass this resolution.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H. Res. 326 as introduced on April 25, 2019, I support Representative LOWENTHAL's determination to advance U.S. leadership in seeking a diplomatic resolution to achieve a ''two-state solution'' to end the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Unfortunately, amendments to the resolution mean I can no longer vote in favor of H. Res. 326 and I will be voting ''present.''

For years, I have heard colleagues say, ''It's only a resolution. It really doesn't mean anything.'' At a time when the Trump administration is actively taking policy actions to inflict pain on the Palestinian people while giving a green light to Israel's annexation of Palestinian lands, a statement by the House of Representatives to Israelis and Palestinians does mean something.

Is there any doubt Israel and the security of the Israeli people have the strong support of Congress? There is zero doubt. But millions of Palestinians working to build a peaceful future feel that they have been abandoned by Congress and attacked by the White House. The U.S. is no longer an honest broker in any diplomatic peace initiative between Israelis and Palestinians. The language added to H. Res. 326 stating an ''ironclad commitment'' to $38 billion in foreign military aid only highlights the contrast that there is no ironclad U.S. commitment to human rights or even providing the most basic life-saving humanitarian aid to the Palestinian people. This House vote today does not reflect the reality on the ground.

This is the time to unequivocally support both the Palestinian people's right to self-determination, justice, equality, and human rights as well as Israel's right to live in peace and security. U.S. aid must never be an ''ironclad'' blank check to any nation. I believe if U.S. military aid to Israel is being used to enable or support the military detention and torture of Palestinian children, the demolition of Palestinian homes, or the annexation of Palestinian lands there should be conditions on that aid—not cuts to aid, but conditions—as has been done to aid to the Palestinians.

Striving for an Israeli state and a Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security is worth the effort of every Member of Congress. But that means Congress will need to support the legitimate rights, needs, and aspirations of both Palestinians and Israelis. In my opinion, H. Res. 326 maintains the status quo and fails to move us towards achieving peace. A peace that both Israelis and Palestinians deserve and need.

[From Noa Landau, Lisbon, Dec. 5, 2019]

NETANYAHU SAYS 'OUR FULL RIGHT' TO ANNEX JORDAN VALLEY, DESPITE ICC PROSECUTOR REPORT

AFP LISBON—Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu told Haaretz Thursday that it's Israel's full right to annex the Jordan Valley if it chooses to do so.

PM says political deadlock hinders controversial move, adding: 'Exactly because of that we should form a government now and do it'

Earlier Thursday, International Criminal Court Prosecutor Fatou Bensouda expressed concern over Israeli proposals to annex this West Bank region.

Asked on the matter by reports in Lisbon, the premier said ''It's our full right to do so if we decide,'' despite the ICC prosecutor's report.

Asked about a timeline for the proposed annexation, Netanyahu said ''there are some questions about what can be done in a transition government. Exactly because of that we should form a government now and do it.''

When asked whether he would agree to renounce serving first as prime minister in a rotation agreement if Kahol Lavan agrees to annex the Jordan Valley and to a defense treaty with the United States, Netanyahu said ''those things will be achieved when I'm prime minister. I have thousands of hours on American prime-time TV and that has a certain influence on the United States, especially now. I won't be able [to influence] if I'm not prime minister.''

Netanyahu refused to tell the press whether he intends to seek immunity from the Knesset in his three pending corruption cases and cancel Likud's primary election, arguing he wouldn't address personal matters in the briefing.

''I intend to invest every effort, despite Kahol Lavan's objection, to reach an agreement and prevent this truly unnecessary election. Benny Gantz can [prevent it] if he manages to overcome Yair Lapid and if [Avigdor] Lieberman overcomes himself,'' Netanyahu said, referring to Kahal Lavan co-leader and Yisrael Beiteinu chairman, who said he has no intention to have his party join a narrow, right-wing government headed by Netanyahu.

''I hope that a minority government with the Joint List is not an option,'' the premier said, reiterating a claim that his political rivals are backed by Arab lawmakers.

When asked why he refuses to resign, the prime minister said that ''the public has chosen me. Let the public decide.''

Responding on the option of holding a direct election for the prime minister between him and Gantz, Netanyahu said: ''First, let's try to avoid another election, but this that's an option that's becoming interesting.''

Earlier today, Netanyahu met with U.S. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo after his phone call conversation with U.S. President Donald Trump on Sunday, when they also discussed the annexation of the Jordan Valley, which Netanyahu told voters in September he would achieve.

Before taking off from Tel Aviv, Netanyahu told reporters his meeting with Pompeo would be focused on ''Iran, first of all,'' a mutual defense treaty and a ''future'' American recognition of Israel's annexation of the Jordan Valley.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution that reaffirms longstanding U.S. policy regarding the two-state solution and which squarely condemns unilateral acts by any party (and I hope the Administration understands that includes the U.S.) that undermines that goal.

The two-state solution has been such a central part of the U.S. policy for this region that it rightly deserves its own debate in this House, rather than just a passing reference in legislation as we have seen in the past.

As noted by the resolution, for more than 20 years, ''Presidents of the United States from both political parties and Israeli Prime Ministers have supported reaching a two-state solution that establishes a Palestinian state coexisting side by side with Israel in peace and security.''

Yet, somehow the two-state solution has now become a controversial position, including within the current Administration which goes out of its way to not even mention it as a goal of our policy anymore. In light of the Administration's refusal to even say the phrase, more and more leaders in the region feel emboldened to also publicly oppose two states living side by side in peace and security.

It is even more critical now that the U.S. Congress unambiguously and clearly express support for the two-state solution.

Current trends are moving us farther away from peace or security and the Administration's efforts are doing nothing to stop that. As a hundred of my colleagues and I recently noted in a letter to the State Department, the Administration's recent announcement declaring that Israeli settlements in the occupied territories do not violate international law as far as the U.S. is concerned, ''following the administration's decision to move the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem outside of a negotiated agreement; its closure of the Palestinian mission in Washington, D.C. and U.S. Consulate in Jerusalem; and its halting of aid Congress appropriated to the West Bank and Gaza, has

discredited the United States as an honest broker between Israel and the Palestinian Authority, severely damaged prospects for peace, and endangered the security of America, Israel, and the Palestinian people.''

This legislation sends a clear message that any U.S. proposal to achieve a just and lasting solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict ''should expressly endorse a two-state solution as its objective.''

Additionally, the resolution also makes clear that ''Presidents of the United States from both political parties have opposed settlement expansion, moves toward unilateral annexation of territory, and efforts to achieve Palestinian statehood status outside the framework of negotiations with Israel.''

It reaffirms the Administration's obligation to actively ''discourage steps by either side that would put a peaceful end to the conflict further out of reach, including unilateral annexation of territory or efforts to achieve Palestinian statehood status outside the framework of negotiations with Israel.''

I don't have to tell my colleagues that unilateral actions, such as annexation or unilateral declarations of statehood will not or cannot achieve the peace or security that is so urgently desired.

Additionally, I know that this legislation has been changed to remove references to occupation and to the settlement enterprise. Whether you agree or disagree with those changes, doing so does not and will not change the actual facts on the ground or the obstacles to peace that remain. And our debate should be based on recognizing those facts, however discouraging or contentious they may be. The Israeli's and Palestinians deserve a debate that does so accurately.

The time for pushing for peace is always now.

But let's be clear, the sentiment in this resolution is only a start. Acknowledging the need for two states is important but even more so is working to actually achieve it. And that is where work needs to happen.

What we need are bold steps forward. Not some half-baked peace plan that has taken nearly three years to develop, is apparently subject to the whims of the U.S. and Israeli election cycles, and has already been dismissed by key stakeholders in the region.

If the Administration refuses to do so, then its time that Congress consider what actions it can take to make the vision of the two-state that we so beautifully describe in this resolution into a reality. Because today, the reality on the ground is one state, continuing tensions, and cycles of violence that can easily escalate.

It's no longer good enough to give lip service to two-states.

So I thank the leadership for bringing this to the floor and for welcoming this debate in the House.

And I know that the two-state solution has its critics who are just as frustrated as I am that both sides have seemingly never failed to miss an opportunity to let peace slip away. But the deadly status quo is no substitute. And wishful thinking for some other ''alternative'' option also is no substitute.

Achieving two-states was never going to be easy. Peace never is.

But ending the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is vital to the interests of our country, Israel, the Palestinians, and the broader region and international communities. This is why we continue to advocate for two-states despite the setbacks and spoilers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VEASEY). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 741, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and on the preamble, as amended.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. ZELDIN. 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 will be postponed.

□ 1030

VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2019

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 741, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 741, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116–322, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4

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 ''Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. VIOLATIONS TRIGGERING AUTHORITY OF COURT TO RETAIN JURISDICTION.

(a) TYPES OF VIOLATIONS.—Section 3(c) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10302(c)) is amended by striking ''violations of the fourteenth or fifteenth amendment'' and inserting ''violations of the 14th or 15th Amendment, violations of this Act, or violations of any Federal law that prohibits discrimination in voting on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group,''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10302(a)) is amended by striking ''violations of the fourteenth or fifteenth amendment'' and inserting ''violations of the 14th or 15th Amendment, violations of this Act, or violations of any Federal law that prohibits discrimination in voting on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group,''.

SEC. 3. CRITERIA FOR COVERAGE OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.

(a) DETERMINATION OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO SECTION 4(a).—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10303(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) DETERMINATION OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) EXISTENCE OF VOTING RIGHTS VIOLATIONS DURING PREVIOUS 25 YEARS.—

''(A) STATEWIDE APPLICATION.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to a State and all political subdivisions within the State during a calendar year if—

''(i) 15 or more voting rights violations occurred in the State during the previous 25 calendar years; or

''(ii) 10 or more voting rights violations occurred in the State during the previous 25 calendar years, at least one of which was committed by the State itself (as opposed to a political subdivision within the State).

''(B) APPLICATION TO SPECIFIC POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to a political subdivision as a separate unit during a calendar year if 3 or more voting rights violations occurred in the subdivision during the previous 25 calendar years.

''(2) PERIOD OF APPLICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if, pursuant to paragraph (1), subsection (a) applies with respect to a State or political subdivision during a calendar year, subsection (a) shall apply with respect to such State or political subdivision for the period—

''(i) that begins on January 1 of the year in which subsection (a) applies; and

''(ii) that ends on the date which is 10 years after the date described in clause (i).

''(B) NO FURTHER APPLICATION AFTER DECLARATORY JUDGMENT.—

''(i) STATES.—If a State obtains a declaratory judgment under subsection (a), and the judgment remains in effect, subsection (a) shall no longer apply to such State pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) unless, after the issuance of the declaratory judgment, paragraph (1)(A) applies to the State solely on the basis of voting rights violations occurring after the issuance of the declaratory judgment.

''(ii) POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—If a political subdivision obtains a declaratory judgment under subsection (a), and the judgment remains in effect, subsection (a) shall no longer apply to such political subdivision pursuant to paragraph (1), including pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) (relating to the statewide application of subsection (a)), unless, after the issuance of the declaratory judgment, paragraph (1)(B) applies to the political subdivision solely on the basis of voting rights violations occurring after the issuance of the declaratory judgment.

''(3) DETERMINATION OF VOTING RIGHTS VIOLATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a voting rights violation occurred in a State or political subdivision if any of the following applies:

''(A) FINAL JUDGMENT; VIOLATION OF THE 14TH OR 15TH AMENDMENT.—In a final judgment (which has not been reversed on appeal), any court of the United States has determined that a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group, in violation of the 14th or 15th Amendment, occurred anywhere within the State or subdivision.

''(B) FINAL JUDGMENT; VIOLATIONS OF THIS ACT.—In a final judgment (which has not been reversed on appeal), any court of the United States has determined that a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting was imposed or applied or would have been imposed or applied anywhere within the State or subdivision in a manner that resulted or would have resulted in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group, in violation of subsection (e) or (f), or section 2 or 203 of this Act.

''(C) FINAL JUDGMENT; DENIAL OF DECLARATORY JUDGMENT.—In a final judgment (which has not been reversed on appeal), any court of the United States has denied the request of the

State or subdivision for a declaratory judgment under section 3(c) or section 5, and thereby prevented a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting from being enforced anywhere within the State or subdivision.

''(D) OBJECTION BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General has interposed an objection under section 3(c) or section 5 (and the objection has not been overturned by a final judgment of a court or withdrawn by the Attorney General), and thereby prevented a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting from being enforced anywhere within the State or subdivision.

''(E) CONSENT DECREE, SETTLEMENT, OR OTHER AGREEMENT.—A consent decree, settlement, or other agreement was entered into, which resulted in the alteration or abandonment of a voting practice anywhere in the territory of such State that was challenged on the ground that the practice denied or abridged the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group in violation of subsection (e) or (f), or section 2 or 203 of this Act, or the 14th or 15th Amendment.

''(4) TIMING OF DETERMINATIONS.—

''(A) DETERMINATIONS OF VOTING RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.—As early as practicable during each calendar year, the Attorney General shall make the determinations required by this subsection, including updating the list of voting rights violations occurring in each State and political subdivision for the previous calendar year.

''(B) EFFECTIVE UPON PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—A determination or certification of the Attorney General under this section or under section 8 or 13 shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 4(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10303(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the first sentence of the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''any State with respect to which'' and all that follows through ''unless'' and inserting ''any State to which this subsection applies during a calendar year pursuant to determinations made under subsection (b), or in any political subdivision of such State (as such subdivision existed on the date such determinations were made with respect to such State), though such determinations were not made with respect to such subdivision as a separate unit, or in any political subdivision with respect to which this subsection applies during a calendar year pursuant to determinations made with respect to such subdivision as a separate unit under subsection (b), unless'';

(B) in paragraph (1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking the second sentence;

(C) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''(in the case of a State or subdivision seeking a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection)'';

(D) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''(in the case of a State or subdivision seeking a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection)'';

(E) in paragraph (3), by striking ''(in the case of a State or subdivision seeking a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection)'';

(F) in paragraph (5), by striking ''(in the case of a State or subdivision which sought a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection)'';

(G) by striking paragraphs (7) and (8); and

(H) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (7).

(b) CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF LANGUAGE MINORITY GROUPS.—Section 4(a)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10303(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''race or color,'' and inserting ''race, color, or in contravention of the guarantees of subsection (f)(2),''.

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO PRECLEARANCE FOR COVERED PRACTICES.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) is further amended by inserting after section 4 the following:

''SEC. 4A. DETERMINATION OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO PRECLEARANCE FOR COVERED PRACTICES.

''(a) PRACTICE-BASED PRECLEARANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State and each political subdivision shall—

''(A) identify any newly enacted or adopted law, regulation, or policy that includes a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or a standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting, that is a covered practice described in subsection (b); and

''(B) ensure that no such covered practice is implemented unless or until the State or political subdivision, as the case may be, complies with subsection (c).

''(2) DETERMINATIONS OF CHARACTERISTICS OF VOTING-AGE POPULATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—As early as practicable during each calendar year, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Bureau of the Census and the heads of other relevant offices of the government, shall make the determinations required by this section regarding voting-age populations and the characteristics of such populations, and shall publish a list of the States and political subdivisions to which a voting-age population characteristic described in subsection (b) applies.

''(B) PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER.—A determination or certification of the Attorney General under this paragraph shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

''(b) COVERED PRACTICES.—To assure that the right of citizens of the United States to vote is not denied or abridged on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group as a result of the implementation of certain qualifications or prerequisites to voting, or standards, practices, or procedures with respect to voting newly adopted in a State or political subdivision, the following shall be covered practices subject to the requirements described in subsection (a):

''(1) CHANGES TO METHOD OF ELECTION.—Any change to the method of election—

''(A) to add seats elected at-large in a State or political subdivision where—

''(i) 2 or more racial groups or language minority groups each represent 20 percent or more of the political subdivision's voting-age population; or

''(ii) a single language minority group represents 20 percent or more of the voting-age population on Indian lands located in whole or in part in the political subdivision; or

''(B) to convert one or more seats elected from a single-member district to one or more at-large seats or seats from a multi-member district in a State or political subdivision where—

''(i) 2 or more racial groups or language minority groups each represent 20 percent or more of the political subdivision's voting-age population; or

''(ii) a single language minority group represents 20 percent or more of the voting-age population on Indian lands located in whole or in part in the political subdivision.

''(2) CHANGES TO JURISDICTION BOUNDARIES.—Any change or series of changes within a year to the boundaries of a jurisdiction that reduces by 3 or more percentage points the proportion of the jurisdiction's voting-age population that is comprised of members of a single racial group or language minority group in a State or political subdivision where—

''(A) 2 or more racial groups or language minority groups each represent 20 percent or more of the political subdivision's voting-age population; or

''(B) a single language minority group represents 20 percent or more of the voting-age population on Indian lands located in whole or in part in the political subdivision.

''(3) CHANGES THROUGH REDISTRICTING.—Any change to the boundaries of election districts in a State or political subdivision where any racial group or language minority group experiences a population increase, over the preceding decade (as calculated by the Bureau of the Census under the most recent decennial census), of at least—

''(A) 10,000; or

''(B) 20 percent of voting-age population of the State or political subdivision, as the case may be.

''(4) CHANGES IN DOCUMENTATION OR QUALIFICATIONS TO VOTE.—Any change to requirements for documentation or proof of identity to vote such that the requirements will exceed or be more stringent than the requirements for voting that are described in section 303(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21083(b)) or any change to the requirements for documentation or proof of identity to register to vote that will exceed or be more stringent than such requirements under State law on the day before the date of enactment of the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019.

''(5) CHANGES TO MULTILINGUAL VOTING MATERIALS.—Any change that reduces multilingual voting materials or alters the manner in which such materials are provided or distributed, where no similar reduction or alteration occurs in materials provided in English for such election.

''(6) CHANGES THAT REDUCE, CONSOLIDATE, OR RELOCATE VOTING LOCATIONS OR REDUCE VOTING OPPORTUNITIES.—Any change that reduces, consolidates, or relocates voting locations, including early, absentee, and election-day voting locations, or reduces days or hours of in person voting on any Sunday during a period occurring prior to the date of an election during which voters may cast ballots in such election—

''(A) in 1 or more census tracts wherein 2 or more language minority groups or racial groups each represent 20 percent or more of the voting-age population of the political subdivision; or

''(B) on Indian lands wherein at least 20 percent of the voting-age population belongs to a single language minority group.

(7) NEW LIST MAINTENANCE PROCESS.—Any change to the maintenance of voter registration lists that adds a new basis for removal from the list of active registered voters or that puts in place a new process for removing a name from the list of active registered voters—

''(A) in the case of a political subdivision imposing such change if—

''(i) 2 or more racial groups or language minority groups each represent 20 percent or more of the voting-age population of the political subdivision; or

''(ii) a single language minority group represents 20 percent of more of the voting-age population on Indian lands located in whole or in part in the political subdivision; or

''(B) in the case of a State imposing such change, if 2 or more racial groups or language minority groups each represent 20 percent of more of the voting-age population of—

''(i) the State; or

''(ii) a political subdivision in the State, except that the requirements under subsections (a) and (c) shall apply only with respect to each such political subdivision.

''(c) PRECLEARANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever a State or political subdivision with respect to which the requirements set forth in subsection (a) are in effect shall enact, adopt, or seek to implement any covered practice described under subsection (b), such State or subdivision may institute an action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for a declaratory judgment that such covered practice neither has the purpose nor will have the effect of denying or

abridging the right to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group, and unless and until the court enters such judgment such covered practice shall not be implemented. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, such covered practice may be implemented without such proceeding if the covered practice has been submitted by the chief legal officer or other appropriate official of such State or subdivision to the Attorney General and the Attorney General has not interposed an objection within 60 days after such submission, or upon good cause shown, to facilitate an expedited approval within 60 days after such submission, the Attorney General has affirmatively indicated that such objection will not be made. Neither an affirmative indication by the Attorney General that no objection will be made, nor the Attorney General's failure to object, nor a declaratory judgment entered under this section shall bar a subsequent action to enjoin implementation of such covered practice. In the event the Attorney General affirmatively indicates that no objection will be made within the 60-day period following receipt of a submission, the Attorney General may reserve the right to reexamine the submission if additional information comes to the Attorney General's attention during the remainder of the 60-day period which would otherwise require objection in accordance with this section. Any action under this section shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28, United States Code, and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court.

''(2) DENYING OR ABRIDGING THE RIGHT TO VOTE.—Any covered practice described in subsection (b) that has the purpose of or will have the effect of diminishing the ability of any citizens of the United States on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group, to elect their preferred candidates of choice denies or abridges the right to vote within the meaning of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

''(3) PURPOSE DEFINED.—The term 'purpose' in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall include any discriminatory purpose.

''(4) PURPOSE OF PARAGRAPH (2).—The purpose of paragraph (2) of this subsection is to protect the ability of such citizens to elect their preferred candidates of choice.

''(d) ENFORCEMENT.—The Attorney General or any aggrieved citizen may file an action in a Federal district court to compel any State or political subdivision to satisfy the obligations set forth in this section. Such actions shall be heard and determined by a court of 3 judges under section 2284 of title 28, United States Code. In any such action, the court shall provide as a remedy that any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting, that is the subject of the action under this subsection be enjoined unless the court determines that—

''(1) the voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting, is not a covered practice described in subsection (b); or

''(2) the State or political subdivision has complied with subsection (c) with respect to the covered practice at issue.

''(e) COUNTING OF RACIAL GROUPS AND LANGUAGE MINORITY GROUPS.—For purposes of this section, the calculation of the population of a racial group or a language minority group shall be carried out using the methodology in the guidance promulgated in the Federal Register on February 9, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 7470).

''(f) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of determinations under this section, any data provided by the Bureau of the Census, whether based on estimation from sample or actual enumeration, shall not be subject to challenge or review in any court.

''(g) MULTILINGUAL VOTING MATERIALS.—In this section, the term 'multilingual voting materials' means registration or voting notices, forms, instructions, assistance, or other materials or information relating to the electoral process, including ballots, provided in the language or languages of one or more language minority groups.''.

SEC. 5. PROMOTING TRANSPARENCY TO ENFORCE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT.

(a) TRANSPARENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 5 the following new section:

''SEC. 6. TRANSPARENCY REGARDING CHANGES TO PROTECT VOTING RIGHTS.

''(a) NOTICE OF ENACTED CHANGES.—

''(1) NOTICE OF CHANGES.—If a State or political subdivision makes any change in any prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting in any election for Federal office that will result in the prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure being different from that which was in effect as of 180 days before the date of the election for Federal office, the State or political subdivision shall provide reasonable public notice in such State or political subdivision and on the Internet, of a concise description of the change, including the difference between the changed prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure and the prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure which was previously in effect. The public notice described in this paragraph, in such State or political subdivision and on the Internet, shall be in a format that is reasonably convenient and accessible to voters with disabilities, including voters who have low vision or are blind.

''(2) DEADLINE FOR NOTICE.—A State or political subdivision shall provide the public notice required under paragraph (1) not later than 48 hours after making the change involved.

''(b) TRANSPARENCY REGARDING POLLING PLACE RESOURCES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to identify any changes that may impact the right to vote of any person, prior to the 30th day before the date of an election for Federal office, each State or political subdivision with responsibility for allocating registered voters, voting machines, and official poll workers to particular precincts and polling places shall provide reasonable public notice in such State or political subdivision and on the Internet, of the information described in paragraph (2) for precincts and polling places within such State or political subdivision. The public notice described in this paragraph, in such State or political subdivision and on the Internet, shall be in a format that is reasonably convenient and accessible to voters with disabilities including voters who have low vision or are blind.

''(2) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The information described in this paragraph with respect to a precinct or polling place is each of the following:

''(A) The name or number.

''(B) In the case of a polling place, the location, including the street address, and whether such polling place is accessible to persons with disabilities.

''(C) The voting-age population of the area served by the precinct or polling place, broken down by demographic group if such breakdown is reasonably available to such State or political subdivision.

''(D) The number of registered voters assigned to the precinct or polling place, broken down by demographic group if such breakdown is reasonably available to such State or political subdivision.

''(E) The number of voting machines assigned, including the number of voting machines accessible to voters with disabilities, including voters who have low vision or are blind.

''(F) The number of official paid poll workers assigned.

''(G) The number of official volunteer poll workers assigned.

''(H) In the case of a polling place, the dates and hours of operation.

''(3) UPDATES IN INFORMATION REPORTED.—If a State or political subdivision makes any change in any of the information described in paragraph (2), the State or political subdivision shall provide reasonable public notice in such State or political subdivision and on the Internet, of the change in the information not later than 48 hours after the change occurs or, if the change occurs fewer than 48 hours before the date of the election for Federal office, as soon as practicable after the change occurs. The public notice described in this paragraph in such State or political subdivision and on the Internet shall be in a format that is reasonably convenient and accessible to voters with disabilities including voters who have low vision or are blind.

''(c) TRANSPARENCY OF CHANGES RELATING TO DEMOGRAPHICS AND ELECTORAL DISTRICTS.—

''(1) REQUIRING PUBLIC NOTICE OF CHANGES.—Not later than 10 days after making any change in the constituency that will participate in an election for Federal, State, or local office or the boundaries of a voting unit or electoral district in an election for Federal, State, or local office (including through redistricting, reapportionment, changing from at-large elections to district-based elections, or changing from district-based elections to at-large elections), a State or political subdivision shall provide reasonable public notice in such State or political subdivision and on the Internet, of the demographic and electoral data described in paragraph (3) for each of the geographic areas described in paragraph (2).

''(2) GEOGRAPHIC AREAS DESCRIBED.—The geographic areas described in this paragraph are as follows:

''(A) The State as a whole, if the change applies statewide, or the political subdivision as a whole, if the change applies across the entire political subdivision.

''(B) If the change includes a plan to replace or eliminate voting units or electoral districts, each voting unit or electoral district that will be replaced or eliminated.

''(C) If the change includes a plan to establish new voting units or electoral districts, each such new voting unit or electoral district.

''(3) DEMOGRAPHIC AND ELECTORAL DATA.—The demographic and electoral data described in this paragraph with respect to a geographic area described in paragraph (2) are each of the following:

''(A) The voting-age population, broken down by demographic group.

''(B) If it is reasonably available to the State or political subdivision involved, an estimate of the population of the area which consists of citizens of the United States who are 18 years of age or older, broken down by demographic group.

''(C) The number of registered voters, broken down by demographic group if such breakdown is reasonably available to the State or political subdivision involved.

''(D)(i) If the change applies to a State, the actual number of votes, or (if it is not reasonably practicable for the State to ascertain the actual number of votes) the estimated number of votes received by each candidate in each statewide election held during the 5-year period which ends on the date the change involved is made; and

''(ii) if the change applies to only one political subdivision, the actual number of votes, or (if it is not reasonably practicable for the political subdivision to ascertain the actual number of votes) in each subdivision-wide election held during the 5-year period which ends on the date the change involved is made.

''(4) VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE BY SMALLER JURISDICTIONS.—Compliance with this subsection shall be voluntary for a political subdivision of a State unless the subdivision is one of the following:

''(A) A county or parish.

''(B) A municipality with a population greater than 10,000, as determined by the Bureau of the Census under the most recent decennial census.

''(C) A school district with a population greater than 10,000, as determined by the Bureau of the Census under the most recent decennial census. For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'school district' means the geographic area under the jurisdiction of a local educational agency (as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965).

''(d) RULES REGARDING FORMAT OF INFORMATION.—The Attorney General may issue rules specifying a reasonably convenient and accessible format that States and political subdivisions shall use to provide public notice of information under this section.

''(e) NO DENIAL OF RIGHT TO VOTE.—The right to vote of any person shall not be denied or abridged because the person failed to comply with any change made by a State or political subdivision to a voting qualification, standard, practice, or procedure if the State or political subdivision involved did not meet the applicable requirements of this section with respect to the change.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'demographic group' means each group which section 2 protects from the denial or abridgement of the right to vote on account of race or color, or in contravention of the guarantees set forth in section 4(f)(2);

''(2) the term 'election for Federal office' means any general, special, primary, or runoff election held solely or in part for the purpose of electing any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Senator, Member of the House of Representatives, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress; and

''(3) the term 'persons with disabilities', means individuals with a disability, as defined in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10302(a)) is amended by striking ''in accordance with section 6''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) shall apply with respect to changes which are made on or after the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. AUTHORITY TO ASSIGN OBSERVERS.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY IN POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO PRECLEARANCE.—Section 8(a)(2)(B) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10305(a)(2)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

''(B) in the Attorney General's judgment, the assignment of observers is otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 14th or 15th Amendment or any provision of this Act or any other Federal law protecting the right of citizens of the United States to vote; or''.

(b) ASSIGNMENT OF OBSERVERS TO ENFORCE BILINGUAL ELECTION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 8(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10305(a)) is amended—

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

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) the Attorney General certifies with respect to a political subdivision that—

''(A) the Attorney General has received written meritorious complaints from residents, elected officials, or civic participation organizations that efforts to violate section 203 are likely to occur; or

''(B) in the Attorney General's judgment, the assignment of observers is necessary to enforce the guarantees of section 203;''; and

(3) by moving the margin for the continuation text following paragraph (3), as added by paragraph (2) of this subsection, two ems to the left.

SEC. 7. PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF SCOPE AND PERSONS AUTHORIZED TO SEEK RELIEF.—Section 12(d) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10308(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''section 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, or subsection (b) of this section'' and inserting ''the 14th or 15th Amendment, this Act, or any Federal voting rights law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group''; and

(2) by striking ''the Attorney General may institute for the United States, or in the name of the United States,'' and inserting ''the aggrieved person or (in the name of the United States) the Attorney General may institute''.

(b) GROUNDS FOR GRANTING RELIEF.—Section 12(d) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10308(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(d) Whenever any person'' and inserting ''(d)(1) Whenever any person'';

(2) by striking ''(1) to permit'' and inserting ''(A) to permit'';

(3) by striking ''(2) to count'' and inserting ''(B) to count''; and

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

''(2)(A) In any action for preliminary relief described in this subsection, the court shall grant the relief if the court determines that the complainant has raised a serious question whether the challenged voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure violates this Act or the Constitution and, on balance, the hardship imposed upon the defendant by the grant of the relief will be less than the hardship which would be imposed upon the plaintiff if the relief were not granted. In balancing the harms, the court shall give due weight to the fundamental right to cast an effective ballot.

''(B) In making its determination under this paragraph with respect to a change in any voting qualification, prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting, the court shall consider all relevant factors and give due weight to the following factors, if they are present:

''(i) Whether the qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure in effect prior to the change was adopted as a remedy for a Federal court judgment, consent decree, or admission regarding—

''(I) discrimination on the basis of race or color in violation of the 14th or 15th Amendment;

''(II) a violation of this Act; or

''(III) voting discrimination on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group in violation of any other Federal or State law.

''(ii) Whether the qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure in effect prior to the change served as a ground for the dismissal or settlement of a claim alleging—

''(I) discrimination on the basis of race or color in violation of the 14th or 15th Amendment;

''(II) a violation of this Act; or

''(III) voting discrimination on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group in violation of any other Federal or State law.

''(iii) Whether the change was adopted fewer than 180 days before the date of the election with respect to which the change is to take effect.

''(iv) Whether the defendant has failed to provide timely or complete notice of the adoption of the change as required by applicable Federal or State law.''.

(c) GROUNDS FOR STAY OR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL.—Section 12(d) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10308(d)) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) A jurisdiction's inability to enforce its voting or election laws, regulations, policies, or redistricting plans, standing alone, shall not be deemed to constitute irreparable harm to the public interest or to the interests of a defendant in an action arising under the U.S. Constitution or any Federal law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group in the voting process, for the purposes of determining whether a stay of a court's order or an interlocutory appeal under section 1253 of title 28, United States Code, is warranted.''.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

Title I of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 21. DEFINITIONS.

''In this Act:

''(1) INDIAN.—The term 'Indian' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.

''(2) INDIAN LANDS.—The term 'Indian lands' means—

''(A) any Indian country of an Indian tribe, as such term is defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code;

''(B) any land in Alaska that is owned, pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, by an Indian tribe that is a Native village (as such term is defined in section 3 of such Act), or by a Village Corporation that is associated with the Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 3 of such Act);

''(C) any land on which the seat of government of the Indian tribe is located; and

''(D) any land that is part or all of a tribal designated statistical area associated with the Indian tribe, or is part or all of an Alaska Native village statistical area associated with the tribe, as defined by the Bureau of the Census for the purposes of the most recent decennial census.

''(3) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian tribe' or 'tribe' has the meaning given the term 'Indian tribe' in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.

''(4) TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.—The term 'Tribal Government' means the recognized governing body of an Indian Tribe.

''(5) VOTING-AGE POPULATION.—The term 'voting-age population' means the numerical size of the population within a State, within a political subdivision, or within a political subdivision that contains Indian lands, as the case may be, that consists of persons age 18 or older, as calculated by the Bureau of the Census under the most recent decennial census.''.

SEC. 9. ATTORNEYS' FEES.

Section 14(c) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10310(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) The term 'prevailing party' means a party to an action that receives at least some of the benefit sought by such action, states a colorable claim, and can establish that the action was a significant cause of a change to the status quo.''.

SEC. 10. OTHER TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) ACTIONS COVERED UNDER SECTION 3.—Section 3(c) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10302(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''any proceeding instituted by the Attorney General or an aggrieved person under any statute to enforce'' and inserting ''any action under any statute in which a party (including the Attorney General) seeks to enforce''; and

(2) by striking ''at the time the proceeding was commenced'' and inserting ''at the time the action was commenced''.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF LANGUAGE MINORITY GROUPS.—Section 4(f) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10303(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking the second sentence; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4).

(c) PERIOD DURING WHICH CHANGES IN VOTING PRACTICES ARE SUBJECT TO PRECLEARANCE UNDER SECTION 5.—Section 5 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10304) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''based upon determinations made under the first sentence of

section 4(b) are in effect'' and inserting ''are in effect during a calendar year'';

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''November 1, 1964'' and all that follows through ''November 1, 1972'' and inserting ''the applicable date of coverage''; and

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

''(e) The term 'applicable date of coverage' means, with respect to a State or political subdivision—

''(1) June 25, 2013, if the most recent determination for such State or subdivision under section 4(b) was made on or before December 31, 2019; or

''(2) the date on which the most recent determination for such State or subdivision under section 4(b) was made, if such determination was made after December 31, 2019.''.

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 the Judiciary.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 4.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019.

H.R. 4 is comprehensive and much-needed legislation to restore the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to its full vitality. This bill responds to the Supreme Court's disastrous 2013 decision in Shelby County v. Holder, which effectively gutted the act's most important enforcement mechanism, section 5, which requires jurisdictions with a history of racial discrimination in voting to obtain Justice Department or Federal court approval before any changes to their voting laws can take effect.

The Court struck down the coverage formula that determined which jurisdictions would be subject to preclearance, but it expressly said that Congress could draft another formula based on current conditions. That, among other things, is exactly what H.R. 4 does.

This bill is the result of an extensive process that included 18 hearings before three different House committees. This process developed a record demonstrating that States and localities and, in particular, those that were formerly subject to preclearance, have engaged in various voter suppression tactics, such as imposing burdensome proof of citizenship laws, polling place closures, purges of voter rolls, and significant scale-backs to early voting periods.

These kinds of voting restrictions have a disproportionate and negative impact on racial and language minority voters and deprive them of a fundamental right guaranteed by the Constitution.

In short, the record is clear that substantial voter suppression exists across the country and that H.R. 4's coverage formula is necessary to address this discrimination.

This legislation not only updates the existing formula to ensure that it accounts for current conditions, but it is also designed so that the formula will update itself regularly as conditions change, thereby directly responding to the Court's concern in Shelby County.

Not surprisingly, the suspension of preclearance unleashed a deluge of voter suppression laws across the Nation, making restoration of this tool even more necessary.

As we consider the record and the need for H.R. 4, it is worth remembering why Congress enacted preclearance in the first place. Before the Voting Rights Act, we saw, essentially, a game of whack-a-mole in which States and localities could engage in voter suppression, secure in the knowledge that any discriminatory law that was struck down by a court could quickly be replaced by another. Preclearance successfully put an end to this game of whack-a-mole.

I want to thank TERRI SEWELL for crafting this important legislation and for her efforts over the last several years on this bill.

I also want to recognize the leadership of MARCIA FUDGE, chair of the House Administration's Subcommittee on Elections, for her extraordinary work in conducting numerous field hearings examining voting problems around the country, as well as Constitution Subcommittee Chairman STEVE COHEN, who presided over many hearings in the Judiciary Committee to develop the substantial record on which this legislation is based.

The Voting Rights Act represents one of the Nation's most important civil rights victories, one achieved by those who marched, struggled, and even died to secure the right to vote for all Americans. I urge my colleagues to honor their sacrifices and to enable section 5 once again to protect the rights of all Americans to vote.

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) control the remainder of the time on the majority side.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the right to vote is of paramount importance in a democracy, and its protection from discriminatory barriers has been grounded in Federal law since the Civil War and, more recently, in the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

A Supreme Court decision called Shelby County will be mentioned here many times today.

And, also, I want to say, it has been mentioned many times that the Supreme Court directed or instructed this body to do something. They did not. What they did say in the decision was that, if Congress wants to, they can revisit this. And, as we could on most anything, we are revisiting. But to say that we were directed to is a little bit of an overstatement and just needs to be clarified.

It is important to remember that this Supreme Court decision only struck down one outdated provision of the Voting Rights Act, namely, an outdated formula based on decades-old data that doesn't hold true anymore, describing which jurisdictions had to get approval from the Department of Justice before their voting rules went into effect.

It is important to point out that other very important provisions of the Voting Rights Act remain in place and were not changed, including section 2 and section 3.

Section 2 applies nationwide and prohibits voting practices or procedures that discriminate on the basis of race, color, or the ability to speak English. Section 2 is enforced through Federal lawsuits, just like other Federal civil rights laws. The United States and civil rights organizations have brought many cases to enforce the guarantees of section 2 in court, and they may do so in the future.

Section 3 of the Voting Rights Act also remains in place. Section 3 authorizes Federal courts to impose preclearance requirements on States and political subdivisions that have enacted voting procedures that treat people differently based on race in violation of the 14th and 15th Amendments.

If a State or political subdivision is found by the Federal courts to have treated people differently based on race, then the court has discretion to retain supervisory jurisdiction and impose preclearance requirements on the State or political subdivision, as the court sees fit, until a future date, at the court's discretion.

This means that such a State or political subdivision would have to submit all future voting rule changes for approval to either the court itself or the Department of Justice before such rule changes could go into effect.

As set out in the Code of Federal Regulations: ''Under section 3(c) of the Voting Rights Act, a court, in voting rights litigation, can order as relief that a jurisdiction not subject to the preclearance requirement of section 5 preclear its voting changes by submitting them either to the court or to the Attorney General.''

Again, section 3's procedures remain available today to those challenging voting rules as discriminatory. Just a couple of years ago, for example, U.S. District Court Judge Lee Rosenthal issued an opinion in a redistricting

case that required the city of Pasadena, Texas, to be monitored by the Justice Department because it had intentionally changed its city council districts to decrease Hispanic influence.

The city, which the court ruled has a ''long history of discrimination against minorities,'' was required to have their future voting rules changes precleared by the Department of Justice for the next 6 years, during which time the Federal judge ''retains jurisdiction . . . to review before enforcement any change to the election map or plan that was in effect in Pasadena on December 1, 2013.''

A change to the city's election plan can be enforced without review by the judge only if it is submitted to the U.S. Attorney General and the Department of Justice and has not objected within 60 days.

Voting rights are protected in this country, including in my own State of Georgia, where Latino and African American voter turnout has soared. Between 2014 and 2018, voter turnout increased by double digits, both for men and women in both of these communities, and we are committed to ensuring the ballot box is open to all eligible voters.

We are committed to ensuring constitutional means are used to accomplish that. We are committed to protecting the value of every American voice by securing our elections from fraud. These are our priorities and our principles.

Full protections are afforded under current Federal law for all those with valid claims of discrimination in voting. Unfortunately, the bill before us today would turn those Federal shields that protect voters into political weapons. This bill would essentially federalize State and local election laws when there is absolutely no evidence whatsoever that those States or localities engaged in any discriminatory behavior when it comes to voting.

The Supreme Court has made it clear that this type of Federal control over State and local elections is unconstitutional because Congress can only do that when there is proof of actual discrimination, which is what the bill is supposed to be about.

House Democrats continue their breakneck speed of everything else that we have going on, and now, today, a partisan bill comes to the floor to prevent States from running their own State and local elections when we are dealing with this very issue of impeachment and discussing elections at the same time.

When can we stop and ask: What is best for the United States? What is best for our voters?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 4, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019. This critical civil rights bill, the result of strong leadership by my colleagues, Ms. TERRI SEWELL and Ms. MARCIA FUDGE, will restore the most important enforcement mechanism of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, its preclearance provision, by establishing a new coverage formula to determine which jurisdictions will be subject to preclearance.

The Supreme Court, when it struck down the previous preclearance requirement in 2013, asked Congress to come back with a new preclearance requirement. That is what we are doing.

This formula is self-updating because it requires a continuous, 25-year look back to determine whether, at any given moment, a jurisdiction has engaged in such pervasive discrimination so as to justify imposing a Federal preclearance requirement on any changes to voting laws that it may make.

This formula reflects the substantial evidentiary record developed in numerous hearings before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, of which I am honored to serve as chair, and other committees of this House.

In short, it reflects current conditions and demonstrates the current need for preclearance. It is, therefore, responsive to the Supreme Court's reasoning in Shelby County v. Holder that wrongfully, in my view, struck down the VRA's previous coverage formula.

Maya Angelou told us: ''When somebody shows you who they are, believe them. . . .'' This is what the court does with the preclearance. When they show you that they are going to discriminate against people and try to make it harder for people to vote, believe them and make it more difficult and make them come on the front end and show what they are doing is right.

We have heard from my colleagues some of the egregious examples of continuing and perverse voter suppression efforts by States and localities since Shelby County, particularly those that used to be subject to preclearance under the old formula. These include poll closures and relocations, changes in district boundaries, voter purges, and barriers to voter registration that target racial and language minority voters.

I want to take this opportunity to respond to one of the main arguments my Republican colleagues have raised. We keep hearing from them that H.R. 4 would represent an unconstitutional Federal takeover of State and local elections.

Born in the South, I can tell you that this argument is old wine in a new bottle. It is what previous generations called ''States' rights,'' a loaded term that was used by segregationists and, before them, by the defenders of slavery to justify a legal regime of white supremacy and racial ideology that said African Americans were, at best, second-class citizens and, at worst, less than human beings.

From slavery, to Jim Crow, to what we have today: States' rights.

The Civil War and the 14th and 15th Amendments that followed settled the question that the other side raises by fundamentally reordering the relationship between Congress and the States, making it clear that Congress not only had the power, but the duty, to intervene against States when they engaged in racial discrimination to deny racial minorities the right to vote.

And States did it and did it and did it, and most of them were in the South, and most of them screamed, ''States' rights.''

Do not be fooled by the argument that H.R. 4 somehow exceeds our constitutional authority to address racial discrimination in voting. The other side will say that the Reconstruction Amendments prohibit only intentional discrimination and that, to the extent that H.R. 4 also addresses discriminatory effects of voter suppression tactics, we are not allowed to address those in this bill.

The Supreme Court, in City of Rome v. U.S., made clear that our authority under the 15th Amendment allows us to do just that, and that is what we should do.

H.R. 4 represents exactly what the Reconstruction Amendments contemplated: Congress intervening against States in the face of overwhelming evidence of continuing racial discrimination in voting.

We must not shirk our constitutional duty. We must pass H.R. 4.

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

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), who is an invaluable part of this work in the House Administration Committee and had a special committee to work on this. This is very close to her heart.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I remember well the day I stood here and raised my right hand and swore before God and country that I would support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and that I would bear true faith and allegiance to the same.

If you believe in the oath you took and they were not just empty words, you must vote to support H.R. 4.

If you believe that Black and Brown people, Asian citizens, Native Americans, language minorities, students, the poor, rural and urban citizens are part of ''we, the people,'' you must vote to support H.R. 4.

To quote our former colleague, the Honorable Barbara Jordan: ''We, the people. . . . I was not included in that 'We, the people.' . . . But through the process of amendment, interpretation, and court decision, I . . . am finally . . . included in 'We, the people.'''

She went on to say: ''My faith in the Constitution is whole. It is complete. It

is total. I am not going to sit here and be an idle spectator to the diminution, the subversion, the destruction of the Constitution.''

The Constitution is the very foundation of our democracy. If your faith in the Constitution is whole, complete, and total, you must vote for H.R. 4.

Sadly, the United States has a long, dark history of denying or restricting the right of people to vote who look like me.

The Black Brigade of Cincinnati, the Buffalo Soldiers, the Tuskegee Airmen, they protected, fought, and many died for this country, but their ability to vote was either outlawed or suppressed.

□ 1045

JOHN LEWIS and Dr. King were attacked. Fannie Lou Hamer was brutally beaten, and Medgar Evers was shot down in his very own driveway.

We, the people.

The 14th Amendment says that: ''All persons born or naturalized in the United States . . . , are citizens. . . . No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges . . . of citizens. . . .''

The 15th Amendment guarantees: ''The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.''

We are all we, the people.

The 24th Amendment prohibits the payment of poll and other taxes to vote. I believe that the purchase of unnecessary forms of identification and payment of fines and fees are just other forms of poll taxes.

And nowhere in the Constitution does it say, if you do not vote in one election, you lose your right to vote. Voting is a right; it is not a requirement. Your right to vote is not a use-it-or-lose-it situation. In my opinion, purging is a constitutional violation.

The same goes for closing polling places and moving them so far that it takes hours to travel there and back, or reducing early voting hours such that it discriminates against those who use those shortened hours.

I implore you not to place party over patriotism, wrong over right. I ask you to do the right thing. Our Nation needs to know if your faith in the Constitution is whole, if it is complete, and if it is total. And if it is, you will vote ''yes'' on H.R. 4.

How many more generations will be required to fight for their constitutional right to vote?

We are the greatest democracy in the history of the world against which all other democracies are judged. If your faith in the Constitution is whole, complete, and total, you must do the right thing, not the political thing.

Do the right thing. Vote ''yes'' on H.R. 4.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), the Republican leader on the House Administration Committee.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. COLLINS, for yielding today.

Today, I rise in opposition of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019.

I fully support the bipartisan Voting Rights Act, which is still in place today. However, the bill we are debating today, H.R. 4, is not a reauthorization of the important, historically bipartisan Voting Rights Act that has helped to prevent discrimination at the ballot box since 1965.

It has only been since the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Shelby County v. Holder that Democrats have decided to politicize the Voting Rights Act. This landmark decision left the vast majority of the Voting Rights Act in place today.

The only thing that was struck down from the VRA was the formula that was using 40-year-old data to determine which States were placed under the control of the Department of Justice, this process known as preclearance. The Supreme Court deemed this data and formula was no longer accurate nor relevant for our country's current climate.

Chief Justice Roberts said: ''The Voting Rights Act of 1965 employed extraordinary measures to address an extraordinary problem.''

He went on to say that: ''Regardless of how to look at the record, no one can fairly say that it shows anything approaching the 'pervasive,' 'flagrant,' 'widespread,' and 'rampant' discrimination that faced'' this ''Congress,'' this institution, ''in 1965, and that clearly distinguished the covered jurisdictions from the rest of the Nation.''

So what does H.R. 4 do? It doubles down on federalizing elections and would attempt to put every State and jurisdiction in this country under preclearance.

The majority has been unable to determine the number of States or jurisdictions that would be covered by this preclearance if H.R. 4 were to become law. Apparently, we have to pass this bill before the American people would know if they would or would not be subjected to it.

The majority knows H.R. 4 is bad policy that will cripple thousands of local election officials across the country if it were ever to become law.

Let me be clear: H.R. 4 is not a Voting Rights Act reauthorization bill. H.R. 4 is about two things: placing the unnecessary preclearance requirements on to States, and the Democrats giving the Department of Justice control over all election activity.

My committee, the Committee on House Administration, has jurisdiction over Federal election policy, but it does not have jurisdiction over the Voting Rights Act. That goes to the Judiciary Committee. Despite that lack of jurisdiction, our Subcommittee on Elections held seven field hearings and one listening session across this great country on the Voting Rights Act, encompassing eight different States and over 13,000 miles of air travel.

Even with this gargantuan effort to gather evidence to reinstate the struck-down formula from the VRA that we are discussing today, the Democrats were still unable to produce a single voter who wanted to vote and was unable to cast a ballot.

This isn't a bad thing. It is a fantastic thing. It ought to be celebrated. We should be celebrating that Americans who wanted to vote were able to do that, and credit should be given to the Voting Rights Act for helping to achieve that.

The 2018 midterm election produced the highest voting turnout in four decades—and that is according to data from our Census Bureau—especially among minority voters.

The sections of the Voting Rights Act 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 this country's elections should be able to cast a ballot. That is why we have the Voting Rights Act, a great example, until today, of a bipartisan solution that is still working today to help Americans and protect from voter discrimination.

I have now seen four election-related bills from the majority come to this floor, and all of them have the same common theme: catchy titles and federalizing elections, a responsibility the Constitution gives to our States.

H.R. 4 is simply more of the same. It is a solution in search of a problem. That is why I cannot support this legislation.

I ask my colleagues to join me in making sure States maintain control of their elections.

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

Before I ask for unanimous consent so that the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) can take over the remainder of the time, I would just like to comment.

I have been in this Congress for 13 years now, and before these sections were added that the Republicans oppose, there was simply the Voting Rights Act with a new coverage formula, sponsored by Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and it had but less than 10 Republicans on it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), and I ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

Nothing is more fundamental to our democracy than the right to vote, and nothing is more precious to my district, Alabama's Seventh Congressional District, than the fight to protect the right to vote for all Americans.

It was in my district, Birmingham, Montgomery, Marion, and Selma, that ordinary Americans peacefully protested for the equal right to vote for African Americans.

Voting is personal to me, not just because I represent Alabama's Civil Rights District, but because it was on the streets of my hometown of Selma that foot soldiers shed their blood on the Edmund Pettus Bridge so that all Americans, regardless of race, could vote.

It was on that same bridge in Selma, Alabama, that our colleague, a then 26-year-old, JOHN LEWIS, was bludgeoned by State troopers with billy clubs in the name of justice. Their efforts led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the seminal and most effective legislation passed in this Congress to protect the right of all Americans to vote.

Those protections were gutted in 2013 by the Supreme Court decision in Shelby v. Holder when the Court ruled that Section 4(b) of the VRA was unconstitutional, stating that the coverage formula that Congress adopted was outdated.

Well, today, 6 years after the Shelby decision, Congress is finally answering the Supreme Court's call to action by passing H.R. 4. H.R. 4 creates a new coverage formula to determine which States will be subject to the VRA's preclearance requirement that is based on current, recent evidence of voter discrimination.

In addition, the bill also establishes practice-based preclearance authority and increases transparency by requiring reasonable notice for voter changes.

This new voter formula is narrowly tailored to cover the States and jurisdictions where there has been a resurgence of significant and pervasive discriminatory voting practices. It does not include those areas where such preclearance would be considered to be an unjustifiable burden.

In all, these changes will restore the full strength of the Voting Rights Act by stopping discrimination before it takes place, as Congress had intended in the pasting of the VRA.

Mr. Speaker, old battles have become new again. The fight that began in Selma, Alabama, in 1965 still persists. Yes, Selma is now.

While literacy tests and poll taxes no longer exist, certain States and local jurisdictions have passed laws that are modern-day barriers to voting. So as long as voter suppression exists, the need for the full protections of the VRA will be required, and that is why it is critically important that we fully restore the protections of the Voting Rights Act by passing H.R. 4.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Judiciary Committee and the House Administration's Subcommittee on Elections for hosting the 17 hearings and collecting the thousands and thousands of pages of documentation supporting the report on H.R. 4.

Likewise, I include in the RECORD letters of support for H.R. 4 from outside groups that detail the existence of current voter suppression.

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA—UAW,

December 5, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than one million active and retired members of the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), I am writing to strongly urge you to vote 'YES' on the Voting Rights Advancement Act (H.R. 4).

This legislation is badly needed as the disastrous Supreme Court's Shelby v. Holder decision has led to the proliferation of state laws that have made it more difficult for the American people to exercise their fundamental voting rights. In the last decade, 25 states have enacted new voting restrictions, including strict photo ID requirements, early voting cutbacks, and registration restrictions. Registered voters have been intentionally purged from voter rolls and states have closed hundreds of polling stations with a history of racial discrimination since the court ruled that they did not need federal approval to change their rules. These repeated attacks have severely undermined people's fundamental voting rights, which are the foundational principles of our representative democracy.

H.R. 4 helps protect citizens' ability to register to vote and provides real enforcement so that marginalized communities will have proper access to the ballot box. Empowering Americans to vote and ensuring that everyone has equal access to participate in the voting process is a core value of our democracy.

The UAW strongly urges you to vote 'YES' on the Voting Rights Advancement Act (H.R 4).

Sincerely,

JOSH NASSAR,
Legislative Director.

NATIONAL HISPANIC LEADERSHIP AGENDA,

December 4, 2019.

Re NHLA Urges Support of the Voting Rights Advancement Act, H.R. 4.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write on behalf of the National Hispanic Leadership Agenda (NHLA), a coalition of the nation's leading Latino nonpartisan civil rights and advocacy organizations, to urge you to vote ''yes'' on the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019 (VRAA), H.R. 4. This legislation restores necessary voting protections to ensure that discriminatory voting-related changes are blocked before they are implemented. There is no right more fundamental to our democracy than the right to vote, and for more than 50 years the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA) provided voters with one of the most effective mechanisms for protecting that right. The VRAA would provide Latino and other voters of color new and forward-looking protections against voter discrimination. The Latino community cannot wait for another federal election cycle to go by without effective mechanisms to guard against discriminatory voting-related changes. NHLA will closely monitor this matter for inclusion in future NHLA scorecards evaluating Member support for the Latino community.

The VRA is regarded as one of the most important and effective pieces of civil rights legislation in our country's history due to its ability to protect voters of color from discriminatory voting practices before they occurred. In 2013, the Supreme Court, in its decision in Shelby County v. Holder, struck down the formula that determined which states and political subdivisions were required to seek federal pre-approval of their voting-related changes to ensure they did not discriminate against minority voters. The Supreme Court put the onus on Congress to enact a new formula better tailored to current history, and after the decision, states or political subdivisions were no longer required to seek preclearance unless ordered by a federal court in the course of litigation.

H.R. 4 includes a new geographic coverage formula to identify those jurisdictions that will have to ''preclear'' their voting-related changes, as well as new provisions requiring practice-based preclearance, or ''known-practices coverage.'' Known-practices coverage would focus administrative or judicial review narrowly on suspect practices that are most likely to be tainted by discriminatory intent or to have discriminatory effects, as demonstrated by a broad historical record. Any jurisdiction in the U.S. that is home to a racially, ethnically, and/or linguistically diverse population and that seeks to adopt a covered practice will be required to preclear the change before implementation. The known practices covered under the bill include. 1) changes in method of election to change a single-member district to an at-large seat or to add an at-large seat to a governing body; 2) certain redistricting plans where there is significant minority population growth in the previous decade; 3) annexations or deannexations that would significantly alter the composition of the jurisdiction's electorate; 4) certain identification and proof of citizenship requirements; 5) certain polling place closures and realignments; and 6) the withdrawal of multilingual materials and assistance not matched by the reduction of those services in English.

Preclearance is an efficient and effective form of alternative dispute resolution that prevents the implementation of voting-related changes that would deny voters of color a voice in our elections. Preclearance saves taxpayers in covered jurisdictions a considerable amount of money because the jurisdiction can obtain quick decisions without having to pay attorneys, expert witnesses, or prevailing plaintiff's fees and costs that are incurred in complex and expensive litigation. In December 2018, redistricting litigation in North Carolina had already cost $5.6 million in taxpayer dollars. The litigation related to Texas's redistricting scheme was also a multi-million dollar affair, ultimately paid by taxpayers for the discriminatory actions of government officials.

Across the U.S., racial, ethnic, and language-minority communities are rapidly growing — the country's total population is projected to become majority-minority by 2044. It is no secret that many states and local jurisdictions fear losing political power, and the rapid growth of these communities is often seen as a threat to existing political establishments. Between 2007 and 2014, five of the ten U.S. counties with the most rapid rates of Latino population growth were in North Dakota or South Dakota, two states whose overall Latino populations still

account for less than ten percent of their residents, and are dwarfed by Latino communities in states like New Mexico, Texas, and California. It is precisely this rapid growth of different racial or ethnic populations that results in the perception that emerging communities of color are a threat to those in political power.

Last month, MALDEF, NALEO—both members of NHLA—and Asian Americans Advancing Justice—AAJC, released a new report, Practice-Based Preclearance: Protecting Against Tactics Persistently Used to Silence Minority Communities' Votes, detailing the need for forward-looking VRA legislation that provides protections for emerging minority populations. H.R. 4 identifies different voting changes most likely to discriminatorily affect access to the vote in diverse jurisdictions whose minority populations are attaining visibility and influence. The report looked at these identified practices and found, based on two separate analyses of voting discrimination, that these known practices occur with great frequency in the modern era.

Congress must protect the access to the polls, and it must include a known-practices coverage formula. H.R. 4 is a critical piece of legislation that will restore voter protections that were lost due to the Shelby County decision. NHLA urges you to stand with voters and to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 4.

Sincerely,

THOMAS A. SAENZ,
MALDEF, President and General Counsel, NHLA Chair, Civil Rights Committee, Co-Chair.
JUAN CARTAGENA,
LatinoJustice PRLDEF, President and General Counsel, Civil Rights Committee NHLA, Co-Chair.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
October 22, 2019.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
U.S. House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 3 million members of the National Education Association who work in 14,000 communities across the nation, thank you for holding this markup of the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019 (H.R. 4). We urge you to VOTE YES on the Voting Rights Advancement Act, which we believe combats voter discrimination and protects the most fundamental right in our democracy. Votes on this issue may be included in NEA's Report Card for the 116th Congress.

The U.S. Supreme Court in Shelby v. Holder invalidated a crucial provision in the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that prevented states with a history of discriminating against voters from changing their voting laws and practices without preclearance by federal officials. This federal review was an important feature of the Voting Rights Act; doing away with it has virtually annulled the federal oversight that was—and remains—crucial to ensuring that millions of people have equal access to the ballot box After the 2013 Shelby decision, several states changed their voting practices in controversial ways that created barriers for people of color, low-income people, transgender people, college students, the elderly, and those with disabilities. The Voting Rights Advancement Act takes several steps toward reversing this harmful, undemocratic trend, including:

Modernizing the Voting Rights Act so that preclearance covers states and localities with a pattern of discrimination;

Requiring jurisdictions to publicly disclose, 180 days before an election, all voting changes; and

Authorizing the Attorney General, either on Election Day or during early voting, to send federal observers to any jurisdiction where there is a substantial risk of discrimination at the polls.

NEA members live, work, and vote in every precinct, county, and congressional district in the United States. They take their obligation to vote seriously because it is essential to protecting the opportunities that they believe all students should have. Furthermore, educators teach students that voting is a responsibility of citizenship, a privilege for which many people have fought and died. We urge you to VOTE yes on the Voting Rights Advancement Act, and to support legislation to expand voter registration, safeguard our elections, and restore voting rights for people with past criminal convictions—important steps to ensure that all have a voice in our society.

Sincerely,

MARC EGAN,
Director of Government Relations, National Education Association.

IN OUR OWN VOICE: NATIONAL BLACK WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE JUSTICE AGENDA,
December 4, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of In Our Own Voice: National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda, a national/state partnership with eight Black Women's Reproductive Justice organizations (Black Women's Health Imperative, New Voices for Reproductive Justice, SisterLove, Inc., SisterReach, SPARK Reproductive Justice NOW!, Inc., The Afiya Center, and Women With A Vision), lifting up the voices of Black women leaders on local, state, and national policies that impact the lives of Black Women and girls, we write in strong support of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act. We oppose any Motion to Recommit. We urge you to vote ''yes'' during the anticipated House floor vote.

At the core of Reproductive Justice is the human right to control our bodies, our sexuality, our gender, our work, and our reproduction. That right can only be achieved when all women and girls (cis, femme, trans, agender, gender non-binary and gender nonconforming) have the complete economic, social, and political power and resources to make healthy decisions about our bodies, our families, and our communities in all areas of our lives. This most certainly includes at the polls.

The U.S. Supreme Court decision in June of 2013 that gutted the Voting Rights Act of 1965, one of the most impactful civil rights laws enacted to date, significantly set back racial equality in voting. Since the Supreme Court decision in Shelby County v. Holder, discrimination has become common place in voting, nationwide, and voter suppression is absolutely rampant throughout the system. We know that such suppression disproportionately impacts communities of color.

Significant barriers exist for Black communities. In a nationwide poll conducted by In Our Own Voice, National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health, and National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum in Spring of 2019, 33% of women of color voters polled experienced an issue voting. Additionally, countless hearings held by the House Judiciary Committee throughout the year have shown significant barriers to accessing the polls, significantly impeding voter participation.

H.R. 4 is necessary to restore and modernize the Voting Rights Act to acknowledge the lived experiences of those working to access the polls in all communities. This legislation would strengthen our voting laws to ensure repeated voting rights violations are addressed, increases processes and transparency around voting changes, and goes great lengths to protection individuals from racial discrimination in voting.

In Our Own Voice's work, particularly through our I Am A Voter project, is to increase Black women's voter engagement in state, local and federal elections, to ensure our stories are told and our voices are represented. H.R. 4 is critical to ensuring that we can express our beliefs and positions through the ballot box. We urge Congress to pass this historic legislation.

Sincerely,

MARCELA HOWELL,
Founder and President/CEO.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
December 5, 2019.

Re Vote YES on H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) urges you to vote ''YES'' on H.R. 4 the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019 (VRAA) this morning. The ACLU will score this vote.

Congress enacted the Voting Rights Act in 1965 (VRA) almost a century after the adoption of the Fifteenth Amendment, which prohibits racial discrimination in voting. The most powerful enforcement tool in the Voting Rights Act was the federal preclearance process, established by Section 5. It required locations with the worst records of voting discrimination to federally ''preclear''—or get federal approval for—voting changes by demonstrating to either the Justice Department or the D.C. federal court that the voting change would not have a discriminatory purpose or effect. What preclearance meant in practice was that states and jurisdictions with documented histories of voting discrimination could not enforce new voting rules without showing that the rules did not discriminate on the basis of race.

While upholding the Voting Rights Act's preclearance process itself, the Supreme Court's 2013 decision in Shelby County v. Holder effectively nullified preclearance protections contained in the Voting Rights Act by invalidating the coverage formula that identified which locations would be subject to preclearance. Many states have taken the Shelby County decision as a green light to enact discriminatory voting restrictions with impunity. These restrictions include photo ID laws, restraints on voter registration, voter purges, cuts to early voting, restrictions on the casting and counting of absentee and provisional ballots, documentary proof of citizenship requirements, polling place closures and consolidations, and criminalization of acts associated with registration or voting.

In turn, this rash of discriminatory voting laws has led to an explosion of litigation to protect voters from state and local violations of federal law. Since Shelby County, the ACLU has opened more than 60 new voting rights cases and investigations and currently has more than 30 active matters. Between the 2012 and 2016 presidential elections alone, the ACLU and our affiliates won 15 voting rights victories, protecting more than 5 6 million voters in 12 states that collectively are home to 161 members of the House of Representatives and wield 185 votes in the Electoral College. The ACLU also submitted a 227-page report to the House Judiciary Committee reviewing the legal landscape, evidence of ongoing voting discrimination addressed by the bill, and an analysis of its key provisions. The ACLU report is publicly available here: https://www.aclu.orglreport/aclu-report-voting-rights-act.

The ACLU's recent litigation experience supports at least two conclusions: our record of success in blocking discriminatory voting changes—with an overall success rate in Voting Rights Act litigation of more than 80 percent—reveals that state and local officials are continuing to engage in a widespread pattern of unconstitutional racial discrimination and pervasive violations of federal law. It also shows that there is a lack of tools necessary to stop discriminatory changes to voting laws before they taint an election. Even in the cases in which the ACLU has ultimately succeeded, these discriminatory policies remained in place for months or even years while litigation proceeded—crucial time during which elections were held, and hundreds of government officials elected, under unfair conditions.

In delivering the Supreme Court's 5–4 majority opinion in Shelby County, Chief Justice John Roberts expressly invited Congress to update the Voting Rights Act's protections based on current conditions of discrimination. It is long past due for Congress to renew the protections of the Voting Rights Act. The price of inaction to protect the voting rights of Americans is high, and history offers a myriad of examples demonstrating its cost to the nation. Congress must act now to cement the legacy of the Voting Rights Act and guard the rights of all Americans. The ACLU urges you to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 4 and reauthorize the Voting Rights Act.

Sincerely,

RONALD NEWMAN,
National Political Director, National Political Advocacy Department.

SONIA GILL,
Senior Legislative Counsel, National Political Advocacy Department.

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE,
June 26, 2019.

Hon. STEVE COHEN,
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Ranking Member, House Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COHEN AND RANKING MEMBER JOHNSON: On behalf of ADL (the Anti-Defamation League), we write to urge the House Judiciary Committee to take prompt action to protect Americans' fundamental right to vote by approving H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019 (VRAA). We ask that this statement be included as part of the official hearing record for the subcommittee's June 25, 2019 hearing on ''Continuing Challenges to the Voting Rights Act Since Shelby County.''

Since the enactment of the Voting Rights Act (VRA) in 1965, a central part of ADL's mission—''to stop the defamation of the Jewish people, and to secure justice and fair treatment to all''—has been devoted to helping to ensure that all Americans have a voice in our democracy. Answering Dr. King's call for ''religious leaders from all over the nation to join us . . . in our peaceful, nonviolent march for freedom,'' ADL lay leaders and staff joined more than 3,000 Americans in ''peaceful demonstration against blind violence, in 'gigantic witness' to the constitutionally guaranteed right of all citizens to register and vote in 1965.''

ADL continues to work today to ensure that all eligible Americans can exercise their fundamental right to vote through advocacy in the courts, legislatures, and communities. We are proud to have stood with leaders such as Dr. King and Rep. John Lewis in 1965 to fight for every citizen's right to vote and we remain equally committed to this goal today. Recognizing the this landmark law as one of the most important and most effective pieces of civil rights legislation ever enacted, ADL has strongly supported the VRA and its extensions since its passage more than 50 years ago, including by filing a brief in Shelby County v Holder.

In the years and decades following the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the law quickly demonstrated its essential value in ensuring rights and opportunities. Between 1964 and 1968—the presidential elections immediately before and after passage of the VRA respectively—African American voter turnout in the South jumped by seven percentage points. The year after passage of the VRA, Edward Brooke became the first African American in history elected to the United States Senate by popular vote, and the first African American to serve in the Senate since Reconstruction. By 1970, the number of African Americans elected to public office had increased fivefold. Today there are more than 10,000 African American elected officials at all levels of government.

To be sure, Section 2 of the VRA, which prohibits discrimination based on race, color, or membership in a language minority group in voting practices and procedures nationwide, has helped to secure many of these advances. Yet it is undeniable that Section 5 of the VRA, which requires certain states and political subdivisions with a history of discriminatory voting practices to provide notice and ''pre-clear'' any voting law changes with the federal government, played an essential and invaluable role in the VRA's success. Between 1982 and 2006, pursuant to Section 5, the Department of Justice (DOJ) blocked 700 proposed discriminatory voting laws, the majority of which were based on ''calculated decisions to keep minority voters from fully participating in the political process.'' Proposed laws blocked by Section 5 included discriminatory redistricting plans, polling place relocations, biased annexations and de-annexations, and changing offices from elected to appointed positions, similar to many of the tactics used to disenfranchise minority voters before 1965. In addition, states and political subdivisions either altered or withdrew from consideration approximately 800 proposed voting changes between 1982 and 2006, indicating that Section 5's impact was much broader than the 700 blocked laws.

Despite decades of success and extensive documentation of the law's effectiveness in preventing discriminatory restrictions on the right to vote, on June 25, 2013 the U.S Supreme Court, in a sharply divided 5–4 ruling in Shelby County v. Holder, struck down Section 4(b) of the VRA. In doing so, the Court substituted its views for Congress's own very extensive hearings and findings conducted in 2006 when Congress almost unanimously voted to reauthorize the VRA for another 25 years. The ruling invalidated the formula used to determine which states and political subdivisions would be subject to preclearance under Section 5 but did not evaluate the merits of the preclearance provision itself. The majority only held that ''the formula in that section can no longer be used as a basis for subjecting jurisdictions to preclearance.''

While Shelby County has done irreparable damage to voting rights in the United States, Congress is not powerless to mitigate this damage and restore the original force of the VRA. In fact, the Court specifically noted that ''Congress may draft another formula based on current conditions'' and reinstate the preclearance provision in Section 5. The Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019 introduces a new, rolling preclearance formula based on current need that would restore the preemptory force of the VRA. The recent onslaught of restrictive voting laws enacted across the country is evidence that litigation pursuant to Section 2 is entirely inadequate to prevent unconstitutional voting practices and discrimination. Since 2010, over 25 states have enacted restrictive voting laws. Half the country now faces stricter voting regulations than they did in 2010.

Perhaps the most illustrative case for the ongoing necessity of a preclearance process is the battle over a Texas voter ID law. In 2011, Texas passed S.B 14, the strictest voter ID law ever enacted in the United States. Because Texas was required under Section 4 of the VRA to seek preclearance for its voting laws, the law was initially blocked from going into effect. The three-judge panel that reviewed the law found that ''based on the record of evidence before us, it is virtually certain that these burdens will disproportionately affect racial minorities. Simply put, many Hispanics and African Americans who voted in the last election will, because of the burdens imposed by SB 14, likely be unable to vote.''

Within hours of the Court's decision in Shelby County, Texas Attorney General Greg Abbott announced that S.B 14 would go into effect immediately. Following the Attorney General's announcement, multiple civil rights groups and Texas voters filed suit under Section 2 of the VRA. In 2014, a district court held that ''SB 14 was enacted with a racially discriminatory purpose, has a racially discriminatory effect, is a poll tax, and unconstitutionally burdens the right to vote.'' On appeal, a court of appeals stayed the district court's decision and allowed the law to take effect.

For more than two years and over the span of two election cycles, SB 14 prevented eligible voters from casting a ballot while litigation was ongoing. By the time the law was finally invalidated in 2016 by a 9–2 vote of the entire Court of Appeals for the D.C Circuit (sitting en bane), no fewer than seven federal judges had concluded the law was discriminatory. Yet because Section 5 of the VRA was not in effect, this patently unconstitutional law was permitted to disenfranchise untold numbers of minority voters, over two election cycles. The consequences of disenfranchisement are not fully quantifiable but are certainly lasting. Elections cannot be undone, and no judicial relief can restore the confidence in our democracy that was unfairly taken from thousands of disenfranchised voters.

Texas is not the only state to adopt strict voter ID laws. The National Conference of State Legislatures identifies 10 states with ''strict'' voter ID laws and finds that 11% of all Americans lack the necessary government ID that these laws require. Voter ID laws have been found on multiple occasions to disproportionately affect marginalized communities, low-income and elderly Americans, and students.

Nor is Voter ID the only, tool states are using to disenfranchise voters for political gain. In Georgia, then Secretary of State Brian Kemp enforced new election code policies for the 2018 election (in which he was a candidate for Governor) which invalidated a voter's registration if there was any discrepancy in their registration paperwork. Of the 53,000 voters whose registration status was arbitrarily questioned, roughly 70% were African American. In Ohio, a ''use it or lose it'' law caused hundreds of thousands of voters to be purged from the 2018 voter rolls because they did not vote in the last presidential election. Gerrymandering, voter intimidation and harassment, cuts to early

voting opportunities, polling place manipulation and closure, and felony disenfranchisement efforts are just some of the other voter suppression tactics that have become prevalent since Shelby County and were used to disenfranchise voters in the 2018 election.

Indeed, we have seen the reversal of half a century of voting rights advancements since Shelby County. While Section 5 of the VRA surely could not have prevented all of these evils, there is no question that this country's democratic institutions would be stronger and our electoral processes more representative if the VRA were in full effect. Following this incredible damage done to the most fundamental of our rights as Americans, Congress now finds itself in the position to act.

The Voting Rights Advancement Act (VRAA) of 2019 is an important first step in restoring voter trust in America's elections and preventing states from enacting additional discriminatory measures to suppress the vote. Just over a decade ago, as Congress was debating the most recent reauthorization of the VRA, committees held 21 hearings and compiled over 20,000 pages of records as evidence of the success of Section 5, the prevalence of ongoing voting discrimination, and the constitutionality of the law. As a result, the reauthorization passed with overwhelming bipartisan support: 390 to 33 in the House of Representatives and 98–0 in the Senate. Congress now has both the power and the imperative to pass the Voting Rights Advancement Act and restore the critical voting protections that quite recently received overwhelming bipartisan approval.

In the face of federal inaction, many states have taken the lead on expanding and securing the right to vote for all people. In 2018, Maryland, New Jersey, and Washington adopted automatic voter registration, a policy which would significantly increase access to the ballot. Since 2016, six states have limited or reversed their felon disenfranchisement laws and 16 states have enacted reforms such as same-day registration, online voter-registration, and expanded early voting opportunities that make it easier to register and vote. Despite the absence of Congressional leadership, there is substantial momentum behind expanding ballot access and preserving America's voting rights.

S. 1945, the VRAA, creates a modern, flexible, rolling formula to determine which states and political subdivisions will have to pre-clear their laws with the federal government. The formula will not require preclearance in all the political subdivisions that have moved to restrict voting rights in the past six years, including some of the examples above, but, over time, the rolling formula will sweep in many of the most problematic jurisdictions. It will restore critical safeguards, preventing enactment of discriminatory voting laws by once more ''shift[ing] the advantage of inertia and time from the perpetrators of the evil to the victims.''

The Fifteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution proclaims that ''the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.'' Section 2 of the Amendment expressly declares that ''Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.'' As the Supreme Court has recognized, ''by adding this authorization, the Framers indicated that Congress was to be chiefly responsible for implementing the rights created in Section 1,'' and ''Congress may use any rational means to effectuate the constitutional prohibition of racial discrimination in voting.'' Passage of the Voting Rights Advancement Act is not only rational. It is critical to enforcing the constitutional prohibition on racial discrimination in voting and protecting the fundamental right to vote for all Americans.

We strongly welcome these hearings on the devastating legacy of Shelby County and appreciate the opportunity to present ADL's views. We urge the Committee to promptly approve the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019.

Sincerely,

EILEEN B. HERSHENOV,
Senior Vice President, Policy.
STEVEN M. FREEMAN,
Vice President, Civil Rights.
ERIKA L. MORITSUGU,
Vice President, Government Relations, Advocacy, and Community Engagement.
MELISSA GARLICK,
Civil Rights National Counsel.

AFL–CIO,
December 5, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL–CIO, I am writing to urge you to vote for the Voting Rights Advancement Act (H.R.4). This bill offers a flexible nationwide approach to protecting voters from discriminatory practices, and it is an important step toward restoration of the protections undermined by the Supreme Court's 2013 decision in Shelby County v Holder. We urge you to oppose any motion to recommit.

The bill would establish a new preclearance coverage formula that is responsive to the discriminatory practices that have proliferated since the Supreme Court's decision in Shelby County v. Holder. As Chief Justice Roberts himself said in the Shelby decision: ''voting discrimination still exists; no one doubts that.'' Discriminatory policies have not only resurfaced in areas formerly covered by the Voting Rights Act's preclearance requirement, but also have proliferated nationwide. State and local officials brazenly have imposed restrictive voting requirements, altered district boundaries, and shifted polling locations in ways that make voting more difficult and less accessible for many voters. The Voting Rights Advancement Act would address these disenfranchisement strategies, as well as others certain to develop.

The right to vote is fundamental to our democracy, and the effort to protect citizens from voting discrimination has been bipartisan for more than half a century. Indeed, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 would not have passed without leadership from both political parties, and Republican presidents signed each Voting Rights Act reauthorization into law.

The integrity of our democracy depends on ensuring that every eligible voter can participate in the electoral process, and, thus, voting discrimination demands strong bipartisan legislative action. Every member of Congress should go on record today in support of this historic legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL, *Director, Government Affairs Department.*

BEND THE ARC: JEWISH ACTION,
December 5, 2019.

Re Vote for the Voting Rights Advancement Act (H.R. 4) and against any Motion to Recommit.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As the Washington Director of Bend the Arc: Jewish Action, I urge you to vote for the Voting Rights Advancement Act (H.R. 4) and to vote against any Motion to Recommit (MTR), when it comes to a vote this week. This crucial legislation would restore and modernize the Voting Rights Act to combat voter suppression and discrimination across the country. As the largest national Jewish social justice organization focused exclusively on domestic policy, Bend the Arc and our members across the country care deeply about ensuring all people are able to exercise their Constitutional right to shape our democracy through voting.

The VRAA responds to the urgent need to undo the onslaught of abuses by state and local governments in the aftermath of the Supreme Court's 2013 decision in Shelby County v Holder, gutting the preclearance provision of the Voting Rights Act. Since that decision, 14 states have imposed new voting restrictions that would have likely been deemed unacceptable were the VRA at full strength. These policies have had real consequences, such as likely contributing to significantly lower turnout amongst targeted populations, including people of color, in both the 2016 presidential election and the 2018 midterms.

The fight to protect voting rights is deeply personal for American Jews. There is something quintessentially American, and also quintessentially Jewish, about voting. After all, voting is a ritual, part of belonging to the community. Additionally, the United States was the first federal government to fully enfranchise Jews. For many Jews, our families migrated to the U.S. fleeing persecution, coming here to find a country where, even if they were not always welcome or even fully protected under the law, they nonetheless had a legal right to exist, and be a part of our democratic system at the basic level.

Today, we draw inspiration not only from that part of the American Jewish experience, but also from the Jewish leaders of the recent past who worked to pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and those today who participate in election protection efforts every Election Day. This is why Bend the Arc has helped mobilize the faith community in support of the VRAA and organized National Days of Action for voting rights to mark the 50th anniversary of the murder of Andrew Goodman, James Chaney, and Mickey Schwerner in 1964, and the passing of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Again, I urge you to vote for the Voting Rights Advancement Act (H.R. 4) and against any MTR, to ensure that all Americans are able to exercise their Constitutionally-protected right to vote.

Sincerely,

RABBI JASON KIMELMAN-BLOCK,
Washington Director, Bend the Arc: Jewish Action.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the many stakeholder groups that have worked so hard on this bill: the Leadership Council, the Legal Defense Fund, the NAACP, the Lawyers' Committee, the AFL–CIO, MALDEF, and so many more.

As we prepare to take this vote, let us be guided by our north star, that is our wonderful colleague, our beloved colleague, JOHN LEWIS, who reminds us each and every day that the price of freedom is not free. It has been bought and paid for by the courage of ordinary Americans who dared to make this Nation live up to its ideals of equality and justice for all.

Let us recommit ourselves to restoring the promise of voter equality and pass H.R. 4 today.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 14¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 20½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, having participated in the restoration and reinvigoration of the Voting Rights Act in the 2000–2008 period that was bipartisan because there was an understanding by President Bush that the denial of one's right to vote is a denial of human rights, I stand here today as a Member who has joined a number of the congressional hearings. I thank Congresswomen SEWELL and FUDGE and Congressmen COHEN and NADLER for the work that has been done, and I encourage my good friend, Mr. COLLINS, to be reminded of the voter suppression in his gubernatorial race that resulted in the loss of Stacey Abrams.

And so I rise today as one who has seen the impact of voting rights, particularly in the State of Texas, and argue vigorously for the restoration through H.R. 4. It is a fair bill: 25-year period on a rolling basis with current conditions, and a 10-year legitimacy for those that pass the test.

President Johnson, during the signing of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, said the vote is the most powerful instrument ever devised by man for breaking down injustice and destroying the terrible walls which imprison men and women because they are different from other men and women.

I am a victim of voting rights suppression. I am a redistrict district that comes from the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Barbara Jordan would not have come to this House had it not been for the right to vote for someone that you choose.

In 1940, only 3 percent of African Americans living in the South were registered. Only after Barbara Jordan submitted an amendment did we include Hispanics.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Only in the period of the horrible Shelby vote did we have voter suppression with the voter ID law that impacted Hispanics in Texas severely, purging language that I helped put in this present bill and, of course, moving polling places.

If we believe in this document called the Constitution, then we believe in H.R. 4. We want it restored because it is the right of the people to vote.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and an original cosponsor, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act, which corrects the damage done in recent years to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and commits the national government to protecting the right of all Americans to vote free from discrimination and without injustices that previously prevented them from exercising this most fundamental right of citizenship.

I thank my colleague, Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL of Alabama for introducing this legislation, to Speaker PELOSI, Chairman NADLER, and the Democratic leadership for shepherding this bill to the floor, and to many colleagues and countless number of ordinary Americans who never stopped agitating and working to protect the precious right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the Supreme Court's invitation in Shelby County v. Holder, 570 U.S. 193 (2013), H.R. 4 provides a new coverage formula based on ''current conditions'' and creates a new coverage formula that hinges on a finding of repeated voting rights violations in the preceding 25 years.

It is significant that this 25-year period is measured on a rolling basis to keep up with ''current conditions,'' so only states and political subdivisions that have a recent record of racial discrimination in voting are covered.

States and political subdivisions that qualify for preclearance will be covered for a period of 10 years, but if they have a clean record during that time period, they can be extracted from coverage.

H.R. 4 also establishes ''practice-based preclearance,'' which would focus administrative or judicial review narrowly on suspect practices that are most likely to be tainted by discriminatory intent or to have discriminatory effects, as demonstrated by a broad historical record.

Under the bill, this process of reviewing changes in voting is limited to a set of specific practices, including such things as:

1. Changes to the methods of elections (to or from at-large elections) in areas that are racially, ethnically, or linguistically diverse.

2. Redistricting in areas that are racially, ethnically, or linguistically diverse.

3. Reducing, consolidating, or relocating polling in areas that are racially, ethnically, or linguistically diverse; and

4. Changes in documentation or requirements to vote or to register.

It is useful, Mr. Speaker, to recount how we arrived at this day.

Mr. Speaker, fifty-four years ago, in Selma, Alabama, hundreds of heroic souls risked their lives for freedom and to secure the right to vote for all Americans by their participation in marches for voting rights on ''Bloody Sunday,'' ''Turnaround Tuesday,'' or the final, completed march from Selma to Montgomery.

Those ''foot soldiers'' of Selma, brave and determined men and women, boys and girls, persons of all races and creeds, loved their country so much that they were willing to risk their lives to make it better, to bring it even closer to its founding ideals.

The foot soldiers marched because they believed that all persons have dignity and the right to equal treatment under the law, and in the making of the laws, which is the fundamental essence of the right to vote.

On that day, Sunday, March 7, 1965, more than 600 civil rights ''demonstrators, including our beloved colleague, Congressman John Lewis of Georgia, were brutally attacked by state and local police at the Edmund Pettus Bridge as they marched from Selma to Montgomery in support of the right to vote.

''Bloody Sunday'' was a defining moment in American history because it crystallized for the nation the necessity of enacting a strong and effective federal law to protect the right to vote of every American.

No one who witnessed the violence and brutally suffered by the foot soldiers for justice who gathered at the Edmund Pettus Bridge will ever I forget it; the images are deeply seared in the American memory and experience.

On August 6, 1965, in the Rotunda of the Capitol and in the presence of such luminaries as the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Rev. Ralph Abernathy of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference; Roy Wilkins of the NAACP; Whitney Young of the National Urban League; James Foreman of the Congress of Racial Equality; A. Philip Randolph of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; John Lewis of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee; Senators Robert Kennedy, Hubert Humphrey, and Everett Dirksen; President Johnson addressed the nation before signing the Voting Rights Act:

''The vote is the most powerful instrument ever devised by man for breaking down injustice and destroying the terrible walls which imprison men because they are different from other men.''

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was critical to preventing brazen voter discrimination violations that historically left millions of African Americans disenfranchised.

In 1940, for example, there were less than 30,000 African Americans registered to vote in Texas and only about 3 percent of African Americans living in the South were registered to vote.

Poll taxes, literacy tests, and threats of violence were the major causes of these racially discriminatory results.

After passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965, which prohibited these discriminatory practices, registration and electoral participation steadily increased to the point that by 2012, more than 1.2 million African Americans living in Texas were registered to vote.

In 1964, the year before the Voting Rights Act became law, there were approximately 300 African-Americans in public office, including just three in Congress.

Few, if any, African Americans held elective office anywhere in the South.

Because of the Voting Rights Act, in 2007 there were more than 9,100 black elected officials, including 46 members of Congress, the largest number ever.

Mr. Speaker, the Voting Rights Act opened the political process for many of the approximately 6,000 Hispanic public officials that have been elected and appointed nationwide, including more than 275 at the state or federal level, 32 of whom serve in Congress.

Native Americans, Asians and others who have historically encountered harsh barriers to full political participation also have benefited greatly.

The crown jewel of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is Section 5, which requires that states and localities with a chronic record of discrimination in voting practices secure federal approval before making any changes to voting processes.

Section 5 protects minority voting rights where voter discrimination has historically been the worst.

Between 1982 and 2006, Section 5 stopped more than 1,000 discriminatory voting changes in their tracks, including 107 discriminatory changes right here in Texas.

Passed in 1965 with the extraordinary leadership of President Lyndon Johnson, the greatest legislative genius of our lifetime, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was bringing dramatic change in many states across the South.

But in 1972, change was not coming fast enough or in many places in Texas.

In fact, Texas, which had never elected a woman to Congress or an African American to the Texas State Senate, was not covered by Section 5 of the 1965 Voting Rights Act and the language minorities living in South Texas were not protected at all.

But thanks to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the tireless voter registration work performed in 1972 by Hillary Clinton in Texas, along with hundreds of others, including her future husband Bill, Barbara Jordan was elected to Congress, giving meaning to the promise of the Voting Rights Act that all citizens would at long last have the right to cast a vote for person of their community, from their community, for their community.

Mr. Speaker, it is a source of eternal pride to all of us in Houston that in pursuit of extending the full measure of citizenship to all Americans, in 1975 Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, who also represented this historic 18th Congressional District of Texas, introduced, and the Congress adopted, what are now Sections 4(f)(3) and 4(f)(4) of the Voting Rights Act, which extended the protections of Section 4(a) and Section 5 to language minorities.

During the floor debate on the 1975 reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, Congresswoman Jordan explained why this reform was needed:

''There are Mexican-American people in the State of Texas who have been denied the right to vote; who have been impeded in their efforts to register and vote; who have not had encouragement from those election officials because they are brown people.

''So, the state of Texas, if we approve this measure, would be brought within the coverage of this Act for the first time.''

When it comes to extending and protecting the precious right vote, the Lone Star State—the home state of Lyndon Johnson and Barbara Jordan—can be the leading state in the Union, one that sets the example for the Nation.

But to realize that future, we must turn from and not return to the dark days of the past.

We must remain ever vigilant and oppose all schemes that will abridge or dilute the precious right to vote.

Madam Speaker, I am here today to remind the nation that need to passthis legislation is urgent because the right to vote—that ''powerful—instrument that can break down the walls of injustice''—faces grave threats.

The threat stems from the decision issued in June 2013 by the Supreme Court in Shelby County v. Holder, 570 U.S. 193 (2013), which invalidated Section 4(b) of the VRA, and paralyzed the application of the VRA's Section 5 preclearance requirements.

According to the Supreme Court majority, the reason for striking down Section 4(b) was that ''times change.''

Now, the Court was right; times have changed.

But what the Court did not fully appreciate is that the positive changes it cited are due almost entirely to the existence and vigorous enforcement of the Voting Rights Act.

And that is why the Voting Rights Act is still needed and that is why we must pass H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

Let me put it this way: in the same way that the vaccine invented by Dr. Jonas Salk in 1953 eradicated the crippling effects but did not eliminate the cause of polio, the Voting Rights Act succeeded in stymieing the practices that resulted in the wholesale disenfranchisement of African Americans and language minorities but did eliminate them entirely.

The Voting Rights Act is needed as much today to prevent another epidemic of voting disenfranchisement as Dr. Salk's vaccine is still needed to prevent another polio epidemic.

As Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg stated in Shelby County v. Holder, ''[t]hrowing out preclearance when it has worked and is continuing to work to stop discriminatory changes is like throwing away your umbrella in a rainstorm because you are not getting wet.''

However, officials in some states, notably Texas and North Carolina, seemed to regard the Shelby decision as a green light and rushed to implement election laws, policies, and practices that could never pass muster under the Section 5 preclearance regime.

My constituents remember very well the Voter ID law passed in Texas in 2011, which required every registered voter to present a valid government-issued photo ID on the day of polling in order to vote.

The Justice Department blocked the law in March of 2012, and it was Section 5 that prohibited it from going into effect.

At least it did until the Shelby decision, because on the very same day that Shelby was decided officials in Texas announced they would immediately implement the Photo ID law, and other election laws, policies, and practices that could never pass muster under the Section 5 preclearance regime.

The Texas Photo ID law was challenged in federal court and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit upheld the decision of U.S. District Court Judge Nelva Gonzales Ramos that Texas' strict voter identification law discriminated against blacks and Hispanics and violated Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, protecting voting rights and combating voter suppression schemes are two of the critical challenges facing our great democracy.

Without safeguards to ensure that all citizens have equal access to the polls, more injustices are likely to occur and the voices of millions silenced.

I believe that Texas, the Lone Star State, can be the leading state in the Union.

But to realize that future, we cannot return to the dark days of its past and must remain ever vigilant and oppose schemes that will abridge or dilute the precious right to vote.

That means standing up to and calling out groups and organizations like ''True the Vote'' and its local Houston-based affiliate, the ''King Street Patriots,'' which in recent years have under the guise of poll watchers, improperly interacted with persons at polling stations in Hispanic and African American communities in an attempt to intimidate them from voting.

The behavior of this group was so outrageous in 2010 that I reported its conduct to the Attorney General and requested the Department of Justice to investigate. (See Attachment, Letter from Congresswoman JACKSON LEE to U.S. Attorney General Holder (October 28, 2010)).

Mr. Speaker, in many ways Texas is ground-zero for testing and perfecting schemes to deprive communities of color and language minorities of the right to vote and to have their votes counted.

Consider what has transpired in Texas in recent past.

Only 68 percent of eligible voters are registered in Texas and state restrictions on third party registration, such as the Volunteer Deputy Registrar program, exacerbate the systemic disenfranchisement of minority communities.

These types of programs are often aimed at minority and underserved communities that, for many, many other reasons (like demonization by the president, for example) or mistrust of law enforcement are afraid to live as openly as they should.

In Harris County, we had a system where voters were getting purged from the rolls, effectively requiring people to keep active their registrations and hundreds of polling locations closed in Texas, significantly more in number and percentage than any other state.

In addition, the Texas Election Code only requires a 72-hour notice of polling location changes.

Next, take what happened here in Texas earlier this year when the Texas Secretary of State claimed that his office had identified 95,000 possible noncitizens on the voter rolls and gave the list to the Texas State Attorney General for possible prosecution—leading to a claim from President Trump about widespread voter fraud and outrage from Democrats and activist groups.

The only problem was that list was not accurate.

At least 20,000 names turned out to be there by mistake, leading to chaos, confusion, and concern that people's eligibility vote was being questioned based on flawed data.

The list was made through state records going back to 1996 that show which Texas residents were not citizens when they got a driver's license or other state ID.

But many of the person who may have had green cards or work visas at the time they got a Texas ID are on the secretary of state's office's list, and many have become citizens since then since nearly 50,000 people become naturalized U.S. citizens in Texas annually.

Latinos made up a big portion of the 95,000-person list.

Texas Republicans adopted racial and partisan gerrymandered congressional, State legislative redistricting plans that federal courts have ruled violate the Voting Rights Act and were drawn with discriminatory intent.

Even after changes were demanded by the courts, much of the damage done was already done.

Reversing the position by the Obama administration, the U.S. Department of Justice has told a federal court that it no longer believes past discrimination by Texas officials should require the state to get outside approval for redistricting maps that will be drawn in 2021.

In addition to affirmative ways to making it harder to vote, we also know face other odious impediments in Texas.

Those of us who cherish the right to vote justifiably are skeptical of Voter ID laws because we understand how these laws, like poll

taxes and literacy tests, can be used to impede or negate the ability of seniors, racial and language minorities, and young people to cast their votes.

This is the harm that can be done without preclearance, so on a federal level, there is an impetus to act.

Those of us who cherish the right to vote justifiably are skeptical of Voter ID laws because we understand how these laws, like poll taxes and literacy tests, can be used to impede or negate the ability of seniors, racial and language minorities, and young people to cast their votes.

Consider the demographic groups who lack a government issued ID:

1. African Americans: 25 percent.
2. Asian Americans: 20 percent.
3. Hispanic Americans: 19 percent.
4. Young people, aged 18–24: 18 percent.
5. Persons with incomes less than $35,000: 15 percent.

And there are other ways abridging or suppressing the right to vote, including:

1. Curtailing or eliminating early voting
2. Ending same-day registration
3. Not counting provisional ballots cast in the wrong precinct on Election Day will not count.
4. Eliminating adolescent pre-registration
5. Shortening poll hours.
6. Lessening the standards governing voter challenges thus allowing self-proclaimed ''ballot security vigilantes'' like the King Street Patriots to cause trouble at the polls.

The malevolent practice of voter purging is not limited to Texas; we saw it just last year in Georgia, where then Secretary of State and now Governor Brian Kemp purged more than 53,000 persons from the voter, nearly the exact margin of his narrow win over his opponent, Stacy Abrams in the 2018 gubernatorial election.

Voter purging is a sinister and malevolent practice visited on voters, who are disproportionately members of communities of color, by state and local election officials.

This practice, which would have not passed muster under section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, has proliferated in the years since the Supreme Court neutralized the preclearance provision, or as Justice Ginsburg observed in Shelby County v. Holder, ''threw out the umbrella'' of protection.

Mr. Speaker, citizens in my congressional district and elsewhere know and have experienced the pain and heartbreak of receiving a letter from state or local election officials that they have been removed from the election rolls, or worse, learn this fact on Election Day.

That is why I worked so hard to secure language in the Manager's Amendment to H.R. 4 that strengthens the bill's ''practice-based preclearance'' provisions by adding specifically to the preclearance provision, voting practices that add a new basis or process for removing a name from the list of active registered voters and the practice of reducing the days or hours of in-person voting on Sundays during an early voting period.

Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility and sacred duty of all members of Congress who revere democracy to preserve, protect, and expand the precious right to vote of all Americans by passing H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

Before concluding there is one other point I would like to stress.

In his address to the nation before signing the Voting Rights Act of 1965, President Johnson said:

''Presidents and Congresses, laws and lawsuits can open the doors to the polling places and open the doors to the wondrous rewards which await the wise use of the ballot.

''But only the individual Negro, and all others who have been denied the right to vote, can really walk through those doors, and can use that right, and can transform the vote into an instrument of justice and fulfillment.''

In other words, political power—and the justice, opportunity, inclusion, and fulfillment it provides—comes not from the right to vote but in the exercise of that right.

And that means it is the civic obligation of every citizen to both register and vote in every election, state and local as well as federal.

Because if we can register and vote, but fail to do so, we are guilty of voluntary voter suppression, the most effective method of disenfranchisement ever devised.

And in recent years, Americans have not been doing a very good job of exercising our civic responsibility to register, vote, and make their voices heard.

Mr. Speaker, for millions of Americans, the right to vote protected by the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is sacred treasure, earned by the sweat and toil and tears and blood of ordinary Americans who showed the world it was possible to accomplish extraordinary things.

So today, let us rededicate ourselves to honoring those who won for us this precious right by remaining vigilant and fighting against both the efforts of others to abridge or suppress the right to vote and our own apathy in exercising this sacred right.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

A final statement of something I am about to submit for the RECORD, it is a Statement of Administration Policy. It says this: ''In sum, several provisions of H.R. 4 violate principles of federalism and exceed the powers granted to Congress by the Constitution, and these provisions would likely be found unlawful if challenged. Accordingly, the administration opposes H.R. 4.''

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this Statement of Administration Policy.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 4—VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2019

(Rep. Sewell, D–AL, and 229 cosponsors)

The Administration opposes passage of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019. H.R. 4 would amend the Voting Rights Act (VRA) of 1965 by imposing a new coverage formula and transparency obligations on States and local jurisdictions regarding their elections. These amendments raise serious policy concerns because the Federal Government would be granted excessive control over State and local election practices. Additionally, the Supreme Court has already held similar restrictions imposed by Congress on States and localities to be unconstitutional.

No individual should be denied or deterred from exercising his or her right to vote. Federal law protects against voting discrimination, allows judicial review of State and local voting laws, and establishes preclearance requirements. H.R. 4 would overreach by giving the Federal Government too much authority over an even greater number of voting practices and decisions made by States and local governments without justifying the current needs for such policies.

Section 3 of H.R. 4 would amend the VRA by setting forth a new coverage formula that subjects certain States and local subdivisions to Federal preclearance requirements before undertaking certain election activities. For example, the coverage formula would place restrictions on States with ''15 or more voting rights violations [that] occurred in . . . the previous 25 calendar years.'' Once a State or locality is covered by the formula, it would need permission from the Attorney General or Federal courts before conducting certain election activities prescribed by the bill.

In striking down the VRA's prior coverage formula, the Supreme Court held that although ''[o]ur country has changed, and while any racial discrimination in voting is too much, Congress must ensure that the legislation it passes to remedy that problem speaks to current conditions.'' *Shelby County* v. *Holder*, 570 U.S. 529, 557 (2013). Accordingly, the coverage formula set forth in section 3 of H.R. 4 that ''imposes substantial federalism costs'' on States must therefore be tailored to ''current needs.'' *Id.* at 540, 553 (internal quotation marks omitted). Instead, section 3 continues to permit reliance on potentially decades-old data—incidents dating as far back as 25 years—as a justification for imposing a preclearance requirement.

Additionally, section 4 of H.R. 4 would create a new ''Practice-Based Preclearance'' standard, which would automatically subject certain election laws to Federal preclearance, thereby raising significant policy concerns. This section would, among other things, prejudice Federal law against State and local voter integrity efforts, such as voter ID laws, and even impose requirements on routine administrative actions that include changing voting locations.

Finally, H.R. 4 would amend the VRA by imposing additional transparency requirements regarding certain election activities in Federal, State, and local jurisdictions. Section 5 of H.R. 4 raises constitutional concerns because its broad language would interfere with State and local elections beyond the powers afforded by the Elections Clause. Specifically, section 5 would require notice of demographic information related to ''any change in the constituency that will participate in an election for Federal, State, or local office.'' This broad language would impose notice requirements on States that make redistricting changes despite no Federal election involvement. By doing so, H.R. 4 would impermissibly grant Congress authority beyond what is authorized by the Elections Clause, and therefore section 5 would likely be found unconstitutional.

In sum, several provisions of H.R. 4 violate principles of federalism and exceed the powers granted to Congress by the Constitution, and these provisions would likely be found unlawful if challenged. Accordingly, the Administration opposes H.R. 4.

If H.R. 4 were presented to the President, his advisors would recommend that he veto it.

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

□ 1100

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I am so proud today to stand here to support H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement

Act. And I want to congratulate my incredible colleague Congresswoman SEWELL for her leadership.

When Congress passed the Voting Rights Act of 1965, it was a recognition that systemic discrimination based on race continued to deny people the right to vote. And as an organizer, I understand the Voting Rights Act as a victory that was hard fought by Black activists like Fannie Lou Hamer and Ella Baker and, of course, our esteemed colleague Representative LEWIS, who devoted their lives to fighting for the right to vote. And it was a victory of the movement that recognized that this right to vote is absolutely fundamental to our concept and our actualization of democracy.

Unfortunately, we have not followed with the same courage. Instead, since 2013, States have enacted laws that have suppressed voting rights across the country, and today, half of the country faces stricter voting regulations than they did 9 years ago.

If we want a true democracy, Mr. Speaker, we must protect the right to vote for all, and this bill is critical to doing that.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for yielding me time, and I thank him for his leadership. And, of course, I thank TERRI SEWELL, who is from Selma, Alabama, who has been a fighter for voting rights all of her life. I thank her for sponsoring this bill along with myself and so many others.

It was in Selma in 1965 that another friend and one of our dearest colleagues, JOHN LEWIS, was nearly beaten to death for having the audacity to demand the right to vote, the right to register, the right to participate in a meaningful way in our democracy. That year, after that Bloody Sunday in March of 1965 and the later march to Montgomery that followed soon after, Congress enacted the Voting Rights Act to protect against voter suppression and voter disenfranchisement.

One of its core provisions required that the Federal Justice Department preclear any changes to voting rules in jurisdictions that have a history of discrimination and voter suppression. Let me, as an aside say, that these elections are Federal elections, so very frankly, my constituents have an interest in making sure that constituents of every other district have an opportunity to have their voice heard.

This is not a State's rights issue, as the administration puts forth. This is an issue of America's values as a democracy, which is that all Americans—and that was not always the case, we had to amend the Constitution of the United States in order to effect that end—that all Americans have the right and ought to be facilitated in exercising that right to vote.

Sadly, we know that, notwithstanding the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, State after State, jurisdiction after jurisdiction, not solely in the south, adopted policies aimed at preventing the exercise of the franchise, of preventing the ability to register to vote and to neuter the vote being cast by redistricting efforts that in effect put people in a place where they could not elect the person of their choice.

As a result, millions of Americans after the Voting Rights Act was adopted were finally able to vote and have their voices heard in their democracy. However, we ought to be chastened as we consider this legislation in knowing that for 100 years after the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments were adopted, for 100 years, for a century, it was still necessary for the JOHN LEWISes and the Martin Luther Kings to march. Some gave their lives to redeem that promise that so many gave their lives to ensure.

Unfortunately, the Supreme Court struck down the formula for that preclearance process in 2013 and charged Congress with updating it. We have responded this day to that charge. Under the previous Republican-led Congress, that charge was ignored.

Again, I would ask my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle to think of their failure to act. Ronald Reagan said to Gorbachev, ''Tear down this wall.''

Today, we have an opportunity to tear down the wall of discrimination and exclusion to millions of Americans who have been confronted with policies that make it more difficult for them to vote.

I hope the Senate will join us in tearing down this wall of discrimination, oppression, and exclusion. I continue to believe that the decision made by the Supreme Court was a bad decision, which did not reflect the reality of the success of the preclearance provisions in the Voting Rights Act.

Indeed, Justice Ginsburg pointed out in her dissent that, ''Throwing out preclearance when it has worked and is continuing to work to stop discriminatory changes is like throwing out your umbrella in a rainstorm because you are not getting wet.''

Today, the Democratic-led House will vote to restore the full force of the Voting Rights Act. And I hope every Republican will join us if they want to ensure that discriminatory practices do not prevent citizens from voting.

We have given this bill the designation of H.R. 4. I said in a press conference a little time ago, H.R. 4, H.R. for the people. Whether you spell it F-O-R or F-O-U-R, this is for the people, for our democracy, for justice, for inclusion. We have given this bill the designation of H.R. 4, appropriately, because it is one of our most important pieces of legislation. Along with H.R. 1, the For the People Act, which contained a number of provisions strengthening ballot access, making voter registration automatic, and expanding early voting, H.R. 4 is part of the Democrats' effort to protect Americans' fundamental right to vote.

H.R. 4, my colleagues, restores the full protections of the Voting Rights Act. As you take your card and contemplate putting it in the slot and pushing either the green button or the red button, reflect upon those who died, not only in the civil rights movement, but those who died on foreign shores defending freedom and democracy. Because as you vote today, you will be voting to defend or to ignore the fundamental formula for democracy, which is having people's votes count.

By updating the preclearance formula requiring reasonable public notice before changes to voting laws or regulations; permitting the Attorney General to request the presence of election observers anywhere there is a threat of racial discrimination at the ballot box—these are not just State elections, I tell my friends; these are elections, which impact my constituents in your State and every other State, when they elect Members of Congress, in the United States Senate—and increasing accessibility and protections for Native Americans and Alaska-native voters.

Again, I want to thank Representative SEWELL for her leadership in this effort and JOHN LEWIS and so many other heroes; my friend JIM CLYBURN, the Democrat whip, who fought for voting rights; for all those of African American descent who fought for voting rights; for Native Americans, the first two women of whom we have in the Congress now.

I thank Chairman NADLER for working closely with TERRI SEWELL and others to strengthen this legislation by including language to ensure that jurisdictions that purge voter rolls or reduce early voting opportunities are subject to preclearance requirements.

It is very nice to say, Well, you can file a suit after the election is over. You may not have the money to do that, and, in any event, it is a fait accompli. It is too late. That is why preclearance has been honored for half a century, and that is why it is so sad that the Supreme Court set it aside.

And, of course, I want to thank, one more time, my dear friend, JOHN LEWIS, who throughout his lifetime has held up the beloved community. Voting rights is part of that beloved community. In Selma 54 years ago, JOHN risked his future, his life and his limb, so every American could cast a vote.

Today 434 of us ought to join JOHN LEWIS, not walking across the bridge with Alabama troopers waiting to beat us and confront us, but to that little box where we have the right to vote. Nobody can stop us from voting in that box today. Let's make sure that nobody stops any of our fellow Americans

from putting their card in that voting slot and making democracy all that our Founders promised it to be.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, the right to vote is precious and central to the integrity of our democracy. It is not a Democratic issue or a Republican issue. It is an American issue.

The Republican party used to support the unfettered right to vote. In fact, every single time the Voting Rights Act has been reauthorized, it was signed by a Republican President: 1970, Richard Nixon; 1975, Gerald Ford; 1982, Ronald Reagan; 2006, George W. Bush. The unfettered right to vote should be a bipartisan issue, but the party of Lincoln is gone. The party of Reagan is gone. The party of McCain is gone. Voter suppression is not a legitimate electoral tactic. It is a stain on our democracy, and it must be crushed.

Vote ''yes'' on H.R. 4.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind those of us voting, we can like this bill or not like this bill, but this is not a reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act. This is in addition to, and it is something we have talked about on our side.

We appreciate the debate going on, but just as a clarification, we are not reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act. The sections that are already there are still going to be there, they are permanently enshrined, and we are not going to be changing that. This is a different part of that, and we would just like to make that clear.

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

□ 1115

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I would simply comment that this is a restoration of the previously authorized Voting Rights Act before the Supreme Court did its dastardly deed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Let me just pick up where they left off. Whether it is a reauthorization, whether it is a restoration, it does not matter. What this is, is fixing the stain on America that prohibited and stopped African Americans and other minorities from voting.

I rise today torn because, on the one hand, I am elated that this House is finally moving H.R. 4 so that we can protect the right to vote, but on the other hand, I am disappointed because we have to do it by ourselves, that this is not a bipartisan effort to ensure the precious right to vote.

Many people may say that it is a burden on the States. What about the burden that the States put on us?

In the spirit of Goodman, Chaney, and Schwerner, who were killed so that I could vote, and JOHN LEWIS and others who crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge, who were beaten so that I can vote, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask for everyone to support H.R. 4. We should join hands and do it together.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for yielding.

I support this bill and its efforts to protect access to the ballot box and advance justice and democracy for all, including Latinos, which represent 77 percent of my district.

Enfranchising minority voters will strengthen our democracy because when all eligible voters can exercise their right, our government works better by living up to its ideals of ''we the people.''

This bill aims to maintain elections free, fair, and accessible to all eligible voters.

Congress must pass the Voting Rights Advancement Act to restore our ability to prevent voter discrimination. We are all equal at the ballot box, and this bill aims to make sure that that is a reality today, tomorrow, and every day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 4.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act, led by our esteemed colleague, Representative SEWELL.

During the civil rights movement, I was the child in the stroller at the March on Washington. My father served as the Illinois branch president of the NAACP for over 25 years, and I was raised to always fight for what is right and just, to stand up for those who do not always have a voice.

My father planned marches to strengthen our voting rights. I can still picture him presiding over meetings at our kitchen table, our house filled with poster boards and preparations and hope.

When it comes to voting rights, my father's work is still unfinished. Today, I am so proud that we are taking this step toward completing that work.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have made my statements very clear on this, and I will continue to do so. For people who have really struggled with and want to be a part of this, I am also going to say that this is a time when we can reach out occasionally across the aisle, and I can help my chairman with a little bit of time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for yielding me the time.

I have been thinking a lot this morning about my growing up in South Carolina. I still remember as a young man driving in a driving rain from Charleston, South Carolina, going up to the little town of Kingstree in Williamsburg County, which I now represent here in this body.

On that day, Martin Luther King, Jr., was coming to Williamsburg County to extol the necessity of voting to all of us. I will never forget his theme that day, ''march to the ballot box.''

It was just a few months after the 1965 Voting Rights Act had been passed into law, and that law has been renewed time and time again throughout the years. But several years ago, the Supreme Court took a look at the law and decided that the formula that had been used in section 4 should be updated.

This bill, thanks to the work of TERRI SEWELL from Alabama and MARCIA FUDGE from Ohio, we have had 17 hearings around the country, eight by the Judiciary Committee—I thank Chairman NADLER so much for that—and nine by MARCIA FUDGE's committee. We have wrapped all of those findings into one bill because we are adhering to what Chief Justice Roberts asked us to do: update the formula.

We have updated the formula. We are putting it on the floor today, and I do believe that this piece of legislation is deserving of bipartisan support.

I can remember when this voting rights bill would pass both houses unanimously. Let's do that today and demonstrate that we are making this democracy work for all.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4 for the people, the Voting Rights Advancement Act. I thank my colleagues, Representatives SEWELL, FUDGE, NADLER, and many others, for their extraordinary work on this critical legislation that protects the most basic and fundamental of American rights, the right to vote.

Ever since the 2013 Supreme Court Shelby decision threw out the preclearance requirement, undermining the Voting Rights Act, States and localities with histories of racial injustice have again started discriminatory voting practices, like requiring IDs, which is particularly harmful to

Hispanic voters; moving voting places so it is more difficult to vote; and many other steps that disenfranchise countless Americans, particularly men and women of color.

This bill restores the Voting Rights Act in its entirety, repeals the Shelby decision, and gives the Federal Government the tools to hold local election officials accountable for discriminatory practices that deny Americans of this fundamental right.

So many brave Americans have made the ultimate sacrifice to protect this right for our people. By passing this legislation, we honor their sacrifice by protecting the right to vote for every single citizen.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the right to vote in our Nation is fundamental to our democracy, and that right to vote continues to come under assault.

States with a history of denying and blocking the right to vote, like my home State of Texas, are no longer held in check by the preclearance requirement of the Voting Rights Act. Worried that changing demographics erode their political power, Texas leaders continue to make voting more difficult for Latinos and other communities of color.

For example, since the Shelby case, the Texas secretary of state attempted to purge nearly 100,000 foreign-born U.S. citizens from voter rolls; the Texas Legislature restricted mobile voting sites designed to make voting more convenient; at least 750 polling locations have been closed, more than any other State; a voter ID law went into effect that a Federal judge later ruled was enacted to intentionally discriminate against Black and Latino voters.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is important to protect every American's right to vote, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for yielding.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was a direct response to evidence of significant and pervasive racial discrimination across the country.

My home State of Wisconsin really has suffered under the Supreme Court decision of 2013. After that ruling, then-Governor Scott Walker, someone I had been fighting since 1990 to prevent him from enacting an onerous voter ID law, he prevailed in 2016.

The very first year that that voter ID law was enacted was in 2016. According to a study done by the University of Wisconsin, between 12,000 and 23,000 registered voters in Madison and Milwaukee, and as many as 45,000 statewide, were deterred from voting by the ID law. The President, of course, won our State by a mere 23,000 votes.

Mr. Speaker, it is important and imperative that we restore enforcement of the Voting Rights Act. I urge my colleagues to vote for this great legislation.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and bringing H.R. 4 to this floor.

I would like to thank Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL for her very consistent efforts to restore the vote and also our Chairwoman MARCIA FUDGE of the Subcommittee on Elections for holding hearings throughout the country, which actually established the foundation for this bill.

The 1965 Voting Rights Act repaired damage in our communities whose voting rights were denied. Dr. Martin Luther King once said he saw that as a great step forward.

However, in 2013, the Supreme Court gutted the Voting Rights Act in the Shelby v. Holder decision. As a result, the Nation saw nearly 20 percent fewer polling locations and 17 million voters purged from voting rolls in States with patterns of voter suppression. This is especially true for communities of color, whose votes have been silenced over the years due to this disastrous Court decision.

Voting is the backbone of our democracy and something that every American should have the right to access.

I was born and raised in El Paso, Texas, and I vividly remember the denial of full citizenship of African Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we need a system that is strong, free, and fair. I urge my colleagues to move forward in a bipartisan way and pass H.R. 4.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I stand today as the chair of the Women's Caucus and as a member of the executive board of the Congressional Black Caucus, and I stand in strong support of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

These repeated attacks on our right to vote have severely undermined the people's fundamental voting rights, which are the principles of our democracy.

H.R. 4 helps protect citizens' ability to register to vote and provides real enforcement so that marginalized communities, like women who celebrate their 100th year to vote and African American communities, will have proper access to the ballot box.

The right to vote is the cornerstone of our democracy, and we must ensure that every eligible American voter has the ability to have their vote heard.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

□ 1130

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time each side has left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Georgia has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Speaker, voting is the cornerstone of our democracy. It has been a hard-fought right. We must ensure that every American that is eligible to vote can make their voice heard.

This right has been trampled on after the Shelby County v. Holder Court decision, which has unleashed a flood of State and local voter suppression laws, silencing targeted voters, particularly communities of color.

In my home State of Florida, laws and policies have cut back early voting, established English-only ballots, and are now trying to thwart efforts to restore voting rights to ex-felons, hurting access to the ballot box for Floridians.

H.R. 4 will push back against suppressive voting laws, restoring the great equalizer for democracy and for our people.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, we have only one remaining speaker, who will be our closing speaker, so the gentleman from Georgia may wish to close for his side.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity at the time we have laid this out. There have been exhaustive hearings on this.

Our objection to this is not about anything else except that we feel the wording of this and the way this bill is laid out is not good for our country, much of it will not be held up and will not have its intended consequences.

I am one who believes and has a State that has been very active in seeing our minority rolls and our minority voting participation increase dramatically over the last 4 or 5 years, after, even, the Shelby decision.

That is an undisputed fact; although, many times, it has been disputed in many public speeches saying Georgia is going backwards. We are not. Georgia is going forward and had many, many successes over the last little bit encouraging minority voting. From my perspective, that is exactly what we are supposed to be doing.

So, simply, as we have looked at it, we must move forward with ways that we make sure every person who wants to vote has the ability to vote and does so in a proper and legal way. That has never been a discussion from our side. My only objection here is the way this goes about it.

And there have been many other issues that we have brought up on numerous, numerous occasions about how this could actually have adverse effects across the country, especially if people wanted to really mess with our voting system and play it for political gain. That is not a discussion that we are having right here because we have had this in multiple hearings up to this point.

So I think, for the voter who looks today, this is something that is going forward with a good-hearted attempt. I will never question the motivations of what is happening here. I just question the very fact of what words are on paper.

We do not, in this body, vote on ideas. We do not vote on thoughts. We vote on words on paper. And the words on paper here do not fulfill what is being said about this bill.

With that said, I would ask that we vote ''no.'' There are plenty of opportunities for us to continue to work on this, just not in this current situation. I respectfully request that people would vote ''no'' and that we move forward with something that actually possibly could work at a future date.

But from the majority side, this has nothing to do with people voting or not voting. We want everyone to vote and everyone to participate, but we want to do so in a fair and legal way.

This is something that we actually think would actually hurt that in the long run as we go forward. That is why we are asking that this be voted down, will not support it today, and, along with the administration, who has said that it will be vetoed if it does reach his desk, this is something we would rather find a way to have a bill that could suffice or could make the provisions of this bill even stronger. This is not happening today.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask for a ''no'' vote when this comes forward, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. NADLER, the distinguished chair of the Judiciary Committee. I thank him for his leadership in bringing this important opportunity for America to the floor of the House today.

I commend Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL for her tremendous leadership, the gentlewoman from Alabama, who knows this subject well, personally, geographically, and officially, now, as a leading member of the House of Representatives. I thank her for her leadership.

I thank Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE for holding field hearings from Alabama to Arizona on this urgent issue of voting rights. That scope of Alabama to Arizona is not alphabetically a big range, but, geographically and experiencewise, it is.

And to Congressman JOHN LEWIS, the conscience of the Congress, what an honor it is for each and every one of us to serve with him, to call him colleague and, in many cases, to call him friend. He is a civil rights hero of the House, whose Voter Empowerment Act was the backbone of H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

Because there is some resistance on the side of the aisle here to our reducing the role of dark money in politics, which is a significant part of H.R. 1, we pulled out H.R. 4 as its own vehicle on the floor, and I thank all the House Democrats who came to Congress committed to restoring the right to the ballot, reflected in our naming of this legislation, H.R. 4, one of our top priorities.

And I say Democrats, but it saddens me to hear the distinguished ranking member's comments about this legislation and urging a ''no'' vote on the Republican side, because I was leader when we passed the Voting Rights Act that the Court sent us back to the drawing board on.

At that time, we had around 400 votes in the House of Representatives, upwards of 395, 400 votes, a completely bipartisan vote to pass that bill; and it was unanimous in the United States Senate, not partisan in any way. And we have come to a place where the Court said you need to do this or thus.

We followed Justice Roberts' guidance; and now, with the improvements insisted upon by Justice Roberts, the Republicans have gone from being part of a nearly 400-vote majority on the bill to, hopefully, not being unanimously against it, but we will see.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 55 years ago, President Lyndon Johnson came to the House of Representatives. He came on the House floor to urge passage of the Voting Rights Act ''for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy.''

He declared: ''This was the first nation in the history of the world to be founded with a purpose. . . . 'All men are created equal.'

''Those are not just clever words. . . . In their name, Americans have fought and died for two centuries. . . . Those words are a promise to every citizen that he shall share in the dignity of man.''

He continued: ''Our fathers believed that if this noble view of the rights of man was to flourish, it must be rooted in democracy . . . the right to choose your own leaders. The history of this country, in large measure, is the history of the expansion of that right to all of our people.''

Yet, a half century later, the constitutional right of all Americans to determine their leaders and the destiny of our democracy is under great assault from a brazen, nationwide voter suppression campaign.

Since the *Shelby* v. *Holder* decision, 23 States—maybe more—have enacted voter suppression laws, including voter purges, strict ID requirements, poll closures, and vote intimidation, denying millions their voices by their vote.

The record compiled by the committees shows that the counties with the worst histories of voter suppression doubled down on their discrimination during this time, purging 17 million voters from the rolls between 2016 and 2018 alone, primarily people of color.

Today, the House is honoring our Nation's sacred pledge—all are created equal—by passing H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

This bill restores the Voting Rights Act's strength to combat the clear resurgence of voter discrimination unleashed by Shelby by updating the data determining which States and practices are covered by the law. No longer will cynical politicians and States with dark histories of discrimination have a green light to freely continue their systematic suppression campaign.

When President Johnson spoke on this floor, he said: ''There must be no delay, no hesitation, and no compromise with our purpose. . . . We have already waited a hundred years and more, and the time for waiting is gone.''

Indeed, it took the courage and the ultimate sacrifice of countless Americans, including our own JOHN LEWIS, to secure the passage of the Voting Rights Act. Honoring and strengthening that legacy is essential to our democracy. We want to be sure that everyone who is eligible to vote can vote and that that person's vote is counted as cast.

Today, too, the time for waiting is gone. We must pass this bill, which is a vote for civil rights, liberty, and justice for all.

I thank Mr. NADLER, MARCIA FUDGE, and TERRI SEWELL, the author of this legislation, which she introduced now to the third Congress, for giving us the privilege to be part of honoring the pledge of our Founders: All are created equal.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote on the bill.

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

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019.

This bill restores the full power of the Voting Rights Act, after the 2013 Supreme Court decision in *Shelby County* v. *Holder* eviscerated it. It will also restore critical voting protections to ensure that discriminatory voter suppression laws do not block Americans from participating in the electoral process.

The right to vote is fundamental to our democracy. During the civil rights movement, courageous Americans fought in the courts, marched, agitated, and gave the ''last full measure of devotion'' for all Americans to be able to exercise their precious right to vote. The bill includes provisions that promote transparency by mandating reasonable public notice for voting changes. It also grants the Attorney General the authority to request the

presence of federal observers anywhere in the country to prevent voter suppression efforts and to address discrimination based on race in the voting process. In addition, this bill authorizes a federal court to order States or jurisdictions to be covered under the Act when there are results-based violations, where the effect of a voting measure is racial discrimination in voting and blocking citizens from utilizing their right to vote.

For all these reasons and more, today, I am so proud to stand with my colleagues and members of the Congressional Black Caucus in support of the passage of H.R. 4, and want to send a special thank you to my colleagues Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL and Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE who have fearlessly and brilliantly led this fight in the House of Representatives.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019. This bill restores the full strength of the Voting Rights Act, after a 2013 Supreme Court Decision gutted the Act. The result was a flood of voter suppression laws throughout the country.

The possibility of restoring a democratic process that has stifled the black and brown vote in the U.S. deserves our support. We must never allow our constitutional rights to be diminished or even eliminated.

In 2013, the Supreme Court decision, *Shelby County* v. *Holder*, struck down the existing formula that determined which states and political subdivisions were required to seek federal pre-approval for their voting-related changes. This was to ensure they did not discriminate against minority voters. The Supreme Court put the onus on Congress to enact a new formula, which resulted in States and political subdivisions not being required to seek preclearance unless ordered by a federal court.

H.R. 4 restores the Section 5 preclearance process by including a new formula for coverage that ensures that only States and jurisdictions with a recent history of discrimination or use of voter suppression practices would be subject to review before implementing new voting laws or procedures.

H.R. 4 protects the sacred rights of minority voters and helps identity discriminatory voting practices. Congress must protect our polls and support H.R. 4 to ensure the constitutional right to vote for every citizen of the United States.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letters of support for H.R. 4.

FAITH LEADER CALL ON CONGRESS TO RESTORE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT NOW

Voting is a sacred right and a cornerstone of democracy. We desperately need to protect every American's right to vote—and right now this right is endangered by gaps in the law. Our spiritual ancestors in the Civil Rights Movement fought for the Voting Rights Act. We must honor their sacrifices today by passing the Voting Rights Advancement Act.—Rev. Dr. Jennifer Butler, CEO, Faith in Public Life

We stand on the shoulders of so many in our nation who have shown courage and resistance to realize their right to vote, who have fought tirelessly to make sure America lives up to its full potential. Voting is a crucial part of what we must do to hold our elected officials—to hold America—accountable to not just the dream that Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. laid out for us, but also the promise that America has held since its beginnings. Yes, it's a promise historically marred by injustice, but it is the promise of a better way. It is a sin and a shame to witness how voting rights have been suppressed and denied since 2013. Voting is a way that we claim the freedom that we have in America. Our most urgent request to Congress is the same as that made by MLK over 40 years ago: give us the ballot.—Rev. Dr. Leslie Copeland-Tune, Chief Operating Officer, National Council of Churches

By our own admission, within our most precious documents, we acknowledge that ALL people are part of God's creation and that we are one nation under God. As such, our democracy says that every citizen should be respected regardless of sex, race, national origin, etc. and that the government is accountable to defend and protect the rights of its public, its citizens. The most precious nature of America society is the right to vote. We have the dignity of citizenship rights; laws are necessary to defend that dignity and those rights, unobstructed, so citizens can enjoy voting and electing their officials.—Imam Dr. Talib M. Shareef, USAF-Retired, President, Masjid Muhammad, The Nation's Mosque

My faith teaches that every person is imbued with dignity, and in a secular democracy our vote is an indicator of that worth. Voter suppression and intimidation is a familiar, age-old practice of marginalizing people in poverty and people of color. A democratic system that suppresses the vote of any citizen is not only unconstitutional, it is dehumanizing. This dehumanizing must stop! Our nation is better than this. A significant step forward would be to pass a 21st Century Voting Rights Act now. This cannot wait. It is the faithful and patriotic way forward.—Sister Simone Campbell, SSS, Executive Director of NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice

The United Methodist Church affirms the critical role of governments in protecting the rights of all people to free and fair elections. In particular, the Church support efforts to dismantle policies and practices that disenfranchise communities of color and perpetuate systemic injustice.''—Rev. Dr. Susan Henry-Crowe, General Secretary, General Board of Church and Society of The United Methodist Church

The Religious Society of Friends (Quaker) faith was founded on the belief in the equality of all. Voter suppression in the United States violates this central belief and we must work to assure everyone has the right to vote. We call on lawmakers across the nation to take a stand against voter suppression and pass the Voting Rights Advancement Act (H.R. 4).—Diane Randall, Executive Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation

The requirement of society to provide human dignity for all, which stands at the root of all theological traditions, strikes a blow at the very heart of the spurious arguments made by those who want to prevent others from voting based on age, race, disability, or history of contact with the criminal justice system. As an organization that works with many who come from communities that have been historically subjected to all forms of discrimination, the National Religious Campaign Against Torture believes that the right to vote and to fully participate in the democracy is a sacred right and one that should never be taken away from anyone, for any reason.—Rev. Dr. Ron Stief, Executive Director, National Religious Campaign Against Torture

As Franciscans, our Christian faith teaches us that we must recognize each person as a gift from God, and that we must emphasize the importance of the essential humanity and dignity of each person. Pope Francis has called on us to ''meddle in politics'' and we interpret this concept as a requirement that all Americans must have an equal say in the public square. Therefore, we must immediately call on Congress to pass the Voting Rights Advancement Act to ensure that all Americans are able to vote.—Patrick Carolan, Executive Director, Franciscan Action Network

At the National Council of Jewish Women, we are guided by the Jewish imperative to pursue tzedek, or justice. For justice to be realized, all eligible voters must have an opportunity to participate in the electoral process. Without access to the ballot, we can't elect lawmakers who represent our communities and our needs. Congress must restore the full strength of the Voting Rights Act without delay.—Sheila Katz, CEO, National Council of Jewish Women

It was when the collective voice of the people cried out to the Lord in Exodus 3:9 that God hears and sent deliverance to Nation of Israel! Voting by the oppressed was the way black people could lift up their voices, cry out, and participate in creating a more just nation! Restoration of the Voting Rights Act so all voices are heard is essential to perfecting this nation and assuring that it does not return to and separate but unequal society!—Rev. Reuben D. Eckels, Church World Service (CWS)

Since voting is so fundamental to our democracy, all citizens should be committed to making it possible for everyone to exercise that right. The Voting Rights Advancement Act is critical to having a genuine representative democracy and to make sure that the most vulnerable populations are not disenfranchised from the democratic process. People of faith are concerned that the voice of the people be truly representative of all the people.—Bishop John Stowe, Bishop-President, Pax Christi USA

In the Bible, we are reminded that ''when justice is done, it brings joy to the righteous'' (Proverbs 21:15). The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) understands that justice is done when we live out our mutual responsibility for one another by guaranteeing our neighbor's right to vote and participate freely and fully in society. In 2013, the ELCA Churchwide Assembly, our denomination's highest legislative authority, adopted a social policy resolution titled Voting Rights to All Citizens. This resolution calls us to express concern for our nation's history of voter suppression from the Jim Crow era to the current climate of restrictive voter laws that create barriers to many people of color in their right to vote. This resolution calls on all part of this church to ''promote public life worthy of the name'' by speaking out as advocates and engaging in local efforts such as voter registration and supporting legislation to guarantee the right to vote to all citizens. We support the Voting Rights Advancement Act (H.R. 2978) as a key step in ensuring the voices of all citizens will be safeguarded and heard through its provisions which would help reinstate guidelines that ensure protection through oversight and combat voter suppression.—Rev. Amy Reumann, Director of Advocacy, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has been a long-time advocate for voting rights. We were deeply dismayed by the actions of the Supreme Court to void Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. This decision left many people of color vulnerable to discriminatory voting laws that have historically plagued communities of color. Voting is our right as U.S. citizens. Taking away or restricting one's ability to exercise their voice at the polls is not only immoral; it is unconstitutional. The actions of many states in passing

extremely restrictive voting laws are unjust and must be addressed. As the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. once stated, ''injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.'' Congress must stand on the side of justice and restore the Voting Rights Act.—Rev. Jimmie R. Hawkins, Director of the Presbyterian Church (USA), Office of Public Witness

As Reform Jews, our teachings motivate our advocacy to protect voting rights and fight voter suppression. Rabbi Yitzhak taught, ''A ruler is not to be appointed unless the community is first consulted,'' (Babylonian Talmud Berochot 55a). Diminished federal voter protections and rampant voter suppression undermines the ability of all people, particularly communities of color, to participate in our democracy. It is time for Congress to restore those protections and pass the Voting Rights Advancement Act (H.R. 4/S. 561). Our faith's commitment to political participation demands that Congress pass this Shelby fix as a step towards ensuring that the whole community is represented.—Rabbi Jonah Dov Pesner, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism

Voting is at the heart of the democratic process. It is the most fundamental access point for individuals to have a voice in the public policy decision-making process that can shape the future of our local, regional and global collective life. As people of faith, we believe every vote is a voice, and every voices counts. It is unconscionable that we are entering the 2020 election season with fewer voting rights protections than we had in 1965. This signals an erosion of our democracy that is a moral crisis. The right to vote is a national value that transcends partisanship. It goes beyond political party identification to our core values as a nation and the centrality of a citizen's free vote, not limited by the powers of money, social class and unequal access to voting. It is imperative that we pass a fix for the damage done by the Supreme Court Shelby decision by restoring voter protections.—Sandra Sorensen, Director of Washington Office, United Church of Christ (UCC)

The National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd calls on Congress to pass the Voting Rights Advancement Act. We have seen over the last six years increasing hostility to full voting rights for all Americans since the U.S. Supreme Court partially struck down the Voting Rights Act. We have seen new barriers put up to restrict the number of voters of color, suppressing the full American voice and skewing our response to important civil and human rights issues in need of our attention. As people of faith, we are called to liberate the oppressed and marginalized. Please restore the vote.—Lawrence E. Couch, Director, National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd

It is clearer than ever today that democracy is a process, not a static state. Democracy requires care, investment, and vigilance to ensure all voices are represented. The shameful history of racism in U.S. voting systems is not over, and new approaches designed to restrict certain communities' access to a free and fair vote cannot be tolerated. The federal government must act now to reinstate and expand protections of voting rights for all people.—Joyce Ajlouny, General Secretary, American Friends Service Committee

The right to vote without any impediments or obstructions is one of the most basic privileges of our democracy belonging to all age-eligible American citizens regardless of race, religion, or gender orientation. I call upon our Senate and House to protect this sacred right which is critical for the defense of all our other rights and privileges.—Rev. Dr. Jeffrey Haggray, American Baptist Home Mission Societies

American Baptist Churches, USA have officially advocated for voter rights for many decades and we continue ''. . . to declare the right to vote to be a basic human right, and support programs and measures to assure this right. The right of citizenship in a nation, to participate in the political process, to form political parties, to have a voice in decisions made in the political arena are basic undeniable human rights. The Bible teaches us that all humanity is created in God's image and that we are all valuable in God's sight.''—Dr. C. Jeff Woods, Acting General Secretary, American Baptist Churches, USA

We are the church, the body of Christ in this world, at this time. We need to stop the racist suppression of the votes of people of color. Denying people their right to vote is counter to the will of God. This is especially true when rich and powerful interests seek to deny people who have been historically marginalized from shaping our society. We need to change our policies and our laws to make voting a concrete reality for all of God's children.—Rev. Ms. Paula Clayton Dempsey, Executive Minister, Alliance of Baptists

People have a right and a duty to participate in society, seeking together the common good and wellbeing of all persons, especially the poor and vulnerable. Voter suppression laws strike at this tenet of Catholic Social Teaching by denying that right to those who are disproportionately poor, especially African American, Native American and Hispanic American communities. As faithful citizens of every faith and humanitarian tradition, we affirm our common responsibility to promote the dignity of every person and to work for justice and the common good. That can only happen if we are all afforded the basic right to vote and to participate fully in our democratic process.—Scott Wright, Director, Columban Center for Advocacy and Outreach

As Unitarian Universalists, our 5th Principle affirms ''the right of conscience and the use of the democratic process within our congregations and in society at large''. Therefore, we advocate for restoration of full protections under the Voting Rights Act. When our democracy is in peril, so too are our civil rights. Racial discrimination and voter suppression are on the rise—an unacceptable circumstance to freedom-loving citizens of the United States and one that our faith calls us to confront. The pernicious impacts of Shelby County v. Holder must be halted and reversed.

As the leader of a faith-based education, witness and advocacy organization, I know that issues like poverty, immigration, climate change, and rising inequity in our society cannot improve unless we defend the basic tenets of our democracy. Our democracy works best when everyone can fully participate. Congress should strive to make our elections more free, more fair and more accessible. The more Americans who participate in our elections, the better our democracy reflects who we are as a country and the better we can meet the complex challenges of our times.—(Pablo) Pavel DeJesús, Executive Director, Unitarian Universalists for Social Justice (UUSJ).

LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER LAW,
December 3, 2019.

Re Recommended Vote in Favor of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: On behalf of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, a nonpartisan civil rights organization formed at the request of President Kennedy to enlist the private bar's leadership and resources in combating racial discrimination and securing equal justice under law, I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act (VRAA). We oppose any Motion to Recommit (MTR).

The VRAA would restore the Section 5 preclearance process that was struck down by the Supreme Court in the 2013 Shelby County v. Holder decision by creating a new formula for coverage that ensures that only states and jurisdictions with a recent history of voting discrimination or use of voter suppression practices would be subject to review prior to implementing new voting laws or procedures.

Prior to Shelby, covered jurisdictions had to provide notice to the federal government—which meant notice to the public—before they could implement changes in their voting practices or procedures. Such notice is of paramount importance, because the ways that the voting rights of minority citizens are jeopardized are often subtle. They range from the consolidation of polling places so as to make it less convenient for minority voters to vote, to the curtailing of early voting hours that makes it more difficult for hourly-wage earners to vote, to the disproportionate purging of minority voters from voting lists under the pretext of ''list maintenance.''

In the more than six years since the Shelby decision, the floodgates to voting discrimination have been swung open, threating the voting rights of millions of Americans. The gutting of the core protection of the Voting Rights Act did not simply harm African Americans and other people of color, it challenged the very foundation of our democracy and our decades-long march towards equality. Voting is the right that is ''preservative of all rights,'' because it empowers people to elect candidates of their choice, who will then govern and legislate to advance other rights. But, voting rights have always been contested in this country, with gains in turnout and representation by people of color often met with an inevitable backlash that sought to reduce their electoral power.

The passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965 marked a turning point in our nation, when the promise of equal justice and democracy in our Constitution was made real for people of color for the first time in our history. Since that time, overwhelming bipartisan majorities in Congress have reauthorized the Voting Rights Act several times, each time amassing a significant congressional record of the current threats to the franchise and implementing changes to ensure the ongoing efficacy of the Voting Rights Act. Now, we ask you to take the mantle from your predecessors and restore the full protections of the Voting Rights Act by passing H.R. 4, the VRAA.

Thank you for your leadership in protecting the fundamental right to vote and our democracy by voting for H.R. 4, the VRAA, and by opposing any Motion to Recommit.

Sincerely,

KRISTEN CLARKE,
President & Executive Director.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, December 4, 2019.

SUPPORT H.R. 4, VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, a coalition of more than 200 national organizations committed to promoting and

protecting the civil and human rights of all persons in the United States, and the 68 undersigned organizations, we write in strong support of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act. We oppose any Motion to Recommit.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA) is one of the most successful civil rights laws ever enacted. Congress passed the VRA in direct response to evidence of significant and pervasive discrimination across the country, including the use of literacy tests, poll taxes, intimidation, threats, and violence. By outlawing the tests and devices that prevented people of color from voting, the VRA and its prophylactic preclearance formula put teeth into the 15th Amendment's guarantee that no citizen can be denied the right to vote because of the color of their skin.

H.R. 4 has received vocal and vigorous support from the civil rights community because it responds to the urgent need to stop the abuses by state and local governments in the aftermath of the Supreme Court's infamous 2013 decision in Shelby County v. Holder, when five justices of the Supreme Court invalidated the VRA's preclearance provision. In its decision, the Court stated: ''Our country has changed, and while any racial discrimination in voting is too much, Congress must ensure that the legislation it passes to remedy that problem speaks to current conditions.''

Since Shelby County, discriminatory policies have proliferated nationwide and continued in areas formerly covered by the preclearance requirement. In states, counties, and cities across the country, public officials have pushed through laws and policies designed to make it harder for many communities to vote. While we have celebrated successful legal challenges to discriminatory voter ID laws in Texas and North Carolina, such victories occurred only after elections in those states were tainted by discrimination. Lost votes cannot be reclaimed and discriminatory elections cannot be undone.

But voter suppression is not merely the province of those states with a long history of discrimination. Pernicious practices such as voter purging and restrictive identification requirements—which disproportionately affect voters of color—occur in states throughout the nation. Although progress has been made, some elected leaders in this country are still working to silence people who were historically denied access to the ballot box.

During the 116th Congress, the U.S. House Committee on the Judiciary held extensive hearings and found significant evidence that barriers to voter participation remain for people of color and language-minority voters in African-American, Asian American, Latinx, and Native American communities. The hearings examined the History and Enforcement of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (March 12, 2019), Enforcement of the Voting Rights Act in the State of Texas (May 3, 2019), Continuing Challenges to the Voting Rights Act Since Shelby County v. Holder (June 25, 2019), Discriminatory Barriers to Voting (September 5, 2019), Evidence of Current and Ongoing Voting Discrimination (September 10, 2019), Congressional Authority to Protect Voting Rights After Shelby County v. Holder (September 24, 2019), and Legislative Proposals to Strengthen the Voting Rights Act (October 17, 2019). The Committee on House Administration also conducted numerous hearings and amassed significant evidence of voter suppression during the 116th Congress.

H.R. 4 restores and modernizes the Voting Rights Act by:

Creating a new coverage formula that hinges on a finding of repeated voting rights violations in the preceding 25 years.

Significantly, the 25-year period is measured on a rolling basis to keep up with ''current conditions,'' so only states and political subdivisions that have a recent record of racial discrimination in voting are covered.

States and political subdivisions that qualify for preclearance will be covered for a period of 10 years, but if they establish a clean record during that time period, they can be extracted from coverage.

Establishing ''practice-based preclearance,'' a targeted process for reviewing voting changes in jurisdictions nationwide focused on measures that have historically been used to discriminate against voters of color. The process for reviewing changes in voting is limited to a set of practices, including:

Changes to the methods of elections (to or from at-large elections) in areas that are racially, ethnically, or linguistically diverse;

Reductions in language assistance;

Annexations changing jurisdictional boundaries in areas that are racially, ethnically, or linguistically diverse;

Redistricting in areas that are racially, ethnically, or linguistically diverse;

Reducing, consolidating, or relocating polling locations in areas that are racially, ethnically, or linguistically diverse; and

Changes in documentation or requirements to vote or register.

H.R. 4 also:

Allows a federal court to order states or jurisdictions to be covered for results-based violations, where the effect of a particular voting measure is racial discrimination in voting and denying citizens their right to vote;

Increases transparency by requiring reasonable public notice for voting changes;

Allows the attorney general authority to request the presence of federal observers anywhere in the country where there is a serious threat of racial discrimination in voting; and

Revises and tailors the preliminary injunction standard for voting rights actions to recognize that there will be cases where there is a need for immediate preliminary relief.

For over half a century, protecting citizens from racial discrimination in voting has been bipartisan work. The VRA was passed with leadership from both the Republican and Democratic parties, and the reauthorizations of the enforcement provisions were signed into law each time by Republican presidents: President Nixon in 1970, President Ford in 1975, President Reagan in 1982, and President Bush in 2006.

Voting must transcend partisanship. No matter what policy issues we care most about, we get closer to these goals through the ballot box. The integrity of our democracy depends on ensuring that every eligible voter can participate in the electoral process. Passing H.R. 4 would be a giant step toward restoring the right to vote and undoing the damage done by the Supreme Court's *Shelby County* decision. During the civil rights movement, brave Americans gave their lives for the right to vote, and we cannot allow their legacy and the protections they fought for to unravel. We urge Congress to pass this historic legislation.

Sincerely,

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; Advancement Project; American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, African American Ministers In Action; American Association of University Women; American Civil Liberties Union; American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME); American Federation of Teachers; Andrew Goodman Foundation; Anti-Defamation League; Arab American Institute; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—AAJC; Autistic Self Advocacy Network; Bend the Arc: Jewish Action; Blue Future; Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law; Campaign Legal Center.

Connecticut Citizen Action Group; Clean Elections Texas; Communications Workers of America (CWA); Congregation of Our Lady of Charity ofthe Good Shepherd, U.S. Provinces; Democracy 21; Democracy Initiative; Demos; End Citizens United Action Fund; FairVote Action; Fix Democracy First; Franciscan Action Network; Generation Progress; Greenpeace USA; Human Rights Campaign; Our Own Voice: National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda; International Union, United Automobile Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, (UAW).

Jewish Council for Public Affairs; Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Leadership Conference of Women Religious; League of Conservation Voters Education Fund; League of Women Voters of the United States; Main Street Alliance; Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF); National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP); NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.; NALEO Educational Fund; National Action Network; National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd; National Council of Jewish Women; National Disability Rights Network (NDRN); National Education Association.

National Urban League; Native American Rights Fund; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; New American Leaders Action Fund; People Demanding Action; People For the American Way; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Progressive Turnout Project; Public Citizen; Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism; Service Employees International Union (SEIU); Sierra Club; Southern Poverty Law Center Action Fund; Stand Up America; Texas Progressive Action Network; UnidosUS; Union for Reform Judaism; United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; Voices for Progress; YWCA USA.

MALDEF,
December 4, 2019.

Re MALDEF Urges Support of the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019, H.R. 4.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: There is no right more fundamental to our democracy than the right to vote, and for Latino voters and other voters of color, that right is in danger. Following the 2013 *Shelby County* v. *Holder* decision, which effectively ended preclearance review under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA), states and localities moved to implement discriminatory voting practices that would previously have been blocked by the VRA. What we have seen post-*Shelby County* confirms what we have long-known—that voter discrimination lives on. Congress must act to restore the preclearance coverage formula in the VRA, legislation that has long-enjoyed bipartisan support. MALDEF (Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund), the nation's leading Latino legal civil rights organization, urges you to support the Voting Rights Advancement Act (VRAA) of 2019, H.R. 4, to reenact safeguards to protect minority voters from discriminatory voting laws.

The VRA is regarded as one of the most important and effective pieces of civil rights legislation due to its ability to protect voters of color from discriminatory voting practices before they take place. Since its founding, MALDEF has focused on securing equal

voting rights for Latinos, and promoting increased civic engagement and participation within the Latino community, as among its top priorities. MALDEF played a significant role in securing the full protection of the VRA for the Latino community through the 1975 congressional reauthorization of the VRA. Over its now 51–year history, MALDEF has litigated numerous cases under section 2, section 5, and section 203 of the VRA, challenging at-large systems, discriminatory redistricting, ballot access barriers, undue voter registration restrictions, and failure to provide bilingual materials. As the growth of the Latino population expands, our work in voting rights increases as well.

Section 5 of the VRA required states with a history of discrimination in voting to seek pre-approval of voting-related changes from the U.S. Department of Justice or a three-judge panel in Washington, DC. A voting-related change that would have left minority voters worse off than before the change would be blocked. The states and political subdivisions that were required to submit voting-related changes for preclearance were determined by a coverage formula in section 4 of the VRA. The preclearance scheme—an efficient and effective form of alternative dispute resolution—prevented the implementation of voting-related changes that would have denied voters of color a voice in our elections, and it deterred many more restrictions from ever being conceived. The Supreme Court in *Shelby County*—struck down section 4 and called on Congress to enact a new formula better tailored to current history. As a result, currently, states or political subdivisions are no longer required to seek preclearance unless ordered by a federal court.

However, Chief Justice Roberts recognized in the majority opinion in *Shelby County* that, ''voting discrimination still exists; no one doubts that.'' Across the U.S., racial, ethnic, and language-minority communities are rapidly growing—the country's total population is projected to become majority minority by 2044. Many officials in states and local jurisdictions fear losing political power, and the rapid growth of communities of color is often seen as a threat to existing political establishments. Fear provokes those in positions of power to implement changes to dilute the voting power of the perceived threatening minority community. Unfortunately, now that states and local jurisdictions are not required to submit voting-related changes for review, there is no longer a well-kept track record on newly implemented discriminatory practices. Nonetheless, we know, based on our litigation and analysis of voting changes, that states and local jurisdictions are still using discriminatory voting tactics to suppress the political power of minority communities.

Last month, MALDEF, NALEO, and Asian Americans Advancing Justice—AAJC released a new report, *Practice-Based Preclearance: Protecting Against Tactics Persistently Used to Silence Minority Communities' Votes,* detailing the need for forward-looking voting rights legislation that provides protections for emerging minority populations. During the VRA's more than 50–year history, all racial and ethnic populations grew, but the growth of communities of color significantly outpaced nonHispanic whites. While there are states and localities where communities of color have traditionally resided in larger numbers, growing communities of historically underrepresented voters are now emerging in new parts of the U.S. Between 2007 and 2014, five of the ten U.S. counties that experienced the most rapid rates of Latino population growth were in North Dakota or South Dakota, two states whose overall Latino populations still account for less than ten percent of their residents and are dwarfed by Latino communities in states like New Mexico, Texas, and California. It is precisely this rapid growth of different racial or ethnic populations that results in the perception that emerging communities of color are a threat to those in political power.

H.R. 4 includes important protections for these emerging populations in the form of practice-based preclearance, or ''known-practices'' coverage. Known-practices coverage would focus administrative or judicial review narrowly on suspect practices that are most likely to be tainted by discriminatory intent or to have discriminatory effects, as demonstrated by a broad historical record. This coverage would extend to any jurisdiction in the U.S. that is home to a racially, ethnically, and/or linguistically diverse population and that seeks to adopt a covered practice, despite that practice's known likelihood of being discriminatory when used in a diverse population. The known practices that would be required to be pre-approved before adopted in a diverse state or political subdivision include: 1) changes in method of election to add or replace a single-member district with an at-large seat to a governing body, 2) certain redistricting plans where there is significant minority population growth in the previous decade, 3) annexations or deannexations that would significantly alter the composition of the jurisdiction's electorate, 4) certain identification and proof of citizenship requirements, 5) certain polling place closures and realignments, and 6) the withdrawal of multilingual materials and assistance when not matched by the reduction of those services in English. The *Practice-Based Preclearance* report looked at these different types of changes and found, based on two separate analyses of voting discrimination, that these known practices occur with great frequency in the modern era.

Congress must protect access to the polls and pass the VRAA, with known-practice coverage provisions. The VRAA is a critical piece of legislation that will restore voter protections that were lost due to the *Shelby County* decision. We cannot allow another federal election cycle to take place without ensuring that every voter can register and cast a meaningful ballot. MALDEF urges you to stand with all voters and to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 4.

Sincerely,

ANDREA SENTENO,
Regional Counsel.

SEIU,
December 4, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of two million members of the Service Employees International Union (''SEIU''), I am writing to urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act (VRAA), which will proceed to the House floor for a vote on final passage this week.

Following the 2013 Supreme Court decision in Shelby v. Holder, we have seen a surge of voter suppression tactics by states and localities. These shameful tactics include the enactment of strict voter ID laws, the purge of voters from state voter rolls, and the closure of hundreds of polling places that negatively impacts the ability of people of color, immigrants, young people, and other historically marginalized groups from accessing their constitutional right to vote. In 2016 alone, 14 states passed new laws that restricted access to the ballot for hard working Americans and since then multiple federal courts found intentional racial discrimination in our elections. These unjust actions by states and localities to our electoral system must be addressed with urgency to ensure the voices of working people—Black, white & brown—are heard at the ballot box.

H.R. 4 is an essential piece of legislation that will restore critical civil rights protections for voters while providing clear and consistent voting laws for every state to ensure all eligible citizens can participate in our democracy. The VRAA responds to the wave of biased attacks on our election system since the Shelby decision by establishing a ''rolling'' nationwide trigger mechanism so that only states that have a recent record of racial discrimination in voting would be covered. Under the legislation, these states would have to submit any changes in their voting laws to be precleared before implementation. In addition, the VRAA would grant more power to the federal courts to hold accountable states or jurisdictions whose voting practices have discriminatory results. The VRAA is the dire reform of our electoral system that our nation needs in order to restore this fundamental right and make our democracy more accessible to all people.

Our democracy works best when all eligible voters, no matter their color or how much money they make, can participate in free and fair elections to make their voices heard. We need Congress to restore integrity to our election system. On behalf of our members, we are proud to support this legislation to strengthen our democracy and values as a nation. We will add votes on this legislation, including the motion to recommit, to our legislative scorecard.

Sincerely,

MARY KAY HENRY,
International President.

AFSCME,
December 3, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I write in support of the Voting Rights Advancement Act (VRAA, H.R. 4). The VRAA is an important first step to restoring voting rights protections and the Voting Rights Act (VRA) of 1965.

Signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson, the VRA of 1965 was landmark legislation necessary to secure the right to vote for every citizen. It ensured that state and local governments would not deny any American the equal right to vote based on race, color or membership in a minority language group.

The U.S. Supreme Court's 2013 ruling in Shelby County, Alabama v. Holder undermined the VRA, and eliminated the significant requirement for states and localities with a well-documented history of discrimination to ''preclear'' any new changes to voting practices and procedures. As a result, those with a history of voter disenfranchisement would no longer have to get approval from the Department of Justice or a court to show that their laws do not have a discriminatory purpose or effect. The results have been devastating and pose a significant blow to the protections provided in the VRA. In the wake of the decision, over three dozen state legislatures have enacted new onerous restrictions on voter access. These recent actions include onerous voter ID laws, restrictions on early voting, and excessive purges of voter registration lists, all of which subsequently make voting less accessible, less transparent, more difficult, and challenging for many voters.

H.R. 4 is needed to restore fairness. It establishes a new coverage formula based on repeated voting rights violations over the preceding 25 years of a state's political subdivisions. It also responds to nationwide discrimination and requires ''practice-based preclearance'' for known disenfranchisement

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)
Barragán	Craig	Gottheimer
Beatty	Crist	Green, Al (TX)
Bera	Crow	Grijalva
Beyer	Cuellar	Haaland
Bishop (GA)	Cunningham	Harder (CA)
Blumenauer	Davids (KS)	Hastings
Blunt Rochester	Davis (CA)	Hayes
Bonamici	Davis, Danny K.	Heck
Boyle, Brendan F.	Dean	Higgins (NY)
	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 F.	Johnson (TX)
Castor (FL)		Kaptur
Castro (TX)	Engel	Keating
Chu, Judy	Escobar	Kelly (IL)
Cicilline	Eshoo	Kennedy
Cisneros	Espaillat	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
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—188

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

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

García (IL)
McCollum

NOT VOTING—14

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

□ 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 Illinois 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 have 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 nonpartisan issue, and the fact that, in this amendment, they would try to politicize voting rights, we should all—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	Gottheimer
Brindisi	Curtis	Granger
Brooks (AL)	Davidson (OH)	Graves (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Graves (LA)
Buchanan	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)

Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McAdams
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Torres Small (NM)
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—215

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

NOT VOTING—15

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

□ 1231

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 187, answered not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 654]

AYES—228

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

NOES—187

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

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

why is this going on? Is this something that the majority party condones or encouraged or was it a surprise to you as it was to us?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that I don't accept his premise that Mr. SCHIFF or the committee spied on anybody. They do have records, apparently.

The gentleman asked me how deep my knowledge is. And I will tell him, frankly, not very deep. But I do not accept his premise that either Mr. SCHIFF, personally, or the committee spied on people.

They did receive information as a result of subpoenas and discovery with reference to what was going on, what were the facts, but I would have to get greater knowledge of the information to give the gentleman a broader response than that in terms of volume or substance.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I would just ask—because we have expressed a deep concern about this when we found out about it. It wasn't something that was discussed in the hearings, and yet, it shows up in the report. And it seemed to be designed in a way to seek political retribution on people that the chairman might have had disagreements with, which is an abuse of power, if that is what happened.

So the questions are, number one: With the press, that is a serious concern, that the chairman of a committee is using Federal subpoena powers to spy on or seek phone records of members of the press who have a job to do. We might not always agree or like some of the articles they write, but they play an important role in our democracy, and many times they talk to people in candid discussions where they have anonymous sources.

□ 1300

Is the chairman trying to go after anonymous sources of members of the press? How many other Members of Congress is the chairman spying on?

This is unprecedented. I have never seen a chairman of a committee abuse their subpoena power to go after other Members of Congress that they have political disagreements with or members of the press that they have political disagreements with. That is over the line. It is an abuse of power if it is going on.

Whether or not the gentleman is aware of all the details, if there are 3,500 pages, why would there be a necessity for the chairman to secretly be holding 3,500 pages of phone records of people that he is going to then selectively leak out to try to punish his political enemies in a retributive way? That is something we all ought to be concerned about.

We don't know a lot because we haven't been told a lot about it, but if there are 3,500 pages of phone records, I think we ought to know that.

What the chairman's objectives are, I think we ought to know that. How many more members of the press the chairman is spying on, I think we ought to know that, and how many other American citizens. It is a concern.

I would hope the gentleman would work with us, number one, to stop this, to not allow a chairman to abuse his power to go and seek retribution after people he has political disagreements with, whether they are members of the press, Members of Congress, or the legal counsel of people across this country.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, what we do know, by the facts, is that the President abused his power.

The gentleman does not want to speak to that, Madam Speaker. We do know the facts that were testified to in the committee.

The gentleman, like the President, seeks to distract.

I reject out of hand any assertion that either Mr. SCHIFF or the committee spied on anybody. Did they pursue discovery so that they could get the facts and the truth? They did.

I don't know the amount. I am not a member of the committee. I am not a member of the Intelligence Committee. I am not privy to all the information that may be available, but I reject, again, out of hand that either the chairman or the committee spied on people.

The gentleman has been a Member of this body for some period of time, and I am sure he watched what went on with Benghazi. Thousands and thousands and thousands of pages were received by subpoena, with cooperation by the Obama administration. The chairman of the Government Oversight Committee had thousands and thousands and thousands of pages of subpoenaed evidence or information.

But I will, frankly, Madam Speaker, look at this information because I believe it is a very serious and egregious accusation that Mr. SCHIFF or the committee spied on anybody.

They may not like the discovery process. They may not like the information that was complied by the discovery process. They may be upset that it did not absolve the President of the United States from clearly abusing his power as President of the United States for his personal gain. But I have no reason to believe it, and no evidence has been offered, just a bald-faced assertion that somehow, Madam Speaker, Mr. SCHIFF spied on people. I reject that and believe that to be totally without merit.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I would hope that the gentleman would work with us to get to the bottom of this. As the gentleman pointed out, he is not aware of what the chairman is really doing. Neither am I, but I am very concerned about what the chairman has done.

He selectively put in a report the names of members of the press, of Members of Congress whom he has had political disagreements with. He didn't put the names of everybody else in there.

If he has 3,500 pages of reports of phone records of people he has been spying on, he won't share all of those people that he is spying on, but he is selectively going to leak out names of members of the press who have written articles maybe that he disagrees with? That is frightening.

That would be an abuse of power, but we don't know because the chairman won't share the details of what he is up to. But he did selectively put some of that in a report that wasn't even discussed in the hearings.

So, yes, it raises alarms. It raises concerns, and I would hope we get to the bottom of it.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, the gentleman said he was in my position of not having a lot of information, yet he makes conclusions, assertions, and accusations that I believe are not based in fact.

He continues the process argument that the Republicans have made over and over and over and over again. Why? Because they do not want to address the facts of this case, because they do not believe, correctly, that the facts are on their side.

I would hope that we could move on. We will see whether there are any facts to sustain what the Republican whip has asserted. I believe there are not, but I am not going to continue to argue process here.

There will be a time in the relatively near future when we will argue substance, the Constitution, the laws in this country, and our oath of office to protect and defend the Constitution of our country, our national security, and the integrity of our elections.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, we are beyond the process arguments because we are into the details now. The facts have been very clear that the President did not abuse power, that the President did not commit impeachable offenses.

The Mueller report confirmed that, first of all, and then even the witnesses that the Democrats brought forward time and time again were asked, ''Can you name an impeachable offense?'' Not one. ''Can you name bribery?'' which was the new term after the majority party focus-grouped ''quid pro quo'' and realized that wasn't getting them where they wanted to go.

Bribery, they were asked, ''Can you name any cases of bribery?'' Not one. Even the witnesses earlier this week, none of whom had any firsthand knowledge of anything. Why they were there, who knows. But not one of them could name any firsthand account of wrongdoing. So those are facts.

What we do know is that over 100 Democrats in this Chamber voted for impeachment prior to the phone call with President Zelensky, voted for impeachment without any facts because

the objective of many in the majority was to impeach the President just because they didn't agree with the results of the 2016 election, not because there were high crimes and misdemeanors. They still haven't been able to lay out any.

They have innuendo, hopes, and dreams, none of which have come to fruition when the witnesses have come forward.

Basically, the two people who really are most pertinent to this are President Trump and President Zelensky because they were the two who participated in the phone call. Both of them said there was nothing wrong done. In fact, President Zelensky appreciated the phone call from President Trump, thanked him for the help he has given that President Obama didn't give to help them stand up to Russia, and ultimately said there was no pressure. And he got the money for additional aid that he requested. Those are the facts.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman if there is anything else that he had.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, apparently he got $391 million to say he wasn't intimidated.

The witnesses to which the Republican whip referred, 75 percent of those witnesses, three out of four, said they believed that the offenses that were testified to by some members of the White House National Security Council, by an Ambassador, by an Under Secretary to Mr. Pompeo who Mr. Pompeo has said is a very credible individual, they all testified, and based upon that testimony, witnesses concluded, three out of four, that, in fact, they believed the offenses that were discussed were worthy of impeachment.

So, I don't know what hearings the gentleman is listening to, Madam Speaker, but the hearings that I listened to had three out of four constitutional experts saying very emphatically that, in fact, if those facts were true—and, of course, we are not going to try them here.

They are going to be tried in the United States Senate. All we do in this body under the Constitution is see whether or not, effectively—although it doesn't say this—there is probable cause to believe that, in fact, an abuse of power occurred.

The three experts who testified yesterday said it was. One expert said it was not. So 75 percent of the experts who testified and, frankly, literally hundreds and thousands of editorial writers, op-ed writers, citizens of this country have said this is an abuse of power.

The Senate will make that conclusion. They will decide whether or not in the trial phase of this matter. But to indicate that the evidence is not overwhelming that was elicited in the hearings by the Intelligence Committee is simply to see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I guess the gentleman is acknowledging it is a foregone conclusion that they are going to pass impeachment of the President by saying it is going to go to the Senate.

But let's keep in mind, when you talk about three out of the four witnesses from this week, all four of them, first of all, acknowledged that they had absolutely no firsthand knowledge of anything that happened, so they were giving their opinions.

All four of them acknowledged not one of them voted for President Trump, which is their prerogative, but some of them actually testified under oath that they have given money to Democratic candidates for President who were running against President Trump.

They are actively engaged in defeating President Trump, and then we are supposed to expect that they are giving some impartial scholarly assessment of evidence that they have seen, acknowledging they have no firsthand knowledge themselves.

They are incredibly biased because they are campaigning against the President, but you brought them in to try to make it look like they are objective witnesses. I think that came out very clearly, their political bias. I am glad that, at least under oath, they acknowledged that they had a political bias. But even one of the witnesses, all of whom said they voted against the President, said it would be abuse of power of this committee, of your majority, to impeach a President based on him exercising his rights and, frankly, following the law. Part of the law, which the gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the committee, and even the Speaker of the House voted for, requires a President of the United States, prior to sending hard-earned taxpayer money to a foreign country, to ensure that they are rooting out corruption, the platform on which President Zelensky ran.

But the old Reagan doctrine of ''trust but verify'' was in process, where they were verifying that President Zelensky was, in fact, the real deal. We determined that, and we have high confidence that President Zelensky is following through on rooting out corruption.

The money was released prior to the deadline for the money being released. There was no investigation, no announcements, and all these other things.

Let's keep in mind the bias of those witnesses. Ultimately, the people of this country, I think, are deciding this already. But the people of the country are the ones next year who should select the President of the United States, not some people who have said since 2016 that they didn't like that election so they are going to try to impeach the President regardless of facts.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman if he had anything else.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One of the facets of this conversation always is that, I believe, the Republican whip adopts premises that are not supported by the evidence.

Ambassador Sondland, a contributor of $100,000, maybe more, to the Trump campaign in 2016, appointed by President Donald Trump and sent to represent the United States abroad, testified that, in fact, he heard and believed that there was a relationship between releasing the $391 million and having a visit at the White House to confirm the United States' continuing support for Ukraine, our ally and friend, assaulted by Russia, which, of course, Putin is pursuing.

Ambassador Sondland made it very clear that those were the conditions for that money being released. This was not hearsay. This is not Democrats. This is somebody who was a substantial supporter.

Apparently, the whip believes that if you are a supporter of somebody else, you must have a bias. So apparently, Ambassador Sondland either had a bias for or maybe he had a bias against because his testimony is firsthand, not hearsay, and, in fact, his testimony is there was a relationship between that.

Now, what I said, Madam Speaker, is not what the Republican whip attributed to me. What I said was the process, not that we had made any conclusion at this point, that the process is this House, under the Constitution, has the responsibility if it believes, and we will see if the Judiciary Committee concludes that, if it believes that there is probable cause to think that bribery was committed, an abuse of power was committed, a solicitation of a foreign government to participate in America's elections. If it concludes that, then the process is not that we make the decision that, yes, those are the facts. It is to be tried in the United States Senate under our Constitution.

□ 1315

They will then conclude, like a jury in any case in our courts will conclude, whether or not those facts lead to the conclusion that abuse of power was committed.

I just want to make sure the gentleman characterizes what I said. A conclusion has not yet been made. What I said was the facts seem to be pretty clear, however. There does not seem to be much difference.

The President of the United States, himself, gave to us and the public notes of the conversation he had: By the way, ''I would like you to do us a favor.'' That was in the context, Madam Speaker, of the President's withholding $391 million. And, of course, Mr. Mulvaney said that it happens all the time; get over it.

Well, I don't know whether the American public is going to get over it or whether the House or the Senate is going to get over it or not. But that was the attitude of Mr. Mulvaney: Of course we did this. It is always done. Get over it.

We will see what is concluded.

There is one more point I want to make.

The gentleman says that over 100 Democrats voted. Three times—in 2017, in 2018, and in 2019—prior to that July 25 phone call, Articles of Impeachment were filed. Three times, the majority of Democrats voted not to proceed and moved to table those resolutions. Three times a majority of Democrats voted. There was no rush to judgment.

And, very frankly, prior to this July 25 phone call and the whistleblower having the courage to come forward and say to the inspector general, I think this is of concern, and the inspector general making a determination that, yes, this was a serious matter requiring urgent consideration and that being transmitted to here, before that point, there was a Democratic Party that was saying, whatever our personal feelings may be about the election or about this President's operations in office, there was not sufficient evidence on which to move forward.

We were having hearings, and we said, until the facts are such that we feel it is timely and appropriate to move, we would not move.

There was no rush to judgment. 2017, 2018, and 2019 rejected a rush to judgment, a majority of Democrats. I made a couple of motions to table.

So, Madam Speaker, we are now proceeding, as our constitutional responsibility dictates that we do, and we will see what happens. But all this talk about process—and I reject any assertions with respect to Mr. SCHIFF and/or the committee—is to distract.

We will focus on the facts; we will focus on the evidence; and we will focus on what the reasonable conclusions based upon that evidence will be at some point in time in the future if the Judiciary Committee makes that determination that they want to recommend the House considering such action.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, hopefully, we will get to the bottom of whatever Chairman SCHIFF has done with these phone records.

I do want to correct the RECORD. Ambassador Sondland was asked, under oath, in committee: Has anyone on the planet shown any direction between, a link between financial aid and investigations? Anyone on the planet. And under oath, he said no. That is clear. That was on the record. I just want to make that clear.

We are going to litigate this. We are going to debate this for hours and hours.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, what he said was he thought there was, in fact, a quid pro quo.

Of course, as the gentleman points out, he had a bias: a substantial contributor to Mr. Trump, appointed by Mr. Trump as Ambassador to the European Union.

His response to that question was—I would suggest if there was a bias from these witnesses that testified yesterday, simply because they support him, the same would apply to Mr. Sondland. But when asked whether or not there was a quid pro quo, his answer was yes.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, when asked under oath whether or not he had any evidence of any link between investigations and money, he said no.

And the bottom line is President Zelensky got the money. The quid pro quo that was being alleged didn't happen. President Zelensky got the money. There were no investigations.

But this will continue anyway, and, clearly, over 100 Members had made up their mind prior to the phone call.

I know we are going to continue this debate over the next weeks. Hopefully, we get beyond it and deal with other issues.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2019, TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

SENATE INACTION

(Ms. OMAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remind our constituents of the work that we have been doing on their behalf. The House of Representatives has passed nearly 400 bills this Congress for the people.

For our Dreamers and TPS recipients, we passed an immigration reform bill, the American Dream and Promise Act.

For our workers, we passed the Raise the Minimum Wage Act, to increase the Federal minimum wage to $15 an hour, and the Butch Lewis Act, to protect the pensions of more than 1 million workers and retirees.

For the personal and financial security of America's women, we passed a strong reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

For our elections, we passed H.R. 1, which restores transparency and accountability to our elections, which included my own legislation to restrict foreign lobbying.

To strengthen our defenses against foreign attacks, we also passed the SAFE Act and the SHIELD Act.

And for our LGBTQ community, we passed the Equality Act.

All of these bills have been ignored. MITCH MCCONNELL brags about being the grim reaper, and that is exactly what he has been for the hopes and the dreams of the American people.

I would like to call for us to remind every single American of the work that we have been doing.

HONORING JO MARIE BANKSTON

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor the life of Jo Marie Bankston, the first woman police officer to serve the people of Houston, Texas.

The year was 1955, 7 years before I was born, when Jo Marie—or Fena, as she was called by her friends and family—graduated in the first Houston Police Department class to include women. At that time, the mere idea of a woman police officer was something very few could imagine, much less pursue.

Fena paved the way for new female recruits through the 1950s and 1960s, ushering in a new era of strength and passion.

Fena passed away, sadly, last week, on Thanksgiving Day. She leaves behind a pioneering legacy of protecting and serving the Houston community. She also left behind a loving family, including her son, Jimmy, who carries out her spirit as a veteran of the HPD and as a current U.S. marshal.

Jo Marie inspired so many—some she knew and many more that she never knew. She made history in her own humble way.

May she enjoy fair winds and following seas in Heaven.

12 DAYS OF SALT

(Ms. SHERRILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, on this third day of SALT, my constituents have said to me that they think the holiday season is the perfect time to eliminate the SALT marriage penalty.

The 2017 tax law violated more than 100 years of Federal tax policy, capping the State and local tax deduction at $10,000. That means married couples filing jointly are constrained to the same $10,000 level that applies to individual filers.

This penalizes tens of thousands of couples in my district. In Morris County alone, there were more than 52,000 middle-class joint filers in 2016, and well over half were above the $10,000 cap. They are now likely subject to a marriage penalty simply for filing their taxes jointly.

I am a member of the SALT task force, and my bipartisan bill, the SALT

Relief and Marriage Penalty Elimination Act, should be the basis for righting this wrong done to families. It will raise the SALT deduction across the board and restore incentives for charitable giving and homeownership.

ONE VOTE, ONE PERSON

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise to again indicate the enormity of what we accomplished today in voting for H.R. 4.

It seems like H.R. 4 has been the center point of giving opportunity to so many across the Nation. That is a bill to give every American one vote, one person.

It was derailed in the Shelby case from Alabama, misguided by a 5–4 decision by the Supreme Court, ignoring the sacrifice of our colleague, the Honorable JOHN LEWIS, who almost died on the Edmund Pettus Bridge, brutally attacked by State and local police. That is the same as local laws and State laws continuing into the decade to oppress voters.

I indicated in that case, that 5–4 decision, that wrongheaded decision, that H.R. 4 corrects, that it was as if we were getting the best of polio and we said we no longer need the vaccine.

I have lived through the question of purging, along with my friends from MALDEF and the NAACP legal defense fund, and I worked hard to get language into H.R. 4 that would stop people being purged illegally off the polls, off the rolls.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from MALDEF and a letter from The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.

MALDEF,
Los Angeles, CA, December 4, 2019.

Re MALDEF Urges Support of the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019, H.R. 4.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: There is no right more fundamental to our democracy than the right to vote, and for Latino voters and other voters of color, that right is in danger. Following the 2013 *Shelby County v. Holder* decision, which effectively ended preclearance review under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA), states and localities moved to implement discriminatory voting practices that would previously have been blocked by the VRA. What we have seen post-*Shelby County* confirms what we have long-known—that voter discrimination lives on. Congress must act to restore the preclearance coverage formula in the VRA, legislation that has long-enjoyed bipartisan support. MALDEF (Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund), the nation's leading Latino legal civil rights organization, urges you to support the Voting Rights Advancement Act (VRAA) of 2019, H.R. 4, to reenact safeguards to protect minority voters from discriminatory voting laws.

The VRA is regarded as one of the most important and effective pieces of civil rights legislation due to its ability to protect voters of color from discriminatory voting practices before they take place. Since its founding, MALDEF has focused on securing equal voting rights for Latinos, and promoting increased civic engagement and participation within the Latino community, as among its top priorities. MALDEF played a significant role in securing the full protection of the VRA for the Latino community through the 1975 congressional reauthorization of the VRA. Over its now 51–year history, MALDEF has litigated numerous cases under section 2, section 5, and section 203 of the VRA, challenging at-large systems, discriminatory redistricting, ballot access barriers, undue voter registration restrictions, and failure to provide bilingual materials. As the growth of the Latino population expands, our work in voting rights increases as well.

Section 5 of the VRA required states with a history of discrimination in voting to seek pre-approval of voting-related changes from the U.S. Department of Justice or a three-judge panel in Washington, DC. A voting-related change that would have left minority voters worse off than before the change would be blocked. The states and political subdivisions that were required to submit voting-related changes for preclearance were determined by a coverage formula in section 4 of the VRA. The preclearance scheme—an efficient and effective form of alternative dispute resolution—prevented the implementation of voting-related changes that would have denied voters of color a voice in our elections, and it deterred many more restrictions from ever being conceived. The Supreme Court in *Shelby County* struck down section 4 and called on Congress to enact a new formula better tailored to current history. As a result, currently, states or political subdivisions are no longer required to seek preclearance unless ordered by a federal court.

However, Chief Justice Roberts recognized in the majority opinion in *Shelby County* that, ''voting discrimination still exists; no one doubts that.'' Across the U.S., racial, ethnic, and language-minority communities are rapidly growing—the country's total population is projected to become majority-minority by 2044. Many officials in states and local jurisdictions fear losing political power, and the rapid growth of communities of color is often seen as a threat to existing political establishments. Fear provokes those in positions of power to implement changes to dilute the voting power of the perceived threatening minority community. Unfortunately, now that states and local jurisdictions are not required to submit voting-related changes for review, there is no longer a well-kept track record on newly-implemented discriminatory practices. Nonetheless, we know, based on our litigation and analysis of voting changes, that states and local jurisdictions are still using discriminatory voting tactics to suppress the political power of minority communities.

Last month, MALDEF, NALEO, and Asian Americans Advancing Justice—AAJC released a new report, *Practice-Based Preclearance: Protecting Against Tactics Persistently Used to Silence Minority Communities' Votes,* detailing the need for forward-looking voting rights legislation that provides protections for emerging minority populations. During the VRA's more than 50-year history, all racial and ethnic populations grew, but the growth of communities of color significantly outpaced nonHispanic whites. While there are states and localities where communities of color have traditionally resided in larger numbers, growing communities of historically underrepresented voters are now emerging in new parts of the U.S. Between 2007 and 2014, five of the ten U.S. counties that experienced the most rapid rates of Latino population growth were in North Dakota or South Dakota, two states whose overall Latino populations still account for less than ten percent of their residents and are dwarfed by Latino communities in states like New Mexico, Texas, and California. It is precisely this rapid growth of different racial or ethnic populations that results in the perception that emerging communities of color are a threat to those in political power.

H.R. 4 includes important protections for these emerging populations in the form of practice-based preclearance, or ''known-practices'' coverage. Known-practices coverage would focus administrative or judicial review narrowly on suspect practices that are most likely to be tainted by discriminatory intent or to have discriminatory effects, as demonstrated by a broad historical record. This coverage would extend to any jurisdiction in the U.S. that is home to a racially, ethnically, and/or linguistically diverse population and that seeks to adopt a covered practice, despite that practice's known likelihood of being discriminatory when used in a diverse population. The known practices that would be required to be pre-approved before adopted in a diverse state or political subdivision include: 1) changes in method of election to add or replace a single-member district with an at-large seat to a governing body, 2) certain redistricting plans where there is significant minority population growth in the previous decade, 3) annexations or deannexations that would significantly alter the composition of the jurisdiction's electorate, 4) certain identification and proof of citizenship requirements, 5) certain polling place closures and realignments, and 6) the withdrawal of multilingual materials and assistance when not matched by the reduction of those services in English. *The Practice-Based Preclearance* report looked at these different types of changes and found, based on two separate analyses of voting discrimination, that these known practices occur with great frequency in the modem era.

Congress must protect access to the polls and pass the VRAA, with known-practice coverage provisions. The VRAA is a critical piece of legislation that will restore voter protections that were lost due to the *Shelby County* decision. We cannot allow another federal election cycle to take place without ensuring that every voter can register and cast a meaningful ballot. MALDEF urges you to stand with all voters and to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 4.

Please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

ANDREA SENTENO,
Regional Counsel.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
December 4, 2019.

SUPPORT H.R. 4, VOTING RIGHTS AND ADVANCEMENT ACT

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, a coalition of more than 200 national organizations committed to promoting and protecting the civil and human rights of all persons in the United States, and the 68 undersigned organizations, we write in strong support of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act. We oppose any Motion to Recommit.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA) is one of the most successful civil rights laws ever enacted. Congress passed the VRA in direct response to evidence of significant and pervasive discrimination across the country, including the use of literacy tests, poll taxes, intimidation, threats, and violence. By outlawing the tests and devices that prevented

people of color from voting, the VRA and its prophylactic preclearance formula put teeth into the 15th Amendment's guarantee that no citizen can be denied the right to vote because of the color of their skin.

H.R. 4 has received vocal and vigorous support from the civil rights community because it responds to the urgent need to stop the abuses by state and local governments in the aftermath of the Supreme Court's infamous 2013 decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, when five justices of the Supreme Court invalidated the VRA's preclearance provision. In its decision, the Court stated: ''Our country has changed, and while any racial discrimination in voting is too much, Congress must ensure that the legislation it passes to remedy that problem speaks to current conditions.''

Since *Shelby County*, discriminatory policies have proliferated nationwide and continued in areas formerly covered by the preclearance requirement. In states, counties, and cities across the country, public officials have pushed through laws and policies designed to make it harder for many communities to vote. While we have celebrated successful legal challenges to discriminatory voter ID laws in Texas and North Carolina, such victories occurred only after elections in those states were tainted by discrimination. Lost votes cannot be reclaimed and discriminatory elections cannot be undone.

But voter suppression is not merely the province of those states with a long history of discrimination. Pernicious practices such as voter purging and restrictive identification requirements—which disproportionately affect voters of color—occur in states throughout the nation. Although progress has been made, some elected leaders in this country are still working to silence people who were historically denied access to the ballot box.

During the 116th Congress, the U.S. House Committee on the Judiciary held extensive hearings and found significant evidence that barriers to voter participation remain for people of color and language-minority voters in African-American, Asian American, Latinx, and Native American communities. The hearings examined the History and Enforcement of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (March 12, 2019), Enforcement of the Voting Rights Act in the State of Texas (May 3, 2019), Continuing Challenges to the Voting Rights Act Since *Shelby County v. Holder* (June 25, 2019), Discriminatory Barriers to Voting (September 5, 2019), Evidence of Current and Ongoing Voting Discrimination (September 10, 2019), Congressional Authority to Protect Voting Rights After *Shelby County v. Holder* (September 24, 2019), and Legislative Proposals to Strengthen the Voting Rights Act (October 17, 2019). The Committee on House Administration also conducted numerous hearings and amassed significant evidence of voter suppression during the 116th Congress.

H.R. 4 restores and modernizes the Voting Rights Act by:

Creating a new coverage formula that hinges on a finding of repeated voting rights violations in the preceding 25 years.

Significantly, the 25-year period is measured on a rolling basis to keep up with ''current conditions,'' so only states and political subdivisions that have a recent record of racial discrimination in voting are covered.

States and political subdivisions that qualify for preclearance will be covered for a period of 10 years, but if they establish a clean record during that time period, they can be extracted from coverage.

Establishing ''practice-based preclearance,'' a targeted process for reviewing voting changes in jurisdictions nationwide focused on measures that have historically been used to discriminate against voters of color. The process for reviewing changes in voting is limited to a set of practices, including:

Changes to the methods of elections (to or from at-large elections) in areas that are racially, ethnically, or linguistically diverse;

Reductions in language assistance;

Annexations changing jurisdictional boundaries in areas that are racially, ethnically, or linguistically diverse;

Redistricting in areas that are racially, ethnically, or linguistically diverse;

Reducing, consolidating, or relocating polling locations in areas that are racially, ethnically, or linguistically diverse; and

Changes in documentation or requirements to vote or register.

H.R. 4 also:

Allows a federal court to order states or jurisdictions to be covered for results-based violations, where the effect of a particular voting measure is racial discrimination in voting and denying citizens their right to vote;

Increases transparency by requiring reasonable public notice for voting changes;

Allows the attorney general authority to request the presence of federal observers anywhere in the country where there is a serious threat of racial discrimination in voting; and

Revises and tailors the preliminary injunction standard for voting rights actions to recognize that there will be cases where there is a need for immediate preliminary relief.

For over half a century, protecting citizens from racial discrimination in voting has been bipartisan work. The VRA was passed with leadership from both the Republican and Democratic parties, and the reauthorizations of the enforcement provisions were signed into law each time by Republican presidents: President Nixon in 1970, President Ford in 1975, President Reagan in 1982, and President Bush in 2006.

Voting must transcend partisanship. No matter what policy issues we care most about, we get closer to these goals through the ballot box. The integrity of our democracy depends on ensuring that every eligible voter can participate in the electoral process. Passing H.R. 4 would be a giant step toward restoring the right to vote and undoing the damage done by the Supreme Court's *Shelby County* decision. During the civil rights movement, brave Americans gave their lives for the right to vote, and we cannot allow their legacy and the protections they fought for to unravel. We urge Congress to pass this historic legislation.

Sincerely,

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; Advancement Project; American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; African American Ministers In Action; American Association of University Women; American Civil Liberties Union; American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME); American Federation of Teachers; Andrew Goodman Foundation; Anti-Defamation League.

Arab American Institute; Asian Americans Advancing Justice—AAJC; Autistic Self Advocacy Network; Bend the Arc: Jewish Action; Blue Future; Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law; Campaign Legal Center; Connecticut Citizen Action Group; Clean Elections Texas; Communications Workers of America (CWA).

Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, U.S. Provinces Democracy; 21; Democracy Initiative; Demos; End Citizens United Action Fund; FairVote Action; Fix Democracy First; Franciscan Action Network; Generation Progress; Greenpeace USA.

Human Rights Campaign; In Our Own Voice: National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda; International Union, United Automobile Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, (UAW); Jewish Council for Public Affairs; Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Leadership Conference of Women Religious; League of Conservation Voters Education Fund; League of Women Voters of the United States.

Main Street Alliance; Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF); National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP); NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.; NALEO Educational Fund; National Action Network; National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd; National Council of Jewish Women; National Disability Rights Network (NDRN); National Education Association.

National Urban League; Native American Rights Fund; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; New American Leaders Action Fund; People Demanding Action; People For the American Way; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Progressive Turnout Project; Public Citizen; Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism.

Service Employees International Union (SEIU); Sierra Club; Southern Poverty Law Center Action Fund; Stand Up America; Texas Progressive Action Network; UnidosUS; Union for Reform Judaism; United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; Voices for Progress; YWCA USA.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, now we have a recognition, that one vote, one person, we will fight to get this signed by the President because the Constitution allows and declares one vote, one person.

TRIBUTE TO MINNESOTA NATIONAL GUARD SOLDIERS

(Ms. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart today that I rise to pay tribute to three brave soldiers from the Minnesota National Guard who lost their lives yesterday in a helicopter accident.

To the families and friends who have lost loved ones, this is a terrible, terrible tragedy.

Their loved ones answered the call to serve the Minnesota National Guard. Those who answer that call do so because they are committed to making our Nation safer and stronger. They defend our Nation abroad, and they serve their friends and family at home by digging us out of snowstorms and shielding us from rising floodwaters.

We recognize that their loved ones were not just citizen soldiers; they were cherished members of their family.

To the Minnesota National Guard who have lost a fellow servicemember, Governor Walz, the congressional delegation, the whole State of Minnesota, and our Nation stand with them at this time of great sadness.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to keep these citizen soldiers and their families in our thoughts.

□ 1330

CIVIL RIGHTS

(Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, today I rise to mark a historic moment for our democracy as the House passed the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

Today, more than 50 years after the original Voting Rights Act was passed into law, the right to be heard at the ballot box is under threat.

The VRAA defends our right to vote with provisions that increase election oversight, strengthen transparency in voting changes, and ensure that the fundamental principle of one person, one vote is intact.

As an Oklahoman, I am truly honored to stand here today to honor the history of a city as well as individuals with strong civil rights histories.

Just over 61 years ago in Oklahoma City, Clara Luper led a group of 13 children at the first sit-in in the Nation at the Katz Drugstore that integrated the first lunch counter, to be followed by much more.

Without Clara and those 13 children and without all of those who came before us, we wouldn't be here today recognizing the passage of the VRAA.

We have more work to do, but as we celebrate today's legislation, we should give thanks to the foot soldiers and those who came before who have laid the foundation and acknowledged the work we have yet to do.

HIGHER EDUCATION

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

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, I am honored to represent the University of California at San Diego, which is one of the leading research universities in the Nation.

As I have worked with my friends on the Education and Labor Committee to reauthorize the Higher Education Act, I have kept all the incredible students at UCSD in mind. I am especially proud of our work to improve access for graduate students and ease their financial burden.

Graduate students are the backbone of research universities, teaching and mentoring undergraduates, performing groundbreaking research, and innovating the solutions for 21st century problems. Unfortunately, many of those same students have crippling student loan debt.

That is why I am so glad that the College Affordability Act recreates the Federal Perkins Loan Program and strengthens the Pell Grant Program to better address the needs of our undergraduate and graduate students.

While there is much more that we need to do to support students, I am proud to cosponsor the College Affordability Act and will continue to work with my colleagues to improve outcomes for our students.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I have been reminded again this week in conversations with some friends across the aisle that there are some people in here with whom I have extremely different views. But I know them, they have got good hearts, and they want to do the right thing; we just disagree on what that is.

There was a lot said today in the debate over the Voting Rights Act change. Some have tried to say and have just been mistaken—I don't think they were intentionally trying to misrepresent anything—but what we voted on today was not a reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act. The Voting Rights Act has been in effect, and it is still in effect.

But going back to the previous reauthorization that came through the Judiciary Committee I am on, it became clear that between the Republican and Democrat leaders in Judiciary, there was an agreement, and they weren't going to allow changes to their agreement. I pointed out to both of them back at the time: You have a provision in here that is reauthorized that will punish States for sins committed by grandparents—in some cases great-grandparents—that happened decades before, in many cases decades before some were born who were there. This is not supposed to be a country where we intentionally punish the children and grandchildren of somebody who committed an offense.

It was wrongdoing in preventing people from voting, and the Voting Rights Act addressed that. But it was reauthorized more than once, continuing to punish the same States that have been found to be lacking, and the data we had at the previous reauthorization showed clearly there were places in some districts, in places like New York, Wisconsin, and California, where the voting disparity and racial disparity was worse than in the States that were still being punished.

I know some say: Well, it is not a punishment for the Federal Government to say you are not trustworthy and so you don't get to be in charge of your elections; we have to approve every single thing you do.

That is an extraordinary and basically unconstitutional action by the Federal Government that has been deemed to be constitutional, but only until such time as the States that were offending have corrected the situation.

I know there was one newspaper in my district that reported I was against the voting rights reauthorization. When I provided them a copy of my transcript from the reporters, the stenographers here, exactly as it was and they read what I actually said, instead of taking talking points from the left-wing alt-left media, the editor at the time—I know from things she had said, she apparently was a Democrat—but she was an honorable person, and they printed a correction and corrected what they had said.

I was in favor of the voting rights reauthorization, but not to continue to punish States that were not in violation and hadn't been for decades. So, in fact, my amendment would have required the punitive parts of the Voting Rights Act to apply to any State in the Union that was found to be in violation of the constitutional protections on voting.

I pointed out to the Republican leader at the time and the Democratic leader, John Conyers.

And actually, John Conyers was more open to making the change. He said: Well, you made a good point. Let me talk to some of our lawyers about it.

The Republican leader said: Absolutely not. We are not changing anything at all.

I said: But this is going to be struck down. There are some things we don't really know. This is one that is going to be struck down. Why risk the court just striking the whole thing down? If you allow my amendment, it will be constitutional, it won't any of it be struck down.

The Republican leader at the time said: Absolutely not.

Mr. Conyers came back to me later and said: I have talked to our lawyers, and they say you do make a good point, but since we have an agreement on it, it is just easier if we go forward, and if they strike something down, they strike it down.

The Supreme Court came back and did just what I said they would do. They struck down an unconstitutional part that I had tried to amend and make it constitutional.

But that is where we are. This today does not reauthorize the Voting Rights Act.

It is interesting hearing comments from folks across the aisle about why this is so important that we don't disenfranchise votes. If you look at what the activity is, and even saying: Oh, there are 17 million people who have been disenfranchised because they are no longer allowed to vote.

Despite what some who make comments online might say, I am not stupid. I have won awards at every school I have been in. But I know that traditionally dead people who vote, vote Democrat. That has just been the way it is. Republicans have had a very difficult time getting dead people to vote Republican.

William F. Buckley talked about an uncle he had had who voted Republican his whole life until the year after he

died, and then he started voting Democrat. He said he wasn't kidding, and that it actually happened there in Texas. Sometimes we kid about it.

Lyndon Johnson, according to David Brinkley, told a story back in the sixties to reporters about how when he was running for Congress that he and his campaign manager were going through the cemetery writing down names of people they needed to have vote the next day, and they got to one tombstone and you couldn't read the name. There was moss and all this stuff on it. So the campaign manager said: Come on, Lyndon, let's go to the next tombstone. Johnson said: I grabbed him, and I told him, no, sir, this man has every bit a right to vote as anybody else in this cemetery. It was funny, and people laughed.

But people who knew about the discrepancies in Duval County and the Dukes of Duval and voting irregularities, the investigation, and the courthouse burning with the records, those kinds of things were what got reported, and Johnson was able to get a good joke out of it. But, nonetheless, it is still true. If you find somebody who is dead who has voted, normally they voted Democrat.

So I hope that my friends will understand. Some of the people they are talking about being disenfranchised by what Republicans want to do to fix election law, it will disenfranchise the dead who are continuing to vote. Their vote will not be allowed to count as it did when they were alive.

We also have had millions reported to have voted who were in this country illegally or voting more than once or were registered more than one place.

My friend, John Fund, used to be a writer with The Wall Street Journal. John had a fantastic book on voting fraud, and I have heard him say to me: Do you know that the biggest fraud about elections is the statement that there is no election fraud today?

So this Voting Rights Act amendment that was voted on by the House today is yet another effort for the Federal Government to ignore the Constitution and ignore the mandate that elections are to be controlled locally, and that is according to the 10th Amendment, not just reserved to the States and people it specifically talked about.

Exceptions have been made over the years that allow the Federal Government to have some say, and that was the case because of abuses and people who were prevented from voting. So I am surprised that we have colleagues here who don't want the dead people to be disenfranchised, whose names have been taken off rolls in areas where Republicans are trying to update the voting rolls. I understand my colleagues are not stupid either. They know that dead people vote more for Democrats than Republicans. So I get it, and why they would want to keep them voting. But it is something that needs to be done.

□ 1345

The other vote we had today regarding Israeli-Palestinian two-nation peace, peace with two independent states, I couldn't vote for that. I pray for the peace of Israel, but I couldn't vote for that, a two-state solution being rammed down the throat of the one of the parties that doesn't want to totally destroy those who want to totally destroy them.

I mean, we send money over to the Palestinians still. One of the things that President Trump has been wanting to do—he agreed with me once when I pointed it out—we don't have to pay people to hate us. They will do it for free.

There is corruption in different places around the world, and especially, there has been in Ukraine. I was glad that President Trump was doing something about it. Obviously, President Obama didn't do anything about it, and we have a huge effort now from our friends across the aisle that want to stop the reform and the elimination of corruption in Ukraine that President Trump was trying to undertake.

Apparently, Ukraine has been quite helpful to our friends across the aisle. Obviously, in the last Presidential campaign, plenty of information indicates they were trying to help Hillary Clinton. That is why it was reported that after the election, they realized: Well, gee, since we were trying to help Hillary Clinton, maybe we better try to warm up to Donald Trump.

But when it comes to Israel, an effort to push through a two-state solution forcing Israel to sign an agreement or an effort to try to push them to sign an agreement with the Palestinians, while the Palestinians in response to each bilateral and unilateral effort that Israel has made to reach out with an olive branch, to try to bring about an effort at peace, they have been slapped down.

As a result of those efforts at peace, Israelis have died; places have been destroyed; and Israelis live in fear. All you have to do is go to southern Israel to find out, because they are coming every day these rockets get fired.

They are not that accurate on where they hit, so nobody can be sure they won't hit them, their homes. Their homes there have to have a safe place within there so that when the warning comes, which may only be seconds before the rocket hits, you have to grab your kids and head for the safe room and hope that you aren't killed.

I heard from one mother once when I was over there. The rockets were flying from the strip that Israel had unilaterally given as a show of peace, an effort to reach out unilaterally, asking nothing in return. I thought it was a huge mistake, but they did it. As a result, rockets fly every day.

But this lady was saying she had her little son in the car, and the warning sounded, the siren. She didn't have time to get her child to a safe place, so she laid on top of him in the car seat, put him down on the car seat and laid on top of him.

When the rockets hit far enough away that it was not a threat to them, and the rockets stopped temporarily, and she sat up, her son cried and said: Mama, if you are going to die, I don't want to keep living. Don't do that to me again. I want to be with you wherever you are.

This kind of stuff gets played out day-after-day in Israel because the Palestinians want to wipe them off the map. They don't want any Jews between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea, and they make that very clear: We want to wipe them out.

They never agreed to back off that position. It is pretty clear that no matter what kind of agreement you have, when you are still teaching children in your schools, which received money from the United States, that Jews are vermin and rats and need to be wiped out—the same kind of things the Nazis were saying and printing, they print them, say them, teach them.

We are going to want to do them favors, send them more money while they use money themselves to teach that kind of hatred?

I was mentioning to my friend LEE ZELDIN earlier today that if the Democrats who were pushing through this demand for a two-state solution were successful, then they could historically stand with Neville Chamberlain and say, as he did, that this two-state solution means peace in our time, when actually it would just be a precursor to the killing of millions of Jews.

We don't need a two-state solution where one of those states is still intent on wiping Israel off the map. It made no sense, and the people on this side of the aisle, most everybody, I think, voted against it, not that they were against peace in the Middle East.

We also heard yesterday—actually, Wednesday, yesterday, today—a lot made about a comment by President Trump when he was talking about whether he would fire Mr. Mueller, Robert Mueller, as special counsel. This article by Charlie Spiering, 6 December, points out what the President said: ''Look, Article II, I would be allowed to fire Robert Mueller. Assuming I did all of the things, I said I want to fire him. Number one, I didn't. He wasn't fired. Very importantly, but more importantly, Article II allows me to do whatever I want. Article II would allow me to fire him. I wasn't going to fire him. You know why? Because I watched Richard Nixon firing everybody, and that didn't work out too well.''

That is the context the President was talking about. Yes, he is exactly right. He had the authority to fire Robert Mueller. I encouraged him not to fire him, just appoint a special prosecutor to investigate Bob Mueller. Why in the world would he hire nothing but people who hated him?

He said: Could I do that?

I said: Yes.

The authority of the Attorney General to hire and fire a special prosecutor comes from the President. It is his power. He could do it if he wants to.

He is exactly right that Article II would allow him to fire Mueller, which he never did. So when the Speaker takes that quote, ''I can do whatever I want,'' when he is talking about whether or not he were to fire Robert Mueller and try to apply that to this is why we have to remove him from office, that is such a dangerous, dangerous direction to go.

It is why I was so saddened to hear that our Speaker wants to now move forward with Articles of Impeachment.

As Jonathan Turley testified before us Wednesday, this bar is so low. Historically speaking, when a governing document like our Constitution is degenerated to this point, you don't normally come back from that.

What you could expect historically, if my friends do as they say they are going to do, they are going to vote to impeach President Trump. He hasn't committed any crime. He has tweeted out some offensive tweets, but to have a bar this low and try to, for the first time in American history, remove a duly elected President, then any President, regardless of party, in the future can expect that when the opposition party controls the House, they will spend 2 to 4 years, however long the opposing party is in power, fighting impeachment. That is what this will do for the future.

I know some of our Democratic colleagues have seen before that they can attack Republicans. They can be unfair. They can encourage people to be unfair to Republicans.

Republicans will not want to treat others the way they got treated when it was so unfair. I can't help but wonder if people think: We can do this to them, and they won't do it to a Democratic President.

There are people who were often pointing out to me bases for President Obama to be impeached. Going back to Fast and Furious, all kinds of things that we should have been investigating. But at the time, we had a Speaker who didn't want to go to court and get court orders in order to get the documents that were demanded. So we had a show vote to hold in contempt, but it was meaningless unless we went to court and had it enforced by a court order, as Jonathan Turley was saying, is the right of the Congress or the President to do.

If the Congress or the President does that, it is not an impeachable offense for the Member of Congress or the President. It is a constitutional right. Once the court orders that it has to be produced or orders that it does not have to be produced, then if the President or the Congress says they are not going to abide by the court order, then that gets into an area that you may want to look at impeachment, but that is not what has happened here. But it is what the next couple weeks' actions may lead us to.

It is unfortunate that the President's comments were taken out of context in whether or not he had the power to fire Mueller. He was right that he did. Article II gives him that power. Then to say he thinks he can do anything he wants to do, well, no. If he thought he could do anything he wanted to do, if he was a monarch, then he would just say he is going to take all the money and shut down the Department of Education totally and divert all that money to securing our border, protecting American citizens, as he wants to do. He has made it very clear.

Instead, he can take only some money here that is, under the law, open enough that it could be used for the purpose of building a wall. Otherwise, he would have a wall all built by now.

But he knows he is not a monarch. So it is a pretty outrageous thing to say.

But when it comes to going to court, Daniel Huff, a smart lawyer who used to be at the Committee on the Judiciary here, had an article published in The Wall Street Journal. The Supreme Court last week blocked a House committee subpoena for 8 years' worth of President Trump's tax returns. The committee will press the matter in further litigation, but the logic that supports the subpoena undercuts House Democrats' effort to impeach Mr. Trump for asking Ukraine to investigate Joe Biden.

In both cases, the use of official power to get dirt on a political rival is consistent with a broader, valid, official purpose, and that is to try to fight corruption. So Daniel Huff makes a great point in that editorial that he wrote.

What we were dealing with in the Committee on the Judiciary on Wednesday, if we are really going to examine a report—and I found out there is a hearing Monday morning at 9:00 a.m.

I asked who the witnesses are. Well, we don't know yet. What are we going to be taking up? Well, we don't know yet.

Well, you are trying to destroy the Presidency, remove a man out of office. Something so serious that the Founders would say this is something that rises to the level—it needs to be treasonous. It has to be really serious.

□ 1400

Under the Constitution itself, it makes very clear you cannot convict someone of treason under this Constitution, Federal court, unless you have the direct testimony of two witnesses. All they had was hearsay on hearsay on hearsay.

They can't try President Trump for something like treason because they don't have two direct witnesses. So much of what they brought would never be allowed or admitted into court.

We deserve to hear from former members of the Obama administration who were holdovers. I know that Mr. McMaster made a comment that he didn't want to hear any more of his employees at the National Security Council ever mention the word ''holdover,'' that just because somebody was hired by the Obama administration and Trump hadn't gotten rid of them yet didn't mean they were holdovers, that they are government employees.

Well, no. They were holdovers, and he should have never been in the position he was. He spent his time trying to undermine the President the best he could.

As of March of this year, our own Speaker said impeachment must be compelling and overwhelmingly bipartisan. She is violating her own statement if she has this go forward next week.

In 1998, our own Judiciary Chairman NADLER said there must never be a narrowly voted impeachment supported by one of our major political parties and opposed by the other. Such would produce divisiveness in our politics and will call into question the very legitimacy of our political institutions.

You know what? JERRY NADLER was exactly right when he said that. If they go through with this in the next 2 weeks or in January—whenever—it is going to do exactly what he said, which is what Professor Jonathan Turley said. It is going to produce even more divisiveness in this country and will call into question the very legitimacy of our political institutions.

It absolutely will. He was right back then. I don't know what has happened since 1998 when he was so acutely aware of the Constitution and the ramifications of actions like they are taking now, but this is where we are.

Some of us were encouraged to file impeachment on President Obama, and some were angry that I wouldn't file for impeachment of President Obama. But I cared so deeply about this country, and I knew that if we had impeachment proceedings on President Obama, no matter what he did, this country would be so divided that it would never recover. Of course, we became much more divided during those years.

Somebody asked me: When President Obama was in office, did you ever have any positive thoughts about him being President?

I said: When he was elected, I didn't vote for him, but I thought, you know what? He could end up being like Coach Williams was to us back where I grew up. Coach Williams was my favorite coach. He happened to be Black, and I loved the guy. He was such a great coach.

But he brought us all together as a team. We had a few good athletes, but most were like me. I was a quarterback and captain on the team at the time, and he brought us together. He treated everybody tough, but he treated everybody the same.

We came together as a team, and we had an extremely winning team. We didn't win every game. We nearly did. But he was a great coach.

I didn't mention to the reporter that I was quarterback, but I said that I hoped that President Obama would bring us together as a Nation the way Coach Williams did as a team. I didn't say what sport, what position I played.

So, the first story I see about my comment from some big liberal was how I said my high school basketball coach was my favorite coach. Apparently, if you are a liberal like that reporter was, you just assume, well, if he was a Black coach, it must have been basketball. I didn't say basketball or football. She just assumed it. I found that rather ironic.

One of my great joys last year: I was asked to come to speak to my old alma mater high school to try to fire them up before the game. Somebody told me Coach Williams was up in the press box, so I went up there. Arms flew open by both of us. He is just a good man, just a good man. He was a great coach, and I treasure the times I got to play with him.

But that hasn't happened here. The country got more divided.

But Sharyl Attkisson had a good account. This was November 25 and updated November 30. Some of the things she pointed out was Mueller, as anti-Trump as he, Weissmann, and all those folks were that he hired, Mueller testified there were instances of Russian social media support for Hillary Clinton as well. Try to find that in the mainstream media.

She also says, according to reporting by Politico, though, in January 2017—it is hard to find at Politico now because they, I am sure, deeply regret they ever reported this. But they reported back then efforts by Democrats and Ukraine to sabotage the Trump campaign in 2016 did impact the race, even though Trump won in the end.

She points out that in March 2016, Alexandra Chalupa reportedly met with top Ukrainian officials at the Ukrainian Embassy in Washington in an effort to tarnish the Trump campaign by exposing ties by Trump, top campaign aide Paul Manafort, and Russia, according to Politico.

Now, this is Alexandra Chalupa. She was a consultant with the Democratic National Committee in 2016 and previously worked under the Clinton administration. She acknowledged in 2017 that she worked as a consultant for the DNC during the 2016 campaign with the goal of publicly exposing Trump campaign aide Paul Manafort's links to pro-Russian politicians in Ukraine. ''Chalupa admitted coordinating with the Ukrainian Embassy, and with Ukrainian and U.S. news reporters.''

But on August 8, 2016, that is when Peter Strzok wrote to Lisa Page that they would stop Trump from becoming President.

Ukraine had formed the National Anticorruption Bureau in 2014 as a condition to receive aid. Why? Because, nominally, the Obama administration wanted to say, as Congress was dictating back then, that we wanted to see some advances in anticorruption by Ukraine.

A recent poll indicated that, in the last year, 68 percent of those randomly chosen for the poll had bribed a government official. Sixty-eight percent, that is just here recently.

But August 19, 2016, Manafort resigned as Trump campaign chairman. I think he was there only 3 months, something like that.

The same day, Ukrainian parliament member Serhiy Leshchenko, who was part of the Petro Poroshenko bloc, held a news conference to draw attention to Manafort and Trump's pro-Russia ties. The original link to a photograph of the news conference was recently removed.

''At the news conference in Ukraine, Leshchenko was said to be exposing 'a firm run by U.S. businessman and Republican Party Presidential candidate Donald Trump's campaign chairman Paul Manafort, who reportedly directly orchestrated a covert Washington lobbying operation on behalf of Ukraine's ruling political party, attempting to sway the American public's opinion in favor of the country's pro-Russian Government.' ''

Anyway, those were just some of the things that were going on that really need to be investigated.

One of the important results to some of those who appear to have been conspiring with Ukraine, Americans who appear to be conspiring with Ukraine to affect our U.S. election, gee, they did have an effect, but it wasn't enough to change the outcome of the 2016 election.

In 2018, Senator RON JOHNSON, chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee in the Senate, and CHUCK GRASSLEY, chairman of the Finance Committee, asked Attorney General William Barr and FBI Director Christopher Wray for various records, including forensic images of Chalupa's devices. They are seeking records also from the National Archives to obtain White House visitor logs regarding any meetings between Chalupa, Ukrainians, and Obama officials.

August 8, 2018, that is when Strzok wrote Page they would stop Trump. But that is 2016, so this has been going on for some time, and more information has come out.

Aaron Klein had a good article November 26 that a second ADAM SCHIFF staffer linked to a Burisma-backed think tank—Burisma being the company that paid millions to people to be on their boards, including Hunter Biden. But this article is very interesting, that another staffer for ADAM SCHIFF served as a fellow for the Atlantic Council think tank funded by and working in partnership with Burisma. Isn't that convenient?

But Sean Misko was close friends with a guy named Eric Ciaramella. In 2015, Sean Misko was a yearlong millennial fellow at the Burisma-funded Atlantic Council.

Thomas Eager, a staffer on SCHIFF's House Intel Committee staff, is currently a fellow at the Atlantic Council's Eurasia Congressional Fellowship, and that educates congressional staff on current events in the Eurasia region, which is obviously the take on issues that Burisma wants them to have or they wouldn't have funded this thing. Burisma cosigned a cooperative agreement with the council to specifically sponsor the Atlantic Council's Eurasia Center, where Eager served as a fellow.

But a trip to Ukraine in August organized by the Atlantic Council revealed that Eager and others had a meeting with Acting U.S. Ambassador Bill Taylor. That name should ring a bell. It may have been perfectly innocent, but nonetheless, Burisma has helped fund some things for some of ADAM SCHIFF's staff.

Of course, it quotes Chairman SCHIFF on September 17 saying: ''We have not spoken directly with the whistleblower. We would like to.'' Of course, it turns out his staff had talked with him, and, in fact, that is apparently the first people that were talked to about the conversation, for good reason.

Misko is listed as providing a small donation of up to $999 to that think tank in 2016 but also contributions from the Open Society network that George Soros had so much to do with.

□ 1415

Another big donor, Perkins Coie, the law firm that was used to help the DNC and the Clinton campaign with hiring Fusion GPS and Christopher Steele and getting the Russian dossier hoax going.

But it is just amazing when you start seeing: Wait a minute. There was a lot going on between people in our government and the Ukrainian Government, corrupt people over there.

And then we find out Kerry Picket, October 11, reported: ''Abigail Grace, who worked at the NSC until 2018, was hired in February, while Sean Misko, an NSC aide until 2017, joined Schiff's staff in late August.''

That was the best information they had at the time.

But it points out that Abigail Grace, 36, ''was hired to help Schiff's committee investigate the Trump White House.'' But she had worked for the Trump White House as an Obama holdover. '' . . . Trump accused Schiff of 'stealing people who work at the White House.' '' She had worked there 2016 to 2018 and briefly for the Center for a New American Security think tank, founded by two former senior Obama administration officials.

But Sean Misko, 37, ''worked in the Obama administration as a member of the Secretary of State's policy planning staff under Deputy Chief of Staff Jake Sullivan, who became Hillary Clinton's top foreign policy official during her 2016 Presidential campaign. In 2015, Misko was the director for the Gulf States at the NSC, remaining

there into the Trump administration's first year.

''A source familiar with Grace's work at the NSC told the Washington Examiner, 'Abby Grace had access to executive privilege information, and she has a duty not to disclose that information. She is not authorized to reveal that information.'

''The same source said that Misko had not been trusted by Trump appointees. 'There were a few times where documents had been signed off for final editing before they go to the National Security Advisor for signature'. . . . 'And he actually went in and made changes after those changes were already finished.' So he basically tried to insert, without his boss' approval.'

'' 'There were meetings in which he protested very heavily, and the next thing you know, there's an article in the paper about the contents of that meeting.'

''Misko often clashed with other NSC personnel at meetings, another source said. Both Grace and Misko were close to Lieutenant General H.R. McMaster, Trump's National Security Advisor''—unfortunately—''from February 2017 until May 2018.

''Misko was a CNAS fellow in 2014. Misko's name surfaced in the Hillary Clinton email controversy when he worked in the State Department during the Obama administration.

''In a December 1, 2009, email released by Judicial Watch, Clinton adviser Huma Abedin sent classified information regarding foreign military contributions to the Afghanistan war effort to her private email account. That email originated with Misko, who wrote to Sullivan that he initially 'accidentally' sent it on the 'high side'—which is secure—but was sending the email again.

''The intelligence committee did not respond to a request for comment.''

And then, updated information, December 3, Kerry Picket reports that, actually, House Intelligence Committee Chairman ADAM SCHIFF hired a former National Security Council aide during the Obama and Trump administrations the day after the phone call between President Trump and Ukrainian President Zelensky.

So it turns out, call on July 25, July 26 Sean Misko gets hired. Sean Misko, Abigail Grace, Eric Ciaramella, they had worked together at the National Security Council. In fact, Misko and Ciaramella, they were reported to be brother-like, or bro-like, that they were just always hanging around.

And then we find out that, after the phone call, apparently, Ciaramella goes over to the staff, and, based on what we know—it appears to me, my opinion—that he goes over there and says, wow, you know, all the work we did with Biden, with Ukraine, maybe they were saying maybe the work we did trying to set some things up to help the Clinton campaign, whatever it was, they were scared. Clearly, they were scared. And somebody comes up with the idea, why not use the whistleblower statute even though it really didn't apply.

And you know, some people say, oh, you guys, you know, you are all dead set on getting the whistleblower.

The whistleblower, as a whistleblower, whoever it is is irrelevant. But these three key people, including Misko and Grace, who worked together at the Obama administration and the Trump administration temporarily, at the National Security Council, that worked with Ukraine, worked with Biden, these people are at the heart of everything about this whole Ukrainian hoax.

Why are we having a Ukrainian hoax? Because all the other hoaxes were exposed, and maybe that is why we are rushing through this in record time, so that people don't find out more about how this all came about.

But we need to talk to Alexandra Chalupa. She met with people involved in this, including Ukrainians, Misko and Abigail Grace and Ciaramella.

Regardless, it doesn't matter who the whistleblower was. What matters is the information these people know about what went on with Ukraine's interference in our election—not the country officially, but the Ukrainian officials that interfered and what all went on. They are in it up to their eyeballs.

We need to be able to talk to these people, and these are the three people—well, four people that neither ADAM SCHIFF nor JERRY NADLER are willing to produce.

Now, I made the request, provided it to our ranking member. Under H.R. 660, he has to provide it, and apparently there is somebody he had to talk to before he was willing to provide it. But at least I am making that request.

To be official, our ranking member has to hand it over. It needs to be done. We need to be able to talk to these people before they irreparably destroy the institutions, as JERRY NADLER said this kind of impeachment would. We need to talk to the people that got it all—that brought about the circumstances in dealing with Ukraine, Biden, Russia. We need to be able to question them about Ukraine, about Biden, about Russia and all these intermingling ties. It is critical. We have got to be able to have that.

And, of course, reference the same person in the Mueller report even, where he is in the Mueller report, is shown or is indicated to be the source of allegations that Russia told, or Putin told Trump to fire Mueller—or Comey.

In any event, this is all rather tragic, where partisan politics, just as JERRY NADLER predicted in 1998, is about to take a huge step toward finishing off this little experiment in self-government.

No government lasts forever. This one won't. But the actions that are being taken now have far-ranging consequences toward destroying the best hope for freedom the world has ever had.

People may hate this country, but you talk to people honestly around the world that have some freedom, like I did with three people from Australia. And I was kidding around. I had a few Members say: If we lose our freedom, we can all go to Australia.

None of them smiled, even.

One of them said: Do you not understand if you lose your freedom here in the United States, China will take us over before you could ever get there? You have got to be strong.

I heard that in Nigeria when I went to meet with mothers whose children had been kidnapped and were being raped daily, and officials there said: Well, you know, your Obama administration said if we want more help with Boko Haram we have got to adopt same-sex marriage and we have got to have abortions.

As one Catholic Bishop reported: Our religious beliefs are not for sale, not to the Obama administration, not to anybody.

So it is not uncommon, as we have been told, and some people want to deny, but there are good reasons to withhold aid. I don't think trying to force somebody to change their religious beliefs, like in Nigeria and Kenya and Togo, some of the places I talked with officials, but, nonetheless, there is nothing wrong with it if it is a legitimate purpose.

And what President Trump is trying to get to the bottom of, you know, it is a legitimate purpose: How do you stop corruption from foreign countries in our 2020 election if you are not allowed to figure out what they did in 2016? We need to be able to know that in order to stop it from happening again.

This is really serious stuff. And I appreciate the comments that so many who are participating on the other side of the aisle have made in talking about this impeachment.

Of course, we even heard that from Feldman, from Harvard. Oh, he was reluctant to bring up this impeachment. My gosh, the guy was all over Twitter over 2 years ago. He thought, gee, we may be able to impeach Trump for his tweet. We may be able to impeach him for this, that, and the other. This guy has been talking about it forever. He had no qualms about wanting to impeach Trump using any little thing possible, until he comes before our committee, and then he is reluctant.

And we have heard that from some other people: We are reluctant to pursue this impeachment. Well, you sure can't tell it the way you are moving forward like you have got a posse and are to hang somebody that you have just run into.

So let me just finish up by stating something I hope.

It was reported this week that, after the Intelligence Committee's Democratic staff had finished rolling up this ball of collusion and, supposedly, sending it to the Judiciary Committee, it was reported that the Speaker provided a cake, and it was decorated as a flag. There was a big drinking celebration.

So I hope that if the Judiciary Committee does what I really do hope and pray they don't, and that is move forward with impeachment on something Trump didn't even do wrong, that if they have another celebration for the Judiciary staff and people are drinking and eating cake and having a good time, I hope they will continue to do their drinking and celebration prayerfully, reluctantly, and soberly, as we have heard they are approaching all of this.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1548

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEGUSE) at 3 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 9, 2019, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3213. A letter from the Acting Principal Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Federal Acquisition Regulation System, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Modification of DFARS Clause ''Accident Reporting and Investigation Involving Aircraft, Missiles, and Space Launch Vehicles'' (DFARS Case 2018-D047) [Docket: DARS-2019-0030] (RIN: 0750-AK12) received December 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3214. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's FY 2018 report titled ''Preservation and Promotion of Minority Depository Institutions'', pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1463 note; Public Law 101-73, Sec. 308 (as amended by Public Law 111-203, Sec. 367(4)); (124 Stat. 1556); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3215. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received December 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3216. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that effective October 13, the Department authorized danger pay for Federal Bureau of Investigations employees in areas of Egypt, Sudan, and Tunisia, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.5928; Sec. 131 of Public Law 98-164; Public Law 101-246, as amended by Sec. 11005 of Public Law 107-273; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3217. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary General License: Extension of Validity [Docket No.: 191115-0082] (RIN: 0694-AH97) received December 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3218. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary General License: Extension of Validity [Docket No.: 191115-0082] (RIN: 0694-AH97) received December 3, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3219. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress for the period ending September 30, 2019, pursuant to Public Law 95-452; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3220. A letter from the Chair, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress, covering the period from April 1, 2019, through September 30, 2019, pursuant to Public Law 95-452; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3221. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Semiannual Management Report to Congress, covering the period April 1, 2019, through September 30, 2019 pursuant to Public Law 95-452, as amended 5 U.S.C 5; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3222. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2019 Performance and Accountability Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3. A bill to establish a fair price negotiation program, protect the Medicare program from excessive price increases, and establish an out-of-pocket maximum for Medicare part D enrollees, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116–324, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. NEAL: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3. A bill to establish a fair price negotiation program, protect the Medicare program from excessive price increases, and establish an out-of-pocket maximum for Medicare part D enrollees, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116–324, Pt. 2). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. NEAL: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4650. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for certain dental items and services under part B of the Medicare program; with an amendment (Rept. 116–325, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. NEAL: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4618. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for certain hearing items and services under part B of the Medicare program; with an amendment (Rept. 116–326, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. NEAL: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4665. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for certain vision items and services under part B of the Medicare program; with an amendment (Rept. 116–327, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3. Referral to the Committee on Education and Labor extended for a period ending not later than December 9, 2019.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. STEWART (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. UPTON, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 5331. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity; and to protect the free exercise of religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Ways and Means, Financial Services, Oversight and Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 5332. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to ensure that consumer reporting agencies are providing fair and accurate information reporting in consumer reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. MARSHALL):

H.R. 5333. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure prompt coverage of breakthrough devices under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 5334. A bill to amend the FAST Act to authorize appropriations for the United States Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada):

H.R. 5335. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish or designate the Distributed Energy Opportunity Board to carry out a program to facilitate a voluntary streamlined processes for local permitting of distributed renewable energy, energy storage, and electric vehicle charging systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. DEAN, and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 5336. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit mandatory predispute arbitration agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 5337. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide assistance for common interest communities, condominiums, and housing cooperatives damaged by a major disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 5338. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to pursue public-private partnerships, innovative financing mechanisms, research partnerships, and coordination with international and multilateral organizations to address childhood cancer globally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 5339. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit certain expenses associated with obtaining or maintaining recognized postsecondary credentials to be treated as qualified higher education expenses for purposes of 529 accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5340. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Hazel M. Johnson, in recognition of her achievements and contributions to the environmental justice movement; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BANKS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. YOHO, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BUDD, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 5341. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to citizen suits and the specification of disposal sites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5342. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow certain expenses of first responders as an above-the-line deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5343. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Hazel M. Johnson, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 5344. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide support to State and local governments in their efforts to counter violent extremist threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BUCK (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 5345. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prevent fraudulent joinder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 5346. A bill to require investigations and reports regarding individuals who died in the custody of certain Federal authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COX of California (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 5347. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a grant program to close gaps in access to safe drinking water in disadvantaged communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROW (for himself and Mr. BURCHETT):

H.R. 5348. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish an Innovation Voucher Grant Program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. OMAR, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. COSTA, Mr. STANTON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. TRONE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CASE, Ms. MENG, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BEYER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. WILD, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BASS, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 5349. A bill to prevent the changing of regulations governing the provision of waivers under the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois (for himself, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 5350. A bill to remove college cost as a barrier to every student having access to a well-prepared and diverse educator workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York (for himself and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5351. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain shipping from the harbor maintenance tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 5352. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increased the above-the-line deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HOULAHAN (for herself and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 5353. A bill to establish a policy to promote and maintain digital and software development expertise in the workforce of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 5354. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to require transportation planners to consider projects and strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois):

H.R. 5355. A bill to amend the America COMPETES Act to prevent political interference in the communication of scientific research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 5356. A bill to amend the America COMPETES Act to strengthen reporting requirements relating to deficiencies in Federal research infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 5357. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a pilot program to develop, expand, and enhance the commercialization of biomedical products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee:

H.R. 5358. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to expand the definition of ''other institutions'' for purposes of acquisition, preservation, and exchange of identification records and information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KATKO, Ms. SPANBERGER, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma):

H.R. 5359. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the exclusion for employer-provided educational assistance and to expand the availability of the student loan interest deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of World AIDS Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself and Mr. WATKINS):

H. Res. 745. A resolution urging the Republic of India to end the restrictions on communications and mass detentions in Jammu and Kashmir as swiftly as possible and preserve religious freedom for all residents; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BEYER, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. ESTES):

H. Res. 746. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should reaffirm its commitment as a member of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and work with other WTO members to achieve reforms at the WTO that improve the speed and predictability of dispute settlement, address longstanding concerns with the WTO's Appellate Body, increase transparency at the WTO, ensure that WTO members invoke special and differential treatment reserved for developing countries only in fair and appropriate circumstances, and update the WTO rules to address the needs of the United States and other free and open economies in the 21st century; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MOORE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BASS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. POCAN):

H. Res. 747. A resolution acknowledging that the War on Drugs has been a failed policy in achieving the goal of reducing drug use, and for the House of Representatives to apologize to the individuals and communities that were victimized by this policy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 5331.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 5332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 5333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 5334.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 and Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 5335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 5336.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 5337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 5338.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 5339.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5340.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 5341.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I:

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5342.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5343.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 5344.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 5345.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 5346.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS

CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. COX of California:

H.R. 5347.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 5348.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5349.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8; U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois:

H.R. 5350.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause III

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York:

H.R. 5351.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 5352.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. HOULAHAN:

H.R. 5353.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5354.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes,

Duties, Impost and Excises; to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 5355.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 5356.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 5357.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee:

H.R. 5358.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 5359.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 94: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 141: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 218: Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 369: Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 535: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 587: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 640: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 763: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 784: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 884: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 912: Mr. HIMES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KIM, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 934: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 943: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 945: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 1002: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 1043: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 1179: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1228: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1349: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1367: Ms. PORTER and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1379: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 1398: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1468: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 1507: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1530: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 1646: Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 1652: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1692: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1694: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1695: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 1766: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1799: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1828: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 1863: Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 1880: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1923: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. LAMB, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. CORREA, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1926: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 1948: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 1970: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 1973: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 1975: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 1992: Mrs. AXNE and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 2096: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CASE, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2117: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 2144: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 2147: Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. MENG, Mr. VARGAS, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. MILLER, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. CLAY, and Mrs. TORRES of California.

H.R. 2153: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2179: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 2213: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2219: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 2258: Mr. COMER.

H.R. 2279: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LATTA, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. COMER.

H.R. 2282: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 2339: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2381: Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 2382: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 2412: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 2435: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 2481: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. ROY.

H.R. 2532: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2541: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2585: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 2599: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 2616: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2643: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2651: Mr. LAMB and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 2694: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2698: Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 2701: Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2711: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2720: Mr. YARMUTH and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2808: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2815: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 2818: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MALINOWSKI, and Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 2831: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 2874: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2881: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 2896: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2918: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 2931: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 2976: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2985: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 3048: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 3077: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 3107: Mr. SMUCKER and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 3114: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 3127: Mr. HIMES, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 3138: Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 3159: Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 3162: Mr. BERGMAN and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3197: Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 3222: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 3265: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 3306: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3349: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 3400: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3414: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 3502: Mrs. BEATTY and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 3522: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 3553: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 3570: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 3584: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 3593: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 3623: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3657: Mr. TRONE and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 3749: Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 3760: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 3783: Mr. MCADAMS.

H.R. 3794: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3798: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 3799: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 3817: Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 3961: Mrs. LEE of Nevada and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 3969: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 3972: Mr. CLOUD and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 4022: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 4069: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mrs. MILLER.

H.R. 4077: Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 4092: Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 4227: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. WEXTON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. COX of California, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. KELLER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 4229: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. FINKENAUER, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. KELLER, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. ALLEN, MR. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. EMMER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 4230: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 4248: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 4307: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 4348: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 4469: Mr. COX of California and Mr. BALDERSON.

H.R. 4545: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 4579: Ms. SHALALA and Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 4588: Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 4589: Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 4671: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 4672: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. MCCARTHY.

H.R. 4680: Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 4681: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 4701: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4722: Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 4735: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 4810: Mr. KINZINGER and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 4817: Mr. BALDERSON and Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 4836: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 4873: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4899: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 4901: Ms. NORTON and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 4903: Mr. EMMER, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 4920: Mr. KILMER and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4926: Mr. BEYER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 4928: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 4932: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4979: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. AXNE, and Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 4995: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
H.R. 5028: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 5046: Mrs. AXNE and Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 5051: Mr. HILL of Arkansas.
H.R. 5102: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 5104: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 5118: Mr. COHEN and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 5190: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 5194: Mr. VARGAS and Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 5213: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 5216: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 5220: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 5221: Mr. COX of California, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 5225: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 5230: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 5231: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5243: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 5248: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 5267: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 5288: Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 5297: Ms. FUDGE and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 5306: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. REED.
H.R. 5319: Mr. CASE and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 5328: Mr. GALLEGO and Mr. FOSTER.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. PANETTA.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
H. Res. 174: Mr. SPANO.
H. Res. 189: Mr. HUIZENGA.
H. Res. 223: Mr. WRIGHT.
H. Res. 452: Mr. RUSH.
H. Res. 527: Mr. CORREA.
H. Res. 538: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H. Res. 574: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. PANETTA.
H. Res. 688: Mr. COSTA, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H. Res. 723: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. BASS, Ms. DEAN, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mrs. HAYES.
H. Res. 727: Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. COSTA.
H. Res. 742: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. PANETTA.
H. Res. 743: Mr. HIMES, Mr. MOULTON, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H. Res. 744: Mr. GIANFORTE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING HAROLD WILLIAM ''BUD'' MARESKO

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, it is with deep sadness but great respect that I take this time to remember one of Northwest Indiana's finest citizens, Mr. Harold William ''Bud'' Maresko, of Crown Point, who passed away on October 17, 2019, at the age of 91. Mr. Maresko's military service to our nation and his dedication to the community of Northwest Indiana is noteworthy and admirable. While he will be truly missed by his family and friends, the impact he has had on his community will live on for generations to come.

Harold William Maresko was born in East Chicago, Indiana. He attended Tolleston High School in Gary, Indiana, before joining the United States Merchant Marine at the age of seventeen. Serving during World War II, Bud transported ammunitions, equipment, and supplies to the Allied Forces on six different liberty ships. Following his discharge in 1946, Bud worked as a crane operator at US Steel in Gary. In 1951, Bud was drafted into the United States Army during the peak of the Korean War and the beginning of the Cold War. He was stationed at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, where he received military communications training. In 1952, Bud was deployed to Germany and was assigned to the 7th Army (5th Corps), 816th Battalion, which was attached to the 30th FA Group. The unit trained at USAG Baumholder and was stationed in Darmstadt. In 1953, Bud was discharged from the United States Army. He went on to graduate from Merrillville High School in 1965 and then became a telephone repairman for AT&T, where he worked for thirty-five years until his retirement from his position of Repair Foreman. Post retirement, Bud worked for Gary Methodist Hospitals as a Communications Director, overseeing the installation and maintenance of the phone systems, a position he held for ten years.

Bud is most remembered for his willingness to lend a hand or his assistance with solving a problem. He was also a devoted fisherman who always owned a boat and loved to be on the water. Harold was a loving husband, father, grandfather, and friend. He is survived by his wonderful wife, Grace, and their two beloved children, William A. Maresko and his wife, Elizabeth, and Laura Ann Low and her husband, Kevin, as well as two amazing grandchildren. He also leaves to cherish his memory many other dear family members and friends, as well as a saddened but grateful community.

Madam Speaker, I respectfully ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in honoring Harold William ''Bud'' Maresko for his outstanding service to the United States military and for his devotion to the community of Northwest Indiana and beyond. Bud's life of service is truly commendable, and he serves as an inspiration to us all.

RECOGNIZING BUFFY SMITH OF HELENA

HON. GREG GIANFORTE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Buffy Smith of Helena for encouraging female students to study computer science and for emphasizing the importance of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) education.

Buffy grew up in and graduated high school in Gardiner. She then went to Carroll College where she majored in English and minored in Computer Science. Following her undergraduate studies, she earned a secondary high school teaching endorsement in computer science. It was there she found her call to teach.

As an educator for 27 years, Buffy is breaking down barriers, paving the way for female and minority students to find their way into computer science.

This year, Buffy received the National Educator Award from the National Center for Women and Information Technology. The award honors educators who encourage underrepresented students to participate in computer science. Buffy won statewide awards in 2014, 2015, and 2017.

When Buffy began teaching, she thought she would focus mostly on academics. Years later, she came to believe the relationships developed in the classroom are as critical.

With her commitment to her students and her knowledge of computer science, Buffy has created an all-inclusive approach to the subject. She prioritizes encouraging students to work with others who have different views and thus enhance the outcome of a project.

Buffy mentors' girls in her class and encourages them to explore computer science and technology careers. She says, as with her classroom, computer science and other STEM fields can only improve with greater diversification.

Madam Speaker, for her dedication to educating Montana students and for encouraging more young people, particularly young women, to study computer science and other STEM fields, I recognize Buffy Smith of Helena for her Spirit of Montana.

CONGRATULATING WASHOE RTC CEO LEE GIBSON ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. MARK E. AMODEI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. AMODEI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Lee Gibson on his retirement from the Washoe County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), where he served as Chief Executive Officer since September 2009.

Having begun his career at Washoe RTC during the height of the Great Recession, Mr. Gibson immediately restructured the agency's transit service to cut costs, preserve service, and build a stronger footing toward sustainability.

With a career spanning 36 years, Mr. Gibson has become a recognized leader in the transportation community, earning some of the highest awards from the Nevada Chapter of the American Planning Association (APA), including the prestigious DeBoer Award for his planning leadership in Nevada. Mr. Gibson has also served on the American Public Transportation Association's (APTA) Board of Directors, as Chairman of its Policy and Planning Committee, and as an APTA speaker on performance-based planning.

During his tenure at the Washoe RTC, Mr. Gibson's organizational leadership, planning policies, and innovative project delivery methods have successfully resulted in well over $750 million of multimodal highway projects in Washoe County, eventually leading the RTC to earn a Silver-level of recognition from the APTA's Sustainability Program in August 2017.

Today, Washoe RTC's transit service employs cutting-edge electric buses, customer service information technologies, and is preparing to expand service. Additionally, our region's highway system supports connectivity that has greatly improved the traveling public's accessibility to jobs, while offering new opportunities to move throughout the region.

Without a doubt, Mr. Gibson's investment in our community's infrastructure projects have significantly improved Nevadans' ability to travel more safely and efficiently.

On behalf of Nevada's Second Congressional District, I offer my sincerest appreciation to Mr. Gibson for his service and wish him all the best on his retirement.

HONORING DR. BENJAMIN BABST FOR FORESTRY SCIENCE RESEARCH AWARD

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Benjamin Babst on receiving the 2019 Ouachita Society of American Forester's Award for Forestry Science Research.

Dr. Babst and his students at the University of Arkansas at Monticello have spent the past five years studying the impact of certain forest management practices on the development of ecosystems. This research includes a study on environmental factors such as flooding or contact with insect species which can influence the growth of the nation's forests. The

development of this knowledge has also served to influence more innovative forest management practices.

His contribution is not limited to the sphere of research, but also includes his commitment to educating the young people of our district and our state. As a fellow forester, it is a supreme encouragement to see the dedication of Fourth District Arkansans like Dr. Babst to the proper management and stewardship of our nation's forests. I take this time to commend him on receiving this honor and to thank him for his years of study and service.

TRIBUTE HONORING MAYOR SAMUEL EUGENE MURRAY

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding South Carolinian, leader, public servant, and personal friend. Samuel Eugene Murray has ably served as Mayor of Port Royal, South Carolina for the past 24 years, and will be leaving office at the end of 2019.

Mr. Murray is a native of Dorchester County and received his Bachelor's and Master's degrees from South Carolina State University. He continued his graduate studies at The Citadel, University of South Carolina, Appalachian State and Harvard University.

Mr. Murray is an educator at heart and served 16 years as a teacher in the Beaufort Country School System. He rose to become an elementary school principal for another 20 years. During his tenure as principal, Mr. Murray was the recipient of a $50,000 Science Foundation Grant and was the only Principal from South Carolina chosen to attend that Summer's Principal Institute at Harvard University.

He has always had a passion for public service. Mr. Murray served on the Port Royal Town Council for 17 years before becoming mayor. During his tenure as mayor, he worked to improve his city's infrastructure with a new town hall, police station, and fire station. He also oversaw the city's growth with the construction of new health care centers, several commercial buildings, numerous businesses, apartment complexes, single family homes, and fast food facilities. During his time in office, Port Royal's population increased from 1,500 to approximately 13,600.

In addition, Mr. Murray has been a servant leader in his community by mentoring a young man with special needs for thirty years, serving as coach for the Neighborhood Youth Core Baseball Team, and volunteering as a homebuilder for Habitat for Humanity. He is involved in many organizations and has served in leadership roles in several of them.

He is currently a board member of the Low Country Blood Alliance and a member of the South Carolina Black Mayors Association. He has served on the Beaufort County Board of Special Needs, the Board of the Municipal Association and the Reconstruction Era Committee that laid the foundation for what is now the Reconstruction Era National Park.

Because of his tremendous service, Mr. Murray has received numerous awards and special recognitions. He was awarded the Lifetime Achievement CIVITAS Award for Business excellence presented by the Beaufort Chamber of Commerce, Congressman Joe Wilson Second Congressional District Minority Advisory Committee Award, and the Special President's Award by the Montford Point Marine Association.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in offering congratulations and sincere gratitude to Mayor Samuel Eugene Murray for his unwavering service to his community. His extraordinary work has made a great impact in the lives of the citizens of Port Royal and I honor him for his selfless deeds throughout his career.

IN RECOGNITION OF JONATHAN DROPIEWSKI FOR A DISTINGUISHED CAREER IN PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the distinguished career of Jonathan Dropiewski as Mayor of Flat Rock for nine years.

Jonathan Dropiewski has become a cornerstone of the Flat Rock community. After receiving his B.S. from Georgetown University and MBA from the University of Michigan's Ross School of Business, Dropiewski moved to Flat Rock to begin a family with his wife, Robin, in 2001. Together, the pair raised two children, Nicholas and Alexander, who inspired Dropiewski to strive to ensure Flat Rock remained a wonderful city for people to live, work, and grow. In addition to his successful career in business and technology, Dropiewski set his sights on public service. In 2004, Dropiewski was elected to serve as a City Council member, and simultaneously served as Mayor Pro-Tempore from 2006 to 2007. In 2010, Dropiewski was elected as Flat Rock's Mayor, a position he has held ever since.

Mayor Dropiewski began his tenure at a critical moment in Flat Rock's history. Mayor Dropiewski faced a significant budget cut coupled with the worst financial crisis since the 1980s. Despite these challenges, Mayor Dropiewski's leadership and business expertise led the city to incredible progress and increased economic development, and his efforts have been paramount in ensuring Flat Rock continues to be a vibrant and welcoming destination for businesses, families, young professionals, and the like. Moreover, his leadership has been widely recognized amongst his colleagues and peers. On two occasions, Dropiewski was elected by his fellow mayors and supervisors to be the treasurer and chairman of the Downriver Community Conference. Among a host of other awards and accolades, Dropiewski was also recognized as a Crain's Detroit Business ''40 Under 40'' Leader, a Detroit Rotary Club Citizen of the Month, and a WWJ Citizen of the Week. Undoubtably, Mayor Dropiewski is beloved, respected, and appreciated by many, and he has left a mark on the City of Flat Rock that will be remembered forever. He started community events that have brought people together and have become traditions such as the Riverfest, Summer Blast, and Taste of Flat Rock.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Jonathan Dropiewski for his years of service to the Flat Rock community. Flat Rock's continued success can be attributed in no small part to Mayor Dropiewski's hard work, leadership, and dedication. We are all grateful for his exemplary service and wish him luck in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF WILLIAM ''BILL'' MOREAU, JR.

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor William ''Bill'' Moreau, Jr. who is retiring from Barnes and Thornburg Law Firm. As a partner in the Firm's Indianapolis and Washington, D.C. offices, Bill has been named as one of ''The Best Lawyers in America'' for his expertise in higher education and government relations practices.

Bill has provided legal, tactical and fiduciary guidance to a variety of post-secondary education institutions including his undergraduate alma mater. As a graduate of Purdue University, he proudly serves as a trustee. He is also a member of the Indiana State University President's National Advisory Board and the Board of Advisors of Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, located in the heart of my congressional district. Bill's expertise in higher education issues was instrumental in the development of Indiana's community college system as a gubernatorial appointee to the Community College Policy Committee.

Bill's government relations practice has included representation at all levels of government over a broad array of issues. Bill is no stranger to Capitol Hill, having worked in both the House and Senate. He also served as Chief of Staff to then-Indiana Secretary of State, Evan Bayh.

For his extensive and passionate work, he has won numerous awards, including being named Master Fellow of the Indiana Bar Foundation. He also received the 2017 Leadership in Law Distinguished Barristers Award from The Indiana Lawyer and, in 2015, he was Barnes and Thornburg's winner of the Joseph A. Marley Pro Bono Award. As an advocate and engaged citizen, Bill has dedicated his efforts to promote civic literacy and engagement and has worked to reduce homelessness in Indianapolis. He led our community in the effort to create the Blueprint to End Homelessness, which is still hailed as a national model. His ongoing support of this priority includes an annual fellowship funded by Bill and his wife, Ann, to support a graduate student training program to advocate for those impacted by homelessness.

I am proud to call Bill Moreau a friend and advisor, and I'm incredibly grateful for his support and counsel through the years. His passionate work on behalf of all Hoosiers shows that he truly understands the meaning of community, and I applaud him for his efforts to improve ours. I have no doubt that he will continue to make a big impact in his next chapter, and I wish him all the best in his retirement.

IN MEMORY OF CATHY THOMAS

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to observe and mourn the passing of one of the pillars of civic life in the Northeastern Corner of the state of Connecticut, Cathy Thomas. Sadly, Cathy passed away on November 26, 2019 surrounded by family and friends at Day Kimball Hospital in Putnam, Connecticut.

Madam Speaker, Cathy served for 40 years as the Chair of the Thompson Democratic Town Committee—a record that I am confident will never be broken. In that role, Cathy supported hundreds and hundreds of candidates for town, state and federal office, generously volunteering her time to the nuts and bolts of campaigns—organizing conventions, lining up delegates, filing the critical paperwork to ensure ballot access and most of all, giving wise, common sense counsel to public officials about what the important issues were and how to talk about them, and address them. Forty years ago, Cathy was a pioneer political leader paving the way for women to occupy positions of power. Over time, the respect she garnered with her quiet, steely manner became an inspiration for other women to succeed in public office. It was truly fitting that she was awarded the 2019 Ella Grasso Women's Leadership Award this year. This is a special honor reserved to an elite group of Women in Connecticut named after the first woman in America to be elected the governor of a state in her own right. I personally experienced and benefitted from Cathy's dedicated work during all my campaigns for Congress. I will be forever grateful to her for her unstinting, unselfish help.

Her life was not solely defined by politics and government. Cathy grew up in Thompson and attended Annhurst College and Nichols College where she received her degree in accounting. She worked as an accountant for many years at Davis publications in Worcester, Massachusetts. She was close to her brother Paul LaRoche of North Grosvenordale and had many friends in town with whom she enjoyed going to concerts, the beach, and Kittery, Maine. She was also an avid New York Yankees fan, living in an area that leans in favor of the Red Sox. Nonetheless, she reveled in the rivalry.

Cathy's passing is a big loss for Northeastern Connecticut and was felt far and wide by all who knew her and will miss her. Madam Speaker, I ask the House to please join me in expressing our deepest condolences to her family and friends.

HONORING MR. FELIPE 'TRES' BARRERA

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Felipe 'Tres' Barrera, a member of the Washington Nationals 2019 World Series Champions and a Rio Grande Valley Native.

Tres Barrera is an incredibly talented professional baseball catcher for the Washington Nationals. He was born in Eagle Pass, Texas, and moved to the Rio Grande Valley when he was 10 years old. Tres played on the baseball team for Hidalgo High School his freshman year, winning the District 32–3A Most Valuable Player award, before transferring to Sharyland High School. At Sharyland High School, Tres played football and baseball, and quickly became a standout athlete and student. He was selected to two all-state teams, and won the 30–5A Most Valuable Player and the All-Valley Player of the Year as a senior. His batting average was an astonishing .452, hitting 22 home runs during his time at Sharyland High School.

Tres' incredible work ethic, determination, and sheer talent earned him a spot on the renowned baseball team for the University of Texas at Austin. As a freshman, Tres was the team's starting catcher, won the 2014 College Home Run Derby, and led Texas to the College World Series. His achievements continued on.

During his sophomore year, Tres was a vital part of the University of Texas' Big 12 championship team, while adding his name to the All-Big 12 second team. In his junior year campaign, Tres earned the 2016 Academic All-Big 12 baseball honors and was named an All-Big 12 honorable mention. He left Texas after his junior year to join the minor leagues, but only after walking away with 20 home runs and 106 runs batted in (RBIs) for the University of Texas at Austin.

Tres Barrera's hard work and dedication continued for the next three years as he played for a number of minor league teams before being called up to the Major League Baseball, MLB, on September 8, 2019, for the Washington Nationals. Being a member of the Nationals, Tres participated in one of the most unlikely runs in the history of professional baseball.

The Nationals' record through 50 games was a poor 19 wins and 31 losses before they won 74 of their next 122 games. This secured the Nationals a wild-card spot in the postseason. The Nationals continued their unlikely playoff run until the very end, where they beat the Houston Astros in seven games, winning the World Series on October 30, 2019. On that day, Tres earned himself the coveted World Series ring.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Tres Barrera worked tirelessly to prove that with determination, will power, and commitment, we can accomplish anything we set ourselves to do in life. Tres made history, gave young people across our country the hope to achieve anything they set their mind to and for that I stand here today to recognize him. He is a proud son of South Texas and the Rio Grande Valley, and we appreciate him for his work and dedication to the Washington Nationals.

TRIBUTE TO THE HEROIC ACTIONS OF FAIRPLAY, PARK COUNTY, COLORADO

HON. JOE NEGUSE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, each and every day, across America our fellow community members find opportunities to be of service to one another. These small acts of heroism, pinnacles of our values and ideals as Americans, are far too frequently lost in the rapidity of our society.

I would like to take a moment to draw attention to one of those small acts of heroism in the town of Fairplay in Park County, Colorado.

In a small mountain town of just 762 people, nearly 750 people were stranded last Friday and Saturday after snow, wind, and low visibility made travel impossible. At the height of the post-Thanksgiving travel rush, with their town's limited shelter resources strained to breaking, the people of Fairplay jumped to action to ensure safety and comfort for all those who could not continue their travels. Hotel operators housed people in every space possible; churches opened their stores of food to ensure no one went hungry; neighbors went door-to-door to gather blankets and supplies; transportation authorities brought vehicles abandoned on the highways to the town and reconnected drivers to their cars. In the end, everyone remained safe and sheltered. This is the type of hospitality and generosity that makes Park County and Colorado such an incredible place.

This year I am grateful for citizens like these in Park County, and throughout our nation, who remind us during this holiday season of the essential goodness of people.

THANKING LC ''BUCKSHOT'' SMITH FOR HIS 56 YEARS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICE

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and extend my gratitude to Mr. LC ''Buckshot'' Smith of Camden, Arkansas.

Officer Smith has spent a lifetime in law enforcement. His career spans over five decades in the Fourth District of Arkansas. Having spent 46 of those years with the Ouachita County Sheriff's Department, he officially retired in September 2010. However, after only a few short months in retirement, he decided to return to the Camden Police Department. At the age of 90 years old, he is still serving the community after 56 years of service.

President George H.W. Bush said, ''Public service is a noble calling.'' Officer Smith has answered this call to service everyday as a police officer, church deacon, and community member for decades. The Ouachita County and Camden communities can attest to the exemplary character and dedication to service found in Officer Smith.

I'm proud to know of the lifelong commitment to service men like Officer ''Buckshot Smith'' have. His life serves as a powerful reminder of what an impact a lifetime of service can have on our communities. I take this time to thank him for the decades he has given to the Fourth District of Arkansas and for the example he has provided for generations of Americans to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARY ZATINA FOR HER DISTINGUISHED CAREER

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mary Zatina and recognize her years of distinguished service with Beaumont Health.

Mary Zatina was the Senior Vice President of Government Relations and Community Affairs at Beaumont Health. In this role, Zatina advanced Beaumont and Oakwood Healthcare's relationship with government leaders, significantly improving the well-being of patients community-wide. Zatina joined Oakwood from the Office of the Governor, where she served as an advisor to Governor Jennifer M. Granholm and chief of staff to First Gentleman Daniel Granholm Mulhern. Prior to her career in the state government, Zatina was the Senior Vice President and Director of Corporate Communications and Strategy at Campbell-Ewald and Director of Corporate Communications for the MichCon/MCN Energy Group.

Throughout all her professional endeavors, Mary Zatina has been recognized as a dynamic, accomplished, and effective leader who strives to effect meaningful and lasting change. She has used all her experiences to enhance Beaumont's partnerships with local, state, and national officials, chambers of commerce, and community leaders at all levels, enabling Beaumont to strengthen its outreach and expand its services. Beyond this, Zatina has also been an active member of her local Michigan community. She is a member of the American Arab Chamber of Commerce, the Michigan Fitness Foundation Board of Directors, the Southwest Solutions Board and Development Committee of the Greening of the Detroit, and serves on the Citizens Advisory Committee for the University of Michigan-Dearborn. In addition, she was a founding member of the Arab-American Women's Business Council and the Chicago Boulevard East Block Club. Zatina's work has earned her widespread acclaim, evident in her designation as a Fall 2017 Arab American Business Woman of the Year and a Crain's Detroit Business ''40 Under 40'' Honoree.

Still, Mary Zatina's accomplishments and accolades only scratch the surface. Put simply, Zatina is a good person with a kind heart. Despite her busy life, she is dedicated to uplifting everyone she encounters and is always willing to lend a helping hand. Zatina is known amongst her friends, family, and colleagues as an accomplished chef, master gardener, and friend who will always do the right thing. Moreover, she is a creative hostess who is welcoming of all, whether it be at spontaneous gathering or one of her famous annual parties.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mary Zatina for her accomplished career at Beaumont Health. We deeply appreciate her dedication to improving the lives of others and wish her the best of luck in her future endeavors.

PARTISAN IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, even before President Donald Trump was elected, Democrats have been scraping for any excuse, threatening impeachment to overturn the election results. It is shameful that House Democrats are wasting time and money, over $30 million dollars, on this Impeachment Hoax instead of fixing trade deals, funding our military, and addressing issues that create jobs.

House Speaker NANCY PELOSI continues to move forward with these warrantless attacks which undermine the results of the last election, nullifying 63 million votes. House Democrats should stop misleading the American public and work for those who put them in office. This partisan witch hunt diverts attention from the President's successes.

The lives of Americans have truly changed for the better under President Trump. The unemployment rate has it record lows, wages have continued to increase, and there is record job creation, showing that President Trump keeps his promises.

In conclusion, God Bless our Troops, and we will never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DIVERSIFYING BY INVESTING IN EDUCATORS AND STUDENTS TO IMPROVE OUTCOMES FOR YOUTH ACT

HON. JESÚS G. ''CHUY'' GARCÍA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the Diversifying by Investing in Educators and Students to Improve outcomes For Youth (DIVERSIFY) Act.

It should be a guarantee that all students in our country are taught by expert teachers and attend schools where the teacher workforce reflects our nation's rich diversity.

However, research tells us that while people of color comprise 40 percent of our nations' population and majority of our public school students, only 20 percent of all teachers are people of color.

One of the barriers to a well-prepared and diverse teacher workforce is the high cost of college and student loan debt.

High quality teacher preparation is also more likely to be financially out of reach for students of color, while the high cost of college and increasing student loan debt burdens hits students of color especially hard as they are more likely to come from families that are unable to contribute financially to their higher education.

These facts come at a time when college affordability has reached crisis levels.

Today, more than two-thirds of individuals entering the field of education borrow money to pay for their higher education, resulting in an average debt of about $20,000 for those with a bachelor's degree and $50,000 for those with a master's degree.

Our nation's service scholarship for teachers—The TEACH Grant Program—has not increased to keep up with the rising cost of college.

While college cost have increased, the TEACH Grant has been cut each year for most of its existence.

Failing to protect and increase the TEACH Grant limits the program's potential to support high needs schools in ensuring that all students are taught by a well-prepared and diverse educator workforce.

I urge this body to pass this bill.

CONGRATULATING REV. JESSE TURNER IN RECOGNITION OF HIS DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Rev. Jesse Turner of Pine Bluff on his recent selection to receive the Distinguished Service Award on behalf of the 400 Years of African American History Commission.

This award is given to those who have made a lasting commitment to community service and work to commemorate the contributions of African Americans to our nation's history. Rev. Turner easily fits this description and is well deserving of this honor by the commission due to the profound impact he has had in his community.

As the pastor of the historic Elm Grove Baptist Church, Rev. Turner's commitment to service has touched the lives of individuals across the country. The City of Pine Bluff issued a proclamation in his honor, highlighting his decades of work promoting African American history in the State of Arkansas and the impacts it has had on the people in his community.

I'm proud to know of men like Rev. Jesse Turner and the commitment he has demonstrated to public service over his lifetime. His is a life well lived and truly is part of ''The Distinguished 400.''

HONORING THE LIFE OF MARIE GREENWOOD

HON. JOE NEGUSE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, each and every day we must honor the legacy of those who came before us; those who dedicated their lives to promoting freedom and forging the path on which all future generations walk.

Today, I wish to honor the life and work of Ms. Marie Greenwood whose long and full life was devoted to creating a more equitable and just society for countless Coloradans. Marie passed away on November 18th at 106 years old.

As one of the first Black teachers to be hired by Denver Public Schools in Colorado, Marie spent her entire teaching career fighting segregation and uplifting students through one simple creed: every child can learn.

A first-grade teacher for 30 years, Marie guided educators throughout her long and illustrious career in the importance of early literacy programs. ''Teaching first grade was the

joy of my life,'' she once said, ''I believe it is there that one lays the beginning of a sound education foundation upon which a child can continue to learn successfully.''

Marie continued her passion for literacy by participating in the Each One Teach One program which aims to improve early literacy by building vocabulary through hands-on community projects. This program allows students to contribute to their communities while building topical vocabulary.

To Marie's four children, to her entire family, and to all those who loved and admired her, I share my condolences and my gratitude for the exceptional dedication and progress made possible by Marie's life and work.

TRIBUTE HONORING VICTORIA BARNES ANDERSON

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and wish a happy birthday to a Centenarian and constituent who serves as an example for how we all might live to see 100 years of life. Mrs. Victoria Barnes Anderson is celebrating this remarkable milestone on December 23, 2019, an added blessing during our nation's most joyous season.

The daughter of a foreman, Mrs. Anderson grew up on a sharecropper's farm in Pineville, South Carolina, and was the fifth of eight children born to parents, William and Mariah Barnes. She attended Barhill Elementary School and later Dubass in Bonneau. She was forced to quit school in the sixth grade when the bus service stopped. However, she later went back to school at night so she could help her children with their homework.

She was married to the late James Anderson, and the couple was blessed with eight children. To support the family, she was a domestic worker earning just $5 to $10 per day. The family did not have much, but never went without. The Andersons were able to put three children through college, an accomplishment she attributes to the Grace of God.

Since she was a young child, Mrs. Anderson has had a great faith. She attended Sunday School and church at the Good Shepherd Reformed Episcopal Church until her marriage, when she joined Bethel United Methodist Church. She has been a member there for 81 years, participating in many ministries: Junior and Senior Choir, Vice President and President of United Women, Women's Day Program Chairperson, Prayer Band Member, and Harvest Day Program Co-Founder. Mrs. Anderson frequently says, ''I've been serving the Lord a long, long time, and I'm not tired yet.''

During her more active days, Mrs. Anderson had a number of hobbies such as gardening, canning, and cooking. She still cooks from time to time with family assistance. Mrs. Anderson enjoys singing and her favorite song is ''Your Grace and Mercy.'' As a devout Christian, Mrs. Anderson's favorite book is the Bible, and her favorite scripture is Psalm 27, ''The Lord is my light and my salvation, whom shall I fear?''

Mrs. Anderson has lived through six wars and 18 presidents. She says the proudest moment in her life was witnessing the election of President Barack Obama. Mrs. Anderson never imagined she would see the election of the first African American President of the United States of America. Her response was simply, ''Look at God.''

In addition to her 8 children, she has 30 grandchildren, 68 great-grandchildren, and 49 great-great-grandchildren who love and cherish her.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in offering congratulations and a special happy 100th birthday to Victoria Barnes Anderson. Her longevity has set an example for all of us and inspires us to persevere no matter the circumstances. I am pleased to honor her for her lifelong devotion to faith and family.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE CUNNINGHAM

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, on December 5, 2019, I was not recorded on Roll Call Vote No. 651 on H. Res. 741, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) Voting Rights Advancement Act and providing for consideration 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. I would have voted Aye.

IN HONOR OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MONTGOMERY FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, today I rise in celebration ofthe 50th Anniversary of the Montgomery Fire Department in Montgomery, Texas.

From its inception in February of 1969, the Montgomery Fire Department has protected and served the entire Montgomery area—approximately 232 square miles—in the Eighth District of Texas, including the Cities of Montgomery, Dobbin, Walden, and Bentwater. This area was originally covered by two fire departments, the Montgomery and the Walden Volunteer Fire Departments but the two merged in 1982 to keep up with the growing population of the county.

As more and more people came into the area, more fire stations were built in Walden, Cape Conroe, the City of Dobbin, and Montgomery. In1989, in response to growing demand for their services, the Montgomery Fire Department hired its first full time firefighter, and in 2001 they opened another station in Bentwater that housed both volunteer and full-time firefighters.

Today, the Montgomery Fire Department has five manned stations and an administrative building. Their full staff includes a Fire Chief, four Battalion Chiefs, 51 full-time firefighters, and 25 part-time or volunteer firefighters.

The Montgomery County Fire Department employs the use of three booster trucks, five pumpers, three tankers, and one All-Terrain-Vehicle. This equipment allows the fire department to respond to fires, car accidents, and any other emergency or natural disaster in Montgomery County.

Under the leadership of Fire Chief Brian Edwards, the fire department serves Montgomery County by offering not only protection from fires and other emergencies, but education and prevention. It's incredible to see just how much they've grown these past 50 years.

I would like to thank the Montgomery Fire Department for half a century of service, and congratulate them on a job well-done. The entirety of Montgomery County is grateful for their service and keeping our community safe. Congratulations on 50 prosperous years, and we look forward to 50 more.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF PENELOPE

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mark an important anniversary. Last month, the Daughters of Penelope, an international woman's organization and affiliate organization of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA), celebrated its 90th anniversary on November 16. Founded in San Francisco, the Daughters of Penelope originally worked to improve the status and well-being of women and their families. They also sought to provide women with the opportunity to make significant contributions to their communities and country. After successfully achieving many of their early goals, the Daughters of Penelope now promote the ideals of ancient Greece: philanthropy, education, civic responsibility, and family and individual excellence, achieved through community service and volunteerism.

I am a proud Greek-American. As a young boy, my grandparents, parents, aunts and uncles instilled in me an appreciation for our beautiful Greek culture, which focuses on family, community, and faith. As Co-Chairman of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, it is with great pride that I see these values shine through the Daughters of Penelope today, across all its 250 chapters worldwide. Through the exceptional Penelope House in Mobile, Alabama and Penelope's Place in Brockton, Massachusetts, the organization vigorously supports efforts to combat domestic violence in Greece as well as the United States. The development of these shelters brought renewed hope to many areas with suffering families who previously did not have access to the same level of care.

As a member on the Health Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I am impressed with the organization's efforts to provide financial support and raise awareness for medical research on treatments for breast cancer, Thalassemia (Cooley's anemia), muscular dystrophy, and Alzheimer's disease. The Daughters of Penelope are also a leading sponsor of the U.S. Department of Housing

and Urban Development's Section 202 Housing for the Elderly Program, which offers affordable housing to senior citizens in Alabama, Indiana, Iowa, Massachusetts, Minnesota and Texas. Recently, the Daughters of Penelope has also demonstrated support for senior nutrition and isolation with support for Meals on Wheels of America.

In addition to helping the elderly, the Daughters of Penelope Foundation, Inc., supports the educational objectives of the Daughters of Penelope by providing tens of thousands of dollars annually for scholarships, sponsoring educational seminars, and donating children's books to schools, shelters and churches through the ''Penelope's Books'' program. After ninety meaningful and productive years, it excites me to see what the Daughters of Penelope will accomplish and how they will help our country and our culture in the next ninety years.

HONORING ROGER E. HEDGEPETH

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I offer these remarks in honor of Roger E. Hedgepeth, one of the longest-serving mayors of Blacksburg, Virginia and a professor at Virginia Tech in that town, who died on November 12, 2019 at the age of 89.

Born in Norfolk, Virginia, on January 17, 1930, Roger E. Hedgepeth went to Maury High School and then graduated from Virginia Tech, where he received a degree in mechanical engineering. Following graduation, Mr. Hedgepeth served in the Armed Forces during the Korean War. Mr. Hedgepeth returned to Virginia Tech after serving his country and received a master's degree in mechanical engineering.

He married Jenny in 1956. They would remain happily married for 55 years until her death.

Mr. Hedgepeth used the education from his two degrees in mechanical engineering to teach students at Virginia Tech for 38 years.

As a resident of Blacksburg while teaching at Virginia Tech, he was active in his community and decided to make the leap to elected office. After two years of serving on the Blacksburg Town Council, Mr. Hedgepeth became mayor. Mr. Hedgepeth served in that position for 24 years, the second-longest tenure in Blacksburg's history.

As mayor, Mr. Hedgepeth was respected by his colleagues in government as well as his constituents. The relationship between Blacksburg and Virginia Tech during his tenure was so cordial that representatives from other college towns around the country would come to study their success.

Virginia Tech and the town of Blacksburg were fortunate to have this leader and educator in the community. Mr. Hedgepeth is survived by his children Natalie and Michael and grandchildren, Taylor and Austin of Bristol, Virginia, and Risher and Azat of Blacksburg. I offer my condolences to the Hedgepeth family on their loss.

RECOGNIZING THE 11TH ANNUAL FAMILY CHRISTMAS EXTRAVAGANZA

HON. BILL POSEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, on December 21, 2019, Brevard County families, businesses and local community organizations will gather to celebrate the 11th Annual Family Christmas Extravaganza. Having become one of the largest Christmas celebrations on the Space Coast, this year's event will be bigger and better than ever, promising a place for family and friends to partake in a wide variety of holiday festivities to get them in the Christmas spirit.

This year's event will take place at Fred Poppe Regional Park in Palm Bay from 11 am–4:30 pm and will be completely free of charge thanks to over 80 local businesses and organizations that came together to donate food, gift certificates and equipment. Because of their generous contributions, families will be able to enjoy cotton candy, hotdogs, snow cones, bouncy houses, ride horses and trains and even go rock climbing.

Hosting the event will be Eddie Anthony Izquierdo as ''Eddie Frost'' and Ahriel Brown as ''Arctic Ahriel,'' who will engage families with Christmas singalongs, short skits, and giveaways. A variety of exclusive performances will follow by Grammy Award-winning bassist Trae Pierce and the T-Stones, Chagy the Clown and the acrobats of Cirque Adventure.

The House of Palm Bay, City of Palm Bay Parks and Recreation along with several community business partners such as Thrifty Specialty Produce, Chick-Fil-A, Gator Automotive and Edible Arrangements are just among the few names of many we have to thank for providing the venue and resources to make the celebration unforgettable.

Senior Pastor Ken Delgado of the House at Palm Bay said in anticipation of the event, ''With today's news being filled with division, contention and expressions of hatred, it is exciting to see the City of Palm Bay, along with its businesses and citizens, create an event where love, joy and peace is expressed. The Family Christmas Extravaganza is the greatest expression that so many people yearn for and is what the angels proclaimed at the birth of Jesus saying, 'Peace and good will towards all men.' ''

The City of Palm Bay issued a proclamation in support for this year's celebration, proclaiming December 21, 2019 Family Christmas Extravaganza Day.

The spirit ofthe holidays is all about giving and spending time with loved ones. This year's Extravaganza brings our community together to remind us of that.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting all those who are doing their part to spread the Christmas spirit this holiday season and those who have worked so hard to make the Annual Family Christmas Extravaganza possible.

DECEMBER VETERAN OF THE MONTH

HON. KEVIN HERN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the American heroes who nobly defended our nation, and those who lost their lives in the name of that cause, during the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

With the 78th anniversary of the infamous attack on Pearl Harbor approaching, I cannot think of a better time to take pause and to remember those Americans who courageously jumped into action upon seeing enemy airplanes overhead. In what would remain the deadliest foreign attack on American soil for 60 years until the devastating events of September 11, 2001, 2,335 American servicemen were killed that day and an additional 1,143 were wounded. In an effort to cripple America's naval might, the Japanese destroyed or damaged 19 United States Navy ships, including eight battleships during the attack. In spite of their best efforts, the Japanese could not defeat American resolve and although our nation was wounded, as the world would later learn, the Japanese had simply awoken a sleeping giant.

As time marches on and we lose more and more members of America's Greatest Generation, I am proud to recognize Arles Cole. Quartermaster Cole was aboard the USS *West Virginia* on December 7, 1941, and heroically defended his ship and its crew at all costs. Quartermaster Cole is one of the few survivors of Pearl Harbor still with us and I am proud that he is my constituent in Oklahoma's First Congressional District. I am honored to recognize Quartermaster Arles Cole not only for his venerable service on December 7th and throughout World War II, but also for his continued commitment to his community.

Every American should take heed of the example set by those brave servicemembers who fought and those who died at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. In the face of overwhelming odds, they remained committed to their mission and to their country even if it meant sacrificing their life. I am proud to recognize them today and to remember and honor their service and sacrifice everyday as we enjoy the freedoms that they so gallantly defended.

IN HONOR OF GERTIE WILKERSON'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Gertie Wilkerson and wish her a very happy 100th birthday.

Gertie was born on December 7, 1919, to Everett and Gracie Cline Carter. Throughout her life she has developed the reputation of living a life full of purpose, commitment and keenness in acknowledging blessings from God.

Gertie and her family moved to Annapolis in the 1920's where she began a 30 year career

at Cannon Mills, which at the time was the world's largest producer of sheets and towels. She married her husband Henry R.C. Wilkerson, a United States Army veteran who fought in World War II. They spent 59 years together and raised three children, who later blessed them with six grandchildren and five great grandchildren.

In her free time, Gertie has led a full life. She was a passionate bowler who played regularly until she was 98 years old. In addition to being a fervent bowler, she has been a faithful member of Central Baptist Church for the last 63 years. Gertie has earned the esteemed reputation of being a funny, dedicated and compassionate individual, who possesses the true principles and morals to which we all aspire. I know all of you will agree with me when I say, she is a blessing to all who know her and a treasured part of this community.

Madam Speaker, please join me today in wishing Mrs. Gertie Wilkerson a very happy 100th birthday.

IN HONOR OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. JOSEPH CATHOLIC CHURCH AND PARISH

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, today I rise in celebration of the 150th Anniversary of St. Joseph Catholic Church and Parish in New Waverly, Texas.

St. Joseph Catholic Church, now a celebrated place of worship, first began as a small gathering for planter families who formed the Waverly Emigration Society. In 1869, Father Orzechowski officially formed the Parish of St. Joseph. The parish met at various farms until 1877 when they opened the first church—a small box building only 20 by 30 feet. The land they built the church and school upon was acquired for the modest price of one dollar.

In 1892, as the parish expanded, a second building was constructed to make room for the growing congregation. This building, designed by Tom Lawandorski, was much larger and more ornate than the first. Mrs. Catherine Ripowski donated trees from her property to aid with construction.

The longest serving priest was the adored Father Bily, whose tenure lasted 19 years. Under his leadership, the church still in use today was built. The gothic style building was designed by architect L.S. Green and took three years to finish. At its opening, it was deemed the finest church in the South. In 1909, four years after the opening of the third church building, St. Joseph's school was built on the property for 160 students.

Since its opening, the church has been restored and repaired, but the welcoming community atmosphere and the parishioners' enthusiasm for worship has remained constant for the last 150 years.

As St. Joseph's Catholic Church celebrates a century and a half of worship, I thank them for creating a welcoming space dedicated to bringing people together to worship The Lord. Congratulations on 150 years, and may the next be just as prosperous.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT LAKES MARITIME ACADEMY

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the 50th Anniversary of the Great Lakes Maritime Academy. Through its commitment to excellence and dedication to its students, GLMA has become an indispensable part of Michigan's First District.

Founded in 1969, the Great Lakes Maritime Academy is one of only six maritime academies in the United States. The first cadets of the academy received an associate degree and a license allowing for service on the Great Lakes upon graduation. In the 1980s, GLMA partnered with Ferris State University to allow cadets to earn bachelor's degrees, opening opportunities for graduates to serve in the United States Navy and Coast Guard. In 2012, thanks to the dedicated efforts of President Nelson and other public leaders, Governor Snyder signed legislation allowing community colleges to award bachelor's degrees in disciplines including maritime technology. This change allowed GLMA to partner with Northwestern Michigan College and enabled cadets to earn a bachelor's degree at a fraction of the cost.

The work of the Great Lakes Maritime Academy is essential for providing the next generation of Merchant Marine officers with the education, training, and credentials needed to serve on the Great Lakes and the high seas. Piloting everything from cruise ships and ferries to tankers and cargo ships, graduates of GLMA play an essential role in supporting our economy, national security, and everyday lives. The impact of their work on the people of Michigan and the United States cannot be overstated.

Madam Speaker, Michigan's proud maritime history is continued every day by the students, graduates, faculty, and leaders of the Great Lakes Maritime Academy, and it is my honor to congratulate them for fifty years of excellence. Michiganders can take great pride in knowing the First District is home to such dedicated citizens. On behalf of my constituents, I wish GLMA all the best as it ventures into the future.

CONGRATULATING MARY RYMAN ON HER RETIREMENT AFTER 46 YEARS AS BRISTOL TOWN CLERK

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mary Ryman on her retirement after 46 years as Bristol Town Clerk, making her the longest-serving town clerk in the State of Indiana.

For the people of Bristol, Indiana, walking into Town Hall means seeing a friendly face every day. For nearly half a century, Mary has been there to serve the community of Bristol, and she is always the right person to ask when residents have a question or need assistance. Her unparalleled commitment to her community exemplifies what it truly means to be a Hoosier and a public servant.

Guided by the values of integrity and respect for all people, Mary has proven to be a pillar of the town and a model citizen. Her unmistakable passion for making Bristol a better place inspires all who know her, and it's no surprise that she plans to continue serving her community as a volunteer at Bristol's Community Food Pantry.

Mary's compassion and warmth go far beyond her duties at Town Hall. She constantly strives to give back to those in need and to strengthen her community. As a member of the Bristol United Methodist Church, she has taught Sunday School for many years and enjoyed singing in the choir. She is also often found helping stray animals by providing them food and comfort. And she is a devoted wife and loving mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of Indiana's 2nd District, I want to thank Mary for the many years she has dedicated to serving the hard-working Hoosiers of Bristol and building a brighter future for northern Indiana. With her retirement, she leaves behind a legacy full of accomplishments, but her impact on the community is sure to last far into the future.

TRIBUTE HONORING COMMISSIONER RAYMOND BUXTON, II

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding leader Raymond Buxton, II, who is retiring after 40 years of service to the State of South Carolina. Mr. Buxton is a personal friend and his many contributions have not gone unnoticed.

Mr. Buxton received his Bachelor of Science degree from Savannah State University in Savannah, Georgia. He went on to serve his country as a dental technician in the United States Army with the 87th Medical Detachment in Nuremberg, Germany and at Moncrief Army Hospital in Fort Jackson, South Carolina. He furthered his education by taking graduate courses at the University of South Carolina and graduating from the South Carolina Executive Institute.

In 1979, when I was South Carolina Human Affairs Commissioner, I hired Ray as a community relations consultant. While in this position, he consulted with community leaders around the state to build relationships among a diverse group of citizens to promote unity. He went on to work as an employment investigator, senior analyst for employment discrimination, division director of the private sector/employment, and executive assistant for internal affairs before being tapped to run the agency in July 2012.

As the agency director, Mr. Buxton has worked diligently to make positive changes within the agency. He was responsible for fully restoring the once underfunded budget for the agency and increased staff from 20 to 46 employees. Also, Mr. Buxton instituted a new initiative, the ''Quality of Life'' dialogue, within the Community Relations Department to promote better human relations among diverse

populations in South Carolina. Professionally, he serves as vice president of the South Carolina Fair Housing Council, Inc. and as a South Carolina Human Affairs Representative for the International Association of Official Human Rights Agencies.

Mr. Buxton is also committed to serving the community. He is a member of Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc. He has served as the Fraternity's Chapter President and has been honored as its Man of the Year. He also volunteers at the Meals on Wheels Senior Resource Center and is an active board member on several committees including the Budget and Finance Committee and Board of Trustees at Saint John Baptist Church, the Columbia Housing Authority Development Board, and the Israel Brooks Foundation Board.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you and my colleagues join me in offering congratulations and well wishes to Raymond Buxton, II, for his 40 years of service at the South Carolina Human Affairs Commission. His extraordinary work has made a great impact in the lives of South Carolinians. I wish him all the best as he transitions into retirement, but I know he will continue to be an active pa1ticipant in the community always striving to improve the quality of life for everyone.

IN MEMORY OF DR. ROY LAWRENCE WILSON

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 2019

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Roy Lawrence Wilson who passed away recently. He had a distinguished military career, retiring from the U.S. Army in 1997 at the rank of Colonel. Between 1967 through 1971, he served three tours of duty in Vietnam and was decorated with multiple awards and citations including a Bronze Star Medal with an oak leaf cluster and an Army Commendation Medal with an oak leaf cluster. Subsequently, he was recalled to active service for Operations Desert Storm and Desert Shield.

Dr. Wilson had a private practice in Richardson, Texas as a dentist and oral surgeon and was a member of the American Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons and the American Dental Association. After twenty years in private practice, he devoted his time during retirement to train students as a clinical advisor at the Texas A&M College of Dentistry.

It is my honor to recognize Roy Wilson's notable service in the military and medical field. He was a beloved husband, father and grandfather and will be sorely missed by his family and friends to whom I extend my sincere condolences.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session and stands adjourned until 3:00 p.m., on Monday, December 9, 2019.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 29 public bills, H.R. 5331–5359; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 78; and H. Res. 745–747 were introduced. **Pages H9345–47**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H9348–49**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 3, to establish a fair price negotiation program, protect the Medicare program from excessive price increases, and establish an out-of-pocket maximum for Medicare part D enrollees, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–324, Part 1);

H.R. 3, to establish a fair price negotiation program, protect the Medicare program from excessive price increases, and establish an out-of-pocket maximum for Medicare part D enrollees, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–324, Part 2);

H.R. 4650, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for certain dental items and services under part B of the Medicare program, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–325, Part 1);

H.R. 4618, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for certain hearing items and services under part B of the Medicare program, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–326, Part 1); and

H.R. 4665, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for certain vision items and services under part B of the Medicare program, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–327, Part 1). **Page H9345**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Brown (MD) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H9297**

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 House agreed to 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, by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 188 nays with two answering ''present'', Roll No. 652. **Pages H9298–H9308, H9330–31**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendments to the resolution and the preamble recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now printed in the bill, modified by the amendments printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–322, shall be considered as adopted. **Page H9298**

H. Res. 741, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) and the resolution (H. Res. 326) was agreed to yesterday, December 5th.

Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019: The House passed 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, by a recorded vote of 228 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 654. **Pages H9308–30, H9331–34**

Rejected the Rodney Davis (IL) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House

forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 200 ayes to 215 noes, Roll No. 653. **Pages H9331–33**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–322, shall be considered as adopted. **Page H9308**

H. Res. 741, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) and the resolution (H. Res. 326) was agreed to yesterday, December 5th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, December 9th for Morning Hour debate. **Page H9337**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:28 p.m. and reconvened at 3:48 p.m. **Page H9345**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H9330–31, H9332–33, and H9333–34. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 3:49 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ROBOTS ON WALL STREET: THE IMPACT OF AI ON CAPITAL MARKETS AND JOBS IN THE FINANCIAL SERVICES INDUSTRY

Committee on Financial Services: Task Force on Artificial Intelligence held a hearing entitled ''Robots on Wall Street: The Impact of AI on Capital Markets and Jobs in the Financial Services Industry''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Impeachment Inquiry into President Donald J. Trump: Presentations from the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and House Judiciary Committee'', 9 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 729, the ''Tribal Coastal Resiliency Act'' [Coastal and Great Lakes Communities Enhancement Act], 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, December 9

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Patrick J. Bumatay, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Monday, December 9

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.