Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, last week, tragedy struck the South Lyon community in Oakland County, Michigan, as we learned of the death of Trevon Tyler.

Just 17 years old, Trevon died from complications following knee surgery.

Trevon was a beloved member of the South Lyon community and a member of the South Lyon East High School football team.

His coach called him ''the nicest, most fun-loving, caring kid.'' He ''walked with a pretty big pep in his step. He always said hi to everybody. Everybody loved him. He was a little bit of a jokester, had this big laugh, always made you smile.''

Trevon's incredible family, friends, classmates, and teammates are all heartbroken by his passing. His life was cut tragically short, but he will always be remembered by that smile, his laugh, his friendship, and his contributions to our community.

Today, we are called to live our lives more like Tre, with joy and love at the forefront.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SEWELL of Alabama) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 5, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on December 5, 2019, at 9:04 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5277.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF 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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 741 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 741

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House 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. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. 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 the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House 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. The amendments to the resolution and the preamble recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now printed in the resolution, modified by the amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 741, providing for consideration of two measures.

First, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019, under a closed rule. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment offered by Chairman NADLER and provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule provides one motion to recommit.

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of 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, under a closed rule.

The rule self-executes two manager's amendments offered by Chairman ENGEL. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Madam Speaker, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is one of the great legislative achievements of American history. It is perhaps the greatest single statute of the 20th century, in a century of great statutes, including the National Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act.

But the Voting Rights Act was born out of the blood, sweat, and tears of the American civil rights movement; in the wake of Freedom Summer; in the murders of Schwerner, Chaney, Goodman, and other civil rights heroes; and in the after the famous March on Washington, where Dr. King made his ''I Have a Dream'' speech.

The Voting Rights Act transformed American politics by bringing into our elections millions of voters who had been disenfranchised for a century after the Civil War ended. It changed the nature of politics in the Deep South and across the United States, and it changed the politics of the United States Congress as well.

Theoretically, the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments had solved the problem of disenfranchisement after the Civil War. The 13th Amendment abolished slavery; the 14th Amendment established equal protection; and the 15th Amendment banned discrimination in voting. But after the dismantling of reconstruction, African Americans were subjected to a regime of disenfranchisement that included violence, terror, grandfather clauses, literacy tests, poll taxes, and an ever-expanding panoply of devices, tricks, and tactics to keep Black people from being able to register to vote and to participate in elections.

The civil rights movement and President Lyndon Johnson fought for the Voting Rights Act, which passed in 1965 and which included a package of strong remedies targeting discriminatory voting practices and devices in the areas where discrimination was most egregious and virulent.

A key component of the Voting Rights Act was section 5, the preclearance requirement, which compelled covered States—that is, the States to which it applied—to stop discriminating and to subject all changes in their voting practices to the Department of Justice or to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

States were covered if they had used illegal voting discrimination devices like literacy tests, poll taxes, and character exams, and if fewer than 50 percent of the people were registered to vote or allowed to participate.

The Voting Rights Act was challenged immediately in litigation called South Carolina v. Katzenbach, but in 1966, the Supreme Court rejected arguments that the Voting Rights Act violated the Constitution.

The Supreme Court said Congress may use any rational means to effectuate the constitutional prohibition on race discrimination in voting. It upheld the preclearance requirement against attack.

Specifically, it was said by South Carolina that it violated the so-called equal footing doctrine, but the Supreme Court said that the equal footing doctrine applied to the admission of States and not to the Congress' power under section 5 of the 14th Amendment or section 2 of the 15th Amendment.

All of this worked for the Voting Rights Act to usher in a new era of real democracy in America. The preclearance requirement meant that the States, counties, and jurisdictions that had been discriminating had to submit to the Department of Justice or to Federal court their plans for changes. That worked to enfranchise millions of voters across America. It worked for the election of thousands of African American elected officials at the local, State, and Federal levels.

The genius of section 5 was that jurisdictions had to submit potentially discriminatory changes before the harm took place. Anybody can go ahead and sue under section 2 after an election is over, but then it is too late because the harm has already been done, the election has taken place. So even if you win in court, the court is not going to order a rerun of the election. It is not going to require all the voting to take place again, so it is too late at that point.

Section 5 puts the burden on the potentially discriminating parties to prove that they are not discriminating when they make changes in voting laws.

It works all the way up until 2013, when the Supreme Court rendered its 5–4 decision in Shelby County v. Holder. The Shelby County case struck down the section 4(b) formula for which States were covered, declaring that this formula was now out-of-date because it went back many, many decades to the 1960s and 1970s and that the Congress would need to update the formula to address current needs in the field and to show that the formula relates to the current problems that we are targeting.

The Court said specifically that coverage was based on decades-old data and eradicated practices, like literacy tests, which don't exist anymore. So when it got struck down, dozens of States and counties that were previously required to preclear changes related to voting didn't have to do it anymore, and they began very quickly, almost instantly, to roll back various kinds of voter protections and to pass strict voter identification laws, to pass massive voter purges, to implement cuts to early voting, to close polling places, and so on.

I am going to read from one of the witnesses who testified before the House Judiciary Committee, Kristen Clarke, the president and executive director of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights, who said:

''We have vetted complaints from tens of thousands of voters in Shelby, many revealing systemic voting discrimination. In short, this is how Shelby has impacted our democracy.

''First, we have seen the resurgence of discriminatory voting practices, some motivated by intentional discrimination, and this discrimination has been most intense in the very jurisdictions that were once covered by section 5. They range from the consolidation of polling sites to make it less convenient for minority voters to vote to the curtailing of early voting hours, the purging of minority voters from the rolls under the pretext of list maintenance, strict photo ID requirements, abuse of signature match verification requirements . . . , the threat of criminal prosecution, and more.

□ 1230

''Second, we have seen increased levels of recalcitrants in hostility among elected officials who institute and reinstitute discriminatory voting changes with impunity. . . .''

''Third, the loss of public notice regarding changes in voting practices that could have a discriminatory effect is significant. . . .''

''Fourth, the public no longer has the ability to participate in the process of reviewing practices before they take effect. . . .''

''Fifth, the preclearance process had an identifiable deterrent effect that is now lost.

''Sixth, the status quo is not sustainable. Civil rights organizations are stepping up to fill the void created by the Shelby decision at insurmountable expense.

''And finally, this will be the first redistricting cycle in decades'' in which redistricting takes place without the Voting Rights Act.

That is one example of testimony that we got from all over America about what the Shelby County v. Holder decision meant by dismantling section 5 by knocking out section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act.

H.R. 4 is doing precisely what the Supreme Court invited us to do in the Shelby County decision: to pass a new coverage formula for the Civil Rights Act preclearance requirement based on new data in a new formula designed to address current contemporary problems.

The Judiciary Committee and the House Administration Committee had a combined total of 17 hearings: 9 on the Judiciary side with its Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, and 8 in the House Administration Committee's Subcommittee on Elections. They heard about restrictive and discriminatory practices taking place in numerous States across the country, including Texas and Georgia, where, after the end of preclearance, Georgia voters faced a myriad of new voting barriers, including the closure of more than 200 precinct polling places, spoiled voter registration materials, purging of more than 1 million voters in a racially discriminatory way, restrictive voter ID laws, systematic rejection of absentee ballots, and more.

We also looked in North Carolina, which passed a so-called monster voter suppression law, which resulted in race discrimination in accessing the polls, including the closure of dozens of polling sites and long voting lines. The law eliminated same-day voter registration, reduced early voting by a week, curtailed satellite polling sites for elderly and disabled voters, and so on.

Madam Speaker, this legislation is the product of massive legislative inspection of voting conditions across the United States of America today, and it threads the needle that was offered to us by the Supreme Court in the Shelby County decision by amending the Voting Rights Act to revise the section 4(b) criteria and providing other voter protections at the same time.

Specifically, the bill creates a new coverage formula that applies to all States and hinges on a finding of repeated voting violations in the preceding 25 years.

It establishes a process for reviewing voting changes in jurisdictions nationwide, focused on a limited set of measures such as voter ID laws and the reduction of multilingual voting materials; it requires reasonable public notice for voting changes; it allows the Attorney General authority to request Federal observers; and it increases accessibility and protection for Native American and Alaska Native voters.

Just turning, now, to H.R. 326, for more than 20 years, American Presidents from both political parties and Israeli Prime Ministers have supported reaching a two-state solution that establishes a democratic Palestinian state to coexist peacefully and constructively side by side with a democratic Israel.

Middle East peace talks have favored the two-state solution and opposed settlement expansions, moves towards unilateral annexation of territories, and efforts to arrive at Palestinian statehood outside the framework of negotiations with Israel.

In 2002, President Bush stated: ''My vision is two states, living side by side in peace and security.''

In 2013, President Obama reiterated this exact same commitment, stating that: ''Negotiations will be necessary, but there is little secret about where they must lead—two states for two peoples.''

This resolution emphasizes the sentiment of the past 20 years of peace talks

by expressing the sense of this House of Representatives that only a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can ensure Israel's survival as a secure democratic state and fulfill the legitimate aspirations for a secure and democratic Palestinian state. It further expresses the sense that any U.S. proposal that fails to endorse a two-state solution will put a peaceful end to the conflict only further out of reach.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank Representative RASKIN for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, the right to vote is of paramount importance in our Republic. We all agree on that. Prohibitions against discriminatory barriers to the right to vote have been grounded in Federal law since the Civil War and, more recently, through the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

We all agree: Discrimination should have no place in our voting system. However, the majority would have us believe that the Voting Rights Act does not prevent any of this and would rather pass this partisan legislation for a Federal takeover of elections.

I anticipate that the 2013 Supreme Court case Shelby County v. Holder will be brought up many times today, but I would like to point out to my Democratic colleagues that, in that decision, the Supreme Court only struck down one outdated provision of the Voting Rights Act.

This provision, section 4(b), was struck down because it was outdated as it had not been updated since 1975, and it violated principles of equal State sovereignty and federalism. H.R. 4 is, quite simply, unconstitutional, as the Supreme Court had held that Federal control over local elections is allowed only when there is proof of discriminatory treatment in voting.

Further, I believe it is important to point out that other very important provisions of the Voting Rights Act remain in place, 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 every other Federal civil rights law, and 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, as well.

Section 3 of the Voting Rights Act also remains in place. This section 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 Federal court finds a State or a political subdivision to have treated people differently based on race, then the court has discretion now to retain supervisory jurisdiction and impose preclearance requirements as they see fit until a future date at the court's discretion. This is all valid now without this bill.

Section 3 has been utilized recently, in fact. U.S. District Judge Lee Rosenthal issued an opinion in a redistricting case that required that the city of Pasadena, Texas, be monitored by the Justice Department because it had intentionally changed its city council districts to decrease Hispanic influence.

States should be allowed to implement their own laws regarding their elections and voting security to ensure all results are accurate on election day. State and local governments know more about how to handle their elections than bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

I applaud State and local governments that are taking the necessary steps to modernize and secure their elections. For example, in Arizona, my home State, we have made continual progress on improving voter turnout and participation.

Mr. RASKIN said that the section that was taken out by the courts was genius. Well, I believe the opposite is true.

Arizona was under this outdated preclearance formula, and I can tell you personally that this section was not genius. Both Arizona Democrats and Republicans, alike, thought to have to preclear every single decision that elected election officials made with the Federal bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., was a total disaster.

Arizona now has free, open, and secure elections, despite not being under this Federal control preclearance anymore. Nearly 80 percent of Arizonans vote by mail. We have a robust online voter registration system, so it is easy to register to vote. We have approximately 1 month of early voting.

While Arizona has made voting easier and more accessible for voters, we have also made our elections more secure by outlining the practice of ballot harvesting. In Arizona, we believe it should be easy to vote and hard to cheat. The policies in Arizona seem to be working, as we have seen in election after election that voter turnout continues to grow.

A couple months ago, I had the opportunity to participate in a field hearing in Phoenix, Arizona, to discuss the Voting Rights Act. There, I spoke with staff of the Maricopa County Recorder, an elected Democrat. She relayed to me how disappointed they were to not have been asked to testify at this hearing as they felt that they had not been able to speak to the story of the successes in Arizona and why they were very concerned about H.R. 4. They did not want the Federal Government preclearing every single decision they made.

Think about it: They don't want to have to go back to the Federal Government every single time they change early ballots or voting locations. They, instead, are making great progress and strides. Voter turnout has soared. They don't want bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., slowing down important and time-sensitive decisions.

This rule also includes H. Res. 326.

I am curious why my Democratic colleagues decided to bring forward this nonbinding resolution as opposed to bringing up H.R. 336, a bill that I am personally a proud cosponsor of, which is identical to the text of S. 1, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act of 2019, which passed the Senate by a vote of 77–23—totally bipartisan—on February 5, 2019. Instead of the nonbinding resolution we have before us today, H.R. 336 would take concrete steps to counter the BDS movement against Israel.

□ 1245

Instead, I am saddened the Democrats brought up this resolution, a resolution that rebukes and ties the hands of the Trump administration and embarrasses Israel. In fact, the resolution expressly states a proposal must be put forward that is consistent with previous administrations' proposals, completely undercutting the Trump administration. This should not be a partisan issue with only Democrat sponsors and not one Republic cosponsor as this bill has. We should not be handicapping our President.

My Republican colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee tell me that a resolution that supports a two-state solution, without attempting to undermine the President, could have been bipartisan. However, this resolution singles out settlement expansion and annexation. These are some of the most delicate issues in our bilateral relationship with Israel, and it shines a spotlight on them in the middle of an ongoing and contentious time in Israel.

The 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.

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

We already voted to support a two-state solution over the summer in H. Res. 246 in a bipartisan manner.

So why do we need this partisan bill?

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. My good friend from Arizona chides me for having described section 5, the preclearance requirement of the Voting Rights Act, as genius, which is amazing to me because this has been a bipartisan national commitment and a

bipartisan commitment in Congress since 1965 when it passed on a bipartisan basis, since 1982 when it was reauthorized on a bipartisan basis, and since 2006 when President Bush signed it, as well, and celebrated it.

So we have had Presidents Bush, Clinton, and Obama, a continuous array of Presidents, supporting it, and Congresses supporting it.

If you don't have it, here is what happens: The NAACP Legal Defense Fund testified to us about successful litigation they had in Texas against a restrictive voter ID law that had discriminatory racial impact. They won on the lawsuit under section 2, but it was too late.

In the meantime, who was elected in Texas?

A U.S. Senator, all 36 Members of the House of Representatives, a Governor, a lieutenant governor, and so on.

The reason why section 5 is genius and why we need to restore the precoverage formula is because it requires States to submit in advance laws that could be potentially discriminatory.

I was amazed to hear again the language of federalizing control and a Federal takeover of elections when this has been a bipartisan commitment for decades grounded in the Constitution of the United States which tells us in Article I, Section 4 we can regulate elections; Section 2 of the Fifteenth Amendment saying we can regulate elections to prevent race discrimination; Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the republican Guarantee Clause, which tells us we must guarantee to people of the States a republican form of government, which means representative government based on democracy.

Finally, I will allow my friend to portray what is going on in her State her way, and she paints a lovely picture. I would just refer her to page 25 of the Judiciary Committee report which says that in Arizona polling places were closed throughout the State, many with significant populations of Latino voters, in advance of the 2016 election. Maricopa County, 31 percent Latino, closed 171 polling places, Mohave County closed 34, and so on. So there is another story to be told there which is embodied in the work.

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

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. RASKIN for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule which adopts bipartisan language which I introduced with my good friends, Congressman TOM REED and Congressman TED DEUTCH, reaffirming the United States' ironclad commitment to providing security assistance to our historic ally, Israel, which, as ever, is key to America's national security in the region, especially in our fight against terror.

This vote officially puts to rest the splinter view of adding new conditions on aid to Israel and reinforces our historic commitment to restoring a two-state solution.

I want to thank my good friend, House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ELIOT ENGEL, for his leadership on this issue and for including our language in his manager's amendment.

Madam Speaker, as we have seen in recent weeks, Israel, the democracy in the region, faces threats like no other country of missile and rocket attacks from terrorist organizations, including Hamas, Hezbollah, and Palestinian Islamic Jihad, as well as the ongoing threat of Iranian-backed forces in Syria.

Vital security assistance to Israel, including missile defense funding for Iron Dome, David's Sling, and Arrow 3, helps our ally to defend itself and preserve its qualitative military edge in the region. That is why in 2016 under the Obama administration, the U.S. and Israel signed a 10-year Memorandum of Understanding which constituted the single largest pledge of security assistance to Israel in America history. The MOU also increased the amount of defense dollars that go to U.S. businesses here at home, with as much as $1.2 billion a year invested in the United States.

We know that this aid helps save countless lives, and we know that the United States is better off when Israel is fully equipped to defend itself. That is why I led a bipartisan amendment with my colleagues, Congressman REED and Congressman DEUTCH, which reaffirms our commitment to providing this assistance without additional conditions or exceptions.

Our amendment was cosponsored by a total of 36 Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, who know that this assistance should not be subject to politics. I deeply appreciate all of our colleagues' support for our amendment, for this vital, lifesaving assistance, and for the bipartisan U.S.-Israel relationship.

This language is absolutely necessary because of the extreme and misguided views of some, especially several currently running for our Nation's highest office, who seemingly believe that assistance to Israel should be held hostage until Israel makes concessions according to their beliefs, including how Israel treats Gaza, which is controlled by the foreign terrorist organization Hamas.

We must stand together in rejecting that harmful view—as one Senator called it, the view of having leverage against Israel, our ally.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New Jersey 10 additional seconds.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, when our ally, Israel, faces more than 450 rockets fired by Palestinian and Jihad terrorists in Gaza, it must have the ability to defend itself, no matter what.

That is why with this vote we commit ourselves to strengthening the U.S.-Israel relationship by ensuring that we fulfill our guarantee to provide vital security assistance to the key democracy in the region.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mrs. LESKO, for her participation in the Election Subcommittee hearing in Phoenix.

Also, Madam Speaker, I want to thank you personally for your hard work in making sure that every person throughout this great Nation gets that opportunity to vote and for your work in furthering civil discussion and civil rights in your career.

Madam Speaker, I do rise in opposition to the rule for H.R. 4 today.

The Voting Rights Act is currently in place. The bill that we will be debating tomorrow is not a reauthorization of this important and historically bipartisan legislation that has prevented discrimination at the ballot box.

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.

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

The 2013 opinion held 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 Congress 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 and would attempt to put every State and jurisdiction under preclearance. This is a bill to federalize elections, regardless of what my colleagues have said in this institution today. During last night's Rules Committee meeting, it became clear that the majority was unable to determine the number of States or jurisdictions that would be covered by this preclearance if H.R. 4 were to become law tomorrow. Apparently, we have to pass this bill before the American people can even find out if they would be subjected to it.

This is a proposition that the majority knows is bad policy, and it is a nonstarter for myself, my colleagues in this Chamber, and those in the other body across this Capitol, the Supreme Court, too, but perhaps most importantly, the thousands of local election

officials across the country who would be crippled if this bill were to ever become law.

H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act, is not a Voting Rights Act reauthorization bill. This is only about preclearance and the Democratic majority giving the Department of Justice control over all election activity.

While it is not in my committee's jurisdiction in the House Administration Committee, our Subcommittee on Elections majority held seven field hearings and one listening session across the U.S., encompassing eight different States and over 13,000 miles of air travel. Even with this gargantuan effort, the Democrats were still unable to produce a single voter who wanted to vote and was unable to cast a ballot.

This is a great thing. We ought to celebrate it. Credit should be given to the Voting Rights Act for helping to achieve this. The 2018 midterm election produced the highest voting turnout in four decades according to data from the Census Bureau, especially among minority voters. That, again, should be celebrated.

Sections 2 and 3 of the Voting Rights Act that are currently in effect are continuing to 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 a ballot. That is why we have the Voting Rights Act, a great example of a bipartisan solution that is working to help Americans today and protecting Americans from discrimination.

Unfortunately, H.R. 4 is just a political attempt from the Democrats to give the Federal Government more control over how States run their elections. I have now seen four voting bills from the majority come to this floor. All of them have one common theme, and that is to federalize elections.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), who has been such a magnificent leader on this legislation.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly rise to support the rule on H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019.

Voting rights are primal. They are the cornerstone of our democracy. No right is more precious to our citizenship than the right of all Americans to be able to vote. When Americans are not able to cast their ballots, their votes are silenced, and we, especially as elected officials, should be alarmed if any American who wants to cast a ballot is unable to cast a ballot.

What H.R. 4 does is it restores the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by giving a new coverage formula. In fact, the Roberts Court specifically said in striking down section 4(b) that it was outdated. So H.R. 4 is our effort, the efforts of three committees, hours of testimony, lots and lots of stakeholders, and lots and lots of people who were American citizens not able to vote; it is that effort that led to a narrowly tailored new coverage formula. That new coverage formula does not look back to the 1960s or to the 1970s. It looks back 25 years, that is 1994 and going forward.

It requires adjudicated violations of voter discrimination. It is narrowly tailored, and it hits the mark as to what the Supreme Court requires us to do in saying that Congress could feel free to update its coverage formula.

The Supreme Court and Roberts, in his opinion, also said that voter discrimination still existed. It admitted that it still existed. And H.R. 4 is our effort to actually provide a modern-day voter coverage formula that will allow States and jurisdictions with the most egregious forms of discrimination to be required to preclear.

□ 1300

The Shelby v. Holder decision originated out of Shelby County, Alabama. I am honored every day to represent Alabama's Seventh Congressional District. It is a district that knows all too well the importance of voting.

You see, my district includes not only Birmingham and Montgomery but my hometown of Selma, Alabama. It was on a bridge in my hometown that our colleague JOHN LEWIS and so many other foot soldiers bled on that bridge for the equal right of all Americans to be able to vote.

This is exactly what H.R. 4 does. It restores the full protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In so doing, it provides a mechanism by which the most egregious States and localities must preclear before the elections. It is so hard to unring the bell once an election has already taken place. So section 2, while it has been used to litigate and to get good results, it only can occur after the election has taken place.

So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not only an important piece of legislation for our Nation to ensure that every American—American—who has the ability, who is 18 years of age or older, has the right to access a ballot box.

It is clear to me that since the Shelby v. Holder decision, so many States have now instituted voter discrimination laws. Some of them have been in the guise of voter fraud, but the Brennan Center and so many others have found that voter fraud happens minisculely in any election.

It is not about voter fraud. It is about voter suppression, suppressing the voices of certain Americans. And that is un-American, Mr. Speaker.

Just the 2018 midterm elections alone highlight the voter discrimination that occurred.

In Georgia, the Republican candidate for Governor used his power as secretary of state to put 53,000 voter registrations on hold, nearly 70 percent of which belonged to African American voters.

In North Dakota, Republicans established a new requirement that voters must show an ID that they live at a residential street address. It was not enough that they had a P.O. Box. That law was a barrier to thousands of Native Americans who live on reservations and use P.O. Boxes rather than residential street addresses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOGGETT). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from Maryland has shown, in Maricopa County, Arizona, which I think is where the gentlewoman is from, there is still voter discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, this is a seminal piece of legislation that will restore rights for the people. All of us, Republicans and Democrats, should be about making sure it is easier to vote, not harder to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 4.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), my good friend.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding me time and for her strong opposition to this rule.

Let's be clear, H. Res. 326 is a one-sided, partisan, and ill-timed resolution. This past summer, Members of this Chamber came to the floor and passed, almost unanimously, a very strong statement opposing the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement, as well as much of the language that is in this resolution, H. Res. 326. This is actually a watered-down version of what we passed last summer. There is nothing in this resolution that we didn't already pass almost unanimously last summer.

So, what happened? We woke up the day after that resolution passed last summer, and the Republicans wanted to pass legislation with teeth. I know that we have a lot of strong, bipartisan support for passing legislation with teeth, S.1/H.R. 336, legislation that already passed the Senate with almost 80 votes. But, unfortunately, for some of my colleagues, they woke up the next day and instead of wanting to pass legislation with teeth that would do something about it, do something about that strong statement that we made, we have been seeing this resolution passed as the main effort for the second half of this year.

In the last 2 years, Israel has been hit by over 2,600 rockets and mortars, and 1,500 of those rockets were fired from the Gaza Strip into Israel in the past year alone. Last week, every headline in the region was about Israel being bombarded with over 450 rockets, and that was just one moment in time.

This resolution fails to not only recognize these latest attacks but all the

persistent assaults on innocent Israelis by Palestinian terrorists. Notice this resolution is reprimanding Israel, but it says nothing about Palestinian terrorists.

My friend on the other side of the aisle, when he was giving his opening remarks, was reprimanding Israel and didn't say anything about Palestinian terrorists murdering innocent Israelis; nothing about the pay-to-slay program where the Palestinians financially reward terrorism and incite violence; nothing about Hamas denying humanitarian aid, calling jihad an obligation, and saying that they do not recognize Israel as a Jewish state.

This reality is lost in this resolution. This resolution completely fails to mention that Israel has made repeated attempts to offer peace proposals to the Palestinian Authority. Time and again, the Palestinian Authority has rejected peace proposals because they refuse publicly and privately to accept a Jewish state in Israel.

This resolution is silent on fundamental facts that shape the way Israel has dealt with this constant threat on its border. This resolution chooses to reference President Obama's policy toward Israel while intentionally leaving out President Trump's policy, ensuring a partisan outcome for this resolution.

Support for Israel in this Chamber has long been bipartisan. For whatever reason, the majority is choosing to advance in the resolution tomorrow that is going to have one of the most partisan votes to ever take place regarding Israel in the history of the House of Representatives. Congratulations.

H. Res. 326 undercuts the administration's efforts to strengthen our critical alliance with our greatest ally, Israel, and the timing of this vote is fooling no one. This resolution 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.

If House Democrats want to pass bipartisan legislation with teeth, they should bring S.1/H.R. 336, which has already passed the Senate, as I mentioned, with strong, bipartisan support and was introduced by Congressman MICHAEL MCCAUL in the House. There is even a discharge petition led by Congressman BRIAN MAST for this bill that has almost 200 signatures on it. If it came to a vote in this Chamber, it would pass.

How about we focus on passing legislation that gets through the House? It has already been through the Senate. It will be signed by the President. We will be doing something about that strong statement that we made last summer.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this rule and against this partisan resolution.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, all I will observe is that the gentleman from New York oddly begins by attacking a resolution for being a recycled version of language we have already adopted on a massive bipartisan basis in the House. Then he closes by attacking us for this resolution being partisan and divisive in some way. Obviously, those two things don't match up.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Voting rights guarantee all of our other rights. When Americans are obstructed from freely participating in elections, our democracy is imperiled.

This bill, six long years overdue, restores a key provision of the Voting Rights Act that was wrongfully nullified by Republican-appointed justices.

How troubling that a law that President Lyndon Johnson long ago secured now is being obstructed, while our home State of Texas has become ground zero for voter suppression. State Republicans have aggressively, illegally purged voting rolls. They eliminated mobile voting to quash especially student and senior voters. They enacted a cumbersome voter ID law. And they horribly, illegally gerrymandered our State.

Republicans split 100 voting precincts to create the district which I serve today, creating one of the most crooked districts that weaken the accessibility and accountability of Congress Members. A three-judge Federal court with two Republican-appointed judges unanimously condemned Texas redistricting as intentional racially discriminatory intent in its work.

Fortunately, the Texas Civil Rights Project, MoveTexas, LULAC, and other groups have challenged the suppression, but this bill is essential to offer the protection that they, and our democracy, deserve.

We need preclearance in Texas. We need preclearance to clear away all the obstacles Republicans insist on imposing to ensure that our State remains a voter nonparticipation State for democracy.

Madam Speaker, let's support H.R. 4.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

If we defeat the previous question, I will bring to the floor H.R. 2207, the Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2019, which most people know as the bill that will eliminate the medical device tax.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SEWELL of Alabama). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, H.R. 2207 was introduced by Mr. KIND from Wisconsin, and it has 253 bipartisan cosponsors, including myself.

Since the medical device tax was imposed by the Affordable Care Act, commonly known as ObamaCare, folks have known that it was detrimental to innovation and to patient access to necessary devices and treatments. The 2.3 percent excise tax has been suspended twice because we know it is bad policy. So what are we waiting for?

Madam Speaker, we should be bringing legislation to this floor that showcases how we can work together. The American people need to see us united on issues as important as this. We need to stand together when opportunities like these arise to better the lives and truly help all of our constituencies. H.R. 2207 does just that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question.

If we defeat the previous question, Republicans will amend the rule to include the repeal of the medical device tax.

The medical device tax takes effect on January 1, 2020, unless Congress acts. Time is of the essence. Yet, my friends across the aisle continue to waste our time and energy and, more importantly, clock time that we need to stop this tax from going into effect.

This is a bipartisan bill with 253 of us cosponsoring it. All I am asking is that the 253 cosponsors get an opportunity before this expires to say stop this, stop the wheels from grinding. Let's do something that counts for our fellow Americans, for senior citizens who are the recipients of a lot of these medical device implants.

It brings quality of life. Oftentimes, it brings the extension of very important quality of life to seniors. It is less time in hospitals. It has been proven—back up on people's feet to engage back in the workforce and their part of the American Dream.

Instead of having nothing happening in a bipartisan way, as our fellow Americans are watching what is happening in this House, if 253 of us agree on this today, we can stop this onerous tax. We can stop costing healthcare and the exorbitant amount of increases sent back down to all of our constituents.

This is a big deal in the State of Indiana, where I come from. What we do in the State of Indiana with 300 medical device manufacturing companies supporting nearly 55,000 good-paying jobs—nationally, the industry directly employs over half a million people.

□ 1315

It is no understatement to say that thousands of jobs are at stake if the medical device tax comes back in 26 days. When the tax was in effect for the 3 years of 2012 to 2015, industry lost almost 30,000 jobs nationwide, according to government data.

Madam Speaker, we should be focusing on important, urgent, bipartisan issues like this. We can do something together to make our constituents and to make our Nation better.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill. Twenty-six days to go. We can work together. Over 250 of us are cosponsoring this legislation.

I ask, on behalf of every citizen, everybody working in the medical device industry, and for the sake of our own economy, let's do something that makes sense for this country.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, in closing, H.R. 4 is totally partisan, without one Republican cosponsor; and H. Res. 326, another totally partisan bill, ties the Trump administration's hands and embarrasses Israel.

Madam Speaker, I urge ''no'' on the previous question, ''no'' on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank my friend from Arizona, who rightfully invites us to focus on legislation that will bring us together.

The gentlewoman from Indiana, who I have not had the good fortune of meeting yet, accuses me of wasting not just time, but something called ''clock time,'' which sounds like a really low blow.

In any event, I think our legislation actually will bring us together and should bring us together. The rule is for two pieces of legislation that I thought ought to have and would have complete bipartisan support.

The first is simply to update the preclearance coverage formula, section 4(b) in the Voting Rights Act, as we were instructed to do by the Supreme Court in the Shelby County v. Holder decision.

The Voting Rights Act is the product of a massive political and social struggle in the country to make America move forward, but it had been supported by huge bipartisan majorities in 1965, in 1982, and in 2006. Yet, today, our friends across the aisle now attack it as a Federal takeover of State elections, which is absolutely flabbergasting that the Republican Party, the party of Lincoln, is now attacking the Voting Rights Act and the preclearance requirement for being some kind of assault on Federalism when it vindicates the right of all Americans to vote, as we are not only authorized to do under the 14th and 15th Amendments, but we are obligated to do under the republican Guarantee Clause to make sure that all Americans are in a representative relationship with their government.

So I invite them to come on back over to this side of the Voting Rights Act.

Obviously, we are all for a two-state solution, as American Presidents of both parties have been for, for the last several decades, so I invite them to come back over for that, too.

This resolution cannot be both a tired rehash of everything we have done in the past, as was claimed, but also some kind of partisan departure. The partisan departure is on their side.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and a ''yes'' vote on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 741

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 2207) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2207.

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

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

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

INSIDER TRADING PROHIBITION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2534 and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RASKIN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 739 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2534.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1321

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2534) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit certain securities trading and related communications by those who possess material, nonpublic information, with Ms. SEWELL of Alabama in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairwoman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2534, the Insider Trading Prohibition Act, introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut, Representative JIM HIMES.

This long overdue bill creates a clear definition of illegal insider trading under the securities laws so that there is a codified, consistent standard for courts and market participants to better protect the hard-earned savings of millions of Americans and bring certainty to the U.S. securities market.

For nearly 80 years, the Securities and Exchange Commission—that is, the SEC—has sought to hold corporate insiders accountable for insider trading through general statutory antifraud provisions and rules it has promulgated under those provisions. This has resulted in a web of court decisions that generally prohibit insiders with a duty of trust and confidence to a corporation from secretly trading on material, nonpublic corporate information for their own personal gain.

These insiders are also generally prohibited from tipping outsiders, known as tippees, who then trade on the information themselves, even though they know it was wrongfully obtained.

But, because there isn't a statutory definition of ''insider trading,'' there is uncertainty around who is subject to insider trading prohibitions; and, with various court decisions, liability for this type of violation has shifted.

For example, in 2014, an appeals court added a brand-new requirement that the tippee must not just know that information was wrongfully disclosed but must also know about the specific personal benefit that the insider received.

This decision has severely hampered the SEC's ability to prosecute insider trading cases and, according to Preet Bharara, the former U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York ''provides a virtual roadmap for savvy hedge fund managers to insulate themselves from tippee liability by knowingly placing themselves at the end of a chain of insider information and avoiding learning details about the sources of obvious confidential and improperly disclosed information.''