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