

why, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the teachers, the staff, and the mentors that have made STEM a priority at Oak Grove, and also congratulations to all the students on a job well done.

#### 2016 BUDGET PRIORITIES

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, our Vice President, JOE BIDEN, once said: "Don't tell me what you value. Show me your budget, and I'll tell you what you value."

This body's routine budgeting practices have faded away in the last 4 years only to be replaced by partisan bickering that uses austere budgets as messaging tools. These budgets invariably go nowhere, while the most vulnerable individuals and families in our communities see their needs grow larger and their potential to make their own success grow smaller.

Our national priorities should be simple enough: public investment in quality education accessible by every student, infrastructure, job training programs, research, and a national energy policy that encourages innovation and new jobs. The strategy we have seen of cutting our way to prosperity simply does not work. The more we do it, the more we cut ourselves down while more nations pass us by.

As we work our way through the 2016 budgeting process, instead of telling our constituents our values, let's show them what we value by producing an ambitious budget that creates opportunity for our American middle class and those struggling to enter it or to stay in it.

#### THE DEPLORABLE ACTIONS OF THE MADURO REGIME

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Maduro regime in Venezuela has moved to expel opposition leaders from the National Assembly, arrested the mayor of Caracas on charges of conspiracy to commit violent acts, and has detained opposition leader Leopoldo Lopez for treason. The government issued a policy allowing police to use deadly force to control protests, which has resulted in the death of a 14-year-old student on his way to school. Over the weekend, Maduro's cronies in the legislature gave him dictatorial powers to more harshly crack down on internal dissent. Venezuela is sadly teetering closer towards a Cuba-style dictatorship.

I condemn these acts of repression which are a desperate attempt by Maduro and his henchmen to cling to power, despite policy failures that have led to shortages of food and medical supplies, long lines at shops, and soaring inflation.

These sanctions announced last week are a long overdue first step to holding the Maduro regime accountable for its grotesque disregard for human rights. But more must be done to ensure that these thugs answer for their crimes.

I stand in solidarity with the peaceful, democratic Venezuelan opposition there and in the U.S. that oppose thuggish rule. They have been instrumental in spreading information about Maduro's deplorable actions.

#### LAW ENFORCEMENT LEADERSHIP

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, maybe even a few months ago, I had the privilege of listening partly to the testimony of Attorney General nominee Loretta Lynch, a brilliant expression of a seasoned and competent, qualified and wise attorney that has served this Nation for many, many years. Formerly, as the U.S. attorney in Brooklyn, New York, she has been one who has received accolades from all over the Nation.

Now, unfortunately, the Senate, the other body, chooses to create a constitutional crisis. As she lingers waiting for a confirmation vote, already approved by the Judiciary Committee with a bipartisan vote, it begs the question: Why we are having this kind of treatment of the appointees of President Obama?

So I ask the other body if they would do what is right for the American people as we look for law enforcement leadership, as we continue to look for direction on antitrust issues, voting rights issues, women's rights issues, human rights issues, and many issues dealing with terrorism that fall under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Justice. It is time, and now, for this confirmation to be done and approved and for this former U.S. attorney to be sworn in as the United States Attorney General in the Department of Justice.

#### THANKING TIM BUTLER, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE 87TH HOUSE DISTRICT IN THE ILLINOIS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a former staffer for his service to this House, my office, and to the people of Illinois. Tim Butler, who most recently served as my district chief of staff, left my office recently to represent the people of the 87th House District in the Illinois General Assembly.

Tim was an asset to my team from day one, as we set out to make sure every constituent in the Thirteenth District knew we were there to serve them by getting answers from Federal

departments like the VA, listening and acting on legislative ideas, and much more. Under Tim's leadership, we opened five district offices, helped more than 1,500 constituents through casework, and launched 10 advisory boards, just to name a few of our team's accomplishments during my first term.

Tim began his service in the House in 1991 with the Committee on Education and Labor, and after leaving the committee, he worked for then-Congressman Ray LaHood for 14 years. It was during his time with Congressman LaHood and my time as projects director for Congressman SHIMKUS that Tim and I met and became friends. With his dedication and record of success helping constituents in Congressman LaHood's office, I knew he would be a perfect fit for mine.

Tim's leadership in my office will be missed, but I know he will provide the same level of exemplary constituent services representing the people of the 87th District in the Illinois General Assembly.

I thank Tim for his service to this House, and I congratulate him on his new opportunity to serve the people of Illinois.

#### THE BATTLE WAGES ON: SECURING EQUAL VOTING RIGHTS IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to be before you this evening on the heels of our Nation's recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Selma marchers which tore down many obstructive barriers to voting for African Americans and which led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

We have grown as a nation since the night Jimmie Lee Jackson was murdered peacefully marching for voting rights in Alabama, and we are not the America we were when Mamie Till made the world see what had been done to her baby. But we are still living in dynamic times for our democracy. Selma has changed, but the issues of Ferguson, Missouri, remain.

Nearly 60 years after Emmett Till was buried, Black mothers still worry about the value of their son's lives when they leave home. We are reminded of this every time we look into the eyes of Trayvon Martin's mother. We are better today than we were then,

and the changes we made to our laws paved our path to prosperity. The President spoke of this in Selma, and Republicans and Democrats alike were united in our feeling that we must uphold the promise of the Nation we inherited because of Selma.

□ 1930

The U.S. Senate should vote to confirm very qualified and exceptional U.S. Attorney Loretta Lynch as the next Attorney General. The CBC devoted an hour of floor testimony last month in defense of her confirmation, but in her role as Attorney General, Loretta Lynch will be tasked with defending the Federal laws that protect the right to vote, and that brings us to our topic this evening.

Tonight's Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour is entitled: "The Battle Wages On: Securing Equal Voting Rights in the United States." This topic is truly timely. This conversation needs to take place now. Work remains to secure equal voting rights in the United States.

Actions like the Supreme Court's decision to gut the Voting Rights Act remind us that the equality that should exist at the ballot is still lacking and why I dream of a day when the Voting Rights Act is no longer necessary. The truth is that voter discrimination and suppression remain as tragic legacies of our past.

In the past few years, many States have introduced restrictive legislation that diminishes an individual's access to the voting booth. The Justice Department may have the tools to fix this problem and go after places that are discriminating against certain voters.

In some places, getting a voter ID that you can use to vote can cost up to \$150, and that can be a burden for someone who is on a fixed income and not driving anymore and doesn't have a license.

Discriminatory laws and policies that hamper access to the ballot box are reasons that the protections and the Voting Rights Act are necessary. The VRA must remain intact as its principles are powerful democratic agents that make our Union more perfect.

With that, I would like to kick off this Special Order hour by yielding to my colleague and anchor, a man who has dedicated his life to the issues of justice in America—a lawyer, judge, and statesman who has defended voting rights—the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the Honorable G.K. BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Thank you very much, Congresswoman KELLY. Thank you for your leadership, and thank you for what you mean to the Congressional Black Caucus.

The Congressional Black Caucus is now the largest caucus in our history. We are very proud to announce that we have 46 members now in CBC, representing more than 30 million people from 23 States, in addition to the Dis-

trict of Columbia and the Virgin Islands, so I am delighted that you have taken this responsibility each week, Ms. KELLY, to come to the floor and manage this time.

Typically, Congressman DONALD PAYNE would be joining Congresswoman KELLY tonight, but Mr. PAYNE is not able to come to the floor tonight to help with this Special Order due to, what I am told, is complications from foot surgery, so we wish Congressman PAYNE a very speedy recovery.

Ms. KELLY, I wanted to particularly thank you for selecting this subject this evening. This is a very timely conversation that we must have in this Congress, and that is the whole subject of the Voting Rights Act. The topic that you have chosen, "The Battle Wages On: Securing Equal Voting Rights in the United States," is so very appropriate; and, hopefully, in the next 2 or 3 minutes, I want to tell you why.

Let me just start by explaining the whole voting rights story. Some of my colleagues may not fully appreciate it and understand that when we talk about voting rights, we just don't talk about 1965.

In order to fully appreciate the voting rights history in this country, we must go back to the end of slavery when 4 million slaves became free. They did not have the right to vote. Once the 15th Amendment was added to the Constitution, then all of the former slave men got and obtained the right to vote.

They got engaged. They got involved in the political process. From 1870 until 1900, a period of some 30 years, African American males, particularly in the South, were fully engaged in the political process.

But do you know what? In 1900, Mr. Speaker, in 1900, that right to vote came to an end. It came to an end because of Southern States like South Carolina, North Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, and the like, all of these Southern States passed disfranchisement laws, particularly a literacy test.

This literacy test had the practical effect of denying the former slaves and their descendants the right to vote. Not only did you have to read and write in order to be able to register to vote, you had to convince the registrar that you were literate.

The practical effect of that was that the whole voting rights movement during those days came to an abrupt end in 1901 when Congressman George H. White, who was one of my predecessors in North Carolina, stood on this House floor on March 3, 1901, and made a very profound welfare speech to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, that is the first era of voting rights in this country.

The next era, I would say, would be from 1901 to 1965, when African Americans, for the most part, were not allowed to register to vote because of the literacy test and were not meaningfully involved.

The next and final phase would be from 1965 until the present. In 1965, this Congress passed a historic 1965 Voting Rights Act, and it was a bipartisan bill. Democrats and Republicans promoted the bill all the way to the finish line with the help of then President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The 1965 voting rights, Mr. Speaker, did many great things, but the three things that I will highlight tonight are: Number one, it eliminated the literacy test; number two, it gave a right of action, it gave to African American communities all across the United States the right to bring legal action to file civil lawsuits in Federal court to challenge discriminatory election laws or practices or procedures; the third part of the Voting Rights Act was what we now refer to as section 5.

The Congress in 1965 set aside certain States in the country and certain subdivisions within a State to require them to get preclearance before election laws when new election laws went into effect.

Many of our Southern States did not like section 5, but it was put on the books for a purpose because, if given the opportunity, these States were going to pass discriminatory election laws that made it very difficult for African Americans to vote.

Section 5 has now been on the books since 1965. It has been strongly enforced by the Attorney General. Section 2 has been strongly enforced in courts all across the country. Now, we have 46 African Americans serving in Congress, we have thousands elected at State and local levels all across the country, and it was because of the Voting Rights Act in many respects.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we received a great surprise on June 25 of 2013. The U.S. Supreme Court declared that section 5 could not be enforced because the formula that gives life to section 5, which is section 4, the court said that section 4 needed to be updated and called on this Congress to amend section 4 to make it more contemporary in its application.

This Congress has failed to act. Now, this is the spring of 2015, and we have failed to act. Our voting rights are under continuous assault with more and more States and counties enacting voting laws that, on their face, appear to not be an impediment to voting. Many of these new laws are discriminatory, I want you to know. Some are intended to be. Others, though not intentional, will have a discriminatory result.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am just unable to understand why my Republican colleagues refuse to support an amendment to section 5 to make this provision compliant with the Supreme Court decision.

Through the years, this Congress has been called upon to extend section 5, and it has done so in a bipartisan way. In 2006, as section 5 was about to expire then, there was a bipartisan bill passed by this Congress, signed by President

George W. Bush. There were 192 Republicans who voted for the bill.

I want to say that to you again, my colleagues: 192 Republicans voted to extend section 5 just a few years ago. I saluted them then; I salute them now. Sixty-six of those Republicans continue to serve in the House today, including the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mr. Speaker, we must fix section 5 to comply with the Supreme Court's decision to update the formula. If we continue down this path and if we do nothing, the practical effect will be that jurisdictions will pass election laws or implement election practices or procedures that will discriminate, and we know it, and we must prevent it from happening.

The only remedy African American communities have to obtain redress from discriminatory practices will be to file very expensive litigation. In the meantime, the law, the new law goes into effect.

If section 5 was in place, there wouldn't be the need for expensive litigation. The jurisdiction would simply be required to make a showing to the Department of Justice, and the Attorney General would determine the effect of the change on minority voting strength. That is the way we have done it for the last 50 years.

I call on my Republican colleagues to please join with us in a bipartisan, bicameral effort to fix the formula so that section 5 can be enforced in our country.

Thank you, Ms. KELLY.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congressman BUTTERFIELD.

It is now my honor to introduce the gentlewoman from Alabama, one that was our gracious host last weekend, and we appreciate everything she did, TERRI SEWELL.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 2015, nearly 100 Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle went to Selma to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday and the 1965 march from Selma to Montgomery. I was humbled to welcome so many of my colleagues in Congress to my hometown of Selma, Alabama.

It meant a lot to me and the State of Alabama to also welcome President and Mrs. Obama and their daughters, as well as President and Mrs. George W. Bush to Selma to commemorate the significant events in American history. The Selma movement for voting rights was a uniquely American story of how ordinary Americans working together achieved extraordinary social change.

I want to thank all of the Members and everyone who participated in the Faith & Politics pilgrimage to Alabama this year. I especially want to thank my Alabama colleagues—Senator SESSIONS, Representative MARTHA ROBY, Representative ROBERT ADERHOLT, Representative BRADLEY BYRNE, and Representative GARY PALMER—for their participation in the delegation. A

special thanks to Congressman JOHN LEWIS and the Faith & Politics Institute for a job well done.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to walk in the footsteps of JOHN LEWIS with JOHN LEWIS is an unforgettable experience that is truly transformative. The bipartisan participation by Republicans and Democrats alike was truly something to behold, especially given the hyperpartisanship of Washington.

It was something to see us gather together in Selma, Alabama, to honor the sacrifices of the foot soldiers who dared to fight for voter equality 50 years ago. I tried not to have any expectation from this bipartisan showing, but I must admit my hope was that all of us would be motivated by the experience of traveling with JOHN LEWIS, in his footsteps with him, to honestly look at modern-day threats to voting rights today.

Now that the spotlight is no longer on Selma, we must move beyond the bridge and see that there is still a need to fight to ensure that all Americans can participate equally in the political process.

New barriers to voting rights have been legitimized in State legislatures across this country. Photo ID laws and efforts nationwide to get rid of early voting or weekend voting are modern-day efforts that have had the profound effect of restricting access to voting.

Any effort that restricts or decreases the likelihood of citizens to vote is a threat to the voting rights of all Americans. There is no denying that modern-day laws imposed to ostensibly prevent voter fraud has had the "unintended consequence" of making it much harder for certain sectors of the population to vote.

My father is a perfect example of an individual who has found it harder to vote because of these modern-day laws. Prior to the State of Alabama imposing a photo ID law to vote, my father, Andrew, a stroke victim who has been wheelchair bound for the last 10 years, had been voting by using his federally issued Social Security card, which does not have a photo; but once the law was imposed, my father—who no longer drives, who no longer works, is retired—had no way of getting a photo ID.

After the Alabama law changed, my mother and I made sure that my father would get a photo ID to vote. The effort was tremendous. We transported my father in a special wheelchair access van and got him into the old Dallas County courthouse, which was grandfathered in from having ADA laws and, therefore, no wheelchair ramp. Once inside the courthouse, the elevator to the registrar's office was being serviced, and we had to wait an hour in order to use it.

Once we finally got to the office of the board of registrars, there was only one person waiting on 25 people in line. My mother and father persevered. They persevered to make sure that my fa-

ther got a photo ID that day because he was resolved in voting because his daughter was on the ballot for reelection.

□ 1945

Just think of all of the seniors or disabled citizens who do not have a relative or a person to take them to get a photo ID. This photo requirement definitely reduces the number of and the ability of certain segments of the society to exercise their right to vote.

In the Supreme Court ruling which invalidated the preclearance provisions of the VRA, the Court said that the formula used by Congress to determine the covered States was outdated, and it implied that there was no need for the Voting Rights Act today since, after all, there was an African American elected as President. Oh, how shortsighted the Supreme Court was. As long as there are vulnerable communities that face barriers to voting, there is still a need for Federal protection.

Just last year, after the Supreme Court ruling, the city of Evergreen, Alabama, came under Federal scrutiny for unfairly excluding African Americans from the voting rolls and for attempting to further dilute their voting power with a redistricting plan that would pack its majority Black population into only two of the five municipal districts. Incidences like this in Evergreen, Alabama, remind us that progress is always illusive and that the injustice suffered on the Edmund Pettus Bridge 50 years ago has not been fully vindicated.

Mr. Speaker, beyond the bridge, there are still laws that explicitly or unintentionally limit the access of Americans to vote. Now that we have commemorated the movement that led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, what are we going to do to protect the progress that has been made and to expand access to the sacred right to vote?

On March 7, 2015, while en route to Selma, President Obama signed H.R. 431, the bill that awarded a Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers of the Selma to Montgomery march of 1965. Finally, this Nation is acknowledging the bravery of these foot soldiers, who dared to make this Nation live up to its ideals of justice and equality for all. While a great honor, a medal is not adequate repayment for their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest tribute that we as Members of Congress can give is to work honestly and earnestly on a bipartisan bill to restore Federal voting protections to vulnerable communities under the Voting Rights Act. While I applaud bipartisan efforts made in the Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2015, which creates a new formula that would determine which jurisdictions require Federal preclearance, this new formula that is in the current VRA Amendment Act omits key States, key States like North Carolina, South

Carolina, and Alabama. I can't imagine, Mr. Speaker, that the very State—Alabama—that prompted the Voting Rights Act that was signed into law 50 years ago would now not be afforded the protection of Federal oversight. The fight for voting rights was born in Alabama, and on my watch, it will not die there.

Voting rights advocates and everyday citizens must remain vigilant and do all that they can to safeguard against efforts to constrict democracy in State and local governments. Our democracy requires it. We can all pay a debt of gratitude to those foot soldiers by voting in every election—local, State, and Federal. We all have our part to play, and we in Congress can play a vital role.

To echo the President's call to action, President Obama said on that day:

Selma shows us that America is not the project of any one person. The single most powerful word in our democracy is the word "we." We the people are tasked with strengthening and safeguarding our democracy. We the people are responsible for ensuring our Nation lives up to its very principles.

On the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act and the historic march from Selma to Montgomery, I urge my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans alike—to recommit ourselves to the work that was done by our predecessors, to work together to restore the Voting Rights Act for all Americans. That is the least we can do on this, the 50th anniversary. I look forward to this august body taking up a voting rights amendment act that fully restores Federal protection to all vulnerable communities so that all Americans can definitely exercise that sacred right to vote.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you to the gentlewoman from Alabama. Thank you for sharing the challenges citizens like your dad can have in complying with the new Voting Rights Act law. Thank you for standing up.

At this time, I would like to introduce the fierce and gentle woman from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend, Representative ROBIN KELLY from Illinois, for her leadership on this night, this first night back.

For Members back from Selma, I appreciate that our chair of the Congressional Black Caucus has been here to give us very important background and history. I particularly appreciate that we have just heard from a Member from Alabama, itself, Representative TERRI SEWELL, and all of that seems to me to be the appropriate prelude for what we are doing here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, yes, this is the first day we are back from this historic trip and are back from the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act. There is no place for the almost 100 Members who went to Selma to be but on this floor this evening. I want to thank Attorney

General Holder for taking the crippled Voting Rights Act and continuing to enforce it. The trip to Selma essentially set the stage for Members to come back and to regard our trip as a call to action and get down to work to revitalize the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

My thanks to Representative JIM SENSENBRENNER and to Representative JOHN CONYERS for cosponsoring a revised version of the act. My thanks to JOHN LEWIS, who has kept Selma and the Voting Rights Act alive by his annual trips with Members and others to Selma. I am appreciative of the almost 100 Members from both parties who went to Selma on the 6th and 7th.

What was the purpose of going?

It could not have been a celebration. You can celebrate the 1964 Civil Rights Act. It has not been dismembered. You can celebrate the 1968 fair housing law. It still is on the books. But you go to Selma to try to bring back to its full glory the Voting Rights Act of 1965, where setback with section 5 has rendered the act virtually obsolete for most of its original purposes.

I stress that the Supreme Court did not invalidate the 1965 Voting Rights Act. It invited the 100 Members who went to Selma and the others in this body to modernize the act. We may differ on how to do that. I do not think there can be any doubt that it has to be revised and that we have to meet the challenge that the Supreme Court has given us. After all, the Voting Rights Act has prevented, literally, hundreds of discriminatory voting practices, and there were countless practices that it simply deterred. I must say that I was disappointed that, early on in this session, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Representative GOODLATTE, indicated that he did not believe that the act was necessary, and he talked about the 11 Southern States that had been under the act.

The fact is that the preclearance Voting Rights Act requirements went far beyond those States. At the time of the Supreme Court decision in 2013, Arizona and Alaska were covered. Parts of California, New York, South Dakota, and Michigan were covered. In the past, parts of Hawaii, Colorado, New Hampshire, Idaho, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Wyoming, Maine, New Mexico, and Oklahoma have been covered. It is true that at the heart of the coverage were the 11 Southern States, but that is where the heart of the violations were, in fact, tracked. That is where the poll taxes were. That is where the violations were.

There has been a compromise bill that has been put forward by Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. CONYERS. In the very act of going to Selma, there was put upon us an obligation to come back and respond to that trip. The bill before us has tried to meet some of the objections that were raised. There is a rolling preclearance formula, for example, that does not require congressional reauthorization. There is a bail-in section of the act to reach those who had

not been covered. There are a minimum number of violations over a period of time that have to be recorded in order for a state to come under the act.

As my good friend from Alabama, TERRI SEWELL, says, the act is not what all of us wanted, but it does mean that in the spirit of compromise and because of the necessity of this act, this act which democratized the South and is necessary now—perhaps not as necessary as it was 50 years ago—but no one can doubt, as a Supreme Court Justice himself said when he said he didn't doubt that there was still discrimination in voting practices, but he said it was up to the Congress to modernize the bill.

I don't see how almost 100 Republican and Democratic Members can have gone to Selma on the 50th anniversary without coming back to revise the act. We went emptyhanded. We went without a bill. I hope that what we got in Selma was the gumption to come back and to put forward a bill. Yes, the act has been dismembered by the Supreme Court, but the Court asked us to reshape it. It asked us to restore it. It was one thing to go without a bill. It is quite another to come back and do nothing about a bill.

The President did not hesitate to say where the responsibility, in fact, lies, and I am quoting from his speech in Selma:

One hundred Members of Congress have come here today to honor people who were willing to die for the right it protects. If we want to honor this day, let these 100 go back to Washington and gather 400 more and, together, pledge to make it their mission to restore the law this year.

That is our mission. The trip to Selma, where we went in the name of the entire Congress, demands that we act before the end of this Congress.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you so much to the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C.

At this time, I would like to introduce the gentleman from South Carolina, our leader, JAMES CLYBURN.

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I often refer to this Hall as America's classroom. I do that because I do believe that, as we conduct ourselves here on this floor, it is to set an example for all citizens, especially our young citizens, who look in on our proceedings and get some idea about how they ought to conduct themselves as Americans going forward. One of those things, I think, that we ought to be very careful of is how we address the rights and responsibilities that we all have as citizens.

□ 2000

We teach our children in our classrooms and in our homes that the right to vote is basic to this democracy of ours. I know that all of us are aware that in our past it is a right that has not always been practiced, but in its

wisdom this body, acting collectively, decided back in 1965 that it would do something about making right the wrongs that have been heaped upon citizens for decades when it comes to voting. And so we did.

A formula was adopted that was based upon the 1964 results of the Presidential election. We have renewed time and time again that law, always updating under that formula; but several months ago the United States Supreme Court looked at the formula and decided that the formula had outlived its usefulness, but the Voting Rights Act was still needed. They invited the Congress to take a look at the formula and update it, as the chair said, and to make it more contemporary. We have worked for months.

I want to thank Mr. SENSENBRENNER of Wisconsin and Mr. CONYERS of Michigan for the work they have done to put together some amendments that would update that formula.

This time we decided to look back just a few years and to see, within the last 10 or 12 years, what jurisdictions have still continued to violate people's rights and who have been found guilty of doing so. Rather than apply the formula to everybody, what we will do is come up with a series of wrongs, put some numerical qualification on it, and make a new formula.

Now, that formula is not going to cover South Carolina today, but under the formula, any jurisdiction, any State that permits these kinds of atrocities and is found to have done so, they will be brought under the formula. So the formula applies to every jurisdiction in the country. I think that it is time for us to be honest that everybody will not do right, but we should have something in place so when a jurisdiction fails to do right, we will have a mechanism to address those ills.

Now, let me hasten to add—and I want all that are listening in to understand—this part of the Voting Rights Act is a preventive measure. It says that it allows for the Justice Department to move to prevent any kind of implementation of a change in the voting laws so that we won't have expensive litigation if something in it is not quite right. I believe that it is incumbent upon us to do what we can to employ methods that will not require citizens and the jurisdiction, their States, their cities and counties, to go to the expense of litigation when we can have an administrative procedure in place to take a look at what has been done and make a decision as to whether or not there is any possibility that someone's voting rights could be taken away. That is all this formula does. That is all section 5 is about.

I would hope that those of us who traveled to Selma last week to renew our commitment to making this country of ours a more perfect Union will sit down in the near future, and before we get to the 50th anniversary of the signing of that 1965 Voting Rights Act,

which comes on August 6 of this year, sometime between now and August 6, let's put in place the kind of amendments that would allow the Voting Rights Act to maintain the life that it has given to so many communities for so many years.

I want to thank Ms. KELLY for putting together this Special Order.

Let me close by saying: The longer I live, the more I get in touch with those old adages that we grew up with, one of which was "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." I believe that these amendments that we are proposing are preventive measures, and it is much more valuable than for us to come back looking for a cure that could be very, very expensive.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for your important insight and your important comments.

Now it is my honor to introduce the gentlelady from Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank my colleagues and thank Congresswoman KELLY and Chairman BUTTERFIELD for the opportunity to carry forward the spirit of the 50th commemoration of the march over the Edmund Pettus Bridge. Let me also begin by thanking our colleague Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL and all of the Alabama delegation for their hospitality and their spirit of unity.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am so moved by that experience that I frankly believe that now is the time to move the bill that is bipartisan that is a response to the United States Supreme Court to the floor of the House, to the Committee on the Judiciary and to the floor of the House.

Leader CLYBURN was very apt in describing a very significant point that really answers the question of the Supreme Court. If I had my way, coming from the State of Texas, I frankly believe that the reauthorization that we did through the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, and which I was very much engaged in in 2006 and 2007, was a thorough expose of the value of the Voting Rights Act. We did 15,000 pages of testimony, and witness after witness from different perspectives indicated that the formula that we were using at that time on the preclearance was an effective formula. Of course, the Supreme Court challenged the data, and I would only argue that it is appropriate to update the data. I welcome that.

But we have gone even further. As has been articulated by the bill that has just been introduced by a number of us, we have crafted a formula that says it is an even playing field, an even playing field for a State to opt in because they have voting rights abuses for all people or to opt out because they have a smooth, evenhanded process for citizens in their State to vote.

So I believe it is important that the message get out of what the Voting Rights Act stands for and what it

meant for those foot soldiers to cross that bridge. They crossed that bridge, and they were willing—and were bloodied, frankly—to do something non-violent, and that is to petition their leaders at the voting box.

I can't imagine that there is any Member here in this place, in this august Congress, that would not want to go to their constituents, whether they live in South Dakota or Utah or Mississippi or New York or Texas, as I do, that there is an unfettered right to vote.

I will soon be introducing a Voting Rights Act that establishes the date that we signed the Voting Rights Act by the President that came from Texas, Lyndon Baines Johnson, with the leaders of Martin Luther King and JOHN LEWIS and many others standing at his side, to introduce that as being Voting Rights Act Day, to reinforce the value to Americans of the importance of voting.

Who would want to oppose the idea that voting is not important?

So I am looking forward to having Members join on the simple premise that it is important to vote in America and that it is important to commemorate the signing of the Voting Rights Act and make it Voting Rights Day. That inspiration came as we saw the thousands that were marching across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

Let me just clarify for a moment, under section 5, the submitting jurisdiction under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and H.R. 885, Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2015, has to prove that the proposed changes are not retrogressive, that they do not have the purpose and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color. We have expanded that, again, to go by acts, by occurrences that would keep someone from voting.

So I believed that this past weekend, or the weekend of Bloody Sunday, was a moving moment that would draw us together, that would allow us to understand H.R. 885. And might I say this: I know that many of us will be willing to have teach-ins to ensure that our colleagues understand the importance of this legislation and that we do it in a bipartisan manner.

Let me conclude my remarks by saying, earlier today I stood on the floor and asked for a bipartisan approach to the approval of the Attorney General nominee by the other body. I say that from the spirit of recognition of the three branches of government. A President has nominated a very well-qualified, distinguished member of the bar, Loretta Lynch, to be the next Attorney General of the United States of America.

We understand differences of opinion with legislation. I have no quarrel with those differences. I happen to support the human trafficking bill and recognize that there is a disagreement on language that I agree with the disagreement, but that disagreement can

be worked out through ongoing talks and however they want to approach it or a vote on the floor. But Loretta Lynch, the Attorney General nominee, should not be held up captive to disagreements on legislation and moving toward a constitutional crisis.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, is wrapped up together. The Department of Justice enforces the Voting Rights Act, enforces the voting rights of Americans. As we look to the future, as we formulate the understanding of the three branches of government, to avoid a constitutional crisis of not having the leadership that is timely for the work that has to be done, I would hope the Senate would move forward, and I would hope that all of us would honor the Voting Rights Act and the message of Selma that we stand together under this wonderful flag and stand for voting rights for all.

Since its passage in 1965, and through four reauthorizations signed by Republican presidents (1970, 1975, 1982, 2006), more Americans, especially those in the communities we represent, have been empowered by the Voting Rights Act of 1965 than any other single piece of legislation.

Section 5 of the Act requires covered jurisdictions to submit proposed changes to any voting law or procedure to the Department of Justice or the U.S. District Court in Washington, D.C. for pre-approval, hence the term “pre-clearance.”

Under Section 5, the submitting jurisdiction has the burden of proving that the proposed change(s) are not retrogressive, i.e. that they do not have the purpose and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color.

In announcing his support for the 1982 extension of the Voting Rights Act, President Reagan said, “the right to vote is the crown jewel of American liberties.”

And Section is the “crown jewel” of the Voting Rights Act.

But a terrible blow was dealt to the Voting Rights Act on June 25, 2013, when the Supreme Court handed down the decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 537 U.S. 193 (2013), which invalidated Section 4(b), the provision of the law determining which jurisdictions would be subject to Section 5 “pre-clearance.”

#### FACTS OF SHELBY COUNTY V. HOLDER

In 2006, the City of Calera, which lies within Shelby County, enacted a discriminatory redistricting plan without complying with Section 5, leading to the loss of the city’s sole African-American councilman, Ernest Montgomery. In compliance with Section 5, however, Calera was required to draw a nondiscriminatory redistricting plan and conduct another election in which Mr. Montgomery regained his seat.

According to the Supreme Court majority, the reason for striking down Section 4(b): “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.

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 stymying the practices that resulted in the wholesale disenfranchisement of African Americans and language minorities but did eliminate them entirely.

Before the Voting Rights Act was passed in 1965, the right to vote did not exist in practice for most African Americans.

And until 1975, most American citizens who were not proficient in English faced significant obstacles to voting, because they could not understand the ballot.

Asian Americans and Asian immigrants also suffered systematic exclusion from the political process.

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, black elected officials were elected anywhere in the South.

Because of the Voting Rights Act, there are now more than 9,100 black elected officials, including 43 members of Congress, the largest number ever.

The Voting Rights Act opened the political process for many of the approximately 6,000 Latino public officials that have been elected and appointed nationwide, including 263 at the state or federal level, 27 of whom serve in Congress.

Now to be sure, the Supreme Court did not invalidate the preclearance provisions of Section 5; it only invalidated Section 4(b).

But that is like leaving the car undamaged but destroying the key that unlocks the doors and starts the engine.

According to the Court, the coverage formula in Section 4(b) had to be struck down because the data upon which it was based—registration rates and turn-out gaps—was too old and outdated.

But my colleagues in Congress and I refuse to let the Voting Rights Act die.

And so we went to work, crafting and drafting the legislation that would repair the damage done to the Voting Rights Act by the Supreme Court decision and capable of winning majorities in the House and Senate and the signature of the President.

After months of hard work, consultation, negotiation, and collaboration, we produced and have reintroduced in the 114th Congress, a bill, H.R. 885, “Voting Rights Amendments Act of 2015” that can achieve these goals.

To be sure, this legislation is not perfect, no bill ever is.

But—and this is important—the bill represents an important step forward because it: 1. is responsive to the concern expressed by the Supreme Court; and 2. establishes a new coverage formula that is carefully tailored but sufficiently potent to protect the voting rights of all Americans.

First, H.R. 885 specifies a new coverage formula that is based on current problems in voting and therefore directly responds to the Court’s concern that the previous formula was outdated.

The importance of this feature is hard to overestimate. Legislators and litigators understand that the likelihood of the Court upholding an amended statute that fails to correct the provision previously found to be defective is very low and indeed.

H.R. 885 replaces the old “static” coverage formula with a new dynamic coverage formula, or “rolling trigger,” which works as follows: 1.

for states, it requires at least one finding of discrimination at the state level and at least four adverse findings by its sub-jurisdictions within the previous 15 years; 2. for political subdivisions, it requires at least three adverse findings within the previous 15 years; but 3. political subdivisions with “persistent and extremely low minority voter turnout,” can also be covered if they have a single adverse finding of discrimination.

The effect of the “rolling trigger” mechanism effectively gives the legislation nationwide reach because any state and any jurisdiction in any state potentially is subject to being covered if the requisite number of violations are found to have been committed.

Prior to *Shelby County v. Holder*, the Voting Rights Act covered 16 states in whole or in part, including most of the states in the Deep South.

The rolling trigger contained in H.R. 885, unfortunately, does not; at least not initially. The only states that would be covered initially under the new bill are: 1. Texas 2. North Carolina 3. Louisiana 4. Florida 5. South Carolina.

To compensate for the fact that fewer jurisdictions are covered, our bill also includes several key provisions that are consistent with the needs created by a narrower Section 5 trigger.

For example, H.R. 885: 1. Expands judicial “bail-in” authority under Section 3 so that it applies to voting changes that result in discrimination (not just intentional discrimination); 2. Requires nationwide transparency of “late breaking” voting changes; allocation of poll place resources; and changes within the boundaries of voting districts; 3. Clarifies and expands the ability of plaintiffs to seek a preliminary injunction against voting discrimination; and 4. Clarifies and expands Attorney General’s authority to send election observers to protect against voting discrimination.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 is no ordinary piece of legislation.

For millions of Americans, and many of us in Congress, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is a 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.

#### ABOUT TEXAS NAACP V. BERRY

(TEXAS PHOTO ID CASE; CONSOLIDATED WITH VEASEY V. PERRY)

1. The suit alleges that the State of Texas’ photo ID requirement for in-person voting, enacted in 2011, was adopted for discriminatory reasons, in violation of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments and Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, and has a discriminatory “result” in violation of Section 2. The case is consolidated with similar suits filed by the United States and other private plaintiffs.

2. Trial was held from September 2 to September 11, 2014, and closing arguments were presented on September 22, 2014.

3. On October 9, 2014, U.S. District Judge Nelva Gonzales Ramos issued a 147-page opinion in which she ruled that the Texas photo ID requirement violates both the U.S. Constitution and Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

4. Judge Ramos found that the law was enacted for the purpose of discriminating against African-American and Latino voters, and that it denies minority voters an equal opportunity to participate in the political process in violation of the Section 2 results standard.

5. Judge Ramos also found that the photo ID law unconstitutionally burdens the right to vote, and functions as an unconstitutional poll tax.

6. On October 14, 2014, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit granted Texas' motion to stay the district court's permanent injunction until Texas' appeal is briefed, argued and decided.

7. On October 15, 2014, the Lawyers' Committee and co-counsel filed an emergency application with the Supreme Court to reinstate the district court's injunction.

8. On October 18, 2014, the Supreme Court denied the application to vacate the stay; Justice Ginsburg filed a dissent, joined by Justices Sotomayor and Kagan.

9. Oral argument before the 5th Circuit is scheduled to take place during the last week in April.

10. Previously, in a lawsuit litigated under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, a three-judge district court in *Texas v. Holder*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 113 (D.D.C. 2012), ruled that Texas' photo ID law did not satisfy the nondiscrimination requirements of Section 5.

11. However, the district court ruling was vacated by the Supreme Court, 133 S. Ct. 2886 (2013), following the Court's decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 133 S. Ct. 2612 (2013), that the geographic coverage formula for Section 5 is unconstitutional.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I thank the gentlelady from Texas for her remarks. Now it is my honor to yield to the gentlelady from Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Congresswoman GWEN MOORE.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged just recently to stand hand in hand and shoulder to shoulder in Selma, Alabama, with 100 Members of Congress, with civil rights leaders, friends of the movement of all races from every State in the United States, with civil rights luminaries such as Mrs. Abernathy, Dorothy Cotton, Amelia Boynton—113 years old—Doris Crenshaw, and, of course, our very own colleague, JOHN LEWIS, who helped lead a march for a better life and more equality for all of America.

But it was very, very hard to celebrate. There was a very sober mood in the crowd as we realized that the voting rights of Americans, particularly African Americans, were under threat 50 years after the Voting Rights Act was signed. As the President said in his remarks:

Right now, in 2015, 50 years after Selma, there are laws across the country designed to make it harder for people to vote.

□ 2015

As we speak, more of such laws are being proposed. Meanwhile, the Voting Rights Act, the culmination of so much blood, so much sweat and tears, the product of so much sacrifice in the face of wanton violence, the Voting Rights Act stands weakened, its future subject to political rancor.

As we think of those martyrs like Viola Liuzzo, James Earl Chaney, Andy Goodman, and Michael Schwerner, it is very, very difficult to deal with the reality that States such as the one that I hail from, Wisconsin, is one of the States who has joined the map of shame and passed one of the strictest voter ID laws in the country.

In the following years since 2011, Wisconsin has been a battleground in fighting this pernicious law. In 2014, a Federal judge ruled that our voter ID law was unconstitutional and violated section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. It found that 300,000 Wisconsinites lacked the proper ID needed under the law and that the law would have a disparate impact on Blacks and Latinos.

Despite that powerful finding, the Federal district court was recklessly overturned by a three-judge panel in the Seventh Circuit. Right before our 2014 election, the United States Supreme Court stepped in and enjoined this law in an emergency stay to prevent them from implementing the voter ID law only 6 weeks before the 2014 election. Recently, members of the Congressional Black Caucus have sent an amicus brief, and I am optimistic that justice will prevail.

I know that there have been many African Americans and people of other races who have marched across that Edmund Pettus Bridge. As a woman, I know that the brave suffragettes fought equal treatment for over 70 years while they faced humiliation and shame from society.

History has made it so very, very clear that voting rights are so fundamental. The 14th Amendment to the Constitution protects voting rights; the 15th Amendment provided that males, even former slaves and males of any race, could vote; women's suffrage; with the 24th Amendment, poll taxes supposedly were eliminated, and the 26th Amendment allowed 18-year-olds to vote.

Of course, we have the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I think it is very, very clear, when you look at the history of this protection, that it is one of the most constitutionally protected rights that there is.

I would urge my colleagues here in this body to do more than hold hands and sing, "We Shall Overcome," but to really pass laws to strengthen the Voting Rights Act.

We have all heard the adage that history repeats itself, and we have seen a race across the country for Republican legislatures and Governors to pass these voter ID laws, but I think we also have the power to shape our future by drawing from the lessons of the past: our civil rights movement, our march in Selma, where we stood hand in hand, arm in arm, and fought back against this tide of oppression.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin. Thank you for sharing your thoughts.

Now, it is my honor to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida, FREDERICA WILSON.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. In Miami-Dade County, I have a program called the 5000 Role Models of Excellence Project. It is a program of Black and Hispanic boys who are trying to grow up into good men.

The Friday before Bloody Sunday, over 500 12th graders—graduating seniors—from that program went to a movie to watch a private screening of the movie "Selma."

I want to give a special shout-out to Nancy Sewell, who is the mother of TERRI SEWELL. As I watched the two of them on C-SPAN, MSNBC, and CNN, I was so proud of them.

These boys were prepared by men who experienced the civil rights battles and know the bitter history and violent battles we had to endure. I wish I had the resources to take all 500 of them to Selma.

During the movie, we planned a Twitter war. Thousands participated all across the Nation. Movie stars, rappers, sports legends, and the White House joined in the Twitter war. These boys will never be the same. They were visibly moved; and their applause, tears, hugs, and tweets proved their transformation.

The next day, on that Saturday, when the President spoke, the Twitter war continued. It was based at my home. So many of them watched and marveled at Representative JOHN LEWIS, a card-carrying, sworn-in member of the 5000 Role Models of Excellence Project. They watched so proudly as he introduced the first Black President of the United States. In fact, he is the only President that they know. They are beyond proud.

Why did I do this? I wanted as many students as possible to experience the importance of voting, and I am not finished. All 8,000 of them will see the movie as soon as it is released for distribution. This generation of children needs to know the importance of voting. They need to know what their forefathers had to endure so that they could vote.

When I was on the Miami-Dade County School Board in 1996, we set up a process in partnership with the department of elections. Every eligible student is registered to vote in the 11th grade, and when they graduate and turn 18, their voter registration card is mailed to their homes. This is a policy that all school districts all across America should adopt.

While they repair the damage to the Voting Rights Act through legislation, graduating seniors in Miami-Dade public schools—Black, White, and Hispanic—will still have the opportunity to vote. Every single one of them will vote. I hope that other school districts will adopt this policy so that children will know and understand the importance of voting. It is their voice.

God of our weary years, God of our silent tears, let us as a people march on until victory is won.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you to the gentlewoman from Florida. Thank you for sharing your success stories. Hopefully, those can be duplicated.

At this time, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Congresswoman ALMA ADAMS.

Ms. ADAMS. Thank you, Congresswoman KELLY, for your leadership. I

appreciate what you are doing very much. Certainly, it is something that we need to do, and we must do.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stress the importance of equal voting rights for everyone. Just over a week ago, I traveled to Selma with several of my colleagues to retrace the steps of those who shed blood as they tried, again, to gain equal access to the ballot box.

As a professor for 40 years at Bennett College in North Carolina, I made sure that the students that passed through my classroom and our campus knew just how important it was to have their voices heard, and to this day, students know: “Bennett Belles are voting belles.”

In 2013, the Supreme Court struck down a major provision of the Voting Rights Act limiting Federal oversight over State voting laws. Sadly, my home State of North Carolina quickly implemented voting laws that disenfranchise voters by making cuts to early voting, reenforcing strict ID requirements, and ending some preregistration programs which did not allow young high school students to be able to register to vote.

As I think about those who risked their lives in order to exercise their right to vote, I cannot believe that 50 years later, in 2015, that simple freedom given to us in the Constitution is still under attack.

It is time for all of us, Mr. Speaker, to come together to restore the Voting Rights Act, to ensure that every voter—no matter their race, no matter their class or creed—can make their voice heard and elect the leaders of their choice.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, again, for her insight and comments.

Here we are, 50 years removed from Selma, 50 years after Americans—young and old, Black, White, Asian, Hispanic, Native American, Jewish—made a decision to stand up for what they knew was right. They stood up for democracy and demanded fair and unobstructed access to the ballot.

As you have heard this hour, the evolution to the America we are today has been a long and challenging journey. The Voting Rights Act has done much to make our Union more perfect, but the strength of the Voting Rights Act has been diminished. With new, discriminatory laws on the books, this Congress must act. This Congress can pass a bipartisan bill that extends section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

As was the case in Selma, the law is not equal for all. We must unite, as we did then. I urge my colleagues to take up this important issue and strengthen the Voting Rights Act.

I would like to take this time to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) and all my colleagues who took the time to speak to us this evening.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues Congressmen PAYNE and

KELLY for leading the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order Hour.

Mr. Speaker, fifty years ago 600 men and women began a peaceful march in Selma, Alabama to demand their full and equal right to participate in our democracy. Their quest for equal voting rights was met with physical violence and racial hatred on what has become known as “Bloody Sunday.”

The marchers were turned back that day, but they remained steadfast. With unwavering determination, residents of Selma, civil rights activists, and inspired people from across the nation completed the march from Selma to Montgomery. Their heroism was instrumental in the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; a watershed bipartisan action of the U.S. Congress.

Fifty years later, on the anniversary of Bloody Sunday, I stood with President Obama and my House and Senate colleagues to honor the legacy of those brave foot soldiers for justice. But unfortunately, the battle wages on. There is still much to be done to ensure the sacrifice of those marchers was not in vain.

The Supreme Court’s decision in *Shelby County v. Holder* to strike down Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act left many Americans more vulnerable to voting discrimination. In the absence of this historic safeguard, numerous states have attempted to suppress voting through restrictive voter ID laws and limits on early voting. My home state of Ohio is one of them.

Congress must act to restore Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act and update critical voter protections. In 2015, no eligible citizen should be disenfranchised. No eligible citizen should be denied full participation in our democracy. Let us recommit to rejecting intolerance and injustice in all forms, and continue the fight for equal voting rights for all Americans.

#### APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY AND INTEGRITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1011c, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following individuals on the part of the House to the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for a term of 6 years:

Upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader:

Dr. George T. French, Fairfield, Alabama

Dr. Kathleen Sullivan Alioto, New York, New York

Mr. Ralph A. Wolff, Oakland, California

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. GRANGER (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a function in the district.

Mr. ROSKAM (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of the passing of his father.

Mr. HINOJOSA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o’clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 17, 2015, at 10 a.m.

#### 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. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 639. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to drug scheduling recommendations by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and with respect to registration of manufacturers and distributors seeking to conduct clinical testing; with an amendment (Rept. 114-41, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 647. A bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-42). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 648. A bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 132. Resolution providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress. (Rept. 114-44). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 639 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### 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. McHENRY:

H.R. 1365. A bill to prevent the reclassification of certain ammunition as armor piercing ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 1366. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to set the retirement benefits age for today’s eight-year-olds at age 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN (for herself and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1367. A bill to amend the Expedited Funds Availability Act to clarify the application of that Act to American Samoa and