

Expansion and Advanced Technology Committee.

Kathy's work on behalf of her constituents earned her a number of honors throughout her years of public service. She was a recipient of the American Legion Achievement Medallion, the Community Partners Family Resource Center 1998 Community Service Award of Excellence, the 1998 National Republican Legislators Association, Legislator of the Year, Nevada Opera Theatre's International Friendship Award (2003), and the Augustus Society's Italian American of the Year (2003).

In addition to her vast public service career, Kathy also had an impressive array of academic achievements. She earned a Bachelor's Degree in Political Science from Occidental College in Los Angeles, and a Master's in Public Administration from California State University, Long Beach. She served as a Delegate to Russia and the Ukraine with the American Council of Young Political Leaders (ACYPL) in 1993 and was selected as an Executive Committee Member to the Biennial Assembly of the Atlantic Association of Young Political Leaders (AAAYPL) in Paris, France in 1995. She participated in the Council of State Governments Henry Toll Fellowship Program and was also selected for the Flemming Fellows Leadership Institute's Class of 1996. In 1999, she attended the Governors Center at Duke University Strategic Leadership for State Executives and, in 2000, graduated from the Greater Reno-Sparks Chamber of Commerce Leadership program. In 2001, she completed the Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Senior Executives in State and Local Government Program.

Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the unexpected and sudden loss of such a young and ambitious woman. Kathy will be remembered for her dedication to the State of Nevada, to her family, and to her friends. She will be deeply missed.

SUPPORTING INTELLIGENCE AND
LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS
TO TRACK TERRORISTS AND
TERRORIST FINANCES

SPEECH OF

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2006

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 895. I strongly support efforts to track and pursue suspected foreign terrorists by monitoring their financial transactions. This Republican resolution, however, shamefully distorts the facts and turns the critical issue of national security into a venue for Republican political gain.

There is no doubt that our country must effectively and responsibly monitor the financial transactions of terrorists. It is for that reason I have cosponsored H.R. 900, the Democratic alternative resolution. This resolution reaffirms Democrats' commitment to protecting our national security by tracking suspected terrorists. It also reaffirms that, when confidential information is leaked, bipartisan Congressional review and oversight are critical—regardless of who may be responsible for that leak. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has denied the Members of this House the opportunity to

debate and vote on this Democratic alternative.

As a result, we are forced only to consider this flawed and misleading Republican resolution.

This resolution claims that the Terrorist Financial Tracking Program is legal, that it protects individual civil liberties, and that Congress has been appropriately informed about its activities.

The fact is that we do not know if the Terrorist Financial Tracking Program is legal or if it protects our civil liberties because no court has ruled on these critical issues. In essence, this resolution asks Members of Congress and the American people to simply accept their word on the legality and civil protections of this program.

The resolution's claim that Congress has been appropriately informed about the Terrorist Financial Tracking Program is simply not true. In fact, few Members knew about this program. Only after its existence was exposed to the public by the press did the Bush Administration offer to brief the appropriate members of Congress. As a result, this questionable program failed to receive critical Congressional oversight.

The Republican philosophy of selective oversight is also exemplified by the fact that this resolution fails to even mention one of the most egregious leaks in recent history—the 2003 identity leak of a CIA agent by a member of the Bush Administration.

This Republican resolution instead attempts to shield the administration and Republican leadership from public scrutiny by shifting the blame for the leaks to the press and diverting attention from the fact that the majority party has had no hearings, no briefings, and certainly no resolutions highlighting this serious issue.

The lack of Congressional oversight on cases of leaked confidential information is another example of the Republican pattern of negligence.

If the Republican leadership were truly sincere about addressing national security issues through this resolution, they would not have brought it to the floor without review by the appropriate Congressional Committees and with a rule that blocks any consideration of a Democratic alternative.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican resolution is deceitful, politically motivated, and an insult to the very American democracy that Republicans claim they want to protect.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 895 and to cosponsor the Democratic alternative, H.R. 900.

FANNIE LOU HAMER, ROSA
PARKS, AND CORETTA SCOTT
KING VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENTS
ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Norwood Amendment to H.R. 9, the "Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006." The Norwood Amendment replaces the existing Section 5 coverage formula with one keyed to whether a jurisdiction has a test or device or voter turnout of less than 50 percent in any of the three most recent presidential elections. The proponents of the amendment claim it is needed to prevent the Supreme Court from striking down the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Chairman, there are several compelling reasons for rejecting this amendment, which I will discuss. But let me respond, Mr. Chairman, to the claim that Georgia has suffered enough and should be let out of the "penalty box." I response is simple: the record amply demonstrates that Georgia earned its way into whatever "penalty box" it is in and it must earn its way out, as eleven local jurisdictions in Virginia already have.

REASONS FOR REJECTING THE NORWOOD AMENDMENT:

Mr. Chairman, the claim that the Voting Rights Act faces constitutional jeopardy from the Supreme Court if section 5 is not gutted is a red herring and is not to be taken seriously. First, the Supreme Court has never ruled the Voting Rights Acts or any of its provisions unconstitutional and there is no reason to suspect it will do so now. The claim that the intent of the Norwood Amendment is to save and protect the Voting Rights Act is disingenuous. It is akin to destroying the village in order to save it!

Second, the Norwood Amendment would eviscerate the effectiveness of Section 5 by extending its reach nationwide. It accomplishes this by basing the pre-clearance "trigger" on election turnout in the three most recent presidential elections. Extending the reach of Section 5 nationwide will weaken it, not strengthen it in at least three ways. A "nationwide" Section 5 would also be vulnerable to constitutional attack as not "narrowly tailored" or "congruent and proportional" to address the harms it is designed to cure, as required by the Supreme Court's recent precedents. Section 5 is directed at jurisdictions with a history of discriminating against minority voters. Nationwide application of Section 5 would be extremely difficult to administer, given the volume of voting changes that would have to be reviewed. This expansion of coverage would dilute the Department of Justice's ability to appropriately focus their work on those jurisdictions where there is a history of voting discrimination.

The lack of understanding of the true purpose and significance of the Voting Rights Act on the part of the supporters of the Norwood Amendment is most revealed by the desire to extend the reach of Section 5 nationwide. The proponents of the Norwood Amendment characterize the pre-clearance provisions of Section 5 as the "penalty box," reserved for those jurisdictions that have "broken the rules."

The right to vote is not a game; it is serious business, and for those who led the fight to secure that right for African-Americans, it was deadly serious. Section 5 is not punitive; it prohibits discriminatory changes affecting the right to vote. The Voting Rights Act has no provisions that name particular states or areas. Section 5 is aimed at a type of problem, not a state or region. It is designed to