

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 REAU-
THORIZATION 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

prevent backsliding by states whose discriminatory literacy tests were outlawed by the original act in 1965. Section 4 banned literacy tests in states where they were used to discriminate, but experience showed that when one method of voting discrimination was blocked—either through court action or a new law—another method would suddenly appear as a replacement. Congress therefore included the Section 5 preclearance provision to prevent the implementation of new discriminatory laws. The objections made since 1965 showed the covered jurisdictions have attempted to use gerrymandering and other forms of discrimination to abridge the right to vote. Section 5 has focused on these efforts.

Mr. Chairman, utilizing recent presidential election turnout data to determine who should be covered by Section 5 preclearance confuses the symptom with the disease. In 1965, Congress used registration and turnout data to select which states should be subject to federal pre-approval of voting changes because that was the most efficient way to identify those places with the longest and worst history of voter disfranchisement and entrenched discrimination and blatant racism by recalcitrant jurisdictions. Congress understood that while a multitude of formulas could be conjured to identify which governmental units would be subject to preclearance, there was and could be only one way for a covered jurisdiction to overcome the need to preclear its election laws, and that is by satisfying an independent federal judiciary that it had renounced its discriminatory past and could be trusted not to employ any artifice that would result in a return to those days of shame.

Mr. Chairman, the coverage formula does not need to be changed to bring it up to date. The current formula correctly identifies jurisdictions that have the longest and worst history of voter disenfranchisement and entrenched discrimination. Jurisdictions free of discrimination for ten years can come out from under coverage. Those with continuing problems remain covered. And those where a court finds new constitutional violations can become covered. If the existing coverage formula were to be replaced with a formula that relies on 1996, 2000, and 2004 presidential election data, it would amount to a repeal of Section 5, even though we know that voting discrimination continues in the currently covered jurisdictions.

Last, the Norwood Amendment undermines the constitutionality of a renewed Section 5. The current coverage formula targets jurisdictions where Congress found a record of pervasive discrimination in voting on the basis of race. There is no evidence that the new triggers relied upon in the Norwood Amendment will target such jurisdictions, and only those jurisdictions, with a history of racial discrimination when it comes to its citizens' exercise of the franchise:

The Norwood Amendment is not likely to pass constitutional muster because it is not narrowly tailored to achieve the Congressional objective of subjecting only those jurisdictions with a history of voter discrimination and electoral racism to the pre-clearance provisions of Section 5.

CONCLUSION

The jurisdictions covered by section 5 of the Voting Rights Act earned their way in; they can earn their way out through the bailout provisions of the Act. What they have not earned

is for this Congress to end preclearance requirements for where there is a continuing need for such oversight, as the Texas mid-decade redistricting case and the Georgia voter identification case make clear.

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 18, 2006 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 19

9 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine the science and risk assessment behind the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed revisions to the particulate matter air quality standards.
SD-628

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine antitrust concerns relating to credit card interchange rates.
SD-226

10 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Business meeting to consider the nominations of Frederic S. Mishkin, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Linda Mysliwy Conlin, of New Jersey, to be First Vice President, James Lambright, of Missouri, to be President, and J. Joseph Grandmaison, of New Hampshire, to be a Member of the Board of Directors, all of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, Geoffrey S. Bacino, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Federal Housing Finance Board, Edmund C. Moy, of Wisconsin, to be Director of the Mint, Department of the Treasury; to be followed by a hearing to examine the semiannual Monetary Policy Report to Congress.
SD-106

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting to consider the nominations of Mark V. Rosenker, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, R. Hunter Biden, of Delaware, and Donna R. McLean, of the District of Columbia,

each to be a Member of the Reform Board (Amtrak), John H. Hill, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Andrew B. Steinberg, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation, routine lists in the Coast Guard and NOAA, and other pending calendar business.

SR-253
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider proposed Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act, S. 843, to amend the Public Health Service Act to combat autism through research, screening, intervention and education, and the nominations of Elizabeth Dougherty, of the District of Columbia, Peter W. Tredick, of California, and Harry R. Hoglander, of Massachusetts, each to be a Member of the National Mediation Board.

SD-430
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine Department of Homeland Security purchase cards.

SD-342
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee
To hold an oversight hearing on the implementation of Public Law 108-148 The Healthy Forests Restoration Act.
SD-366

11 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Technology, Innovation, and Competitiveness Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine high performance computing.
SR-253

2 p.m.
Judiciary
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD-226

2:15 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine judicial nominations.
SD-226

2:30 p.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine Extradition Treaty Between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and related exchanges of letters, signed at Washington on March 31, 2003 (Treaty Doc. 108-23).
SD-419

Intelligence
To receive a closed briefing regarding intelligence matters.
SH-219

JULY 20

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To receive a closed briefing regarding overhead imagery systems.
S-407, Capitol

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine U.S. policy options regarding North Korea.
SD-419

Judiciary
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD-226

10 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine USDA dairy programs.
SR-328A

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of John Ray Correll, of Indiana,