

VOTING RIGHTS AMENDMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, how do we all get here? How do we get to be one of 435 people in the United States Congress, a great honor that it is to serve in this Congress?

Madam Speaker, we all get here because people vote for us, the American public votes. It is the essence of a democracy. That is what makes this country great. That is why we have sent soldiers to Iraq and other places, to try to give other people democracy and have people vote.

Forty-nine years ago, this Congress passed the Voting Rights Act. JOHN LEWIS, a Member of this Congress now, marched in Selma, Alabama, and was beaten by troopers to get the right to vote.

Even before that, students went to Mississippi and throughout the South—which was called the Mississippi Freedom Summer—to register people to vote and had to fight to give African Americans the opportunity to vote.

Schwerner, Chaney, and Goodman were killed in Mississippi. They were Mississippi Freedom Summer fighters. I met with Andy Goodman's—who was murdered down there—brother yesterday because a year ago, almost to the day, if not to the day, the Supreme Court, in *Shelby v. Holder*, ruled part of the Voting Rights Act unconstitutional. Our Chief Justice said it is no longer needed.

Well, he was wrong. It is needed. Everyone should be entitled to vote. There are issues about States, right now, denying people the right to vote—voter ID, Madam Speaker, long lines, ending early voting, different problems being placed before people to stop them from voting, that is anti-American, yet it is occurring in this country right now.

There is a Voting Rights Amendment Act proposed, right now bipartisan, but limited bipartisan. Mr. SENSENBRENNER and a few other Republicans—I can count them on both my hands—are cosponsors, along with Democrats, to pass a law that would require preclearance in States that have shown by actions—indeed, discriminatory practices—that would inhibit the right to vote and stop it before it becomes discrimination, but we have got just a paucity of Republican support.

I haven't been a sponsor of that act because the decision was we wanted to be bipartisan, and for a Democrat to be a sponsor, they had to bring a Republican along.

I went over here, Madam Speaker, and I talked to at least 15 different Republicans and asked them to be a cosponsor because I thought they should have been a cosponsor because I wanted to be a cosponsor, and I had to bring somebody with me.

It would have been easier to go to the South Pacific and find that airplane in the ocean than to find another cospon-

sor over here, so today, it is being opened up for Democrats to show that they want to be for voting rights. I will be added as a cosponsor today, and many, many, many other Democrats will be too. Madam Speaker, every Republican should join as well.

This is American as apple pie, to have a Voting Rights Act that gives the courts—the Justice Department—the right to go and have preclearance and stop discrimination before it occurs.

The Voting Rights Act amendment would create a new coverage formula to identify those States and localities with a recent history of discriminatory voting laws and practices that are still at high risk for continuing voting discrimination.

It would enhance the authority of courts to order a preclearance remedy, require greater transparency regarding voting changes, and clarifies the Attorney General's authority to send Federal observers to monitor elections in jurisdictions subject to preclearance requirements.

Those changes that the Voting Rights Amendment Act would make to current law would help prevent voting practices that are likely to be discriminatory before they have a chance to cause harm.

The House Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, and particularly the Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice, of which I am the ranking member, should have hearings immediately and pass this act now.

Forty-nine years ago, this Chamber historically passed voting rights, and now, we can't pass an amendment. In 2006, the House voted to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act by a vote of 390–33, which meant, on both sides of the aisle, great majorities were for it, but now that the Supreme Court has struck it down and said we need to modernize it by finding States in localities that are currently exercising discriminatory practices, we can't come up with a formula because, politically, it would harm, theoretically, one side more than the other.

Just as Mr. GUTIÉRREZ spoke earlier about immigration and how that is going to affect the Republican Party in the future elections, voting rights will affect them too, and it won't affect them positively because, if the party becomes a party that is against people of color and giving them the American right to vote, as well as opportunities for sound and logical immigration practices, which this country needs for labor, it will be a minority party forever.

I am not here to lecture the Republicans about what they can do to help themselves politically. I am saying what they can do to make America more America. Pass the voting rights amendment.

LINSLEY SCHOOL 200TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 200th anniversary of the Linsly School in Wheeling.

Established in 1814, Linsly is a preparatory school committed to academic excellence and character development. The Linsly School was the first of its kind west of the Allegheny Mountains.

The school's founder, Noah Linsly, was born in Connecticut in 1772. With a law degree from Yale, he began his career at his alma mater. However, recognizing opportunity in this frontier town of Wheeling, Noah Linsly moved there in 1799 and, valuing the need for education, established a school for children.

At the time of Linsly's founding, Napoleon Bonaparte was still causing havoc in Europe. James Madison, the fourth President of the United States, was President; and the British troops had captured and burned Washington, D.C.

200 years ago, there were no phones, no cars, no buses, no trains, just a lawyer with a vision who moved to a small town on the frontier and donated all his belongings to help children get an education.

Reno DiOrio, Linsly's current president for external affairs, said it best when he said:

When one considers everything that has happened to our country and to our local community in the time period of 200 years—the Civil War, two world wars, the Great Depression, major floods in the valley, the civil rights movement—we are proud that Linsly has been able to adapt with the times, to persevere and overcome challenges, and to remain committed to its founding principles.

Linsly's motto—"Forward and no retreat"—has been reflected in their emphasis that the greatest accomplishment is not in ever failing, but in rising again after you fall. With this motto, Linsly has continued to believe that children should be challenged and pressed without the possibility that they will quit.

From the fourth President to the 44th President of the United States, Linsly not only has survived, but has thrived. Among its graduates are Federal judges, business leaders, professional athletes, authors, Congressmen, and college presidents, among others.

This little school in Wheeling—this little school in Wheeling, not Boston or Philadelphia—is the 25th oldest boarding school in the United States of America, and its reputation is spread internationally. Now in its 200th year, Linsly is welcoming students from 15 States and 12 foreign nations.

As one of Linsly's greatest benefactors once stated:

Linsly will, in years to come, influence the lives of hundreds of young people who will go forward to serve their fellow men.

After 200 years, Linsly has already influenced the lives of hundreds of young people, and now, it is ready for another 200.

Madam Speaker, I ask that we honor this momentous and heartfelt anniversary for a program at Linsly. Happy 200th birthday, Linsly School.

IRAQ CANNOT BE LOST OR WON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, over 60 years ago, the United States President sent advisers to a nation in Asia. He did so because a regime that was perceived as friendly to U.S. interests, but which was, in fact, deeply corrupt and rotten, was threatened.

He promised that those advisers would not engage in combat, that they were there to protect American military equipment. Years later, with 60,000 dead Americans and billions and billions of dollars expended, the helicopters lifted off from Saigon, and the Vietnamese regime fell.

Today, another U.S. President is sending advisers to a nation in Asia and contemplating air strikes in a three-way civil war in Iraq. This President is doing it purportedly to preserve a nation which was the creation, as Secretary Albright says, of British and French diplomats lying to each other almost a hundred years ago.

It is a Nation which, while we have paid gravely in blood and treasure to preserve, may not have the support of its own people.

As usual, politics are intruding. The architects of the Iraq war under George W. Bush see the possibility of redemption for their mistakes, so unbelievably, they are accusing this President of losing Iraq.

Let's be very clear: Iraq cannot be lost or won. A brutal dictator or the United States military can sit on top of conflicts between Sunni and Shiite and Saxon tribes that have roiled that society for centuries, but remove that dictator or remove the U.S. military, and those conflicts will reemerge.

At the end of the day, it is Iraqis and Iraqis alone who have to decide whether their Nation will be preserved, whether there will be multiple countries reflecting multiple fates, or whether there will be one pluralistic nation. Whether they will live in the 21st century, the 7th century, a caliphate, what kind of nation they will have is up for them to determine.

There is an argument, of course, that ISIS—the terrorists who have made such astounding gains in regions of Iraq—are bad and brutal people. This is true. I sit on the Intelligence Committee and see, every day, the outrages that they perpetrate.

They have made two mistakes: one, their brutality will ultimately be their undoing with their own people; and, second, they are now occupying territory—this means that they have addresses.

Just as there are terrorists in Nigeria, in Somalia, in Libya, in Lebanon, in Syria, in Iraq, in Iran, in Egypt, and Morocco—the list goes on—there are terrorists in the Sunni areas of Iraq, but the answer cannot be that the United States military will be there to prevent them from doing what they would wish to do.

Our interests—let's be clear about what our interests are—it must first and foremost be up to the citizens of those nations that I just listed to determine what sort of society they will live in. We cannot do it for them, and when we try, it does not end well.

We must say to these nations that: if you work to craft an inclusive society respecting your minorities, respecting the rights of the individual and of women in particular, if you abide by international norms, we will be at your side. We did this 240 years ago, and we know a little something about how one might do it, and if not, we will not be at your side.

Number two, our interest is to say to them that: if, in the birthing pains of your new societies, you nurture or support or in any way assist those terrorists that would target us or that would target our ally Israel or would target other civilized nations, we will find them, we will fix them, and we will take them off the battlefield, as we are doing around the world today.

□ 1030

Those are our national interests. Those goals are worth our time, our treasure, and our talent. Coaching a team in a three-way civil war is not.

Colleagues, let us not expend one more dollar or one more life on military activity that is not in the clear service of our essential national interests.

VIOLENCE AGAINST MUSLIMS IN SRI LANKA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to condemn in the strongest terms the ongoing violence against the minority Muslim population in Sri Lanka.

Last week, Buddhist mobs rampaged their way through three towns, attacking Muslim homes and businesses, burning many to the ground. As one victim said:

The house I own was burned down. My family has nowhere to go.

Another victim describes every night following another attack as being a “nightmare,” with her family cowering in fear of the next attack.

The Sri Lankan government has not done enough to deal with the threat of the so-called Buddhist Power Force, the group responsible for this violence. When the Sri Lankan police were called in to stop the violence, reportedly, many just stood on the sidelines doing nothing.

Madam Speaker, the Sri Lankan government must take a stronger stance against this violence and protect its minority Muslim population. While promises have been made to rebuild houses and shops, it is unacceptable that this minority continues to live in fear.

REMEMBERING SUE KINT

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, today, we pay our respects to Sue Kint, a longtime friend of many in the community of Buena Park, California, who recently passed away after battling what began as lung cancer.

Sue Kint's remarkable story has humble beginnings. Born to Korean parents in Japan, Sue later moved to South Korea as a young girl, where she attended Ewha Womans University in Seoul, Korea. She later moved to the United States to complete her bachelor's degree at California State University of Los Angeles, majoring in finance and law.

Ms. Kint was the founder and CEO of Kint & Associates, a successful international consulting and trading company. Through her exceptional work and dedication, she was recognized as one of 2,000 notable American women.

Among her other notable accomplishments, Sue served on the Chapman University board of governors and was recently awarded an honorary doctor of the university degree. She also served on the Orange County chapter of the National Unification Advisory Council as an appointee of former South Korean President Lee Myung-bak and current President Park Geun-hye. She was a valuable asset on my Asia Pacific Community Advisory Council, and was known as an exemplary woman who cared deeply about excellence in education and what could be done in education and opportunities for the next generation.

In her fight with cancer, she maintained a spirit of courage, dignity, and grace. Her strong will and desire to live a fulfilling life has encouraged others to do the same. She will be truly missed by her brother, Kevin, all of her friends, and all the lives she has touched. She will be remembered as her spirit lives on.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, one of the greatest legislative achievements in the history of our country.

There were so many men and women who were a part of the civil rights movement, but I would like to take this time to highlight one of them who has been especially important in my life, and that is my father, who was a civil rights lawyer and who wrote much of the enforcement language behind the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which was one of the greatest achievements