

WILLIAM PRYOR ON DEMOCRACY

Highlights:

- William Pryor did not stand up for democracy.
 - Pryor opposed the Voting Rights Act.
 - Pryor defended the Supreme Court's intervention in Bush v. Gore.

Pryor Refused To Stand Up For Democracy

PRYOR ADMITTED THAT HE BELIEVED THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT WAS NO LONGER NECESSARY

Pryor Said The Voting Rights Act Was No Longer Necessary Because, “We Have Come A Long Way Nearly 40 Years From” Voter Suppression. While appearing at Committee On The Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Diane Feinstein said, “Can you please explain why you believe that Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act is unnecessary and a burden that has outlived its usefulness? Mr. Pryor. My comments, of course, were not directed to any court but to Congress itself, which has to make the final decisions on reauthorization of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. As Attorney General, my record has been consistently to enforce Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. The Voting Rights Act is, in my judgment, one of the most important and necessary laws in the history of the United States, and I support it. And I support the absolute fact that Section 5 was a necessary provision nearly 40 years ago when Congress was faced with the massive racial discrimination in election systems, particularly in my State and other parts of the Deep South. Having said that, we have come a long way nearly 40 years from then, and now if we want to move a polling place from a school on one side of a street to a firehouse on another side of the street, we have to get permission from the Department of Justice to do so. It's routinely granted, but I have watched in my own capacity as Attorney General as members of my own political party and white voters, who I don't think were designed by Congress to be protected by this law, have used Section 5 as a sword in litigation for their own political opportunity.” [Committee On The Judiciary, U.S. Senate, [6/11/03](#)]

When Asked If The Voting Rights Act Was An “Affront To Federalism And An Expensive Burden That Has Far Outlived Its Usefulness,” Pryor Said, “Yes, I Believe That It Has Outlived Its Usefulness.” While appearing at Committee On The Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Diane Feinstein said, “Senator Feinstein. Do you believe it is an affront to federalism and an expensive burden that has far outlived its usefulness? Mr. Pryor. Yes, I believe that it has outlived its usefulness. I have, nevertheless, as Attorney General actively enforced that law and would continue to do so if I had the privilege of serving as a judge.” [Committee On The Judiciary, U.S. Senate, [6/11/03](#)]

PRYOR DEFENDED THE SUPREME COURT'S INTERVENTION IN BUSH V. GORE

Pryor Was The Only Attorney General To File An Amicus Brief Supporting The Supreme Court's Intervention In Florida's Election During Bush v. Gore. While appearing at Committee On The Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Chuck Schumer said, “So you might think that Attorney General Pryor's State right advocacy knows no bounds, but there is a limit. Bill Pryor was the only State Attorney General to file an amicus brief supporting the Supreme Court's intervention in Florida's election dispute during Bush v. Gore. It appears that when the Attorney General likes the outcome, he is on the States' rights side, but in this important case, where the Supreme Court overruled the States' position, there he was with Federal intervention.” [Committee On The Judiciary, U.S. Senate, [6/11/03](#)]