

Today, Lake Lanier provides power production, flood control, water supply, navigation, fish and wildlife management, and recreational activities to members of the surrounding communities and businesses. This week in June is a suitable time to recognize Lake Lanier's contributions to the area and accomplishments. As summer heat begins to spread across the Nation, both water supply and cooling water recreational activities are on many minds.

More than 60 percent of the population of the State of Georgia relies on water stored in Lake Lanier or down the Chattahoochee River. Similarly, properties around the lake and down the river rely on its banks and dam for flood control.

Nearly 8 million visitors come annually to appreciate the scenery and leisure opportunities provided by the lake. In fact, Lake Lanier holds the title of the most-visited Army Corps lake in the entire country. Facilities include 10 marinas and 57 parks for swimming, boating, fishing and picnicking. In 1996, Lake Lanier hosted the paddling and rowing competitions for the Summer Olympics in Atlanta.

And several years ago, the Marine Trade Association of Metro Atlanta found that Lake Lanier has an economic impact of \$5.5 billion.

I urge my colleagues to join with me and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) in supporting House Resolution 354 to honor the impacts, accomplishments and continuing success of Lake Lanier on its 50th anniversary.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today we recognize the 50th anniversary of Lake Sidney Lanier, an Army Corps of Engineers facility located in the State of Georgia.

Lake Lanier is one of 464 lakes in 43 States constructed and operated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Our Nation is blessed with considerable water resources that support our Nation's economy and quality of life. We need water for our homes, farms and factories. Water also supports navigation, generates power and sustains our environment.

Congress authorized the Buford Dam Project in 1946 just after the end of the Second World War. Groundbreaking for the project began in 1950. Constructed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Lake Lanier is a multipurpose, 38,000-acre lake that provides flood protection, power production, water supply, navigation, recreation, and fish and wildlife management.

Nestled in the foothills of the Georgia Blue Ridge Mountains, Lake Sidney Lanier is one of America's favorite lakes. Over 7.5 million people a year choose to visit Lake Lanier. With over 692 miles of shoreline, the lake is well known for its aqua-blue colored water, spectacular scenery and variety of recreational activities.

When completed, the total cost of construction, including land acquisition, was almost \$45 million. When the gates of the dam were closed in 1956, it took more than 3 years for the lake to reach its normal elevation of 1,070 feet above sea level.

The lake is named for one of the Nation's most famous poets, Sidney Lanier. Born in Georgia in 1842, Mr. Lanier entered Oglethorpe College at 14 years of age, graduating at the top of his class in 1860.

While serving on the blockade runner "Lucy" during the Civil War, Mr. Lanier was captured and contracted tuberculosis while imprisoned in Maryland. Following the Civil War, Mr. Lanier played the flute for the Peabody Symphony and lectured at Johns Hopkins University.

While he is known for works like "The Harlequin of Dreams," "In Absence," "Acknowledgement," and "Sunrise," he is best remembered for "The Song of the Chattahoochee," an enduring legacy for the native Georgian.

I urge all of our Members to support this legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 354, recognizing the year 2007 as the official 50th anniversary celebration of the beginnings of marinas, power production, recreation, and boating on Lake Sidney Lanier, Georgia.

Lake Lanier is named after Sidney Clopton Lanier, a poet and musician who was born in Macon, Georgia, in 1842. After participating in battle during the Civil War, and being captured and imprisoned in Point Lookout, Maryland, Mr. Lanier contracted tuberculosis, which would affect him for the rest of his life.

Mr. Lanier's life was one of practicality and beauty: while he practiced law to support his wife and four children, he was also the first flutist in the Peabody Orchestra in Baltimore, Maryland, and an accomplished poet. The Lake was named after Mr. Lanier because of the way he positively portrayed the Chattahoochee River in his poetry.

In fact, Lake Lanier itself is a symbol of both practicality and beauty. It provides crucial flood control, protecting approximately \$2 billion worth of property in the surrounding area. Similarly, on June 16, 1957—50 years ago this week—Buford Dam began producing power for the first time. Hydropower continues to flow from these waters to this day.

Although the lake is one of 464 lakes constructed and operated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, it has won the annual award for "best operated lake" for three separate years: 1990, 1997, and 2002.

While the flood control, water supply, and power production role of Lake Lanier may be critical to the continuing livelihood of the communities in the surrounding area, the lake also provides beautiful scenery and recreational opportunities that local citizens and visiting tourists enjoy. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers estimates that more than 7.5 million people visit the 692 miles of lake shoreline each year.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in recognizing the 50th anniversary of Lake Lanier.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, I urge passage of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 354.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF LOVING V. VIRGINIA LEGALIZING INTERRACIAL MARRIAGE

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 431) recognizing the 40th anniversary of Loving v. Virginia legalizing interracial marriage within the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 431

Whereas the first anti-miscegenation law in the United States was enacted in Maryland in 1661;

Whereas miscegenation was typically a felony under State laws prohibiting interracial marriage punishable by imprisonment or hard labor;

Whereas in 1883, the Supreme Court held in *Pace v. Alabama* that anti-miscegenation laws were consistent with the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment as long as the punishments given to both white and black violators are the same;

Whereas in 1912, a constitutional amendment was proposed in the House of Representatives prohibiting interracial marriage "between negroes or persons of color and Caucasians";

Whereas in 1923, the Supreme Court held in *Meyer v. Nebraska* that the due process clause of the 14th Amendment guarantees the right of an individual "to marry, establish a home and bring up children";

Whereas in 1924, Virginia enacted the Racial Integrity Act of 1924, which required that a racial description of every person be recorded at birth and prevented marriage between "white persons" and non-white persons;

Whereas in 1948, the California Supreme Court overturned the State's anti-miscegenation statutes, thereby becoming the first State high court to declare a ban on interracial marriage unconstitutional and making California the first State to do so in the 20th century;

Whereas the California Supreme Court stated in *Perez v. Sharp* that "a member of any of these races may find himself barred from marrying the person of his choice and that person to him may be irreplaceable. Human beings are bereft of worth and dignity by a doctrine that would make them as interchangeable as trains";

Whereas by 1948, 38 States still forbade interracial marriage, and 6 did so by State constitutional provision;

Whereas in June of 1958, 2 residents of the Commonwealth of Virginia—Mildred Jeter, a black/Native American woman, and Richard Perry Loving, a Caucasian man—were married in Washington, DC;

Whereas upon their return to Virginia, Richard Perry Loving and Mildred Jeter Loving were charged with violating Virginia's anti-miscegenation statutes, a felonious crime;

Whereas the Lovings subsequently pleaded guilty and were sentenced to 1 year in prison, with the sentence suspended for 25 years on condition that the couple leave the State of Virginia;

Whereas Leon Bazile, the trial judge of the case, proclaimed that "Almighty God created the races white, black, yellow, Malay and red, and he placed them on separate continents. And but for the interference with his arrangement there would be no cause for such marriages. The fact that he separated the races shows that he did not intend for the races to mix.";

Whereas the Lovings moved to the District of Columbia, and in 1963 they began a series of lawsuits challenging their convictions;

Whereas the convictions were upheld by the State courts, including the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia;

Whereas the Lovings appealed the decision to the Supreme Court of the United States on the ground that the Virginia anti-miscegenation laws violated the Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses of the 14th Amendment and were therefore unconstitutional;

Whereas in 1967, the U.S. Supreme Court granted certiorari to Loving v. Virginia and readily overturned the Lovings' convictions;

Whereas in the unanimous opinion, Chief Justice Earl Warren wrote: "Marriage is one of the 'basic civil rights of man,' fundamental to our very existence and survival. . . . To deny this fundamental freedom on so unsupportable a basis as the racial classifications embodied in these statutes, classifications so directly subversive of the principle of equality at the heart of the Fourteenth Amendment, is surely to deprive all the State's citizens of liberty without due process of law.";

Whereas the opinion also stated that "the Fourteenth Amendment requires that the freedom of choice to marry not be restricted by invidious racial discriminations. Under our Constitution, the freedom to marry, or not marry, a person of another race resides with the individual and cannot be infringed by the State.";

Whereas in 1967, 16 States still had law prohibiting interracial marriage, including Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and West Virginia;

Whereas Loving v. Virginia struck down the remaining anti-miscegenation laws nationwide;

Whereas in 2000, Alabama became the last State to remove its anti-miscegenation laws from its statutes;

Whereas according to the U.S. Census Bureau, from 1970 to 2000 the percentage of interracial marriages has increased from 1 percent of all marriages to more than 5 percent;

Whereas the number of children living in interracial families has quadrupled between 1970 to 2000, going from 900,000 to more than 3 million; and

Whereas June 12th has been proclaimed "Loving Day" by cities and towns across the country in commemoration of Loving v. Virginia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) observes the 40th Anniversary of the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Loving v. Virginia; and

(2) commemorates the legacy of Loving v. Virginia in ending the ban on interracial marriage in the United States and in recog-

nizing that marriage is one of the "basic civil rights of man" at the heart of the 14th Amendment protections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 431, a resolution I introduced along with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), commemorating the 40th anniversary of Loving v. Virginia, the landmark Supreme Court decision legalizing interracial marriages within the United States.

I thank Chairman CONYERS for expedition consideration of this resolution so it could be brought to the floor before the actual date of the anniversary which is tomorrow, June 12.

In June of 1958, two residents of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Mildred Jeter, a black Native American woman, and Richard Perry Loving, a Caucasian man, were married in Washington, D.C. Upon their return to Virginia, Richard Perry Loving and Mildred Jeter Loving were charged with violating Virginia's anti-miscegenation statutes, which made their marriage a felony.

□ 1415

They challenged their convictions, culminating in the June 12, 1967, U.S. Supreme Court opinion in Loving v. Virginia, striking down the remaining anti-miscegenation laws that were still in effect in 16 States.

In the unanimous opinion, the Supreme Court rejected bigotry against interracial relations, recognizing an individual's right to marry under the 14th amendment. Chief Justice Earl Warren wrote: "Marriage is one of the 'basic civil rights of man,' fundamental to our very existence and survival. . . . To deny this fundamental freedom on so unsupportable a basis as the racial classifications embodied in these statutes, classifications so directly subversive of the principle of equality at the heart of the 14th amendment, is surely to deprive all the States' citizens of liberty without due process of law."

The opinion also stated that "the 14th amendment requires that the freedom of choice to marry not be restricted by invidious racial discriminations. Under our Constitution, the freedom to marry, or not marry, a person

of another race resides with the individual and cannot be infringed by the State."

The Loving decision marked a critical step forward in our Nation's struggle toward equal rights for all, particularly full marriage equality. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, from 1970 to the year 2000 the percentage of interracial marriages has increased from 1 percent of all marriages to more than 5 percent. The number of children living in interracial families has quadrupled between 1970 and 2000, going from 900,000 to more than 3 million. Because of the decision's profound impact in our society, numerous cities and towns across this country have already proclaimed June 12 Loving Day in commemoration of this decision.

Indeed, the Supreme Court's opinion forcefully rejected the argument employed by Leon Bazile, the trial judge of the case, who defended his decision convicting the Lovings as part of God's plan. Unfortunately, after 40 years, similar types of arguments are still being employed by a few to deny full marriage equality to everyone.

In commemorating the legacy of Loving v. Virginia in ending the ban on interracial marriage in the United States, H. Res. 431 reaffirms the Loving court's recognition that marriage is one of the "basic civil rights of man" at the heart of the 14th amendment protections.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this timely resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin for presenting this resolution to this Congress, and I notice that many of the statements that she has made have laid out I think the history of this Loving case very well to the Congress, and so what I will seek to do is perhaps just add and fill in perhaps some of the blanks that may have been left, although I'm not convinced that there are many.

And that is the emphasis on equal protection and due process clause of the 14th amendment. I think it was clear when a unanimous decision in the Supreme Court in the Loving case, and it isn't often that you see an issue that has been traditionally rooted from the time of our Founders up until 1967, have a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court, even though it met that resistance at every step of the way throughout the entire appeals process until it got to the Supreme Court.

Today, it looks like a clear decision. It looks easy; it's simple. None of us would have any trouble with this Loving decision; but, in fact, then it was a matter of an idea whose time had finally come.

But the Supreme Court laid out very clear language in their decision that legislative classifications based on race

were “odious to a free people whose institutions are founded upon the doctrine of equality,” and further condemned Virginia’s interracial marriage statute. And then the Court concluded: “There can be no doubt that restricting the freedom to marry solely because of racial classifications violates the central meaning of the equal protection clause.”

I just appreciate the privilege to emphasize those things, and then I’d like to add then some other thoughts to this record, Mr. Speaker, and that is that we rightfully celebrate the anniversary of the landmark decision here today. The institution of marriage between one man and one woman is older than the Nation itself. It predates government itself, and it also limits the power of government because traditional families are the fundamental units of our society.

Through them, we pour through that crucible our values from a father and a mother into the children and the values of our patriotism, our faith, our work ethic, our culture. The things we eat and the things we do, every component of our culture and civilization is concentrated through those values of those children that we have and that we’re so well-blessed with; and without marriage, government would be bound to expand to take its place and would try lamely to do so.

But marriage embraces only one principle, and that is the marriage of a union between a man and a woman, and the further distinction of that and to have government draw a distinction between people based upon their ethnicity should be abhorrent to a free people.

And I stand here, Mr. Speaker, before you this afternoon, and I take this position that I believe we are all created in God’s image, and what He has created, I believe it’s an insult to Him if we draw distinctions between His creation. He has also seen to bless us with some specific characteristics that help us identify one another. And because He has seen to bless us with those characteristics, and in this case it was skin color, it doesn’t mean it still isn’t a reflection of God’s image.

And I recall stepping into a church in Port Gibson, Mississippi, the Catholic church there that was built in 1848 by the hands of some of the family of Jim Bowie, and the priest in that church was Father Tony Pudenz, and he showed me in the church that this church that was built in 1848, the floor of the church was built for whites, the balcony was built for blacks. And just a week before that, they had buried the editor of the newspaper who had in 1967 taken his white family from the floor of the church and walked his five children and his wife up there where they sat in the balcony with the African Americans, thereby sending a statement where half of the congregation walked across the street to the Episcopal church where they go to church to this very day. But the balance of

that congregation is an integrated congregation.

And so I would say we can’t be for equality if we’re not in support of intermarriage. God has created us all equally, and based upon that, I support this resolution. I think it’s appropriate that we bring it today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, the Loving v. Virginia decision was a milestone in our continuing efforts to fulfill the original promises of our Constitution, fulfilling the blessings of liberty for all Americans. It is highly fitting that we remember and honor the decision on its 40th anniversary. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 431.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENCOURAGING DISPLAY OF THE FLAG ON FATHER’S DAY

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2356) to amend title 4, United States Code, to encourage the display of the flag of the United States on Father’s Day.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2356

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ADDITIONAL OCCASSION FOR DISPLAY OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES.

Section 6(d) of title 4, United States Code, is amended by inserting after “Flag Day, June 14;” the following: “Father’s Day, third Sunday in June;”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2356 and include extraneous materials in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As part of our Nation’s bicentennial celebration in 1976, Congress passed a

joint resolution re-emphasizing existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag, especially recommending its display on a number of different holidays, including Mother’s Day, the second Sunday in May.

Omitted from the list was Father’s Day. H.R. 2356 would amend the Federal flag code to include Father’s Day, the third Sunday in June, among important holidays on which to fly the American flag.

The law now provides that, in addition to the important occasions listed in the flag code, “the flag should be displayed on all days.” I know that this is the custom in every community in the United States.

Still, I think that it is important for the flag code to recognize both mothers and fathers, who raise the next generation, inculcate them with the values they need to be good citizens and good neighbors.

I want to thank our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) for his efforts to enact this worthwhile legislation.

And I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to honor fathers in the flag code, just as we now honor mothers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this legislation which would add Father’s Day, the third Sunday in June, to the list of holidays listed in the U.S. flag code on which it’s particularly appropriate to fly the American flag.

It’s altogether appropriate that Father’s Day be added to the list of holidays on which the flag should be flown. Both fathers and mothers are essential elements to the basic family unit that has made America so strong. And so the flag should be flown proudly on both Father’s Day, as provided by this bill, and on Mother’s Day, as already provided in existing law, as a sign of respect for both mothers and fathers and the essential role the traditional family plays in raising new citizens in our democracy.

I would add, I want to also thank Congressman TODD TIAHRT for bringing this initiative to Congress. It’s interesting to note that there was a class in his district that when they were studying the history and studying the days that the Federal Government encourages display of the flag, they noticed that Father’s Day was missing. They had written a letter to Congressman TIAHRT asking that he take action on this, and he has introduced a bill and it complements this bill before us.

So I thank him for that and I wanted to emphasize how important it is for citizens to weigh in and to reach out and communicate with Members of Congress because here’s a perfect example of how young people saw a gap, had their voice heard, and we have an opportunity here now to fill that gap.