

Among the daily publications printing editorials on the "Brown" decision were the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Cincinnati Enquirer, Detroit Free Press, Indianapolis Star, Chicago Tribune, Milwaukee Journal, Saint Louis Post-Dispatch, Kansas City Star, Des Moines Register, and Minneapolis Tribune. These newspapers circulated in ten of the Midwest's major population centers.

The Plain Dealer asserted that for a number of states "a greater challenge in the form of 'thall shall not' could hardly have been issued than the Supreme Court ruling against Negro segregation in public schools." Convinced that the Supreme Court "could not have ruled otherwise than it did on the basic issue," the Plain Dealer believed that the Negroes had "earned the right to be treated as first-class citizens and earned it the hard way."

Perceiving that the "Brown" decision "probably will prove to be the most important judicial finding in the field of racial relations in our entire national history," the Enquirer ascertained that it would "work profound changes in a substantial part of the United States—not confined to the South by any means." The Cincinnati newspaper concluded: "What the justices have done is simply to act as the conscience of the American nation."

The Free Press, definitely endorsing the thrust of the "Brown" decision, claimed that the people of the country "who cherish the belief that the American system of democracy is a vital, living organic philosophy, steadily but inexorably, advancing toward the ideals of the founders of the Union, will be heartened by the unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court." While conceding that the "Brown" ruling would "not of itself abolish prejudice nor raise all Americans to the exalter status of men created in the image of their maker," the Free Press maintained: "But it does mark a step in that direction, a step toward fulfillment of man's dream that all men are created equal, and that under a more perfect government of laws they can attain to dignity and all its inherent rights."

Extolling the Supreme Court for having upheld "a vital principle of individual equality under the law," the Star argued that segregation was "morally, practically and economically evil" and denied "the brotherhood of man upon which our whole form of constitutional government is based." While concerned that no provision of the Constitution granted the federal courts "the right to establish or control educational systems," the Star contended:

"Morally, we believe the Supreme Court was right in calling for an end to segregation. It is fortunate that this decision was unanimous for the full authority of the court will carry great weight with the Southern states, who now oppose its view. We hope the states opposing this ruling will accept it in good spirit and earnestly try to meet its demands. We hope Federal authorities will give the states time, and sympathetic assistance in making this conversion. And we hope that any demagogue, white or colored, who tries to inflame public opinion by using this explosive issue will be properly rebuffed by the overwhelming majority of the good people in our states."

While admitting that it was doubtful whether the South would abide by the court's decision, the Tribune was optimistic that the unanimous ruling "should help a good deal to discourage resistance to the finding or attempts to evade its plain meaning." The Tribune, commending the Supreme Court for having "struck down segregation in the public schools of the United States," declared:

"The principle established by this decision is not that anybody has to give up any of his

prejudices, no matter how desirable it might be that he do so. The principle is the much simpler one that the state governments, north and south, must regard all men as created equal so far as opportunities at the disposal of the state are concerned. The idea may appear dangerously novel to some citizens, but the Supreme Court didn't invent it. Indeed, they can be said to have borrowed it from a distinguished Virginian named Thomas Jefferson."

The Journal, analyzing the "Brown" ruling as the "most far reaching court decision on the racial issue since emancipation," anticipated that the decision would "revolutionize the school set-up in the South and, in effect, the racial relationships there are bound to be felt outside the classrooms." Surmising that the consequences of the "Brown" verdict would impact the entire country, the Journal stated:

"... It apparently knocked the last legal prop from any official discrimination against Negroes or other minority groups because of color, race or religion. It banishes any legal recognition of second class citizenship for the members of such groups."

Impressed that the "Brown" ruling was unanimous and written in direct and persuasive language, the Milwaukee newspaper was pleased that there "could be no doubt about the intent or the logic and reasoning supporting the decision."

Feeling that there was "no need to say just how important" the "Brown" ruling was, the Post-Dispatch also emphasized that there was "no point in explaining it today as the most momentous since the Dred Scott decision handed down almost a century ago, on the eve of the Civil War." The Post-Dispatch, pointing out that the substance of the "Brown" verdict was of "transcendent importance," predicted that the decision would have its "impact in one way or another on every community, in every city" and "in less time than we are apt to think around the world."

The Star, recognizing that the "Brown" decision "sets the goal" of ending racial segregation in all public schools, stressed that the principle involved in the Supreme Court ruling "now controls for the future" and "is the law of the land." Warning that there "can be no cheating or blocking" the objective proclaimed by the Supreme Court, the Star offered the following appraisal:

"The breakdown in segregation since World War II has come a step at a time and generally without friction. The Supreme Court's ruling basically is no more drastic than the trend of our times that produced it. Now that the principle is established the future calls for more of the good sense and understanding of racial problems that has generally prevailed."

Praising the Supreme Court for having "begun the erasure of one of American democracy's blackest marks," the Register rejoiced that the nation's "basic law on public education has been brought into line with the ringing spirit of freedom and equality in the Declaration of Independence." While gratified that the "Brown" decision decreed that racial segregation constituted a denial of equal educational opportunities, the Register asserted:

"The Supreme Court decision will ease America's conscience. The strong cry of 'hypocrite' from colored folks all over the world has been heard in Des Moines and in Mobile. But America's conscience will not be cleared until her practice measures up to the noble words of the court decision."

The Tribune, sensing that the "Brown" ruling would "be welcomed and embraced by all who believe in the constitutional guarantee of equal rights meaning just that, and nothing less," suspected that the decision

would "echo far beyond our borders and may greatly influence our relations with dark-skinned people the world over." Concerned that the "Brown" verdict posed "one troublesome immediate question," the Tribune asked: "What will be done in the southern states where political leaders have been most militant in opposing the end of segregation?" While wondering whether the political spokesmen of the South would "persist in their attitudes," the Minneapolis newspaper was "inclined toward the optimistic view."

There was a consensus within the ranks of the major newspapers of the Midwest that the Supreme Court had acted wisely and responsibly in issuing the historic "Brown" ruling. While newspapers tended to analyze the "Brown" decision from somewhat different perspectives, they all agreed that the objective proposed by the Supreme Court was entirely consistent with the nation's long overdue quest for racial equality. In expressing their attitudes on an issue of overriding importance the daily publications of the Midwest were contributing to a dialogue with their readers and historians of the future.

RECOGNIZING BRIGADIER GENERAL STEPHEN J. CURRY

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 2004

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Brigadier General Stephen J. Curry will retire from the Army on June 28. BG Curry is currently serving as the Commandant of the United States Army Military Police School at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri.

BG Curry's first major duty assignment came in October, 1972. He was assigned Tank Platoon Leader, B. Company, 6th Battalion, 32d Armor, 4th Infantry Division, at Fort Carson, Colorado. He stayed at Fort Carson through October, 1974, by which time he had attained the rank of 1st Lieutenant.

In 1978, then-Captain Curry attended the Military Police Officer Advanced Course at Fort McClellan, Alabama. Upon completion of the course he was assigned to Germany as Commander, 615th Military Police Company, 793d Military Police Battalion, VII Corps, United States Army Europe and Seventh Army.

Captain Curry continued his professional military education from August, 1982, through June, 1983, at the United States Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. He followed this with a promotion to Major and consecutive duties at Fort Hood, Texas. In 1986, he moved to Washington, DC, to serve as Personnel Staff Officer for the United States Army Military Police Operations Agency. He went on to serve as Military Assistant in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Logistics, during which time he was promoted to Lieutenant Colonel. He then went on to serve in Operation Desert Shield, Operation Desert Storm, and, as a Colonel, Operation Joint Endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, Stephen Curry was promoted to Brigadier General in August, 2000. His retirement ends the career of a recipient of the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Army

Achievement Medal, and the Army Staff Identification Badge. I know my fellow Members of the House will join me in thanking him for his many years of service to his country and wish him all the best in the years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM GIBBONS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 2004

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a personal explanation of the reason I missed rollcall votes Nos. 267–271 on June 18, 2004. These votes were on amendments to H.R. 4567 and on final passage of H.R. 4567, Making Appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for FY 2005. At the time these votes were called, I was in my Congressional District in Reno, Nevada with President Bush for his speaking engagement.

I respectfully request that it be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that if present, I would have voted: rollcall Vote No. 267, on the Jackson-Lee Amendment—"No"; rollcall Vote No. 268, on the DeLauro Amendment—"No"; rollcall Vote No. 269, on the Roybal-Al-lard Amendment—"No"; rollcall Vote No. 270, on the Tancredio Amendment—"Yes"; rollcall Vote No. 271, on the Maloney Amendment—"Yes"; rollcall Vote No. 272, on the Sabo Amendment—"No"; rollcall Vote No. 273, on the Markey Amendment—"No"; rollcall Vote No. 274, on the Velázquez Amendment—"No"; rollcall Vote No. 275, on Final Passage of H.R. 4567—"Yes".

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2004

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4567) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes:

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflects my vote as "Nay" on Rollcall Vote 266, Representative SWEENEY's amendment to Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2005. I would like to state for the Record that my vote should have been "Yea."

Representative SWEENEY's amendment would increase funding to Urban Area Security Initiative, which provides discretionary grants to high-threat, high-density urban areas, providing that program with \$1.45 billion. This initiative will significantly enhance the ability of urban areas to prevent, deter, and recover from threats and incidents of terrorism. This program is essential for urban cities like Sacramento, California to address its unique security challenges as a large urban area. Right now funds previously directed from this initiative are being used to protect high-risk critical infrastructure facilities and to promote com-

prehensive regional coordination and planning. I strongly support this amendment that will increase the ability for urban areas to protect against the potential threats they face.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 2004

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4568) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes:

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my disappointment about the rejection of several amendments offered to the Interior Appropriations Bill, which aimed at protecting the flora and fauna of our country. These amendments would at least have undone some of the harm the current administration has done to our environment since it has taken office.

It has always been the priority of this administration to serve special industrial interests and not to preserve the natural beauties of our country. Clean rivers and oceans, healthy forests, fresh air and a diverse wildlife have not been of any concern to this executive and the Bush Presidency has thereby rightly been called the most anti-environmental one in the modern era by several grassroots organizations.

The New York Times, in an editorial published two days ago, called upon the House of Representatives "to partly redeem itself" from its failures to hinder the anti-environmental policies of the President and to endorse stricter environmental policies by passing several amendments to the Interior Appropriations Bill. Unfortunately, the House missed this opportunity for redemption.

A majority of 224 members rejected Representative RUSH HOLT's amendment prohibiting the use of funds to permit recreational snowmobile use in Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Park. Visitors go to our national parks to experience the miracles of nature and to find quietness and relaxation. Snowmobiles not only pollute the environment, but they also disturb humans and wildlife alike. I do not understand why so many Members of the House decided to vote against this amendment, which benefits for our environment and our citizens so heavily outweigh the sacrifice of not being able to ride a snowmobile in these particular parks.

I was also dismayed that a majority of my colleagues decided to vote against an amendment offered by Representative MAURICE HINCHAY to stop the killing of buffalos in Yellowstone National Park. The slaughter of these gracious animals is not only cruel but also expensive for American taxpayers. The National Park Service currently spends \$1.2 million a year to kill buffalos only because they do exactly as their instinct tells them: They migrate. They get killed because they do not observe state borders and dare to cross from Wyoming

to Montana during the winter. They get killed under the premise that they transmit diseases to cattle—a thesis that has never been confirmed and for some reason is a concern to farmers in Montana, but not to farmers in Wyoming.

Another amendment benefiting the health of our environment was offered by Representative TOM UDALL and again defeated. It would have prohibited the use of funds for the implementation of the Forest's Service new planning regulations. These regulations, which have been proposed by the administration in 2002, will substantially weaken the protection of our nation's wildlife and natural resources and reduce public participation in the environmental decision-making process.

Representative NICK RAHALL made an effort to present the interests of Native Americans in this country by offering an amendment protecting their sacred sites located on federal lands from energy development and other exploitation. The Native Americans in this country have undergone and are still suffering from discrimination and poverty. Representative RAHALL's amendment would at least have ensured that the holiest sites of the tribes are not further destroyed by capitalist interests. NICK RAHALL asked us, the Members of the House, how we would feel if open-pit mining was allowed in Arlington Cemetery or bulldozers leveled down the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem to build a highway. Only imagining these scenarios give me feelings of grief and anger. But just these things have happened to sacred sites of the Native Americans and it is a disgrace that so many members voted against Representative RAHALL's amendment to stop this evil.

But I am happy that at least one strong environmental amendment to the Interior Appropriations Bill was passed by the House of Representatives. This was Representative STEVE CHABOT's amendment to prohibit the use of funds to plan or construct forest development roads in the Tongass National Forest in Alaska. Last year, the Bush administration announced to completely eliminate the Roadless Area Conservation Rule's protection for the Tongass National Forest in Alaska and to severely weaken the rule everywhere else in the National Forest System. The Tongass National Forest is a national heritage. It is the largest forest our nation has and the biggest intact temperate rainforest worldwide. The exemption of "America's Rainforest" from the roadless protection rule was another present of the Bush administration to big industrial interests, in this case timber logging companies and was paid for by the American taxpayers.

Representative CHABOT's amendment will only restrict the construction of roads that are subsidized by American taxpayers and not those paid for by the timber industry. I do not think that this amendment goes far enough to sufficiently protect this pristine forest, but I think it is a step into the right direction.

I sincerely hope, that those Members of the House of Representatives who have voted against the aforementioned amendments will wake up and recognize that an environment once destroyed will not be easy and mostly impossible to restore. I hope that they will remember that there will be future generations who need clean air and water, healthy oceans and forests and a diverse wildlife not only for their enjoyment, but for their survival.