S.J. RES. 35

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years after the date of its submission for ratification:

''ARTICLE—

''SECTION 1. The seventeenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

''SECTION 2. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the legislature thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

''SECTION 3. If vacancies happen by resignation or otherwise, during the recess of the legislature of any State, the executive thereof may make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the legislature, which shall then fill such vacancies.

''SECTION 4. This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes a valid part of the Constitution.''.

S. RES. 334

Whereas the United States and Singapore have a strong and enduring friendship;

Whereas the United States and Singapore share a common vision in ensuring the continued peace, stability, and prosperity of the Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas Singapore is a member of the coalition for the reconstruction of Iraq and is a strong supporter of the coalition efforts to stabilize and rebuild Iraq;

Whereas Singapore is a steadfast partner with the United States in the global campaign against terrorism and has worked closely with the United States to fight terrorism around the world;

Whereas Singapore is a core member of the Proliferation Security Initiative and is committed to preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction;

Whereas Singapore has provided valuable support to the United States Armed Forces, including inviting such Forces to use the state-of-the-art Changi Naval Base;

Whereas Singapore is the 11th largest trading partner of the United States;

Whereas Singapore was the first country in Asia to enter into a free trade agreement with the United States;

Whereas Singapore, which has one of the busiest ports in the world, was the first country in Asia to join the Container Security Initiative (CSI), a key initiative of the United States Customs Service designed to prevent terrorist attacks through the use of cargo;

Whereas Singapore is a leader in biological research, has established a regional Emerging Diseases Intervention Center, and is leading efforts to respond to new health threats, including emerging diseases and the use of biological agents;

Whereas the relationship between the United States and Singapore is reinforced by strong ties of culture, values, commerce, and scientific cooperation; and

Whereas relationship and international cooperation between the United States and Singapore is important and valuable to both countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) welcomes the Prime Minister of Singapore, His Excellency Goh Chok Tong, to the United States;

(2) expresses profound gratitude to the Government of Singapore for its assistance in Iraq and its support in the global campaign against terrorism; and

(3) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the continued expansion of friendship and cooperation between the United States and Singapore.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 345—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD EXPAND THE SUPPORTS AND SERVICES AVAILABLE TO GRANDPARENTS AND OTHER RELATIVES WHO ARE RAISING CHILDREN WHEN THEIR BIOLOGICAL PARENTS HAVE DIED OR CAN NO LONGER TAKE CARE OF THEM

Mrs. CLINTON (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MILLER, Mr. KERRY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. CORZINE, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mrs. LINCOLN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 345

Whereas, 4.5 million children in the United States are living in grandparent-headed households—a 30% increase from 1990 to 2000—and an additional 1.5 million children are living in households headed by other relatives;

Whereas 70% of grandparents who report they are responsible for the grandchildren living with them are under the age of 60, many of whom are still in the workforce and making a valuable contribution to the national economy;

Whereas, an increasing number of parents are unable to raise their own children due to substance abuse, incarceration, illnesses such as HIV/AIDS, child abuse and neglect, domestic and community violence, unemployment and poverty, and other serious community crises;

Whereas, grandparents and other relatives raising children, especially those without formal legal custody or guardianship of the children under their care, face a variety of unnecessary barriers, including difficulties enrolling children in school, authorizing medical treatment, maintaining their public housing leases, obtaining affordable legal services, and accessing a variety of federal benefits and services;

Whereas, grandparents and other relatives have stepped forward at great personal sacrifice to their financial and health status, to provide safe and loving homes and keep thousands of children from unnecessarily entering the formal foster care system;

Whereas children feel content to live in an environment with people that they know, who are familiar, and who are able to provide them with extended family as additional support and a family history, which gives them a sense of belonging.

Whereas the time, effort, and unselfish commitment shown by these family members is worthy of recognition.

Whereas, almost one-fifth of grandparents who report that they are responsible for the grandchildren living with them live in poverty;

Whereas, grandparents and other relatives have taken over the care of abused and neglected children who have been removed from their homes even though they often fail to receive the same services and supports offered to non-related foster parents.

Whereas, grandparents and other relatives, whether raising children inside or outside of the foster care system, need better access to health insurance, respite care, child care, special education, housing, and other benefits, and where appropriate, support from Temporary Assistance For Needy Families, federal foster care and subsidized guardianship programs.

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of the Senate that

(A) Congress and all Americans should recognize and publicly laud the commitment of grandparents, aunts, uncles, and other relative caregivers raising children whose parents are unable or unwilling to do so;

(B) Congress urges institutions and government entities at every level to promote public policies that support, and remove barriers to these caregivers;

(C) Congress should establish new and expanded appropriate supports and services, such as respite care, housing, and subsidized guardianship, for grandparents and other relatives who are raising children inside and outside of the foster care system.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, today I am pleased to be submitting a resolution that urges Congress to expand the supports and services available to grandparents and other relatives who are raising children when their biological parents can no longer take care of them. I am pleased to have worked with my friend and colleague, Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE, in crafting this important bill.

Today, in Albany, NY, there is a ''GrandRally'' going on to celebrate and honor the almost 300,000 children who live in grandparent-headed households—a total of 6.3 percent of all children in New York State. Another 112,000 children live in households headed by other relatives. I am so pleased that this resolution coincides with the GrandRally because they compliment each other nicely.

Nationwide, four and a half million children are living in grandparent-headed households and an additional 1.5 million children are living in households headed by other relatives. This represents a 30 percent increase between 1990 and 2000.

Kinship care families came to be because there are many tragic instances when parents are unable to raise their own children. Serious illness, death, substance abuse, incarceration, domestic violence, and unemployment are just some of the reasons that have forced grandparents and other relatives to step forward, often at great personal sacrifice, to provide safe and loving homes for the children in their care. This has allowed thousands of children to live with extended family rather than strangers.

We know that children are better off living in an environment with people that they know, who are familiar, and who are able to provide them with extended family as additional support. When foster children are placed with family members rather than strangers, they gain a critical sense of belonging and a family history.

Unfortunately, these grandparents and other relatives raising children often face a number of unnecessary barriers, including difficulties enrolling children in school, authorizing medical treatment, and accessing a variety of government benefits and services. Almost one-fifth of grandparents who are serving as the parents for their grandchildren are living in poverty.

The time, effort, and unselfish commitment of these family members is worthy of recognition.

This resolution encourages institutions and government entities at every level to promote public policies that support these caregivers by expanding existing services such as respite care, housing, and subsidized guardianship for grandparents and other relatives who are raising children inside and outside of the foster care system.

I want to thank all of my colleagues who are cosponsors of this resolution. Senator SNOWE and I are being joined by a diverse, bipartisan group of Senators whose commitment to this issue demonstrates the broad range of support for kinship care families.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 101—TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISION IN BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION OF TOPEKA

Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 101

Whereas Oliver L. Brown is the namesake of the landmark United States Supreme Court decision of 1954, Brown v. Board of Education (347 U.S. 483, 1954);

Whereas Oliver L. Brown is honored as the lead plaintiff in the Topeka, Kansas case which posed a legal challenge to racial segregation in public education;

Whereas by 1950, African-American parents began to renew their efforts to challenge State laws that only permitted their children to attend certain schools, and as a result, they organized through the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (the NAACP), an organization founded in 1909 to address the issue of the unequal and discriminatory treatment experienced by African-Americans throughout the country;

Whereas Oliver L. Brown became part of the NAACP strategy led first by Charles Houston and later by Thurgood Marshall, to file suit against various school boards on behalf of such parents and their children;

Whereas Oliver L. Brown was a member of a distinguished group of plaintiffs in cases from Kansas (Brown v. Board of Education), Delaware (Gebhart v. Belton), South Carolina (Briggs v. Elliot), and Virginia (Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward County) that were combined by the United States Supreme Court in Brown v. Board of Education, and in Washington, D.C. (Bolling v. Sharpe), considered separately by the Supreme Court with respect to the District of Columbia;

Whereas with respect to cases filed in the State of Kansas—

(1) there were 11 school integration cases dating from 1881 to 1949, prior to Brown v. Board of Education in 1954;

(2) in many instances, the schools for African-American children were substandard facilities with out-of-date textbooks and often no basic school supplies;

(3) in the fall of 1950, members of the Topeka, Kansas chapter of the NAACP agreed to again challenge the ''separate but equal'' doctrine governing public education;

(4) on February 28, 1951, the NAACP filed their case as Oliver L. Brown et al. v. The Board of Education of Topeka Kansas (which represented a group of 13 parents and 20 children);

(5) the district court ruled in favor of the school board and the case was appealed to the United States Supreme Court;

(6) at the Supreme Court level, the case was combined with other NAACP cases from Delaware, South Carolina, Virginia, and Washington, D.C. (which was later heard separately); and

(7) the combined cases became known as Oliver L. Brown et al. v. The Board of Education of Topeka, et al.;

Whereas with respect to the Virginia case of Davis et al. v. Prince Edward County Board of Supervisors—

(1) one of the few public high schools available to African-Americans in the State of Virginia was Robert Moton High School in Prince Edward County;

(2) built in 1943, it was never large enough to accommodate its student population;

(3) the gross inadequacies of these classrooms sparked a student strike in 1951;

(4) the NAACP soon joined their struggles and challenged the inferior quality of their school facilities in court; and

(5) although the United States District Court ordered that the plaintiffs be provided with equal school facilities, they were denied access to the schools for white students in their area;

Whereas with respect to the South Carolina case of Briggs v. R.W. Elliott—

(1) in Clarendon County, South Carolina, the State NAACP first attempted, unsuccessfully and with a single plaintiff, to take legal action in 1947 against the inferior conditions that African-American students experienced under South Carolina's racially segregated school system;

(2) by 1951, community activists convinced African-American parents to join the NAACP efforts to file a class action suit in United States District Court;

(3) the court found that the schools designated for African-Americans were grossly inadequate in terms of buildings, transportation, and teacher salaries when compared to the schools provided for white students; and

(4) an order to equalize the facilities was virtually ignored by school officials, and the schools were never made equal;

Whereas with respect to the Delaware cases of Belton v. Gebhart and Bulah v. Gebhart—

(1) first petitioned in 1951, these cases challenged the inferior conditions of 2 African-American schools;

(2) in the suburb of Claymont, Delaware, African-American children were prohibited from attending the area's local high school, and in the rural community of Hockessin, Delaware, African-American students were forced to attend a dilapidated 1-room schoolhouse, and were not provided transportation to the school, while white children in the area were provided transportation and a better school facility;

(3) both plaintiffs were represented by local NAACP attorneys; and

(4) though the State Supreme Court ruled in favor of the plaintiffs, the decision did not apply to all schools in Delaware;

Whereas with respect to the District of Columbia case of Bolling, et al. v. C. Melvin Sharpe, et al.—

(1) 11 African-American junior high school students were taken on a field trip to Washington, D.C.'s new John Philip Sousa School for white students only;

(2) the African-American students were denied admittance to the school and ordered to return to their inadequate school; and

(3) in 1951, a suit was filed on behalf of the students, and after review with the Brown case in 1954, the United States Supreme Court ruled that segregation in the Nation's capitol was unconstitutional;

Whereas on May 17, 1954, at 12:52 p.m., the United States Supreme Court ruled that the discriminatory nature of racial segregation ''violates the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, which guarantees all citizens equal protection of the laws'';

Whereas the decision in Brown v. Board of Education set the stage for dismantling racial segregation throughout the country;

Whereas the quiet courage of Oliver L. Brown and his fellow plaintiffs asserted the right of African-American people to have equal access to social, political, and communal structures;

Whereas our country is indebted to the work of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., Howard University Law School, the NAACP, and the individual plaintiffs in the cases considered by the Supreme Court;

Whereas Reverend Oliver L. Brown died in 1961, and because the landmark United States Supreme Court decision bears his name, he is remembered as an icon for justice, freedom, and equal rights; and

Whereas the national importance of the Brown v. Board of Education decision had a profound impact on American culture, affecting families, communities, and governments by outlawing racial segregation in public education, resulting in the abolition of legal discrimination on any basis: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That—

(1) the Congress recognizes and honors the 50th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka;

(2) the Congress encourages all people of the United States to recognize the importance of the Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka;

(3) by celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, the Nation will be able to refresh and renew the importance of equality in society; and

(4) the Rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on May 13, 2004 or June 17, 2004 for a ceremony to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Supreme Court's landmark decision in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954);

physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3052. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCAIN to the bill S. 150, to make permanent the moratorium on taxes on Internet access and multiple and discriminatory taxes on electronic commerce imposed by the Internet