

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. Elliott)*, 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

Tax Freedom Act; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3053. Mr. ROCKEFELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3054. Mr. ROCKEFELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3055. Mr. ALLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3056. Mr. ALLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3057. Mr. ALLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3058. Mr. ALLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3059. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3060. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3061. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3062. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3063. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3064. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3065. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3066. Mr. DORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3067. Mr. DORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3068. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3069. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3070. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3071. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3072. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3073. Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3074. Mr. GRAHAM of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3075. Mr. HOLLINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3076. Mr. GRAHAM of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3077. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3078. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3079. Mr. GRAHAM of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3080. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3081. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3082. Mr. LOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3048 proposed by Mr. McCain to the bill S. 150, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS— TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 2004

SA 3051. Mr. DOMENICI proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3050 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. JOHNSON) 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 Tax Freedom Act; as follows:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

DIVISION —ENERGY

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the "Energy Policy Act of 2003".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this division is as follows:

TITLE I—ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Subtitle A—Federal Programs

- Sec. 101. Energy and water saving measures in congressional buildings.
- Sec. 102. Energy management requirements.
- Sec. 103. Energy use measurement and accountability.

- Sec. 104. Procurement of energy efficient products.
- Sec. 105. Voluntary commitments to reduce industrial energy intensity.
- Sec. 106. Advanced Building Efficiency Testbed.
- Sec. 107. Federal building performance standards.
- Sec. 108. Increased use of recovered mineral component in federally funded projects involving procurement of cement or concrete.

Subtitle B—Energy Assistance and State Programs

- Sec. 121. Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.
- Sec. 122. Weatherization assistance.
- Sec. 123. State energy programs.
- Sec. 124. Energy efficient appliance rebate programs.
- Sec. 125. Energy efficient public buildings.
- Sec. 126. Low income community energy efficiency pilot program.

Subtitle C—Energy Efficient Products

- Sec. 131. Energy Star program.
- Sec. 132. HVAC maintenance consumer education program.
- Sec. 133. Energy conservation standards for additional products.
- Sec. 134. Energy labeling.

Subtitle D—Public Housing

- Sec. 141. Capacity building for energy-efficient, affordable housing.
- Sec. 142. Increase of CDBG public services cap for energy conservation and efficiency activities.
- Sec. 143. FHA mortgage insurance incentives for energy efficient housing.
- Sec. 144. Public Housing Capital Fund.
- Sec. 145. Grants for energy-conserving improvements for assisted housing.
- Sec. 146. North American Development Bank.
- Sec. 147. Energy-efficient appliances.
- Sec. 148. Energy efficiency standards.
- Sec. 149. Energy strategy for HUD.

TITLE II—RENEWABLE ENERGY

Subtitle A—General Provisions

- Sec. 201. Assessment of renewable energy resources.
- Sec. 202. Renewable energy production incentive.
- Sec. 203. Federal purchase requirement.
- Sec. 204. Insular areas energy security.
- Sec. 205. Use of photovoltaic energy in public buildings.
- Sec. 206. Grants to improve the commercial value of forest biomass for electric energy, useful heat, transportation fuels, petroleum-based product substitutes, and other commercial purposes.
- Sec. 207. Biobased products.

Subtitle B—Geothermal Energy

- Sec. 211. Short title.
- Sec. 212. Competitive lease sale requirements.
- Sec. 213. Direct use.
- Sec. 214. Royalties and near-term production incentives.
- Sec. 215. Geothermal leasing and permitting on Federal lands.
- Sec. 216. Review and report to Congress.
- Sec. 217. Reimbursement for costs of NEPA analyses, documentation, and studies.
- Sec. 218. Assessment of geothermal energy potential.
- Sec. 219. Cooperative or unit plans.
- Sec. 220. Royalty on byproducts.
- Sec. 221. Repeal of authorities of Secretary to readjust terms, conditions, rentals, and royalties.