

with distinguished elected service in between, Julian Bond has been in the forefront of the fight for justice in America. Given his extraordinary leadership in the struggle against discrimination based on race, and given the efforts of some to argue that the fight against homophobia is somehow entirely different from the fight against racism, Julian Bond's eloquent, forceful defense of the right of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered people to be treated fairly is noteworthy.

On Saturday, October 1, Mr. Bond addressed another important civil rights organization, the Human Rights Campaign, at the HRC's Washington Dinner. His speech, not surprisingly for a champion of human rights, is a strong defense of the right of people to be free from prejudice based on their sexual orientation, and an explicit affirmation that the fight against racism and the fight against homophobia have a common basis.

As he said in that speech, "denial of rights to anyone is wrong, and . . . struggles for rights are indivisible."

Mr. Speaker, because of the eloquence of his repudiation of the effort to divide those who fight against racism from those who fight against homophobia, and because of his extraordinary stature in the fight to make sure that the rights spelled out in our Constitution are in fact fully enjoyed by everyone, Julian Bond's words at the Human Rights Campaign Dinner deserve the attention of every Member of this body, and I ask that those remarks be printed here.

I am more than honored to receive this award, and want to express my thanks to all responsible for it. I want to promise you that I intend to live my life as if I actually deserve it.

I believe it represents a common acknowledgment that denial of rights to anyone is wrong, and that struggles for rights are indivisible.

I feel tonight a little like the great abolitionist Frederick Douglass must have felt in April, 1888. Douglass, by then an old man, was addressing a women's convention in Seneca Falls, New York. They praised him for his devotion to the cause of women's suffrage. Forty years earlier, at the world's first Women's Rights Convention, when Susan B. Anthony made a motion that American women had the right to vote, it was Douglass who seconded the motion.

In 1888, Douglass reflected back on that moment and told his audience, When I ran away from slavery, it was for myself; when I advocated emancipation, it was for my people; but when I stood up for the rights of women, self was out of the question, and I found a little nobility in the act.

You have all made me feel noble tonight. I am proud to represent an organization that has fought for justice for all for nearly 100 years, and while we've won many victories, we know—you know—there are other battles yet to be waged and won.

At the NAACP, we were proud to have opposed the federal marriage amendment and its wrong-headed versions in several states. President Bush backed amendments banning same-sex marriage, calling marriage "the most fundamental institution of civilization."

Isn't that precisely why one should support, not oppose, gay marriage?

The NAACP recently passed a resolution to strengthen families, including yours. We promised to "pursue all legal and constitutional means to support non-discriminatory policies and practices against persons based on race, gender, sexual orientation, nationality or cultural background."

We know there was a time, not so long ago, when black people in this country couldn't marry the person of their choice either. The California Supreme Court was the first, in 1948, to strike down laws prohibiting interracial marriage.

Now the California legislature has become the first to legalize gay marriage.

As California goes, so goes the Nation. It's just a matter of time.

Almost twenty years after California legalized interracial marriage, the United States Supreme Court heard the aptly named case *Loving v. Virginia*.

A married couple—Richard Loving, a white man, and Mildred Jeter, a black woman—won a ruling from the Court that Virginia's miscegenation laws were unconstitutional. That case enabled me to get married in Virginia. That case recognized marriage as one of the inviolable personal rights pursuant to happiness.

That's why when I am asked, "Are Gay Rights Civil Rights?" my answer is always, "Of course they are."

"Civil rights" are positive legal prerogatives—the right to equal treatment before the law. These are rights shared by all—there is no one in the United States who does not—or should not—share in these rights.

Gay and lesbian rights are not "special rights" in any way. It isn't "special" to be free from discrimination—it is an ordinary, universal entitlement of citizenship. The right not to be discriminated against is a common-place claim we all expect to enjoy under our laws and our founding document, the Constitution. That many had to struggle to gain these rights makes them precious—it does not make them special, and it does not reserve them only for me or restrict them from others.

When others gain these rights, my rights are not reduced in any way. The fight for "civil rights" is a win/win game; the more civil rights are won by others, the stronger the army defending my rights becomes. My rights are not diluted when my neighbor enjoys protection from the law—he or she becomes my ally in defending the rights we all share.

For some, comparisons between the African-American civil rights movement and the movement for gay and lesbian rights seem to diminish the long black historical struggle with all its suffering, sacrifices and endless toil. However, people of color ought to be flattered that our movement has provided so much inspiration for others, that it has been so widely imitated, and that our tactics, methods, heroines and heroes, even our songs, have been appropriated by or served as models for others.

No parallel between movements for rights is exact. African-Americans are the only Americans who were enslaved for more than two centuries, and people of color carry the badge of who we are on our faces. But we are far from the only people suffering discrimination—sadly, so do many others. They deserve the law's protections and civil rights, too.

Sexual disposition parallels race—I was born black and had no choice. I couldn't change and wouldn't change if I could. Like race, our sexuality isn't a preference—it is immutable, unchangeable, and the Constitution protects us all against prejudices and discrimination based on immutable differences.

Those whose bigotry is Bible-based selectively ignore Biblical injunctions in Exodus to execute people who work on the Sabbath and in Leviticus to crack down on those who get haircuts or who wear clothes with more than one kind of thread.

Recently, they've even ignored the sanctity of marriage—just ask Michael Schiavo.

Many gays and lesbians worked side by side with me in the '60s civil rights movement. Am I to now tell them "thanks" for risking life and limb helping me win my rights—but they are excluded because of a condition of their birth? That they cannot share now in the victories they helped to win? That having accepted and embraced them as partners in a common struggle, I can now turn my back on them and deny them the rights they helped me win, that I enjoy because of them?

Not a chance.

In 1965, those of us who worked in the civil rights movement were buoyed by a radio address given by Lyndon Johnson.

His words speak to us today. He said then:

It is difficult to fight for freedom. But I also know how difficult it can be to bend long years of habit and custom to grant it. There is no room for injustice anywhere in the American mansion. But there is always room for understanding those who see the old ways crumbling. And to them today I say simply this: It must come. It is right that it should come. And when it has, you will find that a burden has been lifted from your shoulders too. It is not just a question of guilt, although there is that. It is that men cannot live with a lie and not be stained by it.

One lesson of the civil rights movement of yesterday—and the on-going civil rights movement of today—is that sometimes the simplest of ordinary acts—taking a seat on a bus or a lunch counter, registering to vote, applying for a marriage license—can have extraordinary ramifications. It can change our world, change the way we act and think.

Thank you again for this honor.

The old ways are crumbling.

It must come.

Let us leave here determined to fight on until it does.

#### HONORING RICK GEHA

#### HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 2005

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Rick Geha who is being honored by The Ohlone College Foundation in Fremont, California, as 2005 Citizen of the Year.

Since 1987, the Ohlone College Foundation has awarded a Citizen of the Year Award at its Annual Benefit Luncheon to honor individuals or organizations that have made an exceptional contribution and commitment to the advancement of the community.

Rick Geha is being honored for his "Commitment to Excellence." As a businessman, he is a leader among Bay Area realtors and a mentor in the real estate business.

As a community activist, he is a strong advocate for children and education. He has served on the Ohlone College Foundation Board since 1993 and has held the position of Board Chair for the past eight years. He has served two terms on the Kidango Board of Directors. Kidango, formerly Tri-cities Children's Center, provides a variety of child development programs in 46 locations in three Bay Area Counties. The Fremont Education Foundation honored Rich Geha as the Community Honoree for its 2005 Excellence in Education award.

Rick Geha gives tirelessly to the community through his philanthropy, community service, business expertise, and dedication to making

a positive difference. On October 21, family and friends as well as the grateful recipients of Rich Geha's kind service and financial support to non-profit organizations, will gather to acknowledge his years of community service. I join them in appreciation for his commitment to excellence.

HONORING HEALTHSOURCE  
SAGINAW, INC.

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 2005

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to honor the administration and staff of HealthSource Saginaw, Inc. For 75 years, this facility has provided superior medical care to patients throughout the Saginaw area, and on October 21, they shall break ground on a new, larger facility.

Originally known as Saginaw County Hospital, HealthSource Saginaw was established by county officials in 1930 as a tuberculosis sanitarium. In 1991, it became a Municipal Health Facility Organization and qualified for non-profit status with the Internal Revenue Service. Throughout the years, it has maintained a vision to offer the finest care available, care that meets and exceeds the latest in healthcare, communications, and information technology. At the same time, HealthSource Saginaw has continued to provide the quality level of compassion for which it is known for throughout the State of Michigan.

With 319 inpatient beds, HSS is comprised of three divisions: Behavioral Medicine Services, an Extended Care Center, and a Medical Rehabilitation Center. They offer specialty services such as inpatient and outpatient Chemical Dependency and Mental Health care and treatment, restorative care, physical, occupational, and speech therapy, and the region's only inpatient adolescent mental health program. They receive accreditation from the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities and the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, who have given them the most optimal level of distinction for their hospital level services.

In addition to its non-profit status, HSS receives significant funding from Medicare, Medicaid, and of course through the support of Saginaw County residents, who have authorized a millage to help with costs. Over 99 percent of their total budget, including funds received by the millage, is earmarked for direct patient care, with the remaining one percent slated for equipment.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor and a pleasure for me to have this opportunity to recognize this outstanding group of medical professionals. Many families have benefited from their care and services. The staff considers it their duty and privilege to protect and defend human dignity and the quality of life for their patients. I am grateful for HealthSource Saginaw's commitment to go beyond the ordinary when providing healthcare services, and I ask my colleagues in the 109th Congress to please join me in congratulating and wishing them well on their expansion.

STATEMENT IN REMEMBRANCE OF  
KENNETH SMITH

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 6, 2005

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow I announce the passing of Kenneth Smith of Manahawkin, New Jersey, after a long battle with cancer. Ken dedicated his life toward enhancing the sandy beaches, not only of New Jersey, but of the entire nation.

Ken Smith was a tireless and dedicated advocate for protecting and enhancing our beaches. He knew how much they mean to our state and national economies, and he fought tenaciously to assure the federal government gave beach preservation the priority it deserves. For over a quarter of a century, Ken was America's "Coastal Advocate."

Ken spent eight years as a Vice President and as a Director of the American Shore and Beach Preservation (ASBPA); and is a co-founder of the Alliance for a Living Ocean, formed in response to the terrible summer when garbage and other pollution was washing up on the Jersey shore in 1987. The Alliance for a Living Ocean won the Governor's Award for Volunteerism in 1999. Ken, known as ASBPA's "Tenacious Bulldog at the Beach," won the organization's prestigious Morrough P. O'Brien Award in 1999, followed by its Lifetime Achievement Award in 2004.

The millions of tourists who come to visit and enjoy our beaches each year from across the nation and from around the world, as well as all those whose communities are protected from the ravages of storms by these same dunes and healthy beaches, owe Ken a debt of gratitude for all that he accomplished. Ken was the leading force in bringing an awareness to so many people about the importance of working together to preserve not only our beaches and oceans, but the environment and our natural resources as a whole. His dedication to not only protecting the beaches but educating people on the importance of preservation was unparalleled.

I extend my sympathies to his wife, Pat, and to his entire family and hope that these words of appreciation will comfort them in their time of sorrow.

THREATENED AND ENDANGERED  
SPECIES RECOVERY ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 29, 2005

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3824) to amend and reauthorize the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide greater results conserving and recovering listed species, and for other purposes:

Ms. ESHOO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Pombo bill and in support of the reforms in the substitute amendment offered by Representatives GEORGE MILLER and SHERWOOD BOEHLERT.

The Endangered Species Act is a cornerstone of environmental protection. I'm very

proud that one of my predecessors in the Congress, Pete McCloskey, was a leader in enacting this bipartisan law.

After more than 30 years, it's worth reevaluating and updating this law to better meet its objectives. I understand some of the frustrations that constituents have with the current law, but I don't think we should throw "the baby out with the bathwater" as the underlying bill would do.

While critics rightfully point out that we need to do more to help endangered species recover so they can be removed from the endangered list, the fact is the Endangered Species Act has been highly successful, with 99 percent of species listed under the ESA being saved from extinction.

I have very deep concerns about the bill before us today.

First, the bill requires the Federal Government to pay developers' costs in complying with the Endangered Species Act whenever even a portion of a property is impacted. There's no limit on the compensation payments that would be paid. The Congressional Budget Office has said this is a new entitlement that will increase spending by billions of dollars and establish a dangerous precedent. Imagine, for example, the Federal Government paying a factory owner for the costs of complying with the Clean Air Act when a decision is made to expand the plant. That's the principle this bill will establish. It's an extraordinary mistake.

Second, the bill removes protections against the use of hazardous pesticides. It's estimated that 67 million birds die each year from the effects of pesticides. These protections must be kept in place. One of the reasons the Endangered Species Act was adopted in the first place was to address declines in the population of the bald eagle caused by DDT.

Third, the bill strips the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of its role in administering the Endangered Species Act, transferring it to the Department of Interior with no assurance whatsoever that this agency will have the resources or the expertise to take on this responsibility.

Fourth, the bill reduces the role of science by ending the current requirement that Federal agencies consult with wildlife biologists before undertaking actions that might harm endangered species.

The Miller-Boehlert Substitute makes great sense if we want to capitalize on the successes and the lessons of the last 30-plus years.

The substitute will repeal the current requirement that the Secretary designate "critical habitat" for endangered fish, wildlife, and plants *before* formulating a plan for species recovery. Instead, the substitute requires real habitat recovery efforts to conserve rare and threatened fish and wildlife. It ensures that recovery plans include the best possible science and that they're enforceable.

The substitute directs the Secretary to first determine whether public lands are sufficient to protect and save the endangered species before taking other measures that will impact private landowners.

The substitute will help small landowners who may not have the resources to comply with the Act. It will provide dedicated funding for technical assistance for these private property owners and establish a conservation grants program for landowners who help conserve the species on or near their property. It