

physicians combined, and included there is appointments to numerous hospitals in the city of Cleveland. He shared his knowledge and experience with young students eager to join his honored profession, serving as an instructor and clinical assistant professor at Case Western Reserve.

Involved in numerous community activities, he was a trustee, grand jury foreman, a trustee of the American Red Cross. Here indeed was a man who dared to dream, who lived his dreams, and shared his vision. Anthropologist Margaret Mead "measured success in terms of the contributions that an individual makes to his or her human beings." Booker T. Washington said "success is to be measured not so much by the position that one has reached in life as by the obstacles which he has overcome while trying to succeed." By either measure, Dr. Middleton H. Lambright, Jr., was a successful man.

On behalf of the citizens of the Eleventh Congressional District of Ohio, I express gratitude to this outstanding citizen of Ohio for his life and service and extend my condolences to his family and friends.

[From the Plain Dealer, June 19, 1999]

DR. MIDDLETON LAMBRIGHT, OVERCAME
RACIAL BARRIERS

(By Richard M. Peery)

EUCLID—Dr. Middleton H. "Middie" Lambright Jr. was a pioneer who broke barriers of racial discrimination throughout his career.

He was the first black doctor to attain full hospital privileges in Cleveland when he was admitted to the staffs of University and Mt. Sinai hospitals.

He worked with his father to found Forest City Hospital, enabling black doctors to head medical departments.

He was the second in the nation to head a local affiliate of the American Medical Association when he became president of the Cleveland Academy of Medicine in 1964.

When he left Cleveland in 1972 to become assistant dean of the Medical College of South Carolina, he was welcomed to the state by Sen. Strom Thurmond, who had been one of the leading defenders of racial segregation in the nation.

Dr. Lambright returned to Cleveland in 1984 to serve as a vice president of Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Ohio. He retired four years later.

Dr. Lambright died Monday at his home in Euclid. He was 90.

He was born in Kansas City, Mo. When he was 12, his father moved the family to Cleveland so his children would not be subjected to segregated education. Dr. Lambright graduated from Glenville High School.

He attended Lincoln University in Pennsylvania, but his graduation was delayed while he recovered from tuberculosis. He eventually received a degree from Western Reserve University in 1934. He decided to specialize in surgery while he was a student at Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Tenn., where he graduated in 1938.

Dr. Lambright completed his internship at City Hospital, now MetroHealth Medical Center, and was serving a surgical residency there when World War II broke out. Although fellow residents joined the Lakeside Medical Unit that served under Gen. Douglas

MacArthur in the Pacific, Dr. Lambright was not allowed to go with them because of the racial segregation in the military. Because the Army's only black medical training unit was full, he remained at City Hospital throughout the war.

Dr. Lambright became an assistant professor of surgery at Case Western Reserve University and chief of surgery at Forest City Hospital. He was medical adviser for The Plain Dealer Golden Gloves tournaments and medical director for the Cleveland Boxing and Wrestling Commission.

In addition to his memberships in numerous professional organizations, Dr. Lambright found time for civic activities. He served on the original trustee board for Cleveland State University. He was also a trustee of several local organizations, including the Automobile Association, Growth Association, United Appeal, American Cancer Society, Red Cross, Welfare Federation, Urban League, Cedar YMCA and Barons Hockey Club.

He was appointed Cuyahoga County grand jury foreman in 1965.

After he returned to Cleveland from South Carolina, he was a trustee of the Cleveland Scholarship Program

He was a member of Alpha Omega Alpha Honor Medical Society and Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity.

Dr. Lambright is survived by his wife, Willie Callahan Lambright of Greensboro, N.C.; a sister, Elizabeth B. of Euclid; and a granddaughter, Lodi of Providence, R.I.

Services will be a 11 a.m. June 26 at the Mausoleum of Lake View Cemetery, 12316 Euclid Ave., Cleveland.

Arrangements are by the E.F. Boyd & Son Funeral Home of Cleveland.

Memorial donations may be made to the CWRU/Forest City Hospital Endowment Fund, Bolton School of Nursing, 10900 Euclid Ave., Cleveland 44106-4904; or to Meharry Medical College, Division of Institutional Advancement, 1005 D.B. Blvd., Nashville, Tenn. 37208.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TRANSITION TO TEACHING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROEMER. It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that as education goes, so goes America. Whether we are talking to a labor union in South Bend, Indiana, or a small business in Elkhart, Indiana, and with an unemployment rate of about 3 percent, everybody is saying the same thing across our State, that we need to work together in the United States Congress to improve education, not just simply improve it, but to creatively and boldly improve education for every single one of our Nation's children.

Now the new Democrat coalition, which I helped start and found, has taken the approach that we need to do a host of creative and bold new things. Certainly we all agree that parental involvement and community concern is the Number one issue, and in addition to that we need more charter schools and public school choice. This was a bill that I wrote and drafted with new

Democrat help and with the help of Mr. Riggs from California, and we passed this bill in 1997. This is a bipartisan bill to provide more public choice for all our Nation's children and parents.

Secondly, we need more teachers, not just more of them, but better quality of teachers to compliment and supplement the number of teachers that are working so hard in America today, and my good friend from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) and I have introduced a bill called Transition to Teaching Act that will boldly improve on the Troops to Teachers bill to try to build relationships with the private companies and foundations to help transition people from their first career, as maybe a businessman or a businesswoman, somebody in science, somebody as a police officer or a fireman, and transition them into a second career of teaching. This is a dream for many people when they are in their 40s or 50s or 60s, to enter the teaching profession, and my colleague from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) and I will introduce this bill on Thursday, the Transition to Teaching Act.

Thirdly, we need technology. The E-rate, which I would say the E stands for equality or education, the E-rate needs to make sure that we win the battle of connecting up our schools and libraries to this exciting new technology of the Internet. It is not the answer, the panacea, to all our Nation's questions of research, but it does provide us some interesting opportunities for helping with new curriculum, helping develop role models for new teachers, helping share information from one classroom to another. The E-rate is the battle of the new century to make sure that all of our Nation's children in the inner city, in the rural communities which I represent in Indiana, that they all have access to get to this technology and that our teachers, that our teachers are equipped with the sufficient skills to learn this and teach it and convey it to our children.

Fourthly, when we just succeeded on this, and I worked closely with my good friend from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), a Republican, on the education flexibility bill, we will give our local communities additional waivers from Federal and State regulations if they attach more success to that student, that student that gets better scores and graduates from year to year and out of high school into college.

That education flexibility is directly tied to the success of the student and not to more and more red tape, regulations, and requirements. And, Mr. Speaker, we need to do more. We need to look at bolder and newer and more creative ideas, teacher academies set up with our universities and colleges. We need to look at preschool initiatives when we are hearing that our children are learning more and more at earlier and earlier ages and they are capable of more and more.

We need to look at helping provide the resources to our local communities to stop social promotion. It does not do our children any good to be promoted from grade to grade to grade when they cannot provide, they cannot read, they cannot provide themselves with the opportunity to learn more about geography and math and science.

So, Mr. Speaker, as paraphrasing Abraham Lincoln in conclusion, Abraham Lincoln talked about making sure that we all have the opportunities not to guarantee that we will all finish the race of life at the same time. No, nobody can guarantee that, but at least we get the opportunity for an equal start in life, and that comes back to education.

Let us work together across the aisle, Democrat and Republican, for creative bold new reforms in education as the new Democratic coalition has sought to do.

WHAT WE WOULD BE DOING BY AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION TO MAKE IT ILLEGAL TO DESECRATE THE AMERICAN FLAG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we have on our schedule the debate and the vote on a constitutional amendment, the amendment that would make the desecration of the flag illegal. Many who support this amendment imply that those of us who oppose it for some reason might be unpatriotic. That, of course, is not true.

I would like to call attention to my fellow colleagues just exactly what I see us doing by amending the Constitution.

The very first thing that Communist China did after it took over Hong Kong was to pass legislation to make sure that it was illegal to desecrate the Chinese flag. Now let me say that one time again. As soon as Red China took over Hong Kong, that was the very first thing they did. One of the first pieces of legislation was to make sure that the people of Hong Kong knew it was illegal to do anything to desecrate the Chinese flag.

Now another interesting thing about the Chinese and their flag is that we monitor human rights in China. As a matter of fact, the State Department is required to come before the House and the Senate and report to us about the violations of human rights in China. The purpose is to find out whether or not they qualify for full trade with us, and the argument comes up every year. Some say, well, they violate civil rights and human rights all the time; therefore, we should not be trading with Red China, which is an argument that can be presented.

But in this report that came out in April to summarize last year, our gov-

ernment lists as a violation of human rights that we are holding them accountable for that we want to use against them so that we do not trade with them is the fact that two individuals last year were arrested because they desecrated the Communist Chinese flag.

□ 1845

I think that is pretty important. We should think about that. First, the Chinese Government makes it illegal to desecrate a flag in Hong Kong, and then they arrest somebody and they convict them, and they want to hold it against them and say we do not want to give them Most Favored Nation status because they are violating somebody's human rights.

Mr. Speaker, my point is obviously that why do we want to emulate them? There are other countries around the world that have similar laws: Iraq, Cuba, Haiti, Sudan; they all have laws against desecration of the flag. But in this country we have not had this. We have never put it in the Constitution. This debate would dumbfound our Founders to think that we were contemplating such an amendment to the Constitution.

We have existed now for 212 years since the passage of our Constitution, and we have not had laws like this, but all of a sudden we feel compelled. What is the compulsion? Do we see on the nightly news Americans defying our flag and defying our principles of liberty? I cannot recall the last time I saw on television an American citizen burning an American flag or desecrating our flag. So all of a sudden now we decide it is a crisis of such magnitude that we have to amend the Constitution; at the same time, challenging the principles of freedom of expression.

There is one State in this country that has a law which they have the right to, a law against desecration of the flag. And the flag police went to a house to find out what was going on because they were flying their flag upside down. What is going to happen when we try to define "desecrate"? Desecrate is usually something held for religious symbol. Have we decided to take the flag and make it a holy symbol? But will a towel that is in the shape and the color of a flag that somebody is lying on at the beach, is that going to be a reason to call the FBI and call the flag police in to arrest someone for this desecration? Because we do not define the desecration, we just say we will write the laws to police this type of activity.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks we have had many Members in this Congress cite the Constitution. As a matter of fact, the Constitution is cited all the time. Sometimes I see it inconsistently cited, because when it pleases one to cite the Constitution, they do; and

when it does not, they forget about it. But just recently we have heard the citing of the Constitution quite frequently. In the impeachment hearings: We have to uphold the Constitution, we have to live by our traditions and our ideals. Just last week we were citing the Constitution endlessly over the second amendment which I strongly support, and which I said the same thing. We must uphold the Constitution to defend the second amendment. But all of a sudden here we have decided to change the Constitution that we are in some way going to restrict the freedom of expression.

We say, well, this is bad expression. This is ugly people. These are people that are saying unpopular things, and they are being obnoxious. But, Mr. Speaker, the first amendment and the freedom of expression was never put there for easygoing, nice, conventional, noncontroversial speech. There is no purpose to protect that. Nobody cares. The purpose of freedom of expression is to protect controversy, and if somebody is upset and annoyed, the best thing we can do with people like that is to ignore them. If we pass a constitutional amendment and people are so anti-American that they want to display their anti-Americanism, they will love it. They will get more attention because we will be sending in the Federal flag police to do something about it.

Some will argue the Constitution does not protect freedom of expression; it protects freedom of speech, and this is not speech, this is ugly expression. But the Constitution does, does protect freedom of expression. That is what speech is. What about religion? To express one's religious beliefs. What about one's property, the right to go in and express what one believes? That is what freedom is all about is the freedom of expression and belief. I do not see how this country can become greater by having an amendment written that is in some ways going to curtail the freedom of Americans to express themselves. We have not had it for 212 years, and here we are going to change it.

It is expected that this will be passed overwhelmingly, and in the Senate possibly as well, and then throughout the country, but I do not see this as a positive step. We here in the Congress should think seriously before we pass this amendment.

NEXT STEPS FOR REDUCING GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, we first need to go back to the American