

His legacy has inspired Americans to name educational institutions, Federal Buildings, legal societies, libraries, and numerous academic achievement awards in his honor. It is indeed my honor to recognize a man whose career is a monument to our judiciary system and who has inspired so many to continue his quiet crusade.

Marshall was born and raised in the Congressional District I represent—Baltimore City, Maryland—and lived in a home about eight blocks from where I live now. We both attended Howard University and, more significantly, he was once turned away from the law school I attended and graduated from—the University of Maryland. As such, I am especially proud to honor Thurgood Marshall, as I share a common background with him.

Through his knowledge, advocacy and devotion to the cause of civil rights, Marshall contributed to the battle fought in the United States courts to eradicate the legacy of slavery. I believe, however, that he should be revered most for his courage and independent judiciary and for breathing life into the text of the Constitution. He worked tirelessly to guarantee all Americans equality and liberty in their individual choices concerning voting, housing, education and travel.

In 1954, he argued the case of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* before the Supreme Court, where racial segregation in public schools was declared unconstitutional.

He won 29 of the 32 cases he argued before the Supreme Court, including, cases in which the court declared unconstitutional:

A Southern state's exclusion of African-American voters from primary elections (*Smith v. Allwright, 1944*); state judicial enforcement of racial "restrictive covenants" in housing (*Shelley v. Kraemer, 1948*); and "separate but equal" facilities for African-American professionals and graduate students in state universities (*Sweatt v. Painter* and *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents, both 1950*).

I honor and praise him for his civil rights and professional achievements within our judicial system.

President John F. Kennedy appointed Marshall to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in 1961. Four years later, President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed him Solicitor General of the United States.

President Johnson nominated Marshall to the Supreme Court of the United States and the Senate confirmed the appointment on August 30, 1967, making Marshall the first African-American justice to sit on the Court. Marshall served 23 years on the Supreme Court, retiring on June 27, 1991, at the age of 82.

After his death an article in the *Washington Afro-American* stated, "We make movies about Malcolm X, we get a holiday to honor Dr. Martin Luther King, but every day we live the legacy of Justice Thurgood Marshall."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PULL FEDERAL FUNDING FROM BROOKLYN MUSEUM OF ART

HON. JOHN E. SWEENEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1999

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution along with Mr. FOSSELLA, that calls for an elimination of federal funds for the Brooklyn Museum of Art if it proceeds with an exhibit that desecrates religion.

The Museum, which has come under fire for using taxpayer money to host an exhibit featuring a portrait of the Virgin Mary smeared with elephant dung, has received more than \$700,000 from the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities over the past three years.

John Cardinal O'Connor, in published new accounts, called the exhibit "an attack on religion itself and, in a special way, on the Catholic Church." In fact, it is an affront to the more than one billion Catholics worldwide!

In addition to the Virgin Mary painting, the art show titled, "Sensation: Young British Artists from the Saatchi Collection," also features a portrait of a convicted child murderer fashioned from small hand prints. Do we really want to glorify convicted murderers?!

I wholeheartedly agree with my colleague, Mr. FOSSELLA, who describes the exhibit as "little more than publicly-funded bigotry." He was correct in saying that "the American people have a right to know that their tax dollars are not being used to desecrate religion and promote bigotry."

When taxpayers decide to support the arts, I doubt these are the kinds of exhibits they have in mind. Our resolution will give a voice to the millions of Americans who are disgusted that they are being forced to fund this offensive exhibit. Furthermore, I believe that most of my constituents would join me in saying that this exhibit goes too far and is devoid of culturally redeeming value, by any standard.

Our federal tax dollars should not be spent on images that glorify immoral and criminal behavior. They should be used to defend not offend. Further, if we are to subsidize the expression of art, let that expression carry a message of education, not defecation.

We have no obligation to call it art and the American people don't have to subsidize it. While these so-called artists have a right to create their "art," and galleries have a right to display it, the First Amendment does not guarantee that the American people must subsidize it.

The City of New York has threatened to pull the museum's funding, and so too should the federal government.

Again, I urge my colleagues to continue to cosponsor this important resolution.

October 1, 1999

INDEPENDENCE DAY FOR CYPRUS

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1999

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Republic of Cyprus on the 39th anniversary of its independence.

As we celebrate this important day, we are sadly reminded of the political impasse which continues to divide the island into two communities. However, recent seismic shifts in the region give hope to optimists who believe that for the first time in many years we could see progress towards a fair and just settlement on this island nation.

Even before the recent tragic earthquakes that rocked Turkey and Greece in August and September, we were seeing fissures in the previously frozen relations between the two nations. The far sighted leadership of Foreign Ministers Papandreou and Cem brought them together to talk in a meaningful way about coordinating policy in the wake of the crisis in Kosovo—breaking the silence which had stifled dialogue between Athens and Ankara since the invasion of Cyprus.

Little could they have imagined that serious earthquakes this year would take the lives of thousands in the region and elicit such profound and heartfelt responses from the peoples of each country towards their neighbors in times of crisis. The outpouring of assistance and sympathy during these consecutive tragedies demonstrated that the citizens of Greece and Turkey were following the lead of their respective foreign ministers in acknowledging that no country is an island.

Neither political tremors touched off by Slobodan Milosevic's military aggression nor geological tremors caused by tectonic shifts stayed confined within international borders. The peoples of Greece and Turkey worked together during these crises because there was no other feasible option. Now they must work together as must Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots to find a solution in Cyprus.

Both Turkey and the people of Northern Cyprus have much to gain from an end to the strife which has divided the island for a quarter of a century. The United States, the United Nations, the G-8 nations, and the Council of Europe are united in urging a settlement in Cyprus that establishes a stable bizonal, bicommunal federation with adequate security guarantees for all citizens on the island nation.

Restarting serious talks in Cyprus without stymying pre-conditions would produce enormous progress for Turkey towards solving an impediment to its relations with the international community and for the people of Northern Cyprus to emerge from their painful isolation from the rest of the world.

Greece has built on "earthquake diplomacy" to send signals that it would not oppose Turkish entry into the European Union. Ankara could build on this momentum by urging Turkish Cypriots to reestablish crucial cultural and business exchanges between the two communities and restart negotiations immediately. Because of past history, Turkish Cypriots have every right to demand strong security guarantees when the partition of the island is removed. But this legitimate concern cannot be