

matters, the failure to be proactive in seeking out other key witnesses, and responding only when unavoidable when evidence is thrust upon the NFL leads to the judgment that an impartial investigation is mandatory.

There is an unmistakable atmosphere of conflict of interest or potential conflict of interest between what is in the public's interest and what is in the NFL's interest. The NFL has good reason to disclose as little as possible in its effort to convince the public that what was done wasn't so bad, had no significant effect on the games and, in any event, has all been cleaned up. Enormous financial interests are involved and the owners have a mutual self-interest in sticking together. Evidence of winning by cheating would have the inevitable effect of undercutting public confidence in the game and reducing, perhaps drastically, attendance and TV revenues.

The public interest is enormous. Sports personalities are role models for all of us, especially youngsters. If the Patriots can cheat, so can the college teams, so can the high school teams, so can the 6th grader taking a math examination. The Congress has granted the NFL a most significant business advantage, an antitrust exemption, highly unusual in the commercial world. That largesse can continue only if the NFL can prove itself worthy. Beyond the issues of role models and antitrust, America has a love affair with sports. Professional football has topped all other sporting events in fan interest. Americans have a right to be guaranteed that their favorite sport is honestly competitive.

In an extraordinary time, baseball took extraordinary action in turning to a man of unimpeachable integrity—Federal Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis—to act forcefully and decisively to save professional baseball from the Black Sox scandal in 1919.

On this state of the record, an objective, thorough, transparent investigation is necessary. If the NFL does not initiate an inquiry like the investigation conducted by former Senator George Mitchell for baseball, it will be up to Congress to get the facts and take corrective action.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### HONORING MILDRED AND RICHARD LOVING

• Mr. CARDIN. For many young Americans, it is hard to believe that only 40 years ago, citizens of the United States were subject to prosecution and imprisonment for marrying someone of a different race. But in 1967 that was indeed the situation in 16 States where interracial marriage was illegal.

In 1958, Mildred Jeter, a black Native American, traveled with Richard Lov-

ing, a Caucasian, from Virginia's Caroline County to the District of Columbia to be married. They came here because their home State of Virginia's anti-miscegenation laws prohibited interracial marriage. Shortly after returning to Virginia, Mr. and Mrs. Loving were arrested in their home. They pled guilty to violating section 20-58 of the Virginia Code: "Leaving State to evade law—If any white person and colored person shall go out of this State, for the purpose of being married, and with the intention of returning, and be married out of it, and afterwards return and reside in it, cohabiting as man and wife, they shall be punished as provided in Section 20-59, and the marriage shall be governed by the same law as if it had been solemnized in this State. The fact of their cohabitation here as man and wife shall be evidence of their marriage." Section 20-59 of the code provided for confinement for between 1 and 5 years. The Lovings were sentenced to 1 year in jail, but the trial judge suspended the sentence for a period of 25 years on the condition that the couple leave the State and agree not to return simultaneously for the next 25 years.

But after some time away, the couple began to miss Virginia and decided to pursue justice. They hired lawyers and challenged the Virginia law through years of court cases leading up to the United States Supreme Court. The Supreme Court heard the case of Richard Perry Loving et ux, v. Virginia on April 10 and decided the case unanimously on June 12, 1967, noting that "the clear and central purpose of the Fourteenth Amendment was to eliminate all official sources of invidious racial discrimination in the States. . . . We have consistently denied the constitutionality of measures which restrict the rights of citizens on account of race. There can be no doubt that restricting the freedom to marry violates the central meaning of the Equal Protection Clause. . . . Under our Constitution, the freedom to marry, or not marry, a person of another race resides with the individual and cannot be infringed by the State. These convictions must be reversed. It is so ordered."

Due to their unyielding belief in equality and the work of dedicated attorneys, the Lovings prevailed. They made their home in Virginia and raised three children. According to published accounts of their life together, times were hard for the family. Hit by a drunk driver in 1975, Richard Loving died and Mildred Loving was injured. Mrs. Loving lived her remaining years in Virginia until Friday, May 2, 2008, when she died at age 68.

Mildred Loving's name lacks the prominence shared by other heroes of the civil rights movement. In fact, she eschewed the limelight and viewed her case differently than what many might expect.

On the 40th anniversary of the decision, Mildred Loving stated:

(When my late husband, Richard, and I got married in Washington, DC in 1958, it wasn't to make a political statement or start a fight. We were in love, and we wanted to be married. . . . We didn't get married in Washington because we wanted to marry there. We did it there because the government wouldn't allow us to marry back home in Virginia where we grew up, where we met, where we fell in love, and where we wanted to be together and build our family. You see, I am a woman of color and Richard was white, and at that time people believed it was okay to keep us from marrying because of their ideas of who should marry whom. . . . Not long after our wedding, we were awakened in the middle of the night in our own bedroom by deputy sheriffs and actually arrested for the "crime" of marrying the wrong kind of person. Our marriage certificate was hanging on the wall above the bed. The state prosecuted Richard and me, and after we were found guilty, the judge declared: "Almighty God created the races white, black, yellow, malay and red, and he placed them on separate continents. And but for the interference with his arrangement there would be no cause for such marriages. The fact that he separated the races shows that he did not intend for the races to mix." He sentenced us to a year in prison, but offered to suspend the sentence if we left our home in Virginia for 25 years exile. We left, and got a lawyer. Richard and I had to fight, but still were not fighting for a cause. We were fighting for our love. Though it turned out we had to fight, happily Richard and I didn't have to fight alone. Thanks to groups like the ACLU and the NAACP Legal Defense & Education Fund, and so many good people around the country willing to speak up, we took our case for the freedom to marry all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court. And on June 12, 1967, the Supreme Court ruled unanimously that, "The freedom to marry has long been recognized as one of the vital personal rights essential to the orderly pursuit of happiness by free men," a basic civil right.

Mrs. Loving's words express more poignantly than any others the importance of this case. Although she did not embrace the role of a civil rights hero, because of her forthright bravery, history will remember her as such. Last June, the House of Representatives passed unanimously H. Res 431, commemorating the 40th anniversary of the landmark Supreme Court decision legalizing interracial marriage within the United States. In addition, June 12 has informally come to be known as "Loving Day" in the United States in their honor.

Next month, when we acknowledge the 41st anniversary of that historic decision, Mrs. Loving will not be with us, but her spirit will remain. Today, I pay tribute to Mildred and Richard Loving and to their remarkable courage. I offer my sincere condolences to their children and grandchildren, and I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering them.●

#### IN MEMORY OF LOUISE SHADDUCK

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, on May 4, Idaho lost a pioneer and one of her