

Hill, editor of the Garvey papers at UCLA, historian John Henrik Clark and others.

Yet, the government has held firm in its conviction that Garvey was a "menace," as he was described by the young J. Edgar Hoover, who made Garvey one of his first targets, as FBI director. Among his last was Martin Luther King, a philosophical successor to Garvey, who was branded a "communist," wiretapped and hounded by the aging Hoover.

It may be difficult to comprehend today, but in the racial climate of the 1920's, Garvey success was his greatest liability. At a time when Black people were stigmatized as intellectually inferior—and were economically more disadvantaged than today accomplishments of the magnitude achieved by Garvey were immediately and almost universally dismissed as fraudulent. But as Garvey's mystique has grown, so too has our understanding of the wealth of his contributions and his historical importance as the trailblazer for the great civil rights leaders who followed.

In the United States, where he lived for 10 of his 53 years, Garvey inspired hundreds of thousands of Black American supporters with hope for a better future. Today, he stands out in the pantheon of Black America's greatest and most controversial leaders. But in the records of the U.S. Department of Justice and the Federal Courts, Garvey remains ex-convict number 19359.

Almost 75 years ago, Marcus Garvey was released from Atlanta Federal Penitentiary, his sentence commuted by President Calvin Coolidge. Deported to his native Jamaica, Garvey died 13 years later, and entered history as that nation's preeminent hero. As a role model to millions of common people in the Americas and the Third World, he would inspire the independence movements that liberated colonial Africa.

Despite the harassment and the weakness of the evidence against him, Garvey's prosecution may have been inevitable in the 1920's. But by unbiased standards, the charges were not substantiated and his conviction was not justified. We cannot overturn the verdict but we can prove that times have changed and that we now know better.

SCHOOL READINESS ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 2003

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2210) to authorize the Head Start Act to improve the school readiness of disadvantaged children, and for other purposes:

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in opposition to H.R. 2210, the School Readiness Act of 2003. Head Start has provided a strong foundation for millions of children over the past 38 years. The program was created in 1965 to help young children become more academically prepared for school and to encourage healthy families. Head Start, which currently assists over 900,000 children, is the only major federal effort to provide comprehensive social and educational services. Head Start targets the nation's poorest children, those living in families at or below the federal poverty level as well as children with disabilities and special needs. It emphasizes not only children's cognitive development but

also their social, emotional, and physical development and encourages strong parent involvement.

H.R. 2210 reauthorizes the Head Start program through Fiscal Year 2008. While the measure seeks to improve the school readiness by increasing the focus on academic performance, the bill's authorization provides only 2.9 percent more than the FY03 appropriation, just barely enough to cover inflation. I have other serious concerns with this reauthorization legislation. In particular, H.R. 2210 changes current law to permit religious organizations who run Head Start programs to discriminate in hiring employees based on religious affiliation. The bill also establishes a demonstration program that permits eight states to integrate their own preschool programs with the federal Head Start programs. This is the first step in a concerted effort by the Majority to block grant Head Start and take oversight away from the federal government. I believe block granting will weaken performance standards and ultimately could lead to a dismantling of the entire program.

As a strong supporter of Head Start, I believe we should be focusing on ways to build upon the success of the program by strengthening school readiness, improving program quality and accountability, and expanding access to more eligible children. For that reason, I support the substitute offered by Representative MILLER. The substitute strengthens Head Start's focus on preliteracy, language and pre-math skills while improving teacher quality by requiring 50 percent of Head Start teachers to have bachelor's degrees by 2008 and prohibiting new hires without associate's degrees after 2005. The Miller proposal creates salary and scholarship funds to ensure Head Start teachers are able to remain with Head Start for several years. Most importantly, it expands access to all pre-school students, expands access to Early Head Start and increases the flexibility of Head Start programs to meet community local needs.

During a time where there is a lot of talk about "Leaving No Child Behind", let's truly stand up for the children who need our help the most. The research is clear—children who participate in Head Start arrive at school better prepared than low-income children who do not participate in the program. This high quality program must be preserved—it works and it works well. It is illogical to cut funding or weaken this proven program. I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 2210 and for the Miller substitute to ensure that vital, comprehensive services remain available to all Head Start participants.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL TERRORISM REDUCTION ACT

HON. DARLENE HOOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 2003

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, throughout our history, America has been a country committed to justice. In the wake of an 1837 mob lynching of an abolitionist newspaper editor, our great leader Abraham Lincoln urged his fellow Americans to "let reverence for the laws . . . become the political religion of the nation," to let legislatures and

judges chosen by the people, rather than lynch-mobs motivated by passion and hatred, decide important issues. In the end, Lincoln's philosophy was vindicated. Our nation remains united, and we are committed to the rule of law.

But there is a minority of Americans who refuse to abide by this covenant. They believe the rule of law does not apply to them, and in the forests and communities of Oregon and the Western United States, their actions are a rapidly growing problem.

Oregon has seen a growing number of incidents of environmental terrorism. I have traveled to the site of one of these, a Boise Cascade building that was burned down by the Earth Liberation Front (ELF) on Christmas day a couple of years ago.

While environmental terrorists claim that they don't want to harm people, they need to sit down with the volunteer firefighters who were roused from their beds early on Christmas morning to fight the blaze they started.

You see, the way incendiary devices used in arsons work, the buildings targeted by environmental terrorists often fall in very quickly, and we are extremely lucky that none of the brave women and men who fight fires have been seriously hurt or killed in one of these blazes.

In 2001, poplar trees involved in a research project at Oregon State University were destroyed by a group expressing concern about genetically modified organisms. The ironic thing about this is that the trees were involved in research designed to prevent genetically modified organisms from spreading into the wild—a goal which the saboteurs probably support.

Unfortunately, neither side in the battle over the environment has a monopoly on the use of violence—both environmentalists and those who oppose increased protections of our natural resources have resorted to illegal tactics to advance their causes.

Federal land managers have been harassed, intimidated, and threatened by those who are opposed to environmental protections. For example, in 1997 ranchers in New Mexico threatened to kill Forest Service employees enforcing protections for endangered species.

Let me be clear: using violence or intimidation in the name of a political cause is wrong. In a democracy, we fight for change at the ballot box and in the halls of our legislatures, not with pipe bombs and incendiary devices.

I strongly urge my fellow colleagues to ensure that our local, state, and federal law enforcement officials are effectively upholding the law. That said, environmental terrorism poses additional challenges for the law enforcement community.

It is a well-know fact that very few environmental terrorists have been caught. These groups have no formal organization, and they act in small terrorist cells, which are autonomous from one another.

Because these crimes are investigated with limited resources and manpower, local law enforcement officials have little success in successfully closing these cases.

For the second Congress, I am attempting to reverse the current situation by sponsoring the Environmental Terrorism Reduction Act. This bill would provide federal assistance where it is needed most, at the local level.

This legislation would require the Attorney General to establish a national clearinghouse