

Six months later, he was quickly rearrested after speaking openly for democracy and human rights, granting interviews to foreign reporters, meeting, indeed, with our own Secretary of State, Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights, John Shattuck, and writing essays for overseas publications, including the New York Times.

He was taken into custody on April 1, 1994, and has not been seen or heard from since. His family has not been allowed to see him, and requests from foreign governments and international rights groups for information on his case have gone unanswered.

After repeated inquiries by his family, the Public Security Bureau acknowledged in April that Wei was under a form of house arrest. Since then the Chinese officials have merely referred to him as a criminal and have said that, without elaborating, he was under investigation. Now the Chinese Government has acted. They have officially charged him with a capital offense, trying to overthrow the Government.

This is, of course, ridiculous. However, the charge is of such seriousness and the nature of the Chinese judicial system of such concern that I call this to our attention. Trials in China are usually swift, in secret, and behind closed doors. The verdict is usually predetermined and severe. Attempting to overthrow the Government, as Wei Jingsheng is mistakenly charged with, is considered a political crime which can be punished by death.

Many of our colleagues in this body and in the Senate, indeed parliamentarians throughout the world, nominated Wei Jingsheng earlier this year for the Nobel prize. We were proud to do so.

I am calling this to the attention of the House of Representatives because I hope that we will have a resolution out of this body condemning the charges against Wei Jingsheng and calling for his immediate and unconditional release and demanding that if indeed he does go to trial, that foreign media and diplomatic observers be allowed to attend.

I mentioned that Wei Jingsheng had met with Assistant Secretary of State John Shattuck in April, and since then he has been, as I say, detained, and now charged. This is very serious for the United States, because our Government has said that we will not use certain methods to improve human rights in China, we would not use economic sanctions, but we would do other things, and right now this administration has not spoken out strongly enough against the charging of Wei.

I recently wrote to the Vice President, Vice President Gore, asking him for a strong statement from the Clinton administration. Only strong public expressions of concern and interest at our highest levels will be read by the Chinese leadership as a true indicator of American policy regarding Wei and other democracy advocates. If we do

not raise the issue of Wei's charges, it could be read as tacit consent by the United States of whatever fate China has chosen for Wei Jingsheng.

The public intervention of the Clinton administration is most important in establishing United States policy regarding the treatment of Wei Jingsheng, clearly and unequivocally. The need for public and strong statement at the highest levels, I repeat, of the Clinton administration is critical given China's foreign ministry statement last week that the United States stop its confrontation with China at the U.N. Commission at Human Rights in Geneva. Such a statement, coupled with Wei's charge, is a challenge to the United States we must answer.

Mr. Speaker, I am very hopeful that the Clinton administration will indeed speak out. They were very, very strong in sending a message to the Chinese about Harry Wu. I commend them for their actions. That was responsible for Harry Wu's release. I hope they will do the same thing in the case of Wei Jingsheng and look forward to working with them and the Members of this body to free Wei Jingsheng.

INJUSTICE IN REDISTRICTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to at least make a statement about what we have heard over the last hour. I would just like to say that George Bush proclaimed a New World Order, but Bill Clinton is making one.

Bosnia is not about war, it is about peace. In the ethnically diverse community of Dayton, OH, three warring ethnic groups came together, sat down at a table, and made peace. I really do not understand how people can advocate pouring billions of dollars into a defense establishment to make war, and at the same time they can deny sick kids Medicaid, they can raise taxes on the working poor, but they are not willing to make peace. I do not understand that.

Also, I would just like to say a few words about an announcement that I heard about today, about the retirement of one of our leaders, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER]. I would just like to say that she is a trailblazer, a role model for all of us, and a real leader. Her leadership in the 105th Congress is sorely going to be missed. But because of her leadership I do not know how many Congresses before, she has made a way for me and other women who now serve in Congress, and her outspokenness on issues affecting families and children and women and men alike, really, has been really a beacon I guess, for all of us.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, I thank her for

the opportunity to join in paying tribute to our colleague, PAT SCHROEDER. It cannot be said better than you have done commending Representative SCHROEDER for her leadership. It is a sad day for us in the House of Representatives on the day that she announced she would not be seeking reelection.

Whether they know it or not, women across America, and, as you say, indeed men too, owe PAT SCHROEDER a great debt of gratitude. Through her leadership on issues relating to families and children, she has changed the public policy in that regard. It is our most important issue in fact that we deal with here, the issue of children.

But on this day in this House of Representatives, when on the one hand we are talking about the possibility of sending our young people to keep the peace in Bosnia, and at the same time we are talking about human rights throughout the world and talking about family and children, there is a person who served us here with great leadership, an articulate spokesperson for children, for human rights, for peace, and, at the same time, a strong, strong voice on the Committee on National Security, now called I think the Committee on National Security. So her expertise and her voice was heard across the spectrum of issues in our budget priorities. She has led us well. I hope she will continue to outside of Congress. I know she has plenty of wonderful options open to her, but, nonetheless, as happy as we are for her on her decision, it is a sad day.

I speak for myself and my constituents when I say that her presence in this Congress for this country will be sorely missed.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I do want to say one thing. I would like for Congresswoman SCHROEDER to come to this floor and tell the story, because I know she can tell it much better than I would ever be able to tell it, but she came to this Congress at a time when you just did not have women serving on the Committee on National Security and women serving in this Congress. She tells the story of how the chairman had she and the gentleman from California, RON DELLUMS, share a single chair. Those are the kinds of stories that this leader had to endure in order to make sure that I could get a full seat in the U.S. Congress. Her story is a wonderful story that needs to be told, and her leadership has benefited us all.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. If the gentlewoman will yield, I would just like to associate myself with those remarks about our leader. She has certainly been a role model for the women in Congress. Her leadership not only will be missed, but it is going to make our work extremely hard, because she has been just a Trojan for women's issues, for children's issues, and more national security issues. So this is truly a sad day for all of us.

Ms. MCKINNEY. It certainly is.

Mr. Speaker, changing our focus a little bit, I would like to ask a question, and the question is, what happens to a jogger, someone who strategizes, maps out a fitness routine, and the regime that is mapped out is done so that a target heart rate can be reached; and, unbeknownst, to our jogger, without any knowledge at all of our jogger, the wrong target heart rate has been given. Then the folks who gave the wrong heart rate allow the jogger to go out and jog. What happens? The jogger could die.

The issue that I am about to talk about is a real issue of life and death, political life and political death. In my opinion, we have a few southerners who have conspired to orchestrate the political death of blacks, Latinos, and women. I have a transcript of a Florida hearing that just took place.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. It was a response to a pretrial hearing on Monday, October 19.

Ms. MCKINNEY. It reads, "At the time the Degrande court drew the districting lines for the State of Florida, it engaged in a good faith effort to adopt a politically neutral redistricting plan that would enhance the voting opportunities for African-American and Hispanic voters. The Degrande court closely followed the dictates of the Voting Rights Act and traditional redistricting principles throughout this process. This court must now reexamine the redistricting lines drawn by plan 308 and decide whether the contours of District 3 are unconstitutional in light of Shaw versus Reno and Miller."

What this means is that in Florida the legislature did not draw the current congressional lines, the court did it, and when the court drew the lines, the court was operating in good faith, trying to do things that were beneficial to all of the people of the State of Florida. Now, because of what happened in North Carolina and what happened in Georgia, all of that is subject to change.

Joining us is the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK]. But let me give you just a brief history.

First of all, the Florida legislature could not pass a plan, so the courts had to intervene so that we could have elections in Florida. Now, there are many reasons why the Florida legislature could not pass a plan, but basically it was politics, politics, and more politics.

□ 1800

Everyone that was in charge of redistricting was running for Congress.

It is hard to take the politics out of politics.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. You cannot take the politics out of politics.

However, the courts drew the plan for Florida, and, basically, we are now at the stage where there was a ruling last Monday in that the courts ruled, with a dissent, that the Third Congressional District was racial gerrymandering but

still could be constitutional, and we will go to a hearing or a trial early next year to determine based on Shaw versus Reno and the case of Georgia.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I have a question to ask the gentlewoman, before she gets into her remarks, and it is my understanding that her district, the district that she represents, is 50 percent black and 50 percent white.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Yes.

Ms. MCKINNEY. How can race be the predominant factor in a 50-50 district?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Well, it is not quite 50-50. It is 50.1 or 2.

Ms. MCKINNEY. 50.1. So that makes it race-predominant.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Well, the fact is my district is one of the most integrated districts in Florida, if not in the country.

Ms. MCKINNEY. If not in the country.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. If not in the country. So race was a factor, but just one of many factors.

In fact, I am very proud of the Third Congressional District of Florida. Many of the people I represent were disenfranchised before my election. If we go back and just look at the way the voter participates in these districts, for example when we come out of an area and we are getting 80 percent of the vote, black and white, what does that tell my colleagues? That tells me that there is balance in my district. I have one of the most Democratic districts in the State of Florida.

Ms. MCKINNEY. But the gentleman's district was challenged.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Challenged, that is correct, and we are headed to court.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I am sure that this is costing the taxpayers of Florida an inordinate amount of money.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. And time, and also the frustration on the people of the Third Congressional District. Often my constituents come to me and say what are they trying to do to our district? Why is it that the voters from the Third Congressional District and other districts in Florida have to wrestle with the question of whether or not we are going to have our district?

Ms. MCKINNEY. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have been joined by the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] who served illustriously in the Florida legislature and probably knows more—

Ms. BROWN of Florida. If I may ask the gentlewoman to yield just for a moment to let me say one thing about the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Certainly.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mrs. MEEK served in the Florida House, but when she was elected some 13 years ago to the Florida Senate, it was the first time in over 100 years that we elected a black to the Florida Senate, and she was the first black female ever elected to the Senate. So we do not have a long history in Florida of inclusion.

And, in fact, before our election in 1992, it was the first time in over 100

years, I am sorry, 120 years, that an African-American came to this Congress to represent Florida, even though Florida's population, as far as minorities is concerned, is over 40 percent. Good-old-boy politics has controlled how the districts have been drawn throughout Florida.

I do not know about any other place, but I can tell my colleagues about the history of Florida, and I know the gentlewoman from Georgia wants to yield to Mrs. MEEK.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues and compliment and commend them for having called this special order to talk to the country about some of the things that have happened in reapportionment.

I am reminded of a saying that the more things change, the more they remain the same. The gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] has been on the forefront of this, and so has the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] but I want to say to them that it is just amazing and also ironic that after all of these years we are still fighting for the same thing that many had to fight for years ago.

I need to say to my two colleagues that their efforts will be rewarded, as well as all the rest of us. We must raise the consciousness level of the country as to what is happening in the reapportionment and apportionment fight. As everyone knows, every 10 years the census is taken, and then comes the reappointment process.

I am reminded of the struggle that I have undertaken in this for 10 or more years, and I am reminded of what the poet, Robert Frost, once wrote about; these woods are lovely, dark and deep, and I am tempted to sleep; but I have promises to keep, promises to keep, and miles to go before I sleep.

That is what has happened to my colleagues here. They know this has been a fight from the very beginning. I can recall when I went to the Florida legislature in 1979. There were only two blacks in the Florida legislature, and they were certainly not treated, Ms. MCKINNEY, the way we are treated today. They were treated as blacks, and they pretty much were isolated from the other people there.

When I went, in 1979, I was able to participate in the reapportionment of the Florida legislature, and because of that we were able to bring on Ms. BROWN and all of my other colleagues who came after me.

Ms. MCKINNEY. If the gentlewoman would allow me to reclaim my time for a moment. The tool that the gentlewoman used was the Voting Rights Act.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Yes, I did, and it was under attack even then. The most amazing thing is that we were able to bring Ms. BROWN and five other people there in the House but we were unable to get a congressional seat. We had the numbers then. There were

enough African-American inhabitants in the population of Florida, but my colleagues would be surprised to know that every congressperson from this body, from Florida, had either a paid consultant or someone there to be sure that their influence could be felt in the reapportionment process.

Ms. MCKINNEY. So, actually, what the gentlewoman is saying is that the Members of Congress and the legislators were picking their voters before the voters had a chance to pick their representatives.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Absolutely. My colleagues would be surprised at how they utilized the black populace, in that they really fought hard to get the African-Americans, particularly the Democrats, because what they wanted to do was to be sure they had enough African-Americans in their district, in their congressional district, to be sure that they came back to Congress. Because, naturally, it was sort of traditional and fully accepted during that time that if an individual were black, they were Democrat and they would vote for a white Congressman who represented their district.

I want to give my colleagues another example of what happened, and I am surprised that they are looking at the gentlewoman from Florida's district and talking about gerrymandering, because hers certainly is not nearly as gerrymandered as the district that sent me to the Florida Senate. When I came from the house, I was on the reapportionment committee and I could see what was happening to us in the Florida house. I lived in Liberty City. My representative in the Florida Senate lived across Biscayne Bay, a body of water, all the way over on Miami Beach. He represented 103,000 African-Americans. Yes, he was our representative in the senate.

It shows my colleagues that this gerrymandering, that I am a living example of what happens. So I insisted that that seat be removed from over on that side and we be given the representation that we so direly deserved and needed, and that is how I got to the Florida Senate, by doing what the gentlewoman from Georgia and the gentlewoman from Florida are doing now, fighting for the representation that I knew that we needed to have.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Congresswoman, there is an article here that I have from the Florida Times Union of November 24 where a noted political scientist from the University of Georgia is quoted as saying if a white Congressman has a 10-percent or 20-percent minority constituency, they might not have a person who votes 100 percent of the time with the black agenda but they will get those votes from him some of the time. So, apparently, representation some of the time is OK.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. It was OK because what they were doing was using us as mayonnaise on the sandwich to be sure that they got a chance to come back to Congress instead of utilizing us and using us to represent us.

I really feel very emotional about this situation, and to see now that my young sisters have picked up this battle and they are running hard and winning it, it just gives me such pleasure to see when the gentlewoman from Georgia and the gentlewoman from Florida stand up and talk about this.

We did not have the technology available that my colleagues have now. I had to draw my maps with a piece of crayon to try to quickly show, because we were not allowed on the computers at that time, and the computers were just coming in, and they had these maps already drawn. But I think with the two of my colleagues, their maps and their legal representation, they have it all.

Ms. MCKINNEY. We have everything except the Supreme Court.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Everything but the Supreme Court, that is right.

And what Mrs. Bethune would say, when she saw the kind of fight that the gentlewoman from Georgia and the gentlewoman from Florida have put up, she would say what hath God wrought. So God has wrought that these two sisters here would keep up this fight, which we have had all these years, and to stand here tonight and to see how the two of my colleagues are pushing forward to be sure that we do not get misrepresented again, and that the people that we represent will have representation in Congress and in the statehouses and all over this country.

I have been in several legal fights for reapportionment, and even though I am a little beyond the age that these young women are, I expect to continue to do so. But it is good to be here in the Congress and to know that, Ms. MCKINNEY, there are people in this country who know that the gentlewoman from Georgia and the gentlewoman from Florida and the rest of us have served notably here in the Congress, and it was not because of the color of our skin but the content of our character.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Oh, you are wonderful.

We also know that this cold wind that has blown across the South did not start in Georgia and it did not stop in Florida. Actually, I think it probably started in North Carolina. And we have the subject of the North Carolina redistricting fight on the floor with us.

And we also know that it swept through Texas, and we have the gentlewoman from Dallas with us; and we hope that Alabama will be spared, but we have the gentleman from Alabama with us, and I will yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I thank and applaud the gentlewoman from Georgia and the gentlewoman from Florida for organizing this special order this evening so that we can highlight the issue of voting and the issue of democracy in this country, really.

I came in when my colleagues were all paying tribute to our colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado, PAT

SCHROEDER, who has indicated that she is not planning to run again after serving out this term, and I want to join with them first in paying a special tribute to her and join in expressing the sentiments that others have expressed, that she will be missed very much by those of us who have admired her and followed her lead on many issues.

Second, I want to say that tomorrow, in Durham, NC, there is an opening of a traveling exhibition which is called "The long road up the hill. African-Americans in Congress." I was on the phone before I came over here talking to a newspaper reporter in Raleigh-Durham about that exhibit, and I pulled out the press release that had been issued about that exhibit. It catalogs the history of African-Americans in the Congress of the United States, and I thought it might be helpful to take a minute or two, if the gentlewoman would allow me, to put this in a historical context.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I certainly will.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. The gentlewoman says this hurricane started in North Carolina in 1993 or 1992. It really started in the South more than 100 years ago.

□ 1815

And I think we really need to keep that in perspective. So, if I could, let me talk a little bit about the historical context that we are dealing with.

Between 1870 and 1897, after the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments had freed the slaves and granted them citizenship and the right to vote, Southern States actually elected 22 black men to Congress. And this is not a sexist thing. It just happened that all of them were men at that time. Some had been slaves; other had been born free. All of them, ironically, during that period from 1870 to 1897, were members of the Republican Party, which was the party at that time that most black people associated themselves with.

In 1870, a black minister was tapped to fill Confederate President Jefferson Davis' unexpired Senate term. Hiram Revels of Mississippi became the first American of African descent to serve in the Senate. That same year, Joseph Rainey was sworn into office in the House of Representatives; Jefferson Long of Georgia was sworn into the House 1 month later. Rainey went on to serve five terms, often speaking in favor of civil rights legislation, outlawing racial discrimination in juries, schools, public accommodations and transportation.

Many of the early African-American Congressmen introduced bills calling for education and land ownership for blacks and removal of what was called cotton taxes. Most of those bills died in committee because their sponsors often lacked the support of their white colleagues. That might sound familiar to some of us in this day and time.

During the chaotic Reconstruction years, defeated white politicians disputed the elections of blacks to Congress 21 times. So, this is not a new

phenomenon that we are dealing with. Congressmen whose elections were challenged often were not sworn in until a House committee had reviewed the evidence and found in their favor. Several black lawmakers were not seated for many months. Some were not sworn in until a short time before the end of their terms. Two duly elected Congressmen who were elected, black Congresspeople, never, ever got to serve.

Finally, a story that I can relate to, by the time we got to the late 1800's, there was only one black African-American left in the Congress of the United States. He was a gentleman from North Carolina. His name was George H. White, and he was the last former slave to serve in Congress. He took the oath of office in March 1897, and after an election in 1898, in which the evidence indicated that even in precincts where there were only 200 or 300 people registered, in some cases 700 or 800 people voted and he was voted out of office. He took to the floor of the House of Representatives in 1901 and made a historic speech in which he professed to be speaking on behalf of the outraged, heartbroken, bruised and bleeding, but God-fearing people. He went on to predict that some day, some day, black representatives would rise up and come again to this House of Representatives. That was in 1901.

His prophesy did not become a reality that we would have another black Representative in Congress until 28 years later. Mr. Speaker, 28 years later.

Ms. MCKINNEY. But how many years from North Carolina did it take?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. That was the next point I wanted to make. It was not until the gentlewoman from North Carolina EVA CLAYTON, my colleague, and I were elected in 1992, 91 years later, that an African-American was elected to Congress from the State of North Carolina.

So, the point I am making, and I will yield back to you all to carry this on, is this is not a new phenomenon. We have been fighting this battle since years and years and years ago, and we fought it in the face of literacy tests, where people were required to read and interpret documents before they were allowed to vote; grandfather clauses, which prohibited people from voting unless their grandfathers had voted, keeping freed slaves from casting ballots; poll taxes which kept poor people, blacks and whites alike, from voting; lynchings, which were flourishing throughout the South, and now in that historical context, the Supreme Court would ask us to be color-blind as a Nation and go back to a situation where we are absent minority representation in Congress.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Will the gentleman yield just for 1 minute?

I have my horror story that I want to put in. Florida's horror story. At the time Josiah Wells was the first Member of Congress from Florida. He was elected to the House of Representatives in

1879 from Gainesville, FL. I represent Gainesville, FL, which is in the Third Congressional District. Josiah Wells' election was challenged and he lost his seat after only 2 months in office. However, by that time he had already been reelected to a new term. But listen, believe it or not, his next victorious election was challenged after the ballots were burned in the courthouse fire, ending the first congressional career of Florida's first black Representative. It took Florida 120 years to elect another African-American.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD.

Next week, the Supreme Court will hear arguments in yet another round of reapportionment cases; it has an opportunity to end the mischief started in 1993 when it announced its decision in *Shaw versus Reno*. In the *Shaw* case, the Court ruled that white voters can state a claim under the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment if they allege that a district is so irregular or bizarrely shaped that it could only be understood as a racial gerrymander. Last term, in reviewing a *Shaw*-type attack on the congressional redistricting plan in Georgia, the Court went a step further. It ruled that where race is the predominate factor in redistricting that has resulted in the substantial disregard of traditional redistricting principles, then a district is presumed to be unconstitutional.

When *Shaw* was first handed down, a number of civil rights groups and political observers felt that the decision would have minimal impact. But the *Shaw* decision has taken on a life of its own. Cases attacking congressional districts as alleged racial gerrymanders are pending in Florida, Texas, North Carolina, Louisiana, State legislatures and local governments.

Of course, it troubles me a great deal that the end result of all these cases may return us to the pre-voting rights days when the Halls of Congress were reserved for white males. In those days, congressional districts drawn to protect white incumbents, no matter how bizarre or irregular they looked, and regardless of the all-white racial composition, the districts were viewed as politics. Eliminating districts where minority voters comprise a bare majority of the voters will return us to the days of segregation when Congress resembled an all-white club.

As troubling as all this is, I am equally concerned that the Supreme Court has refused to look at facts. The Court has consistently overlooked that in each of the States where the challenged majority minority districts were drawn, racially polarized voting patterns existed. What this means is that before the majority minority districts were drawn, a factual basis existed that minority voters were politically cohesive, that is, they supported minority candidates, and whites usually voted as a bloc to defeat the minority voters' preferred candidate. This is important because not only is the creation of majority minority districts necessary to overcome the effects of the white bloc vote, but the Supreme Court itself has consistently recognized in decisions spanning the last 20 years that such racial bloc voting has been the principal cause of minority vote dilution.

What is especially troubling about this is that the Court seems to have accepted racial

bloc voting as a fact of political life, but chooses to ignore the reality of its impact. Thus, in the Georgia case, the Court said that the deliberate creation of majority minority districts may increase the very patterns of racial bloc voting that majority minority districts are said to counteract. In fact, the developing evidence that the opposite may be true, that creation of majority minority districts may be reducing, not increasing, bloc voting.

Consider, for example, the majority minority congressional district in Mississippi created in the 1980's. The district was barely majority black and in 1986, Congressman Mike Espy was elected. In his first election, Espy generated only 21 percent of the white vote. In Espy's reelection bid in 1988 and 1990, nearly half of the white voters in the district voted for him. Other members of the Congressional Black Caucus have reported similar increases in white support after their initial reelection. We attribute this increase in crossover voting in two circumstances: First, our decision to represent all our voters regardless of race; and second, a reduction in white fear and harmful stereotyping that may have predated our initial election.

The creation of minority opportunity districts comprised of a majority black voting age population does not entrench racial bloc voting. Although, there is a need to study the evidence that is available on this point, what evidence there is suggests that the creation of majority-minority districts promotes a political system in which race does not matter as much as it did before.

Along with a number of African-Americans, I was elected to Congress in 1992 in a district that was one of the most integrated in my State. My district is roughly 50 percent black and 50 percent white in voting population. Does that sound segregated or gerrymandered? All of my constituents are important to me, whether they are black or white. That would be true whether my district was 50 percent black or 99 percent black. My district is one of the most Democratic districts in the State of Florida. Many of my voters had been disenfranchised.

Redistricting since the 1990 census has marked tremendous gains for women and minorities. 1992, the year I was elected to Congress, was very historic for Florida. For the first time in over 120 years, an African-American was elected to Congress from Florida. At the same time I was elected to represent the Third Congressional District, my colleague's Representative CARRIE MEEK and Representative ALCEE HASTINGS, were also elected to represent Florida in Congress. Sixteen new African-American Members, most from the South, were seated in the House of Representatives and one African-American Senator, CAROL MOSELY-BRAUN was seated, expanding the number of Congressional Black Caucus Members to 40, the largest ever. There are now 57 women, 19 Hispanics, 8 Asians, and 1 American-Indian. This is the highest number of minorities to ever serve in the history of the U.S. Congress. Despite these gains, less than 2 percent of the elected officials in this country are black. We still need the Voting Rights Act, we still have a long way to go. I, and others, would not have the privilege of serving in Washington if it were not for the courage and sacrifice of those great leaders who led the way before us.

Let me tell you a little bit about a great leader, Josiah Wells, who was Florida's first Member of Congress. Josiah Wells was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1879, from Gainesville, FL, which is in the Third Congressional District. Josiah Wells' election was challenged and he lost his seat after only 2 months in office. However, by that time, he had already been reelected to a new term. Believe it or not, his next victorious election was challenged after ballots were burned in a courthouse fire. And thus ended the congressional career of Florida's first Black representative.

Once Reconstruction began, 21 black Congressmen were elected from the South between 1870 to 1901. However, after 1901, when Jim Crow tightened his grip, no black person was elected to Congress from the South for over 70 years. It is more timely than ever, to study what happened to black representation during Reconstruction. This period may seem like ancient history, but what happened then seems to be happening all over again.

The court would do well to consider these facts, rather than assuming the worst about the body politic and African-American Members of Congress. Integrated districts like mine are good for minority voters because they provide for electoral opportunities where none previously existed. They are also for democracy in the sense that they help to break down racial isolation and polarization.

When a minority group like African-Americans, who were denied a representative in the Florida delegation for 120 years before my election in 1992, are able to elect their candidate to Congress, it makes our Government more legitimate because it is more inclusive and less prone to bias. I cannot understand why the Supreme Court would want it any other way, yet their decisions up to now are leading us precisely down that path. Because I have faith in the system and in the rule of law, I remain hopeful that the Court see these truths to be self-evident.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. The point is that there were funny things going on in that time, and there are funny things going on now; all designed to assure that the minority community does not have representation in this body.

White I do not want to dwell on the historical context, I do think it is important to get it into a historical context so that people understand that this is not something that we come to complain about just because it is happening in 1990. This has been going on for well over a hundred years, and for us, it has been going on in this country ever since we came to these shores.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I think the gentleman's point about the historical context in which this whole drama that is not being played out must be viewed is very important. To reiterate, 21 times blacks had their elections challenged, blacks in Congress had their elections challenged. Right now, we are looking at challenges that have been filed or are planning to be filed in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina legislative districts, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, New York, and Illinois. You are absolutely right, that this is not anything new.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. If the gentlewoman would yield just for 1 more minute, because I am going to have to leave and I do want to put this in a slightly different context also, in addition to the historical context, because the Supreme Court has suggested that all of the sudden we should wave a magic wand and will that the Nation and its voters be color-blind and this problem will be solved.

Often, in talking about this and getting people to understand how ridiculous that notion is, I make reference to what has recently transpired in South Africa where they had a very small white minority controlling that country for years and years and years. Then they had a miraculous historic transition to a real Democratic government.

The question I ask is, "Do you think that the United States of America would have been satisfied if the black majority in South Africa had come forward with a proposed democracy that said we are going to be color-blind; we are not going to take race into account at all; we are not going to assure the white minority in South Africa representation in this new Democratic government?" Do you think that the United States of America would have stood still for that kind of thinking?

My answer, obviously, is no, because it would have been ridiculous to think that all of those years of history could have just been wiped out and we could have created a color-blind society, a color-blind democracy in South Africa. It could not happen.

If the white minority in South Africa was going to have any chance of having a fair shot at representation and having its views reflected in that democracy, the only way it was going to happen was to set up a system that allowed them to have representation.

Yet, if we take that scenario and we reverse the roles, our Supreme Court essentially is suggesting that exactly what we would have rejected in South Africa is what we should be doing in our democracy here in the United States.

It is outrageous. It makes no sense in terms of fairness. It makes no sense in terms of the political and historical realities of the situation.

So, I applaud the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON and the gentlewoman from Georgia, Ms. MCKINNEY and the gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. BROWN. I applaud all of these gentlewomen for doing this this evening, and bringing this issue back into focus. Especially, since on Tuesday of this coming week, the Supreme Court is, again, hearing oral arguments in the North Carolina case and in the Texas case.

Our Nation and our people need to be focused on this issue and why it is important to have every segment of our society represented if we are to have an effective democracy in this country.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Will the gentleman yield just for one moment before he leaves? Can the gentleman from

North Carolina shed some light on what the Supreme Court will be reviewing as far as Shaw versus Reno?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I think there is a real substantial question about what they will be reviewing. They set up a series of criteria in the original Shaw versus Reno decision. Many of those criteria were not upon even mentioned when the Supreme Court decided the Georgia case. They seemed to change the criteria.

So, the North Carolina case has been tried under criteria that we do not know whether are applicable criteria any more or not. I am hoping that they will evaluate the case on the criteria that they set up in the North Carolina case. But even if they do not, if they evaluate it on the criteria that they set in the Georgia case, that race cannot be the predominant factor, I still am confident that even on that standard, the districts can and should be upheld both in North Carolina and in Texas.

□ 1830

Ms. MCKINNEY. The gentleman, with respect to his South Africa comments, raises an interesting question that I am glad you answered.

We have with us a gentleman from Alabama, who is a strong fighter, always has been a strong fighter, and now he comes to the floor of this House to make sure that what happens in this whole redistricting arena is not something that catches people off guard. We want to make sure that folks are not asleep while this quiet counterrevolution takes place.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the historical analysis that both Members gave dealing with the State of Florida as well as North Carolina. We also have a history in Alabama. I am the first African American to represent African Americans or anyone else in the State of Alabama in 117 years.

I, too, come, being the fourth from the State, the fourth African American. But let me tell you about the second and the third. They never served. They were elected, but they never served, because their elections were a challenged, and that is a tragedy. But it is all reflective of what our country has undergone during our short history.

Unfortunately, there are those in the majority that believe in democracy but do not believe in diversity. They will use such terms as equality, such terms as colorblind society to justify why there are not nor should not be African-Americans in Congress or in the State houses or in city halls anywhere in this country.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, what is color-blind? Does that mean we are invisible?

Mr. HILLIARD. I would think in the context that it is used by those who are against diversity, against African-Americans participating in the democratic process in this country, it means invisible, yes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, that means that you do not participate.

The point I was making is a very simple point. Throughout history, those persons who have been in the majority always seek ways and vehicles to protect their majority status in every respect, if you look at any country.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, protecting majority status, there is nothing wrong with that. Our presence in this body does not threaten the majority status.

Mr. HILLIARD. Well, it does not threaten it from the standpoint, from your standpoint. That is because I am sure you believe in diversification. You believe in participation by everyone. But protection of the majority status to those persons that I have come in contact with and, as I say, I am from the South, means that everything has to be the way of the majority, which means they do not appreciate diversity. And they are not interested in districts if the districts produce African-American Representatives, or any minority Representatives.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a 10-year-old son. My son accompanies me on the floor of this House. Now, if my presence here threatens the majority status, how do I explain that to my son when he clearly looks around and says: "Well, mama, there ain't enough of you. There ain't very many women in this body. There ain't very many African-Americans in this body." So what is threatened by my presence in this body?

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, it is the same type of threat that is pervasive throughout our society. Even if we look at affirmative action policies, which is very much akin to this issue and to this argument. Set-asides, 5 percent. It is a threat because it is not 100 percent. They want 100 percent. So they are against affirmative action. They are against set-asides. And we are only talking about 5 out of 100 percent. But that is 5 percent that is too much, because they cannot have it also. That is the type of threat that is in our society. It has been here.

Ms. MCKINNEY. So those who have 96 percent are not satisfied unless there is 100 percent?

Mr. HILLIARD. Absolutely. Unfortunately, this is also the philosophy of the highest court in our land and the Supreme Court. And it does not allow for diversity in anything.

I am going to yield, because my colleague from Texas has been here patiently, and she has some things to say.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me express my appreciation for the sponsorship of this hour. I will not dwell on the history of Texas because we all know it. But I want to dwell on the present.

We have encouraged our children and our grandchildren that this democracy is worth dying for. We have said that

this is our country, and we are going to fight for this country, that this is the greatest country in the world. But they do not understand that, when you follow the rules, get education and training, that the opportunities are different for you.

Mr. HILLIARD. And limited.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I believe strongly that I have represented the district that I was elected in as well or better than any previous elected official. I have answered mail. I have never referred to my constituents as "you people." I have been responsive. I have not just sent form letters. I have researched the issues. And I try very hard to come before them to listen. I have learned a lot by listening.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague has given representation all of the time whereas before it was representation some of the time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, the representation from my area and for me meant seeing my elected official once every couple of years at some of the churches or buying a ticket or a table to a church or the NAACP banquet. That was my representation.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. You mean your representation was not showing up once a year at the festival?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I can guarantee you, they showed up every other year and at the churches.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I think representation, one of the things that the research will have shown is that, when African-Americans are elected, they represent all of the people. When we fight for school lunch programs, I want every last one of our kids to eat all over the country, really.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. When I look out for corporate opportunities, for research and development, rarely are those large businesses owned by people that look like me. But I believe strongly that, when we have a strong business community and lots of research to look out for the future, that it is good for all of us. But all of us then must have some opportunity in it.

We will fight the wars. We will help to do things. But when we are treated as invisibles or unwanted, then it does not encourage my children or my grandchildren to go to college, to go to training, to be well equipped, because they see parents are having a struggle after they have done it. They do not know whether there will be an opportunity.

There is no understanding in my community why the district that I represent is being attacked. Because, you see, it is less than 50 percent African-American, and we have districts in Texas that are 88 and 90 percent Anglo, but they are constitutional. I do not understand that. Are they unconstitutional because it happens to be a few more that the incumbents allowed me to put in a district, because our efforts

in Texas were to preserve the incumbents?

Ms. MCKINNEY. The gentlewoman from Texas, from Dallas, as well as the gentlewoman from Houston have both endured constitutional challenges to their districts where the lower court found that their districts were unconstitutional.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. The second time around.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, the district in Dallas was found unconstitutional, and the district in Houston, more than ably represented by Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, was also found unconstitutional.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I forgot to say that 20 years ago Barbara Jordan represented this district, and that is really frightening because we are talking about regression here. This is the district that was held by Barbara Jordan, one of the first females elected to Congress.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Barbara Jordan's historic district has now been found unconstitutional.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia because we have spent many hours discussing our families and our sons. How important it is for us to give encouragement to young people, as my colleague from Texas has already mentioned. I listened passionately, as others were speaking passionately. I might remind us, as this comes somewhat to a close, of the words that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] offered about the last African-American preceding this era who served here in the House and who had to leave not of his own accord in 1901. I think it is important because, as the American people are watching, they are looking at two gentlewomen from Florida, and the gentleman from Alabama, and the gentleman from North Carolina, and all of us look alike. And they might wonder what is this issue.

It is an issue of democracy. It is an issue that would be as attractive and should be to our Hispanic brothers and sisters, our white brothers and sisters, our Asian brothers and sisters, because it is a question of disenfranchising people. And on December 5, 1995, we will again be in the U.S. Supreme Court challenging some of the districts in Texas and North Carolina.

Might I say something that I take great offense at, in fact I am appalled, and I might simply give just a very small, small summary of that case. The petitioners in the Richards versus Vera case, the Texas case in particular, came to sue that whole redistricting plan. They sued the whole State of Texas. They said the whole plan was wrong. But when it came down to a final solution, the only districts that they held unconstitutional were the 29th, Hispanic district, the 30th in Dallas, and, of course, the 18th, all of which were very much diverse, mine being under 50 percent African-American. But the court said that these districts were like racial apartheid.

I take great issue to describe democratically drawn districts that allow people to select a person of their choosing as an ugly term compared to South Africa of racial Apartheid. To the American people, that is not true. It is something that you should not accept. It is simply the adding of diversity.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out what the gentlewoman has referred to. The entire map of Texas was challenged, and they picked over this district. Talking about the lower court, the three judge panel found this district here, which is 91 percent white, constitutional. They did not find anything wrong with that district. They had to leap all the way to Barbara Jordan's district and say: Now, no, we do not want people like Barbara Jordan in Congress, so her district is unconstitutional; but this district right here withstands constitutional scrutiny.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Until the Voting Rights Act was in place, the Hon. Barbara Jordan would not have been in the U.S. Congress to represent all of the people and all Americans.

Ms. MCKINNEY. The gentlewoman is absolutely right.

I would like to conclude by saying that I know that there are people who understand this issue, who are not asleep during the counterrevolution and who truly appreciate that there is something wrong when a district like the Sixth District of Texas can be found constitutional, and the districts that we all represent can be found unconstitutional or can be challenged as to whether or not they are constitutional.

□ 1845

I received a letter dated November 9 from Richard Hamilton from Fleetwood, PA, and he says, "I'm a white northern conservative Republican. You have gained my respect through this speech. I wish there was some way I could help you with your problem. To lose someone like yourself through this redistricting is a tragedy for your district."

This comes from the pen of a conservative, a staunch pro-gun, pro-life, small-government, low-taxes conservative:

Government needs people like yourself. Your voting record, I'm sure, would be directly opposite to my views. No matter. This is a democracy. Even though I may not agree with some of your views, I respect them. Having heard you, I would be compelled to vote for you. You are qualified in every sense. I would be honored to have you represent me in Congress. Sounds crazy; doesn't it?

Mr. Speaker, it does not sound crazy at all. Mr. Hamilton gets it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield for just a moment, we say the word "democracy." And I applaud her for that letter because that is a commonsense American, and that is why I think this evening is important, so that individuals understand that we are not trying

to grab something that does not belong to us or grab something for our personal selves. What will happen is your constituents, those who you represent at this point, will be denied the opportunity to select someone of their choosing, and that person can be of any array of individuals, but they have the opportunity now, more than they have ever had before in history, to do so, but this body is also a republic.

Some people always hear the word "Republican" because it is in the majority right now. A republic means that you have a representative body and that we are all not alike. Before the Voter Rights Act of 1965 they were all alike, and in fact until women got the right to vote, they were all alike, and it is since these laws have created opportunities we have seen women coming to the U.S. Congress, and we have seen minorities, and particularly African-Americans, Hispanics, and we have Asians coming into this body; that is a republic. That is what we are saying to the American people.

Why would the Constitution be selected to undermine the rights of citizens to select someone of their choosing?

Ms. MCKINNEY. The Supreme Court has taken the bold step of declaring the district that I represent unconstitutional. I do not lose. The people of America lose. And if each one of us is taken out of this body, what kind of republic, what kind of democracy, can America claim?

Is it that the Congressman from Alabama wants to say some concluding words?

Mr. HILLIARD. I just want to add that it is important that we preserve American democracy, and in order to preserve democracy we must make sure that all persons in this country are represented, that all persons participate, and there is no other way of doing it.

Thus through district representation it is what our forefathers would have fought for if we had had districts at that time, but because of the fact things were so small, there were so few Americans, there was not a need for it.

But things have changed. Our Constitution has changed, and it has changed because it wanted to make sure that protections that were not granted before to those persons who were absent are now granted.

So we need to, along without our forefathers, make sure that everything is constitutional and everyone has an opportunity to participate.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I have a piece of legislation which has been introduced, House Resolution 2545, which proposes a solution to this problem. It gets us to color blindness, it gets us to republican representative democracy, it gets us to the kind of participation that we all want and value in this country.

In the next special order we will talk about some solutions to this problem that do not rely on single-Member districts which have been the tool that

the Voting Rights Act allowed us that are now under attack because they have been so successful.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. In closing, next week, when the Supreme Court will hear the arguments in another reapportionment case, let me say that I have faith in the system, and I do believe that the Supreme Court can clear up what they have started in 1993 in Shaw versus Reno and acknowledge what really drives districts. It is not race; it is politics. It is politics, my colleagues. It is politics.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I would just like to say in conclusion thank you to all of the Members of this body who have come to me personally and, I am sure, have come to each of the other Members who are on this floor right now to express their concern about what is happening in redistricting, and how valuable our participation is and how valuable the notion of diversity is to having policies produced that are meaningful to the broad spectrum of the American electorate.

MONTGOMERY BUS BOYCOTT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, this Friday marks the 40th anniversary of the Montgomery bus boycott and the creation of the Montgomery Improvement Association. This Friday marks the start of an American journey. In my home State of Alabama, 40 years ago, African-Americans said they were sick and tired of being mistreated and humiliated; sick and tired of being kicked by the brutal feet of oppression; and sick and tired of being denied access to full American citizenship.

This was the most significant boycott of the civil rights movement. On December 1, 1955, when Mrs. Rosa Parks decided not to stand up and move to the rear of the bus, this was the day when African-Americans stood up to injustice and moved to the forefront of the struggle to outlaw discrimination, segregation and the notion of separate but equal.

For 13 months, African-Americans in Montgomery refused to ride the buses. They refused to accept an unjust system that demoralized and humiliated them.

The strength and spirit of these courageous citizens captured the consciousness of the entire world.

A lawsuit was subsequently filed challenging the constitutionality of bus segregation. The United States Supreme Court found that the Montgomery AL statutes regarding the segregation of passenger seating was in violation of the Constitution of the United States. On December 21, 1956, 13 months after the boycott began, African-Americans boarded Montgomery City Line buses free to sit where they pleased.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution recognizing the Montgomery