United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1997 No. 17

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 11, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable DAN MILLER to act as Speaker pro tempore for this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 21, 1997, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leader limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] for 5 minutes.

POLITICAL SYSTEM OVERHAUL

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, for too long our political system has been in need of an overhaul. Our political campaigns last too long, they are too negative, and they cost far too much. Each year this country breaks the record-setting campaign spending of the previous year, and the end is never in sight. By some estimates over $2.5 billion was spent on the 1996 elections. Mr. Speaker, clearly the system has become obscene.

Last week President Clinton came to this Chamber and he challenged this House to pass meaningful campaign finance reform. He set July 4 as the deadline. I believe the House can certainly pass reform legislation by then and declare itself independent of the fundraising tyrant that plagues our system.

We all know that this is not a new issue. It is not an issue that needs to be studied and spoken and lobbied forever. The Members of the House know the issue of campaign finance reform, and they know it well. There is not one credible reason why the Republican leadership cannot get finance reform to the floor by the President's deadline. In fact, before the Republicans were in the majority, the House had passed campaign finance reform legislation. However, it was vetoed by President Bush.

When campaign finance reform laws were first created following the Nixon Watergate scandal, the goal was to get money out of the system and disclose to the American people exactly where the money was coming from to finance Federal campaigns. Over 20 years later, there is more money than ever in the system, and it is not being fully disclosed to the American people.

To begin with, the explosion of what we call soft money has infused more money into campaigns than ever before; nearly $881 million in soft money, which is about 73 percent of the increase since 1992. This soft money comes from corporate and other sources specifically barred from campaigns by Federal law, and it has seeped into the system over the years and is now completely out of control. Our campaign finance laws need to be tightened when it comes to the issue of soft money.

Another problem is independent expenditures. Various well-funded interest groups from either side of the political spectrum will target their political opponents and spend millions to defeat them. However, these millions will not count toward the current contribution limits, and the target of the independent expenditure has to raise even more money to stay competitive.

Finally, the cost of the campaigns themselves have completely gotten out of control. Television costs, between production and broadcasting, have gone through the roof. The same is true for radio. And any aspiring politician living in New York, Chicago, or the Los Angeles media market knows that the costs there alone may be the sole reason that keeps him or her from running. They simply cannot afford it.

The fact that someone should be scared away from running for office merely because they do not have the money, I believe, is a tragedy. How many good honest councilmen or small town mayors or clever businessmen or women were kept from going further in public service because they lacked the money? How many great Congressmen and Senators have left us because they were just sick of the fundraising chase and had enough? How many millionaires will decide to run for Congress and win not on the strength of their ideas but on the size of the bank accounts? Mr. Speaker, if we do not have campaign finance reform on the floor by July 4, we may just end up a Congress of millionaires and not of the people.

Although it is still fairly early in the session of Congress, there have been several good campaign finance reform bills already introduced in-house. I just wanted to mention some of them. There is a bipartisan bill introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] which seeks to implement voluntary spending limits, lower media costs, and eliminate soft money. This bill is the House version of the Senate McCain-Feingold bill that President Clinton endorsed. There is also another voluntary spending limits bill introduced by my colleague from California (Mr. PARR].

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

There is even a bill proposing a constitutional amendment to put limits on campaign spending.

Clearly, the membership of this House is ready to tackle the issue of campaign finance reform and get a bill passed by July 4, the deadline set by the President. It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that the leadership, the Republican leadership, are ready to meet the President's challenge because I think it is clearly one of the most important issues facing this Congress this session.

HOUSING HOPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized during morning hour debates for 1 minute.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Housing Hope is an organization founded in 1987 by a consortium of churches concerned about homelessness. From its humble beginnings 10 years ago, it has now become a leader in providing affordable housing to homeless families in Everett, WA, in my district.

Working cooperatively with churches, labor unions, banks, corporations, and government agencies, Housing Hope has launched a $3.2 million housing development to provide transitional shelter for the homeless, child care facilities, and permanent homes for low-income families. This public-private partnership is a model for the rest of the Nation.

In 1995, for their volunteer efforts on Housing Hope, I nominated members of a union in my district for an award. I am gratified that the President saw the vision Housing Hope is building and presented the union with a Presidential Point-of-Light Award.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, the clock is ticking.

Last week in this very Chamber, the President called for Congress to pass campaign finance reform by July 4. The President and, most importantly, the American people are committed to meeting that deadline. That is only 143 days away. History shows us we have the support to meet that deadline if the people in charge of the schedule do not drop the ball.

In the 103d, the 102d, and the 101st Congresses, the Democrats were able to corral enough votes in both Chambers to pass legislation to fix the system. A Presidential veto stopped us once, a veto threat stopped us another time and a Republican filibuster in the Senate stopped it a third time.

The burden now rests with the current Republican leadership to keep campaign finance reform on track. All of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, have a golden opportunity to at long last correct problems that have plagued this system for far too long. Let us not lose it because of stalling tactics or partisan political games.

The American people are looking for results. Their confidence in our election system depends on it. Mr. Speaker, the clock is ticking.

COMMENDING MILLER WILLIAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend a distinguished Arkansas writer and teacher, Miller Williams, who recently composed a poem for President Clinton's reinauguration ceremony.

Mr. Williams, a professor of literature at the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville is the author of more than 20 outstanding books of scholarship and poetry. I can add little to the national chorus of praise his colleagues, students, and readers have already offered. His peers have recognized his talent with such prestigious awards as the American Academy of Arts and Letters' Prix de Rome.

In composing a poem for President Clinton's inauguration, Mr. Williams joined the select company of two other great American poets: Fellow Arkansan Maya Angelou and the New England poet Robert Frost.

In his inaugural poem, ''Of History and Hope,'' Mr. Williams celebrates the American tradition of memorializing our past through stories and songs. I congratulate him for his own lyrical and provocative contributions to our Nation's understanding.

I also wanted to say that the people of Arkansas are proud of this contribution. But I also commend him for his contributions to our youth. Mr. Williams has spent nearly 30 years helping students to examine themselves and the history they will inherit. As he suggests in his poem, we cannot control the future. We can only hope to equip the next generations with resources that they will need to make the right decisions. For helping us in this endeavor I offer my thanks and gratitude to Mr. Williams.

MORE ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, last week the President of the United States came to this Chamber, and he challenged us to give him a comprehensive campaign reform bill by July 4 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I responded the next day by introducing the campaign finance reform bill, H.R. 600. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you are committed to campaign finance reform, as your handshake with the President a year ago would lead us to believe, then I would urge you to take up this call and this bill and bring it to the House floor.

Daily we are greeted with headlines in newspapers with stories about questionable campaign practices. Regularly we are confronted by our constituents asking for sanity in the election process.

Always we are faced with the burden of our own campaign needs and how to meet them in a way that does not destroy the faith in the political process. We need campaign finance reform, and we need it now.

H.R. 600 is one of the bills introduced in this House. It embodies comprehensive reform, and it meets the principles of reform that we can all embrace. First it is fair. Real reform does not favor one party over another or one candidate over another.

Second, it reduces the influence of special interests. Political action limits, limits on large donors and the elimination of soft money can accomplish this.

Third, it must be a level playing field. That is, campaigns are made to be competitive by enhancing spending limits.

Fourth, there must be access to this body and to this system by nontraditional candidates. Women and minority candidates should be able to run as easily as anyone else.

Mr. Speaker, many of us wrote you a letter requesting action on campaign finance reform within the first 100 days of this session. The President would like to sign the bill on July 4.

You can make it happen if you are committed to reform. I am. The question is, are you? What day will we vote on campaign reform? The Nation is waiting for your answer.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM IN 105TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues who preceded me in the well have pointed out, one of most important items on the agenda of this Congress is campaign finance reform. Until we are able to reform this system, we will not regain the confidence of the American people that there is a level playing field in the Congress of the United States for the average American and the special interests.

Day after day the press reports to us of special accommodations that are given to those with the most money invested in campaigns of Members of

Congress, Members of the Senate, members of the administration and members of the opposing party in the Presidential campaign. It is very clear that these reports are making the people even more cynical about our political system than they are today.

Our obligation is to report campaign finance reform from the House of Representatives to the Senate at the earliest possible date. The reason we must do that is that, time and again, the delay of consideration of campaign finance reform not only changes the likelihood that it will ever become law but, should it become law, it postpones it through one more cycle of campaigns.

If we do not do campaign finance reform very quickly in the House and in the Senate, pretty soon Members will say, it cannot take effect in 1998, it must take effect 4 years from now. And then we go through an entire new cycle of the outrageous sums of money that are being lavished on campaigns in this country.

That is why we are pleading with the Republican leadership and the Speaker of the House to schedule campaign finance reform. The President has asked that it be done by July 4. Over 100 Members of this body sent both the Speaker of the House and the minority leader of the House a letter asking that we do it in the first 100 days.

□ 1245

Two years ago we saw a very aggressive legislative agenda for the first 100 days of that Congress. That Congress worked more hours, took more votes and passed more legislation in that 100 days, I believe than any other Congress in history.

Now we come to this Congress. Today is the 9th legislative day. We are in session today. We have no votes today. It is the 9th legislative day; however, today is in fact the 26th calendar day of the year. We have chosen to be in session 9 of those days.

If we comply with the President's request and pass campaign finance reform by July 4, it will be the 129th calendar day of this session, but under our current schedule it will be only the 63d legislative day of the year. I think we can start to see that the Congress is meeting less than 1 out of every 2 days.

If we ask that we do it in the first 100 days, the 100th day would be May 26 of this year. But if we go under the current schedule put forth by the Republican leadership, the 100th day will be October 14. That will signal that campaign finance reform is going to die.

We have got to do better than working every other day or every third day on behalf of the issue of campaign finance reform. Clearly this is an issue where people have studied it for many years.

As my colleagues have pointed out, there are many proposals, many of which Members of this body can live with, many which would improve the system, many of which would make the system more transparent and open to public scrutiny. We ought to move on that agenda, and we ought to move with the dispatch of at least what the President asked for or what the Members of this Congress have asked for, in the first 100 days.

If we do not, if we do not, soon we will be talking not about campaign finance reform for the next election but we will be talking about it for the election after that. And what will happen if that happens is we will continue the corrosive impact of campaign contributions on the workings of this institution.

Very often the press likes to talk about a vote that has been taken and the money that has been given. But we all understand that there are a whole other series of decisions made. Some are public and some are not. It is not just about what we do, it is not just about the vote we take. It is about the issue not presented to the Congress, it is about the vote not taken, it is about the amendment not offered.

Today too many of those decisions are being influenced by the promise of campaign contributions or the receipt of campaign contributions in the past. We must take that away from this institution. We must return this institution back to a level playing field so that the average person in this country will have confidence that our decisions are made on the level, and that they are made on the merits and not based upon who received what money in what amount to vote one way or the other on a given issue or not to have an issue considered.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House stands in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We are aware, O gracious God, that Your Spirit can minister to us in the depths of our hearts, that Your amazing grace can give us comfort and peace that passes all human understanding. We pray this day for all those who desire a full measure of Your blessings that they will receive all the gifts of faith and hope and love. May the fellowship of Your Spirit so live in the minds and souls of those who call upon You, that Your will may be done on Earth as it is in heaven. In Your name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PAPPAS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 103, Public Law 99–371 (20 U.S.C. 4303), the Chair appoints as a member of the Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University the following Member of the House: Mr. LAHOOD of Illinois.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF HARRY S. TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5(b) of Public Law 93–642 (20 U.S.C. 2004(b)), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation the following Members of the House: Mrs. EMERSON, of Missouri, and Mr. SKELTON, of Missouri.

THOMAS ALVA EDISON

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, today is the 150th anniversary of the birth of one of our Nation's foremost technology pioneers, Thomas Alva Edison. In Ft. Myers, FL, the site of his winter home for some 45 years, we hold the annual Festival of Light celebrating his remarkable contribution to modern society.

With more than a thousand patents, Edison was certainly a prolific inventor, but more importantly his inventions revolutionized our everyday lives. The light bulb. The phonograph. Wax paper. An electronic voting machine that we use here in-house. As he put it, ''I find out what the world needs. Then I go ahead and try and invent it.'' What a refreshing thought.

The enduring spirit of the independent inventor was brought to life by people like Thomas Edison. I join the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLMOR] today in introducing legislation to authorize a commemorative coin whose

proceeds will support the historical organizations dedicated to Thomas Edison's legacy. I hope all of my colleagues will support this bill.

COMPREHENSIVE CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, when the Republicans were in the minority, they would often challenge the Democratic leadership of the House to implement comprehensive campaign finance reform. We are now in the 3d year of the Republican majority, and the Speaker in fact has only brought one campaign finance reform bill to the floor, a bill, and I should mention that the Republican leadership knew would fail, and did in fact fail by over 250 votes. I guess the Republicans' fervent quest for reform has been tempered by the power of being in the majority.

Campaign finance reform again is not a new issue to this Congress by any means. In fact, the House had passed a comprehensive campaign finance reform bill when Democrats were in the majority, but, as I mentioned previously, this was vetoed by President Bush.

Last week President Clinton came to this Chamber and challenged this House to pass meaningful campaign finance reform. He made it a priority of his administration. He set July 4 as the deadline. I believe the House can certainly pass reform legislation by then. I think it would be a true test of our democracy, and it certainly is a challenge we must face this session.

CAPITAL GAINS TAXES

(Mr. PAPPAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, on my first day as a Member of Congress, I kept a pledge to the people of my district to introduce legislation that would improve the quality of their lives. My legislation reduces the capital gains tax by 50 percent and seeks to eventually eliminate it.

All over central New Jersey, I have been told that overtaxation is a huge problem. I have had people tell me that they are not going to sell their homes or businesses until Congress acts.

People and businesses create jobs, not the government. Lower capital gains taxes leave more capital in the hands of businesses, entrepreneurs and individuals who create and expand businesses and jobs.

A New Jersey painting contractor was quoted in an article in the Washington Post as saying:

> You're looking at a poor man who thinks the capital gains tax is the best thing that could happen to this country, because that's when the work will come back. People say capital gains are for the rich, but I've never been hired by a poor man.

The growth of our Nation's economy can be vibrant and grow if we are only willing to allow it to happen. Pass capital gains tax reform.

THE IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATION

(Mr. MCINTYRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago tonight the President underscored the importance of education. Education must be paramount and we must do whatever we can to help our children which is the wisest investment that we can make for tomorrow.

This investment has three callings for us: concern, commitment, and character. First, we should show our concern by contacting our local schools now and finding out how we can best help our teachers. Second, we should be committed. For the last 16 years I have gone into the classroom to volunteer and to work with our kids. Are we as business leaders willing to take the time to go and be role models for our children?

And third, we should be building character. Next week in our district we will have an electronic classroom that will go throughout the whole district to address children and to help bring them together with technology to talk about respect and responsibility, important ingredients for the citizens of tomorrow.

These are the three callings that we must answer. We must be ready with concern, commitment, and character and do what we can do now to help education on the local level.

RESPONDING TO PRESIDENT'S CALL FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first let me salute all the many veterans that I have had the opportunity to see today who are expressing their views and pay tribute to them certainly for their service to their country. It is for that reason that I rise to talk about giving this House back to the people of this Nation.

Even though we have heard so much talk about campaign finance reform, the real question will be whether we will be serious as a bipartisan body to address this issue. Although I will say to you that most Americans will say just do a good job, recognizing that each individual Congressperson that represents their district does the very best they can and is assessed by the people who vote them in, but they do want us to come to the understanding that people control this House and not money.

At the same time I think it is important that those who want to express their interest by supporting candidates should have the opportunity. I am glad to support the Farr bill which is a bipartisan approach to real campaign reform. It sets limits. It allows us to access the telecommunication highways, if you will, to communicate to the public. And, yes, it allows PAC's that represent people to participate. Let us come together by July 4 and give real independence and vote for real campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, I come before the House this morning to urge my colleagues to respond to the President's call to enact comprehensive campaign finance reform by July 4 of this year. This House in which we are all privileged to serve, is the people's House. It belongs to all of the citizens of this Nation and these citizens are calling out to their congressional Representatives to restore their confidence in Congress' ability to act for the good of the Nation. During the congressional cycle of 1996 we saw unprecedented amounts of money spent on these elections, which only heightened public cynicism regarding how our democracy works.

If comprehensive campaign finance reform is enacted by the July 4 deadline set by the President, American citizens will truly be able to celebrate Independence Day. It will be independence from excessive fundraising by candidates running for political office. Independence from outside organizations having such a large and overwhelming impact on the electoral process simply because they have spent huge sums of money. Mr. Speaker, the people of the 18th District of Texas in which I am honored to represent want this House returned to the people. Let's have a real Independence Day this year. Let's not let partisan politics get in the way. Let's enact real comprehensive campaign finance reform and have a real Independence Day.

TRIBUTE TO U.S. AMBASSADOR CARL B. STOKES

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory and the accomplishments of U.S. Ambassador Carl B. Stokes who passed away in 1996 after a long and distinguished career as a political leader. The world will always remember him as the first African American mayor of a major American city. I will always remember him as a friend, a confidante, and a mentor who helped me navigate the rough waters of Cleveland politics.

Carl B. Stokes was born in 1927, the son of a laundry worker who died when he was 2 years old. His mother worked as a domestic. He and his brother, the Honorable LOUIS STOKES, who serves as Congressman, worked in neighborhood stores and delivered newspapers to help the family.

Over the years Carl Stokes excelled in many aspects of life: as a soldier during World War II; as a middleweight boxing champion in 1948; as an attorney and investigator for the Ohio Department of Liquor Control. In 1962, he

became the first black Democrat elected to the Ohio House. In 1967, he became mayor of Cleveland, serving during a critical time in the history of my home town. After 4 years as mayor, he moved on to a television journalism career in New York City, to election as a municipal judge and finally as U.S. Ambassador to the Seychelles.

The Reverend Jesse Jackson said about Carl Stokes, all that exists now in the political spectrum for African-Americans are seeds from trees that Carl Stokes planted. He has left a proud legacy to his family, to the Cleveland community and to America.

OBITUARY OF U.S. AMBASSADOR CARL B. STOKES

Carl Burton Stokes died on April 3, 1996, at the age of 68, following a battle with cancer. With his passing, America mourned the loss of one of its most famous sons. Ambassador Stokes may be one of America's most vivid examples of how this nation has responded to the drive for success by the members of what was only one hundred and thirty-three years ago an enslaved group of people. Ambassador Stokes' life has been one of a series of ''firsts'' for African Americans. America's first Black mayor of a major American city became the first African American ever to be elected to all three branches of government—the legislative, the executive and the judicial.

In November, 1962, Stokes became the first Black Democrat in the history of the State of Ohio to be elected to the Ohio General Assembly. He was re-elected in 1964 and 1966. At that time, members of the Assembly were elected county-wide. Cuyahoga County's population was only 14% Black. Stokes remains the only Black Democrat ever elected county-wide to the Ohio State Legislature.

On November 13, 1967, Stokes attracted international attention when he was sworn in as Mayor of the City of Cleveland—the first Black mayor of a major American city, population 810,000. Since Cleveland was only 37% Black at that time, it also marked the first time an African American has been elected mayor of a predominately white major city of this nation.

In that election, Clevelanders selected Stokes, the grandson of a slave over Seth Taft, the grandson of a United States President. Subsequently, Mayor Stokes was asked by the White House to represent the United States on goodwill trips to Europe. As such, he was received by many heads of state, including nations where relations were strained, such as Romania and Yugoslavia. He was also sent to the Caribbean on missions to Puerto Rico, the Bahamas, Barbados, and Trinidad. His visit to Israel resulted in a friendship with Mayor Teddy Kolleck of Jerusalem that endures to this day.

In 1970, the 15,000 member National League of Cities, composed of mayors and city and county officials from throughout the nation, unanimously voted Stokes as president-elect to head their organization—the first Black official ever to hold that office.

Having completed two terms as mayor, Stokes decided to end his political career and begin a new one in broadcast journalism. In April, 1972, Carl Stokes became the first Black anchorman to appear daily on a television news program in New York City. At NBC's flagship station, WNBC–TV, Stokes also served as urban affairs editor and was often assigned to the United Nations where he interviewed many heads of state and other foreign dignitaries. Additionally, as a correspondent, he traveled throughout several nations of Africa, including Gambia, Zambia, Uganda, Kenya, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe.

In September, 1980, after eight years as an award-winning broadcast journalist, Stokes returned to Cleveland and to the practice of law. He became the first Black lawyer to serve as General Counsel to a major American labor union—the United Auto Workers, Region 2 and 2A. Stokes also represented Cleveland's largest city labor union—Laborers' Local 1099, among others.

On November 8, 1983, Stokes was elected as Judge of Cleveland Municipal Court, Ohio's largest court. A few weeks later, on December 22nd, his 12 colleagues elected him Administrative Judge of the Court. And on January 9, 1984, his fellow-judges elected him as their Presiding Judge. Never before had a freshman judge been elected Administrative/Presiding Judge of the thirteen-judge Municipal Court. He served two terms as head of the Court.

Ambassador Stokes' election was a benchmark in American history since few Americans—and no other African American—has ever been elected to the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government in our nation.

Carl Stokes was born on June 21, 1927, in Cleveland, Ohio. He was only two years old when his father, Charles, a laundry worker, died. His widowed mother, Mrs. Louise Stokes, supported her two sons by working as a domestic and for a time the family was on public assistance. He and his older brother, Louis, who is now in his 14th term as Ohio's first Black U.S. Congressman, augmented the family income as newspaper carriers for the Old Cleveland News, and by working in neighborhood stores. Congressman Stokes is the senior member from the Ohio delegation to Congress and is the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs-Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies.

Once a high school drop-out, Ambassador Stokes has received honorary doctorate degrees from 14 colleges and universities around the country. He has been a visiting lecturer at academic universities and business institutions throughout the United States, Trinidad, Haiti, Puerto Rico, the Bahamas, England, France, Germany and Italy.

On Tuesday, November 2, 1993, Stokes was re-elected to a third six-year term as Judge of Cleveland Municipal Court.

On Friday, August 26, 1994, President Bill Clinton appointed then-Judge Stokes as his Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Republic of the Seychelles. In this post, Carl was given the opportunity not only to serve the United States in a diplomatic position, but he also derived the satisfaction of displaying his professional qualifications in an international forum. Carl served as Ambassador to the Republic of Seychelles until the time of his death.

The passing of Carl Burton Stokes brings to close a life of love, commitment and inspiration. He was a leader, a visionary, a role model, and above all, a pioneer. His feat of becoming America's first Black mayor of a major American city changed the landscape of American politics. But above all, Carl was proudest of the fact that he was the first Black American to acquire the political power to break down barriers and open unprecedented opportunities for minorities. This will stand as a legacy and lasting tribute to a remarkable individual.

Left to mourn Carl's passing is his loving wife, Raija Stokes; two sons, Carl B. Stokes, Jr., and Cordell E. Stokes; a stepson, Sasha Kostadinov; and two daughters, Cordi D. Awad and Cynthia Sophia Stokes. In addition, he leaves to mourn two granddaughters, Jevonne Laraija Stokes and Cybil Quinn McBee; a grandson, Cordell E. Stokes, Jr., and his brother and sister-in-law, Louis and Jay Stokes. Other relatives include a nephew, Chuck Stokes; three nieces, Shelley Stokes Hammond, Judge Angela R. Stokes and Lori Stokes Thompson. Additionally, Carl leaves to mourn Linton Freeman, whom Carl considered to be a special cousin and dean of the family. He also leaves Wynona Jones, Elizabeth Bowes, Blanche Richards, Katie Walker, and a host of other relatives and friends, all of whom were special to Carl in his lifetime.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

□ 1415

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TRIBUTE TO HERB CAEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, they say that a picture is worth a thousand words, and in this visual era that we live in that has never been truer. But words have power, too, and a name, Herb Caen, to our community was worth 1,000 words every single day for nearly 60 years, mostly with the San Francisco Chronicle.

Last week we suffered a great loss in our community with the passing of Herb Caen. It was a tremendous loss for the entire Bay area community. Indeed, Herb Caen gave us our sense of community with his sense of humor.

But 1996 was a great year for Herb. It was the year he turned 80, it was the year he got married, it was the year he was awarded the Pulitzer prize, and it was the year that our community recognized him at Herb Caen Day. This special day was put on by Willie Brown, the mayor of San Francisco, and our Chief of Protocol, Charlotte Maillard, and over 75,000 people turned out to pay tribute to Herb Caen and to name an over-3-mile stretch of street in San Francisco Herb Caen Way.

Seventy-five thousand people, joined Walter Cronkite and Joel Grey and

other figures, celebrities, many in the sports arena, politics, the arts, show business in paying tribute to Herb. I do not know of any other person, living person, who has had such a tribute, who can make that claim.

His funeral took place this past Friday, and thousands of people attended. In the evening there was a candlelight march after work for the many people who could not take time off during the day, along Herb Caen Way, to honor him. It is very hard to explain to our colleagues a person so special that tens of thousands of people would turn out for him in life and in death, but he lived as he had died, surrounded by friends.

So I once again on the floor of this House want to extend my deepest sympathy to Herb's wife, Ann Caen; his son, Christopher; and Stacy, Steven and Catherine. It is a very difficult time for them and for all of San Francisco, the area which considered itself part of Herb's family.

Our mayor, Willie Brown, said it best when he said Herb Caen is irreplaceable. Again, as I say, because he was so special, it may be hard for our colleagues to understand the esteem in which he was held. The mayor called him irreplaceable. I will borrow the words of W.H. Auden, with some poetic license, to try to give expression to the sadness of our community on the death of Herb Caen:

> Stop all the clocks, cut off the telephone, prevent the dog from barking with the juicy bone, silence the pianos and with muffled drum bring out Herb's friends, let the mourners come.
>
> Let airplanes circle moaning overhead, scribbling on the sky the message he is gone. Put crepe bows around the white necks of the public doves, let the traffic policemen wear black cotton gloves.
>
> He was, in our community, he was our North, our South, our East and our West, our working week and our Sunday rest. Our moon, our midnight, our talk, our song; we thought that he would last forever, but we were wrong.
>
> The stars are not wanted now; put out every one: Pack up the moon and dismantle the sun; pour away the ocean and sweep up the woods: for nothing can ever come to any good.

I do not agree with that last line. Herb would certainly want his leaving to come to some good.

On his Herb Caen Day he said when he died and, hopefully, went to heaven, when he got there he would say of heaven ''It ain't bad but it ain't San Francisco.''

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

[Mr. SAXTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TOUCH THE FUTURE: INVEST IN EDUCATION

(Mrs. McCARTHY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have spent the last week traveling throughout my district in Mineola, Garden City, Uniondale on Long Island, and meeting with hundreds of children. I have visited their classrooms, met their teachers, and watched them work on computers, listened to their lessons and heard them read their books.

These children are full of enthusiasm and spark. They want to learn and they are enjoying it. These are visits that have made more clear to me that our children are one of our Nation's most precious resources.

I saw a bumper sticker recently that said, ''I touch the future. I teach.'' In Congress we can also touch the future by improving our educational system and making college more affordable for working families. And those who choose not to go to college, let us not forget them. We want to make sure that they have good and well-paying job opportunities.

Let us pass President Clinton's 8-point educational plan, which includes a $10,000 tax deduction for tuition and training as well as a plan for 2-year, $1,000 Hope scholarships. It is important for our children's future. Let us do it.

ANSWER TO EDUCATION PROBLEMS NOT IN WASHINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] will be recognized for 40 minutes and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] will be recognized for 20 minutes as the designees of the majority leader.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, today we continue a discussion that began in 1996. It deals with this city. This is a picture of Washington, DC. And it deals with what we really can expect Washington to do and the kind of balance that we need to strive for in this country between what we expect from Washington, what we expect from the private sector, what we expect from individuals, and perhaps what we can expect from faith-based and religious and volunteer organizations in America.

In many cases, I believe we have moved too much power to this town. We have asked Washington to do all kinds of things that perhaps it is not best equipped to do. We saw some of this last week when we heard the President articulate a vision for education, a vision that I believe moves power, authority, and control from the local level, from the parental level back to this community, back to this town, and it says the way we improve education in America is we empower Washington and we empower the bureaucrats in Washington to make decisions.

We used this chart for the first time or this picture for the first time in 1996 when we talked about the crisis that this Nation was facing in welfare. Because what we had done in welfare is we had moved decisionmaking away from the local level, where we were best equipped to help those in need, and we moved it to Washington.

We moved it to buildings here in Washington, so that when the State of Michigan or when the State of Wisconsin wanted to design a program that they felt best met the needs of their citizens, they had to come to a building over here and a bureaucrat in Washington, who had maybe never been in Wisconsin, maybe never been in California, maybe never been in Michigan, and say ''Can I do this in my State?'' And the bureaucrats in Washington were empowered to make the decisions.

Yesterday I had the opportunity to meet with a new program in the State of Michigan, where in my home county they are working on what they call Project Zero, which is to move everybody off of welfare. It is a partnership. It is a partnership between local agencies, it is a partnership with the State, and it is a partnership in a volunteer way with faith-based institutions to reach out and embrace those families that need help and to lift them up in a permanent and in a meaningful way off of welfare.

Those are the kinds of programs that I expect we will see over the next 12, 18, 24 months that will have a dramatic improvement in the welfare situation in this country.

Now, after we have made that change in welfare, which moves power back from Washington, back to the States and, more important, back to the local communities where we can have these creative mergers of people coming together to help others in the community, we find that the President does not really believe that the era of big government is over. He now believes that the era of big government has moved from a failure in welfare, and it is kind of like we did not learn our lesson: We are going to take that bureaucracy now and create and expand the Department of Education.

Over the last 9 months we have had hearings around the country, and we know that that model does not work. We know that the model of moving power to Washington and moving power to bureaucrats in Washington is not the answer. These bureaucrats are knowledgeable, talented people, but they cannot address the problems at the local level.

In hearings that we have had in New York City, that we have had in Chicago, that we have had in Cleveland, that we had a couple of weeks ago in Los Angeles and Phoenix, the answer is very clear. The way that we improve education is we empower parents, we move decisionmaking back to the local level, we focus on basic academics, and we drive dollars back into the classroom and not into a bureaucracy and

into bureaucrats, as well-meaning as they may be.

The system today is fairly clear and what the President proposes is fairly clear. It is the myth. It is the myth of the magical President who believes that by having good intentions in Washington and outlining wonderful-sounding programs, and moving dollars to Washington and moving responsibility to Washington, we can actually solve the problems that we have in education.

There is no doubt that in certain parts of our country education is in crisis, if we take a look at some of the statistics. This is not a debate about whether we need to improve education or whether we need to put a focus on education. The statistics are clear: One-half of all adult Americans are functionally illiterate.

Two weeks ago we had a hearing in California. Think about it: Twenty-five percent of the students that enter higher education in the State of California need remedial education. This is kids in 8th grade, this is kids in 10th grade, these are kids going into higher education. Twenty-five percent of them, when they enter the institution of higher education, need remedial education.

What does that mean? That means that they are entering into college and they cannot read or write at an 8th grade level. Sixty-four percent of 12th graders do not read at a proficient level. In international comparisons U.S. students scored worse in math than any other country except for Jordan.

If we take a look outside of this building in Washington, DC, it is also not an issue of money. We spend about $8,300 per child in the city of Washington, DC, and we have some of the lowest test scores in the country. In the State of Michigan we spend about $5,400 per student. So it is not let us pour more money into these programs or into these cities, it is let us focus on the basics.

When we have gone around the country, the exciting thing that we have noticed is that we can go into many areas that we would identify as having at-risk kids, the kids that maybe when we take a look at their environment and a whole series of factors we might be saying they are at risk, and they are at risk because maybe they are in an environment where it is most difficult for them to learn. The exciting thing about this is, as we go into these areas we see schools, we see teachers and we see parents and, most importantly, we see some of the greatest kids in this country, and they are learning and they are learning successfully.

But it is because of the schools, and it does not make a difference whether it is a public school or a private school or whether it is a charter school. We have seen examples of all of these, but when the schools make a commitment to involve the parents, where they have been freed from the rules and regulations from Washington and from the State so that the teachers and the administration can focus on the kids rather than the rules and regulations, it works. When the dollars go into the classroom rather than into paperwork, it works, and when the schools are focusing on basic academics, it works.

□ 1430

Here is the system today, and here is why I am leery about sending more money to Washington and why I believe it is a myth and why I believe that in the area of education, at least in Washington, more does not mean better.

Remember what we have in Washington today when we say education. Washington has been trying to help in the area of education for the last 20 years. Twenty years of work, 760 different programs running through 39 different agencies, spending about $120 billion per year. Washington has been going after this problem, but we have not been doing it very successfully.

Why? What is the process? Well, we start with parents, which is where we should start. We should have focus on parents and kids. But when we move the education system and the focus of education to Washington, we end up getting a whole bunch of layers in between parents, kids and teachers and local school boards.

In Washington, in this model that some want to expand, we have parents paying into Washington about $120 billion, into Washington programs, into Washington bureaucracies, 760 different programs. We are worried about reading and writing? Washington, a couple of years ago, had 32 different literacy programs. We still have more than 14 literacy programs. $120 billion into 760 programs, 39 different agencies.

Then the Washington bureaucracy, all the arrows point one way in terms of putting rules and regulations and dollars back on State and local school boards, but what happens when we create a program? If you create a program, somebody has to find out about it, so we spend dollars communicating to a school board or to a State saying, ''We've got these dollars available for these kinds of programs.''

So we invest dollars in a communications effort. School boards find out about it; they do not automatically get it. They have to now say, ''I wonder if we qualify for this? What do we need to do to qualify for this? How do we apply?''

They then fill out applications, and it goes back to the bureaucracy. The bureaucrats in Washington say, ''Well, you know, we've got *x* amount of dollars, we've got so many school districts applying. We're going to have to go through a sorting process to decide who gets this money and who does not.''

So they go through a decisionmaking process in the awarding of grants. The Vice President's National Performance Review outlined that in one of these grant applications in the Department of Education the process went through 487 different steps to move dollars from Washington actually back to a school board, back actually to the kids.

Washington then sends money to a school board or to a local school district. Of course, we cannot trust the people at the local level to do what we ask them to do, so of course we have rules and regulations and we have reporting structures back into Washington that says, ''Yes, we received your money,'' and ''Yes, here is proof that we spent it exactly the way you wanted us to.'' We in Washington, of course, cannot believe those, so we have to put in place an auditing program that says, ''Make sure you keep your records, because we may want to come back and audit that you actually spent the money the way we intended you to spend it.''

The bottom line is when parents send $120 billion to Washington and they funnel it through the 760 programs that we lose at least, conservatively we lose at least 15 cents of the Federal dollar. If you take a look at how much we lose at the State and the local level as they go through the process of applying and meeting the rules and regulations in the local cost, we probably lose somewhere in the neighborhood of 35 to 40 cents of each and every education dollar that goes to Washington to funnel it back.

We are not getting the money into the classroom. Most of this money or a good portion of it, probably 35 to 40 percent of the dollars that we think we are investing in education, gets sucked up into the bureaucracy and into the paperwork, and what happens is rather than school boards focusing on and working with parents as to what they need to do in their local district, what we have created is a model that says, kids are important, but I need to meet the rules, the requirements and the regulations from Washington. So their focus goes to a bureaucracy in Washington and not to parents and not on kids.

We have got to break the cycle. We have to focus on what is important, the basics, local and parental control and getting dollars into the classroom. We need to focus and we need a model where the people who are involved in education and setting the direction for education for our kids are parents, kids, and local leaders in the community.

I can say that with conviction because of the success we have seen around the country. We visited the Vaughn Charter School in L.A. 2 weeks ago, south central Los Angeles, one of the lowest performing schools when it was part of the Unified Los Angeles School District. It is now a charter school. It is still a public school. It is still accountable to the taxpayers. But what they did when they became a charter school, they cut the strings of bureaucracy. Dr. Chan, who is heading that school, saved the school district,

and the number is a little bit disputed, but somewhere in the neighborhood of $1.5 million. But more importantly, talking to the parents, talking to the kids, going into the classrooms, sitting around a table and talking about what makes this school different today, the parents, Dr. Chan, and the students are all saying it is because this is the model.

The model is one where the school, the principal, and the teachers have a partnership with the parents, and they are focused on the kids. Parents talk about we got our school back. As a matter of fact, it is now a neighborhood school. The kids in this neighborhood were being bused all over. The kids now have the choice of where they want to go to school. They are now going back to this school. They not only took control of the school back for the parents, but it is now a neighborhood school and in a very rough part of Los Angeles. It is kind of like a bright beacon in that community about what a local community can do when it cuts the strings from a bureaucracy and is empowered to take over a small part of its own community, and it is empowered to take over a very important part of its community, which is the schools.

There are a couple of other interesting statistics when we talk about what happens when dollars go into Washington.

We know we lose at least 15 cents here in Washington and we know that we lose at least another 20 cents when you go to the costs incurred by the local schools and the State, but it is kind of interesting how these dollars get distributed. Dollars do not follow kids. Dollars go all over the place.

If you are in Alaska, sending dollars to Washington and increasing the Washington bureaucracy is a good deal, because even though you maybe lose 40 cents of every dollar you send to Washington, with Alaska, when you send $1 in, you get $3.12 back. So the dollars coming in, the share back to you is very positive. It is a disproportionate share back to Alaska.

If you are in Connecticut, it does not really pay. Connecticut gets all of 39 cents back to that State. If you are in Mississippi, you get $2.41, if you are in New Mexico, you get $2.34. If you are close to New Mexico, in Nevada, too bad, you only get 39 cents back.

So it is a huge shell game in Washington that is not focused on kids. It is not focused on improving education. It is focused on bureaucrats and politicians trying to do something that really parents and local school districts can do a whole lot better.

As we take a look at this, this system does not work, when we take a look at what is going on and some of the proposals that the President has to improve learning, to improve education. It is interesting, one of the proposals he has, and I have oversight over this area, is the President proposes $809 million for the Corporation for National and Community Service. National and community service. It sounds great. Our volunteers through the Corporation for National Service cost us as taxpayers about $27,000 apiece, or as high as $27,000. They are going to go out and they are going to get tutors. I think that is a laudable objective. Schools are doing this today. Community groups are involved, and I am not sure what the Federal Government can do to help and assist in that process.

We fund and send money through the Corporation for National Service, and it would be one thing if we knew where now another roughly $1 billion going into this model, we know we are going to lose some of that in the structure and in the hierarchy and in the bureaucracy. We also know that, at least for the Corporation for National Service and for many of these other agencies, we are not actually going to know where the money goes.

The Corporation for National Service, this is an agency that spends about $600 to $700 million per year. The books still are not auditable. Think about it. Sending taxpayer dollars to an agency that was set up and was going to be the model for a government agency and how government should run but cannot have an independent accounting firm come in and audit its books.

That is one example. The Heritage Foundation cites a number of other examples that says these 760 programs do not have the kind of oversight necessary to determine whether they work and where the dollars are going and whether they are efficient or not. Is it not interesting that we know we have a problem in reading, we know that our kids are not reading at competitive standards, that in certain States a high percentage of them need remedial education, and rather than focusing on the real problem as to why kids are not learning in the classroom, the response in Washington is to create another program.

We have known that this has been an issue. We have got 14 literacy programs. And now what we are doing is we are funding an overlay of perhaps volunteers reading 2 hours per day or 2 hours per week with students, but we are not asking the fundamental questions as to why are kids not learning to read in the classroom.

Is there something going on in the classroom that is prohibiting kids from learning? Why do we not take a look at what is going on in the classroom before we do anything else, and maybe moving dollars into the classroom is a more effective way of addressing this problem than putting another Band-Aid on an open wound. Maybe we ought to go back and take a look at the 14 literacy programs that are already spending over $8 billion per year from a Washington level and saying, why are those 14 literacy programs not driving the kinds of results that we would like to have?

□ 1445

If they are good programs and they are working, why are we not putting more money into those programs? If those programs are not working and we do not feel we should be putting more money into them, but we should be going in this new route or in a different route, why do we not take a look at eliminating those programs and getting true effectiveness into the system? But no, the proposal that we have in front of us is more bureaucracy in Washington, not critically evaluating the programs that we have in place.

Well, that is not going to work in this Congress.

We do have in place a program which we call Crossroads in Education. The Crossroads in Education project that is coming out of the Committee on Education and the Workforce is going to do, and is in the process of doing, a critical analysis of these 760 programs. We want to find out where the dollars go; are they getting results or are they not getting results; how can we make them more effective; and what is working and what is wasted in education today?

So what does that mean? It means that the first step is last year we asked the question: How many programs are there? Nobody had ever asked that question before. We did some work, we did some research; some other outside organizations, some parts of the executive branch helped us. They said 760 programs, 39 agencies—actually the 760 is a little old. Since that point in time they have identified about a hundred more programs that we have. So it is somewhere in the neighborhood of 850 to 900 programs that we really have in Washington.

But we are now going through and we are asking what is the process; how is this money distributed; what are the actual links back and forth between a bureaucracy and the State and a local school board; how are people awarded and granted dollars; what is the largest grant request you get or that you gave out; what is the smallest?

We found a grant request for safe and drug-free schools. The school district went through all of the work, a very thick application, and I will tell you they got their money's worth. They got a grant for $13. The Government cannot even write a check for $13, but that is what the school district got. Maybe that went out and would have paid for lunch for the person who spent considerable time putting this grant request together: $13 for a school district to develop their safe and drug-free school program.

Think of the costs that went in. We are doing that. What is the largest and the smallest grant request you got? What do these grant requests look like? Are they 2 pages, are they 50 pages? In some cases we found that they may be a thousand pages. How much time and energy? What happens to the grant requests when they come to Washington? How are they sorted

through? Who reads them? You then go back and you take a look at when the grants go out, how much paperwork?

The statistics I believe that we had in our hearing in Arizona 2 weeks ago was that of the 6 percent—let me find the exact quote—this was from Lisa Graham Keegan who is Arizona's superintendent of education—said, I will say that the 8 percent Arizona receives from the Federal Government easily accounts for more than 50 percent of the work in my department and school districts.

The paperwork. They receive 8 percent of their money—remember this $120 billion is only about 5 or 6 percent of what any school district gets, but on a national average some get more, some get less. Here in Arizona it is about 8 percent of their total dollars come from Washington and about 50 percent of their paperwork. Is that a good investment? What do bureaucrats in Washington really know about what needs to be done in Arizona?

So what is the paperwork that goes back and forth? We have had meetings, and we asked superintendents to tell us about their paperwork, and one of the things that they keep coming back with is, we appreciate the money we get from Washington. In some cases it does some good and we can work in those areas. But the real problem is when we take a look at our local school district and we take a look at the needs that we have. If we had more flexibility to use that money in different ways, we would spend it in different ways than what you are mandating that we spend it on.

So we know that this process is not an ideal process. Fifty billion dollars of more spending in Washington is not the way to improve education. Spending $50 on education may be a worthwhile effort. It is probably a good exercise. Spending it at the State and the local level, where you have more control and direction about what you need in your community, and actually getting the dollars into the classroom probably makes a lot more sense.

Recognize that when we spend and say we are going to spend $50 billion in Washington, maybe only 25 to 30 billion will actually make it back into the classroom. Twenty billion is going to get lost somewhere else in the process.

A couple of other proposals that the President is talking about that I think need serious consideration: talking about school construction. As soon as we put in Federal dollars, any amount of Federal dollars, into a local school construction, Washington will come in and mandate what contractors need to be paid on an hourly basis for the work that they perform in your school district. It is called Davis-Bacon, mandated from Washington what you will pay. We have an elaborate system in the Department of Labor that is not very good but that tries to track wages in thousands of different communities around this Nation, in a number of different construction categories, and that is what you have to pay. In other projects where you do not have Davis-Bacon, we go through this kind of complex way of determining how much a project will cost. It is called competitive bidding. School districts cannot competitively bid. They have to pay Davis-Bacon wages.

So in effect, when you go on a construction project with Federal dollars or partially funded with Federal dollars, you lose again about 15 percent of your purchasing power by being required to pay the wages established here in Washington versus what you may be able to get in a competitive bid.

I enjoy the discussion about the HOPE scholarships. Making education available to more students on a longer basis I think is a worthwhile goal, saying that Washington is now going to provide scholarships for those that maintain a B average.

The IRS today cannot track our income tax system, our Income Tax Code. Just think of what wonderful work they are now going to have also trying to match tax deductions with information from schools indicating that, yes, these people did maintain a B average and that B averages across the country are consistent, so that the same B that you get in Michigan is equivalent to a B that you get in Arizona.

It is going to create a lot more work for bureaucrats, and it is going to move a lot less money into the classroom.

The evidence is clear. We need to focus on education, but more compelling is the case that rather than increasing and building and expanding this city in Washington, the keys to improving education is moving dollars and power away from this city and moving it back to parents, moving it back to local school boards and empowering teachers.

It is not only school boards. It is teachers that want control of their classroom. It is the parents that want their schools back. They do not want to come to Washington to take a look or to fight for what they want to do in their classroom. They want control of their schools. They know specifically what they need for their kids and their community.

The needs of this country are so diverse. We need to be able to have the flexibility to tailor the programs for our kids from one city and one community to the next, and we need to empower parents.

That is not a concept or a theory. We know that it works. Take a look at the schools that are working, take a look at the schools that are excelling, and that is the bright spot in the picture in education.

Yes, there is some bad news, there is some information that says we ought to be worried about this and that in some parts of the Nation education may be in a state of crisis. But the good news is that we can look at models of success and we can learn from those models of success, we can learn what the characteristics are, and we can then tailor Federal policies and rules and regulations, or whatever, to empower that kind of change and reform to happen at the local level.

And what we learn is very simple: Parents, basics and getting dollars into the classroom, empowering parents instead of empowering bureaucrats, dollars to kids, not to bureaucracy, fundamental basic education, not the latest education fads; it is a key issue, it is an important issue. It is going to be a vigorous debate. I think in the end kids and parents will win, and politicians and bureaucrats in Washington will lose. That is the system that works, that is the model that we will build on, and that is the direction that we need to go.

PROPOSING A TERM LIMITS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized for 20 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I come today to speak about a subject that will be greatly debated tomorrow on the floor of the House; that is, term limits. I am the author of House Joint Resolution 2 which will be out here on the floor. It is the term limits amendment for 12 years in the U.S. Senate, 12 years in the U.S. House, something that better than 70 percent of the American people in principle support.

The issue that will be before us will be a historic debate, the second time that we have heard the subject of term limits debated in the Congress of the United States. First time was in the 104th Congress, 2 years ago when this amendment that I offered received 227 votes, which is a simple majority, more than a simple majority because 218 is that, but not enough to reach the required supermajority of 290 votes to pass a constitutional amendment in the House.

I am hopeful that when we conclude the debate tomorrow that this amendment will receive more than the 227 votes it received last year, that we will be further progressing toward the 290 votes that we need for the ultimate passage of this amendment, even though I have no illusions that we have yet to reach the numbers in the House who support term limits sufficient to actually pass this amendment tomorrow.

I am hopeful that the debate will be centered primarily upon the divisive issues that normally we debate here; that is, those who favor a differing length of term and those who favor no term limits at all.

There are those who favor 6-year House terms and 12 years in the Senate, and I respect that view. There is certainly a difference of opinion we can

all share. I personally think that 12 and 12 is far superior. For one thing, if we are going to limit the Senate to 12 years and the House to 6, we are going to wind up giving the Senate more power than the House in conference committees and elsewhere, and I do not think that is smart. I think we need a balance between the two bodies. We need to have a symmetry. There should be the same length of term limits with respect to the House as there is with the Senate.

So that is why I for one think the 12 and 12 is better than a 6 and 12 or an 8 and 12 limit process.

I also happen to believe that 6 years is frankly too short in the House. I think there needs to be time in grade, if you will, time to learn and time to gain knowledge in this very complex government that we operate, to learn the subject matters that we have to deal with before a Member becomes the chairman of a full committee or ascends to a major leadership post in one of the political parties running this body. And I do not believe, having been here a few years, that 6 years is long enough for a Member in most cases to acquire that kind of knowledge and that experience that we would like to see; and to support a lesser term than 12 years is to support something that is subject to the criticism of those opponents objectively who oppose term limits altogether.

□ 1500

But that is a fair argument to have. Men and women of differing persuasions will come to different conclusions about these things, and I look forward to that debate.

What bothers me more than anything else, though, is that there is a group working supposedly for term limits out there that may in fact be in the process of destroying the effort we are making; may in fact be so intent upon getting their way or no other way that in the end they gridlock this body and we never reach the goal ultimately of getting to term limits.

The reason I say that is because the tactics they are using are such that we are likely to see that instead of 227 votes out here tomorrow, there may be a lesser number than 227 for the one and only proposed amendment that really has any chance of getting to the 290 needed to pass it any time in the foreseeable future. I am referring to an organization known as United States Term Limits. I want to talk about this group and what it has been doing for a few minutes today so that we can focus more tomorrow on the substance of the actual debate over term limits itself.

I, first of all, would like to refer to a column that was written in this week's current issue of Newsweek magazine by a very well-liked and respected columnist, George F. Will. George Will's column of February 17, 1997, is too long for me to read in its entirety into the RECORD, but I would like to request that at the end of my remarks today that the column in its entirety appear in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

I do want to quote from one of those:

> United States Term Limits is a bellicose advocate of term limits, and, like fanatics through the ages, it fancies itself the sole legitimate keeper of the flame of moral purity. However, it has actually become the career politician's best friend. That is why it was opponents of term limits who invited a U.S. Term Limits spokesman to testify at recent House hearings on the subject. Opponents understand that U.S. Term Limits' obscurantism, dogmatism and bullying embarrassed the cause.

Frankly, they do more than embarrass the cause. In their effort to have their way or no other way, they have done a lot of damage to the cause. They have embarked in the past on a course of attacking term-limit supporters. In the last Congress they produced television commercials and ran them in a number of districts of term-limit supporters who supported something other than their preferred version, which is the 6-year House limit and the 12-year Senate limit. They took the position that if you were willing to compromise to actually pass a term-limits amendment, and that meant looking for proposals other than the 6-year House limit, then you incurred their wrath. Their view is that 12 years in the Senate is fine, but they declare that a greater limit than 6 years in the House is worthless and the Congressman who votes for a 12-year House limit is hypocritical.

How inconsistent and reckless that is. It is really quite reckless, in fact. They have turned on the prime supporter of 6 years, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and criticized him. He is part of their Rogue's Gallery, now on the Internet, if you want to look it up, and yet he is a strong advocate and will probably offer the 6-year House version here tomorrow.

The reason they turned on him is because when the 6-year version came up, way short of getting anywhere near the number necessary to pass it, he saw the truth of the matter was that the only way we are ever going to get term limits in this body was to vote for the 12-year limit. So after his version failed, he voted for the 12-year limit.

Their latest strategy is the passage of misleading ballot initiatives. Like the wolf in Red Ridinghood, disguised as the sweet old granny, United States Term Limits has deceived voters into believing they were instructing their representatives to vote for term limits. The deception involves passing initiatives in the States that would require legislators to adopt their no-compromise policy on a 6-year limit. Any legislator who runs afoul of United States Term Limits gets the words ''disregarded voter instructions on term limits'' next to their name on the ballot in the next election.

Let us make this crystal clear. This scarlet letter is placed beside any Congressman's name, even if, in fact, he voted for several term-limit amendments, just not solely for United States Term Limits' 6-year limit. Not only that, but there are nine separate States that have passed this particular initiative, and each of the States has some different language in it, which is why we are going to have a series of nine votes, in addition to the base bill and Mr. INGLIS' and perhaps a couple of other amendments out here tomorrow.

The States of Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Maine, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, and South Dakota have all passed an initiative that United States Term Limits sponsored regarding the 6-year-term limit for the House and the 12-year for the Senate, but each one has some subtle difference, and if you do not follow their instruction precisely, if you are a Member of Congress from the particular State in question and you do not offer and get an opportunity to vote for precisely the language that was put on the ballot in those States and passed, then you get this scarlet letter beside your name on the next ballot when the next election comes around. It is absolutely designed to gridlock this body over the issue of term limits, not help it pass it.

Therein lies the whole problem. For good reason, many Members do not want to appear to be against term limits. So in order to avoid the scarlet letter, Members from these States that have passed the initiatives, who support term limits in general, will vote against the one bill, a 12-year limit in the House and Senate, that has a chance of ever passing the House, much less the Senate. Instead of working to pass term limits, the United States Term Limits' initiatives are actually reducing the number of votes for term limits in the House. How ironic that is.

Here is how this scam works in one particular illustration. In Idaho, one of the nine States that passed the initiative, the actual United States Term Limits initiative text runs 2,286 words. That is four pages of single-type space. However, all that appeared on the ballot were 207 words, not 2,286. The full text and requirements were available only upon special request from the secretary of state or the elections office.

Most importantly, however, is the clever wording of the short title and the first thing voters see on the ballot:

> Initiative instructing candidates for State legislature and U.S. Congress to support congressional term limits requires statement indicating nonsupport on ballot.

That is a very broad statement. I would submit that any citizen who supports term limits, and as I said earlier, about 70 percent do, would wholeheartedly support, I would support that, and the people of Idaho supported that. They voted for it. If United States Term Limits were really sincere in their drive for a 6-year limit, then why did they not declare right up front in the title of the initiative that it requires support for only the 6-year limit?

Their latest effort to attack limit supporters is destructive not only of

the term-limit movement itself, but it sets a dangerous precedent for manipulation of the Federal ballot by special interest groups. It does not take much imagination to see that the initiative process could be manipulated by powerful special interest groups on a whole variety of issues to do this sort of destructive thing. It would not be long before every special interest group in the country would seize on the opportunity to gain the ballot to their political and legislative advantage.

So again I have to ask the question, What is United States Term Limits' real objective? Obviously, they are saying they are for term limits. They are a nonprofit organization that goes around the country beating their chest over this issue.

They have every right to be for a different term-limits proposal than I am or the majority of this body is. They have every right to go out and advocate it, and they have a right technically to get on these ballots. But what is their effort really going to amount to, and why would any rational person who really wants term limits be proceeding in this manner that is guaranteed in a suicidal fashion to gridlock this body over the whole issue, and instead of leading us to term limits, will mean the death of the term-limits movement as a practical matter?

There is no way anybody can look forward and see when it will ever occur if they continue this process, even if they pass initiatives in several States that ultimately conform to one methodology and one set of language. There is no way anybody could ever see in the far-distant future how that is going to lead to the passage of a term limits constitutional amendment through Congress or through the several States.

For one thing, only about half the States, actually I think a little less than half, have an initiative process. The State legislatures of other States will not go along with this. Maybe one or two would, but certainly not all. In the most ideal of circumstances, there is no way that United States Term Limits can succeed with this suicidal methodology. It is absolutely replete with a useless type of process, and in addition to that, as I said, is a dangerous type of process.

Now I would like to comment a little bit about why some of us passionately believe in this issue, why we believe term limits is so important. The reason I believe term limits is so important is because I am concerned that Members of Congress are too concerned about getting reelected every time and not enough concerned in each vote that is taken with the best interest of the country as a whole. That is a simple way of saying they are career oriented. They are worried about staying around here, and so they try to please every interest group. That is not true of every vote and every Congressman, of course, but true of too many; too many votes and too many Congressmen at any given time.

Yes, we have had some turnover in Congress. We have had quite a bit in the last couple of years. The problem is those who are really in control and run this place are those who are most senior. While there is not an absolute seniority system since the Republicans took over control of Congress and limited the tenure of 6 years to any committee or subcommittee, and limited the tenure of our leadership to any 6- or 8-year period, there still is, as a practical matter, seniority.

Those who have been here longest serve in the positions of the most power, and that is the way it is going to continue to be. That is the way it has been historically in every legislative body, and that is the way it will continue to be here. If we do not have term limits, we are going to have to chose who do stay, those who choose to stay and be reelected, and the vast majority are. A very high percentage are reelected or run for reelection every time that run for Congress, and they are going to have control of this body. I do not think that is an appropriate thing. I think that we need to change that career orientation. I think it is much better if we have term limits, and as I said, I think 12-year is the best of all.

In the article I cited earlier by George Will that appears in Newsweek, under the last column heading, ''Save Us From the Purists,'' where he discusses the folly of U.S. Term Limits at some length, he also talks about the rationale for term limits, and I agree with him on this. He says, ''Term limits are a simple surgical Madisonian reform. By removing careerism, a relatively modern phenomenon as a motivator for entering politics and for behavior in office, term limits can produce deliberative bodies disposed to think of the next generation rather than the next election. This is the argument favored by those who favor term limits, not because of hostility toward Congress, but as an affectionate measure to restore Congress to its rightful role as the first branch of government.''

Mr. Will goes on to discuss, intelligent people will differ, as I have said earlier, about the terms and whether they are this term or that term and even whether term limits is a good idea at all. But he wonders aloud, with me, over why an organization like U.S. Term Limits, supposedly dedicated to the proposition, would go about doing what they are doing in such a reckless manner.

He says, ''U.S. Term Limits is not merely eccentric, but preposterous and antithetical to dignified democracy because it insists that three House terms is the only permissible option. If U.S. Term Limits'', and I am continuing to quote Mr. Will, ''merely espouses this position, it could simply be disregarded as a collection of cranks. What makes it deeply subversive of the term limits movement is its attempt to enforce its three-year House term fetish by using a device that degrades what the movement seeks to dignify—the principle of deliberative representation.''

''Last November'', he goes on to say, ''in 9 States with 30 House Members, 19 of them Republicans, whose party platform endorses term limits, U.S. Term Limits sponsored successful campaigns to pass pernicious initiatives. These stipulate precisely the sort of term limits measure for which those States' Members should vote and further stipulate that unless those Members vote for them and only for them, then when those Members seek reelection, there must appear next to their names the statement, ''violated voter instruction on term limits.''

''More than 70 percent of Americans favor the principle of term limits without having fixed, let alone fierce, preferences about details. But U.S. Term Limits, tendentiously presenting meretricious evidence, baldly and farcically asserts that Americans believe that term limits involving 6-year House terms is not worth having. Because of U.S. Term Limits' coercive device of instruction, there may have to be a dozen votes, which probably will happen, this week on various term limits amendments to the Constitution. And U.S. Term Limits' ham-handedness probably will produce a decline in the votes for the most popular proposal: 6 House and two Senate terms, or 12 years, I might add, in each body. No measure is yet going to receive the 290 votes or 67 Senate votes needed to send an amendment to the States for ratification debates. However, U.S. Term Limits' rule-or-ruin mischief will splinter the voting bloc that last year produced 227 votes for a 12-years-for-each-chamber amendment.''

''The thinking person's reason for supporting term limits is to produce something that U.S. Term Limits' instruction of Members mocks: Independent judgment. U.S. Term Limits, which thinks of itself as serving conservatism, should think again. It should think of that noble fountain of conservatism, Edmund Burke. In 1774, having been elected to Parliament by Bristol voters, Burke delivered to them an admirably austere speech of thanks, in which he rejected the notion that a representative should allow ''instructions'' from the voters to obviate his independent judgment.

□ 1515

He said, ''Government and legislation are matters of reason and judgment,'' and asked: ''What sort of reason is that in which the determination precedes the discussion?''

In the 1850's some Abolitionists were interested less in effectiveness than in narcissistic moral display, interested less in ending slavery than in parading their purity. The abolition of slavery required someone [Lincoln] who was anathema to fanatical abolitionists. Similarly, restoration of deliberative democracy will require patient people, not USTL's exhibitionists.

I quoted liberally from Mr. Will, though not his entire text, which will

appear, as we said earlier, at the end of these remarks. I think he stated it very well.

Let us hope tomorrow as we debate term limits the debate is civil, and that our Members debate the merits of the various proposals. But understanding that, if we do parade before this body and the country nine separate proposals in addition to the underlying 12 years in the House, 12 years in the Senate, House Joint Resolution 2, that we are doing that because of this rather bullying tactic of U.S. term limits, this self-defeating effort that they are making to try and somehow bring attention to this cause.

It is very obscure to me as to what they think they are going to achieve in this process, other than gridlock on the term limits movement. I would urge my colleagues all to seriously weigh this when they vote tomorrow, and as many as possible who do not feel compelled to follow the instructions in those nine States, take the risk and the chance of facing up to these bullies, and, in the end, after all is said and done, please vote for the passage of the one term limits proposal that is rational and has a chance of ultimately prevailing and being sent to the States for ratification: 12 years in the House and 12 years in the Senate.

I include for the RECORD the article previously referred to.

[From Newsweek, Feb. 17, 1997]

SAVE US FROM THE PURISTS—SOME SUPPORTERS OF TERM LIMITS HAVE DEVISED A TACTIC AT ODDS WITH THE BEST REASON FOR LIMITS

(By George F. Will)

Since the apple incident in Eden, the human race has been disappointing. Hence term limits for Congress may become one of the few exceptions to the rule that when Americans want something, and want it intensely and protractedly, they get it. Only the political class can enact limits, and limits would be unnecessary if that class were susceptible to self-restraint.

That is a structural problem of politics with which supporters of term limits must cope. But the organization U.S. Term Limits is an unnecessary impediment to term limits. As the House votes this week on the issue, consider what happens when a reform movement's bandwagon is boarded by people ignorant of, or indifferent to, the principal rationale for the reform.

USTL is a bellicose advocate of term limits, and, like fanatics through the ages, it fancies itself the sole legitimate keeper of the flame of moral purity. However, it has actually become the career politician's best friend. That is why it was opponents of term limits who invited a USTL spokesman to testify at recent House hearings on the subject. Opponents understand that USTL's obscurantism, dogmatism and bullying embarrass the cause.

The primary argument for term limits is not that, absent limits, there will be a permanent class of entrenched incumbents shielded from challengers by advantages of office. Although incumbents who choose to seek re-election still are remarkably safe—91 percent of them won in the turbulence of 1994 and 94 percent won in 1996—most members of Congress arrived there in this decade. (This rotation in office has been produced partly by something the nation does not wish to rely on—revulsion arising from scandals and other malfeasance.) And the primary argument for term limits is not that Congress is insufficiently ''responsive'' and hence must be made ''closer to the people.'' Rather, the primary argument is that we need ''constitutional space'' (the phrase is from Harvard's Harvey Mansfield) between representatives and the represented.

Term limits are a simple, surgical, Madisonian reform. By removing careerism—a relatively modern phenomenon—as a motive for entering politics and for behavior in office, term limits can produce deliberative bodies disposed to think of the next generation rather than the next election. This is the argument favored by those who favor term limits not because of hostility toward Congress, but as an affectionate measure to restore Congress to its rightful role as the First Branch of government. This would put the presidency where it belongs (and usually was during the Republic's first 150 years), which is more towards the margin of political life.

Intelligent people of good will differ about whether term limits are a good idea, and supporters of limits differ concerning the appropriate maximum length of legislative careers. Most supporters consider six House and two Senate terms a temperate solution. It is symmetrical (12 years in each chamber) and allows enough time for professional learning, yet removes the careerism that produces officeholders who make only risk-averse decisions while in office. USTL is not merely eccentric but preposterous and antithetical to dignified democracy because it insists that three House terms is the only permissible option.

If USTL merely espoused this position, it could simply be disregarded as a collection of cranks. What makes it deeply subversive of the term limits movement is its attempt to enforce its three-House-terms fetish by using a device that degrades what the movement seeks to dignify—the principle of deliberative representation. Last November in nine states with 30 House members (19 of them Republicans, whose party platform endorses term limits) USTL sponsored successful campaigns to pass pernicious initiatives. These stipulate precisely the sort of term limits measures for which those states' members should vote, and further stipulate that unless those members vote for them and only for them, then when those members seek re-election there must appear next to their names on the ballot this statement: ''Violated voter instruction on term limits.''

More than 70 percent of Americans favor the principle of term limits without having fixed, let along fierce, preferences about details. But USTL, tendentiously presenting meretricious ''evidence,'' baldly and farcically asserts that Americans believe that term limitation involving six House terms is not worth having. Because of USTL's coercive device of ''instruction,'' there may have to be a dozen votes this week on various term limits amendments to the Constitution. And USTL's ham-handedness probably will provide a decline in votes for the most popular proposal—six House and two Senate terms. No measure is yet going to receive the 290 House votes or 67 Senate votes needed to send an amendment to the states for ratification debates. However, USTL's rule-or-ruin mischief will splinter the voting bloc that last year produced 227 votes for a 12-years-for-each-chamber amendment.

The thinking person's reason for supporting term limits is to produce something that USTL's ''instruction'' of members mocks—independent judgment. USTL, which thinks of itself as serving conservatism, should think again. It should think of that noble fountain of conservatism, Edmund Burke. In 1774, having been elected to Parliament by Bristol voters, Burke delivered to them an admirably austere speech of thanks, in which he rejected the notion that a representative should allow ''instructions'' from voters to obviate his independent judgment. He said ''government and legislation are matters of reason and judgment'' and asked: ''What sort of reason is that in which the determination precedes the discussion?''

In the 1850s some Abolitionists were interested less in effectiveness than in narcissistic moral display, interested less in ending slavery than in parading their purity. The aboliton of slavery required someone (Lincoln) who was anathema to fanatical abolitionists. Similarly, restoration of deliberative democracy will require patient people, not USTL's exhibitionists.

TERM LIMITS: A SOLUTION FOR A PROBLEM THAT DOES NOT EXIST

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LATOURETTE]. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly have the greatest respect for the Member who just finished speaking and, in fact, respect him about as much as anybody in this body, but I do disagree with him on this issue. If ever there was a solution for a problem that does not exist, it is term limits for Members of Congress.

First of all, more than half of this House has served just since January of 1993, 4 years or less. One-third has served 2 years or less. There is greater turnover in elective office today than at almost any time in the history of this country.

Second, unlike Federal judges, bureaucrats, and members of the military, the terms of Members of Congress are already limited. We face the voters every other year. We are given only a 2-year term in the House. If the voters do not like what we are doing, they can easily kick us out. Elections are the best term limits ever invented. In fact, it is slightly arrogant for someone to say, I am going to limit myself only to 6 or 12 or some other number of years in office. That decision is only up to the voters, and that is the way it should be.

Actually, if term limits are needed, they are needed more for unelected people than for those who regularly have to be approved by the voters already. Many people say the real power lies in the bureaucracy anyway.

Third, term limits are unconstitutional. They were specifically considered by our Founding Fathers and specifically rejected, for a whole host of good reasons.

Fourth, term limits are undemocratic, with a small d. They would prohibit voters from voting for a candidate who might otherwise be their first choice. They would prohibit good people from running for office. They would take away freedoms that we have always held dear in this Nation.

Fifth, term limits would increase the power of unelected bureaucrats and

lobbyists. They would become the real experts, and very few Members of Congress would be able to develop experience and expertise about important matters on which they were expected to legislate.

Six, term limits would hurt small, less populous States. A State like California, with 52 Members, would be able to get far more than its share. Many smaller States gain at least some protection and some benefits if they are represented by Members with some seniority.

Seventh, term limits would cause even more money to be spent on elections. Most people want less money to be spent on election campaigns, not more. Now, some incumbents who are doing a good job and doing what their constituents want do not have to spend huge amounts to be reelected, nor do they have huge amounts spent against them. Term limits would cause big money to play an even greater role in elected politics.

Eighth, and perhaps most important of all, we would never consider applying term limits to any other field. We would never go to a great teacher or doctor or engineer or scientist and say, we know you are doing a great job, but even though we cannot prove it, we have this feeling that we need new blood every 6 years or 8 years or 12 years or whatever, so you have to go do something else. Workers in any other field would scream to high heaven if arbitrary time limits were applied to them, except possibly after a full career. I would say to anyone listening to these words, or who later reads these words: Would you want term limits applied to you?

Ninth, term limits would have cut short the careers of some of our greatest legislators. People like Howard Baker, Everett Dirksen, Sam Rayburn, Robert Taft, Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, George Norris, Robert LaFollette, and many, many others have achieved some of their greatest service after they would have been term-limited out by the proposals that we will vote on tomorrow, and several did not become even well known nationally until their later years in office, after they would have been forced out of office by the proposals we will vote on tomorrow. John Kennedy in this country and Winston Churchill in Great Britain would have been term-limited out before gaining national office under these proposals.

Finally, last but certainly not least, term limits are being pushed primarily for political reasons, not because they are needed or are good public policy. There is a great deal of hypocrisy, demagoguery and outright political posturing on this issue. Many elected officials pushing term limits are doing so just as a way to gain higher office. If an officeholder says he believes in a 6-year term limit, ask him if he will leave public office and never run for another public office after 6 years. If he really believed in term limits, he would return to the private sector and not just use advocacy of term limits as a way to gain higher office.

If you really want to see someone squirm, Mr. Speaker, ask your State legislator or any officeholder supporting term limits, will you limit yourself to 6 years in public office or are you just promoting this so you can run for higher office?

Mr. Speaker, I have been told that Mexico is the only Nation that presently has term limits for its national legislators. I do not think many people would hold Mexico up as the best example of good government for us to follow.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of this talk, term limits solve a problem that does not exist. We should let the voters decide, and not just arbitrarily limit their choices.

NINE PROPOSED RESCISSIONS RELATING TO BUDGET RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105–44)

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LATOURETTE] laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report nine proposed rescissions of budgetary resources, totaling $397 million, and one revised deferral, totaling $7 million.

The proposed rescissions affect the Departments of Agriculture, Defense-Military, Energy, Housing and Urban Development, and Justice, and the General Services Administration. The deferral affects the Social Security Administration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1997.*

REPORT ON CANADIAN WHALING ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105–45)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Resources and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On December 12, 1996, Secretary of Commerce Michael Kantor certified under section 8 of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967, as amended (the ''Pelly Amendment'') (22 U.S.C. 1978), that Canada has conducted whaling activities that diminish the effectiveness of a conservation program of the International Whaling Commission (IWC). The certification was based on the issuance of whaling licenses by the Government of Canada in 1996 and the subsequent killing of two bowhead whales under those licenses. This message constitutes my report to the Congress pursuant to subsection (b) of the Pelly Amendment.

In 1991, Canadian natives took a bowhead whale from the western Arctic stock, under a Canadian permit. In 1994, Canadian natives took another bowhead whale from one of the eastern Arctic stocks, without a permit.

In 1996, under Canadian permits, one bowhead whale was taken in the western Canadian Arctic on July 24 and one bowhead whale was taken in the eastern Canadian Arctic on August 17. The whale in the eastern Arctic was taken from a highly endangered stock. The IWC has expressed particular concern about whaling on this stock, which is not known to be recovering.

None of the Canadian whale hunts described above was authorized by the IWC. Canada withdrew from the IWC in 1982. In those instances where Canada issued whaling licenses, it did so without consulting the IWC. In fact, Canada's 1996 actions were directly contrary to IWC advice. At the 1996 Annual Meeting, the IWC passed a resolution encouraging Canada to refrain from issuing whaling licenses and to rejoin the IWC. However, Canada has recently advised the United States that it has no plans to rejoin the IWC and that it intends to continue granting licenses for the taking of endangered bowhead whales.

Canada's unilateral decision to authorize whaling outside of the IWC is unacceptable. Canada's conduct jeopardizes the international effort that has allowed whale stocks to begin to recover from the devastating effects of historic whaling.

I understand the importance of maintaining traditional native cultures, and I support aboriginal whaling that is managed through the IWC. The Canadian hunt, however, is problematic for two reasons.

First, the whaling took place outside the IWC. International law, as reflected in the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, obligates countries to work through the appropriate international organization for the conservation and management of whales. Second, whaling in the eastern Canadian Arctic poses a particular conservation risk, and the decision to take this risk should not have been made unilaterally.

I believe that Canadian whaling on endangered whales warrants action at this time.

Accordingly, I have instructed the Department of State to oppose Canadian efforts to address taking of marine mammals within the newly formed Arctic Council. I have further instructed the Department of State to oppose Canadian efforts to address trade in marine mammal products within the Arctic Council. These actions grow from our concern about

Canada's efforts to move whaling issues to fora other than the IWC and, more generally, about the taking of marine mammals in ways that are inconsistent with sound conservation practices.

Second, I have instructed the Department of Commerce, in implementing the Marine Mammal Protection Act, to withhold consideration of any Canadian requests for waivers to the existing moratorium on the importation of seals and/or seal products into the United States.

Finally, the United States will continue to urge Canada to reconsider its unilateral decision to authorize whaling on endangered stocks and to authorize whaling outside the IWC.

I believe the foregoing measures are more appropriate in addressing the problem of Canadian whaling than the imposition of import prohibitions at this time.

I have asked the Departments of Commerce and State to keep this situation under close review.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1997.*

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I come today to open a discussion and create a forum right here on the floor of the House on African-Americans. We are, in the month of February, proudly celebrating American life and history for African-Americans.

We come today to take this time to talk about the contributions of African-Americans, to talk about the struggle of African-Americans, to identify and to celebrate the many contributions that African-Americans have made to this country and this world.

Back in 1926, Dr. Carter G. Woodson, a Harvard Ph.D. who had 11 years earlier founded the Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History, initiated what was known as Negro History Week. It was Dr. Woodson's hope that through this very special observance, all Americans would be reminded of their ethnic roots, and a togetherness in U.S. racial groups would develop out of a mutual respect for all backgrounds.

Now we have expanded Negro History Week to Negro History Month, so the entire month of February you will see programs and activities all over America. You will see children in elementary schools identifying the contributions of African-Americans to this Nation. You will witness plays, you will see poems written, all kinds of activities basically focusing on the work, the life, the history, and the times of African-Americans.

□ 1530

I come today to share this time with the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus and others who would like to give their observations and to do their documenting of those events and those individuals who have been central and important to the development of African-Americans in this Nation.

It is with that that I will yield to the gentleman from Chicago, IL [Mr. DAVIS], one of our new Members in the House of Representatives, who has come today to share in this very special moment and to give his observations on the life and times of African-Americans in this Nation.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the United States of America is indeed a strong, vibrant, diverse, and great Nation. Much of its strength, character, and greatness stems from the fact that it is rich in diversity.

We are America, a nation that is made up of many different individuals and groups who have contributed significantly to its growth and development.

During the month of February, yes, we celebrate African-American or Black History Month, a period which we set aside to take special note and highlight the accomplishments and achievements of African-Americans who have excelled or made noteworthy contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I should take this opportunity to highlight some of the outstanding African-Americans who grew up in, lived, and/or worked in the district which I am proud to represent, the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois, one of the most diverse districts in the Nation. Downtown Chicago, Chinatown, the Gold Coast, the Magnificent Mile, housing developments like Cabrini, like Rockwell, Abla, the West Side of Chicago, home of the riots, suburban communities, Oak Park, Maywood, Bellwood, Broadview.

It became a focal point of the Negro Free Speech Movement in the 1890's. At that time it was home to one of the most famous black female journalists of all times, Ida B. Wells Barnett.

It was the last port of entry for African-Americans leaving the South in large numbers, migrating to the North, the Northeast, and the Midwest.

It has been a launching pad for many black firsts. The first black woman to receive an international pilot's license, Bessie Coleman, lived there. The world renowned chemist Dr. Percy B. Julian, the holder of 19 honorary doctorate degrees, an individual who helped to shape medical research procedures, lived there.

The famous black daily newspaper, the Chicago Daily Defender, was founded there by Robert Abbot with $25 and a typewriter at his kitchen table.

Johnson Publishing Co., Ebony, Jet, and other components of the business founded by Mr. John H. Johnson and now operated by his daughter, Ms. Linda Johnson Rice, operates in the Seventh District.

Parker House Sausage Co.'s president, Daryl Grisham, lived in the district. Oprah Winfrey, that everybody in America knows, operates out of the Seventh District. Marva Collins, founder of the Westside Prep School and Paul Adams, principal of Providence-St. Mel College Prep, two of the most successful educators in the country today, live and work in the district.

Earl Neal, one of the top attorneys in the Nation, lived and worked in the district. Jewel Lafentant-Mankarious, the first black woman to become Deputy Solicitor General of the United States of America, lived in the district.

The district has been home to the practice of Dr. Maurice Robb, one of the foremost ophthalmologists in the Nation. It has produced star athletes like Mark Aguirre, Isiah Thomas, Kevin Garnett, Daryl Stingley, Michael Finley, Glenn Rivers, Hershey Hawkins, Russell Maryland, Mickey Johnson, Otis Armstrong, and others.

Michael Jordan and Scottie Pippin have perfected their craft in the Seventh District. And when we see children playing in the James Jordan Boys and Girls Club, you see greatness at work. The renowned writer, producer, and actor, Robert Townsend, grew up in the district.

This inner city district has produced the likes of Jerry (Iceman) Butler, Ramsey Lewis, Tyrone Davis, Alvin Cash, Gene Chandler, the Brown Brothers, the Family Jubilee, Vernon Oliver Price, the Thompson Community Singers, Angela Spivey, and other great entertainers; nationally renowned African-American ministers like the Reverend Clay Evans, Bishop Louis Henry Ford, Rev. Harry McNelty, Rev. Wallace Sykes, Rev. Johnny Miller, Rev. Clarence Stowers, Rev. Charlie Murray, Rev. Jimmie Pettis, Rev. Albert Tyson, Rev. August Minor, and others all live in the district.

I have spoken of contemporaries. I have made a point to do so because so often when we talk about history, we forget about those individuals who are struggling each and every day in an effort to make history real. And so all of the individuals, the people who struggle on a daily basis, who work with our children, who work with our seniors, the chairpersons of local advisory counsels, of public housing units and public housing developments, all of these individuals are my heroes and sheroes. They are my heroes, Mr. Speaker, they are my heroes because they understand what Fred Douglass taught when he suggested that struggle, struggle, strife, and pain are the prerequisites for change. They understand that if there is no struggle, there is no progress. And so Black History Month reminds us that when we glory in the struggle, all of America can rejoice in the victory.

So, yes, African-Americans have indeed contributed and African-Americans have indeed made progress. But I

tell you, Mr. Speaker, we must continue to struggle to keep affirmative action alive. We must continue to struggle so that we can prevent redlining. We must struggle for equal protection, for help for the helpless and hope for the hopeless. We must struggle for a livable wage so that as individuals work, they can earn enough to take care of their basic needs.

So, yes, we have made great progress. And as James Weldon Johnson would say, Stony has been the road we have tred, bitter the chastening rod, felt in the days when hope unborn had died, but with a steady beat, have not our weary feet brought us to the place for which our fathers sighed.

Mr. Speaker, we have come over ways that with tears have been watered. We have come treading through the blood of the slaughtered, out from the gloomy past until now we stand at last where the white gleam of our bright star is cast.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that as we celebrate African-American history month, as we face the rising sun of our new day begun, I am confident that with the leadership of the gentlewoman from California, Ms. WATERS with the togetherness of the caucus and with the activation of Americans all over this land, as we face the rising sun of our new day begun, I am confident that we shall march on till the victory is won.

I thank so much the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, before moving onto our next presenter, I would like to again take a moment to thank our colleagues who are joining me in the House Chamber today. Again, I would like to reiterate, we gather to mark the congressional observance of Black History Month. I join my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle as we acknowledge the contributions of African-American men and women to the building and shaping of this great Nation. African-Americans have a history which is inextricably woven into the economic, social and political fabric of this Nation.

In 1926, the late Dr. Carter G. Woodson really understood that African-Americans were not receiving proper recognition in history for their contributions. To alleviate this, Dr. Woodson proposed setting aside one week during the month of February to commemorate the achievements of African-Americans. In 1976, the observance was changed to Black History Month. As we mark the 1997 observance of Black History Month, we do so with great appreciation to Dr. Woodson for his foresight and leadership.

The Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History, which Dr. Woodson founded, is responsible each year for establishing the theme for our Black History Month observance. This year the organization has selected as our theme African-Americans and civil rights, a reappraisal. This theme allows us to examine how far we have come in the struggle for civil rights. I am pleased to join my colleagues as we chart our progress and acknowledge the contributions of African-American men and women to the history of the struggle.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here as the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus. Traditionally, we have witnessed at this moment the presentation and the leadership of one of our great leaders in the Congressional Black Caucus. He is here with us today, and he has decided that he shall let us go forward and he will sit by and guide us, as we attempt to make this presentation today. It is my great pleasure to attempt to carry on in the fine tradition of our leader, Congressman STOKES, from the great State of Ohio.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, one of our new Members who will share with us her observations of black history.

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], Black Caucus chair, for organizing this special order and affording me this time to say a few words in recognition of Black History Month and the contributions that people of color have made to this Nation and to the world.

In keeping with this year's theme, African-Americans and civil rights, a reappraisal, I wanted to address reappraisal by especially highlighting and honoring the contributions of Virgin Islanders, the people from the district that I represent. We in the Virgin Islands are proud of our history. The revolt by African slaves on our smallest island of St. John in 1733 is one of the earliest successful revolutions in this hemisphere.

□ 1545

On St. Croix our own Moses Gottlieb Buddhoe, along with Anna Heegaard, were credited with playing a major role in bringing about our emancipation in 1848, more than 10 years before our sisters and brothers on the mainland. In 1878, three women, Queen Mary, Queen Agnes, and Queen Mathilda, continued the quest for civil rights and led a ''firebun'' revolt for fair wages. Later, in 1916, D. Hamilton Jackson and others continued the struggle for increased rights for Virgin Islanders, resulting in better working conditions and freedom of the press.

Many of our firsts have largely gone unrecognized. For example, we had the first black female president of a U.S. State legislature in Senator Ruby Margaret Rouss, and the first African-American woman to be a U.S. Attorney General in J'Ada Finch Sheen.

We look back with pride at our first elected Governor, Dr. Melvin H. Evans, the first African-American to be elected Governor under the U.S. flag. He was also a Member of Congress and a member of the Congressional Black Caucus from 1978 to 1980.

My father, Judge Almeric L. Christian, was our first native Federal District Court judge.

We have also shared our heroes and their contributions with our Nation at large.

Before the relationship between the United States and the Virgin Islands began in 1917, Virgin Islanders migrated to the United States for education, for economics or to join family and friends already located here.

Late in the 19th century and early in the 20th, renowned pan-Africanist Edward Wilmot Blyden, whose written works were a mainstay of African-American intellectuals, was born on St. Thomas. His contemporary, Hubert Henry Harrison, known as the Black Socrates, a native of St. Croix, was well-known for his soap box lectures in Harlem. His were some of the words that fueled the careers of many early workers for civil rights, including Marcus Garvey.

Frank R. Crosswaith, a native of Frederiksted, St. Croix, was an early crusader for the integration of Negro workers in the labor movement. His work channeled thousands of African-American workers into many unions, including those in the AFL-CIO.

It was a Crucian mother who gave us Arthur Schomburg, who collected and preserved many important works by African-Americans during the Harlem Renaissance; and it was St. Thomas that produced the ''Harlem Fox,'' J. Raymond Jones, widely known for his rise through and contributions to the New York City political establishment in the first half of this century.

There are many more, such as Roy Innis of St. Croix, national chairman of the Congress of Racial Equality; and others too numerous to mention who served in the movement in the '40's, '50's, '60's, '70's and even today as students, as marchers, workers, and as other average everyday Americans who made their contributions to the furtherance of civil rights.

It is important for us to recognize that the history of African-Americans is still being written by our hands. As we celebrate this month, we acknowledge that there is still much to be written. And let it be written that we extended health care to everyone; that we educated our children well and kept them safe; and that we rid our communities of drugs.

As we owe this to our forbearers and to those who we now nurture, let it also be written that we saw to it that the celebration of our history, which was once compressed into 1 month, was finally woven into the fabric of everyday American life.

We in the Congressional Black Caucus consider it our solemn duty to keep this history, our history, alive, hopeful and full of the greatness that is deserving of our people.

I thank the gentlewoman for the opportunity to say these few words.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for this time. I want to express my sincerest thanks for my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio, Representative LOUIS STOKES, and the gentlewoman from California, MAXINE WATERS, for giving me the opportunity to participate in this special order commemorating Black History Month. The trials and tribulations of the African-American people stand as a needed reminder of America's past and the promise of our future as a Nation. And while the days of slavery and social segregation are over, our country continues to face challenges engendered by racism and ignorance.

People from the Territories, the people of Guam, can certainly relate to this disenfranchisement and discrimination when it comes to the level of participation that we are granted within our own Federal system. We do not have complete representation in the House of Representatives, we do not have any representation in the Senate and we do not even vote for the President.

Many years ago Joshua Fishman, the noted linguist, in writing about ethnic relations in America, stated that other minorities in the 1960's got the black disease. By implication this disease was the affliction nonblack minorities contracted after black Americans became conscious of their roots and justifiably defiant in their pride about their origins and their many contributions to American society.

I am proud to say that I was afflicted with this so-called disease in the 1960's, and that the efforts to raise awareness about black Americans not only brought into appropriate line the perceptions and the understandings of black Americans in American society but certainly opened the society to issues surrounding other minorities in this country.

In the context of American history, black heroes and she-roes, to borrow a term from an earlier Speaker, are everyone's property. We all share and we all take inspiration in and we are all motivated by the statements and the actions of a Frederick Douglass, a Malcolm X, a Martin Luther King, a Barbara Tubman or even a MAXINE WATERS.

I know this from my own personal growth as an individual from a faraway island that has not been fully recognized for its contributions and relationship to this Nation. And I know this from my own intellectual growth and the efforts of my people in struggling with the issues of identity and participation and citizenship, in its battle with discrimination, racism and ignorance.

We have much to be grateful for in the commemoration of Black History Month. All of us, black and white and all the colors, which make up the fabric of our great social and political experiment which we label the United States.

And we must be ever mindful of the fact that Black History Month is more than the celebration of individuals who did well. It is the commemoration of a people's struggle to be great despite all of the odds laid before them. I take pride in that struggle, and the people of Guam, I think, continue to be inspired by it.

I cannot emphasize strongly enough how much the civil rights movement benefitted all other minority groups in the United States. And for the people of Guam this meant a push for more self-government and a demand for the resolution of injustices that have occurred throughout the past.

We on Guam also want to celebrate Black History Month with our small but vibrant black community. Several long-time black Guamanians have influenced the community in very special ways.

Fred Jackson of Mangilao is a pioneer businessman on the island, having opened the first black-owned business on Guam in the 1970's. His wife, Dr. Marilyn Jackson, is a respected educator, having taught in many of the island's public schools. And Mrs. Claudette McGhee is yet another pioneer, having been one of the first equal employment opportunity counselors on the island. I also want to finally draw attention to the first black Guamanian Attorney General in the government of Guam, Calvin Halloway, a long-time island resident and good personal friend.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great day when the entire Nation recognizes the achievements and influence of black communities and individual African-Americans throughout the United States of America. I hope that our efforts in educating the public into embracing equality and basic civil liberties will provide a base upon which we will eventually triumph in our battle against racism and its accompanying politics of division and destruction.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and I yield to the gentleman from the State of Georgia, the Honorable JOHN LEWIS.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from California, MAXINE WATERS, for yielding me this time and for calling this special order, along with the gentleman from Ohio, LOU STOKES.

I want to thank MAXINE WATERS, our colleague, the new chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus, for her leadership, for her vision, for bringing to the caucus a sense of vigor and vitality.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be here today to celebrate Black History Month; to talk about the civil rights movement and all that it has accomplished. Thirty-two years ago blacks in the South could not vote. I could not vote. Blacks were not allowed in the same restaurant as whites, the same hotels as whites. Blacks were not even allowed to drink from the same water fountain as whites.

Growing up in rural Alabama, in the heart of the black belt, I grew up surrounded by the signs that divided our world: white waiting, colored waiting; white men, colored men; white women, colored women.

In the 1960's, during the movement, all of this changed. People from all across our country, men and women, young and old, black and white, red, yellow and brown, came to the South. They came to change the world and they succeeded. We succeeded. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 changed our country. It changed our world. It is a better place. It is a more inclusive place.

So it pains me today to hear people attack these laws. It pains me to hear politicians say that these laws have done more to divide our country than to unite it. These people do not know what they are saying. They do not know how far we have come.

To those who say these laws do not work, I say ''Walk in my shoes.'' I have seen the progress. I have seen us grow as a Nation and as a people. I have seen a poor black man, denied the right to vote, become a Member of Congress because of these laws.

It is not the laws that divide, it is people who divide. It is politicians playing the race card to win votes. It is politicians who attack any solution to the racism that still exists in our society. It is people who ignore the racism and attack those who offer solutions and work to overcome the racism that is still with us.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have made great progress as a Nation and as a people. The Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act have made us equal under the law, but we are still not equal. The scars and stain of racism still plague our society.

We must speak up against those who see the world as rich against poor, black against white, us against them. We have heard the political speeches, seen the political ads. They fan the flames of racism, the racism that burned dozens of black churches to the ground last year.

My colleagues, thanks to the civil rights movement, we are all equal under the law. We have come a long way toward being in a country where all men and women are created equal. We have come so far because of the movement, because of the laws, not in spite of them.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for us to speak openly about race. We must redirect the priorities of our Nation. We must use our resources not to divide but to bring together, not to tear down but to uplift, not to oppress but to set free.

We, every one of us, have a moral obligation, a mission and a mandate from the spirit of history, from our fallen martyrs, Martin Luther King, Jr., Medgar Evers, James Chaney, Andy Goodman and Mickey Schwerner. We

have an obligation to work for hope and opportunity for all, to build upon the civil rights movement, to build upon its legacy which has brought us here today.

Yes, Ms. WATERS, as I said earlier, we are a better nation, a better people because of the civil rights movement.

□ 1600

We are in the process of laying down the burden of race, but we must do more. We must continue to fight injustice wherever it rears its ugly head. And we must continue to dialogue between all men and women of good will. I thank the gentlewoman again for holding this special order.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am overwhelmed by the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] and those of all of our other colleagues who have spoken in tribute to Black History Month. I want to thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] for having this special order, more importantly for her incredible leadership on issues of concern to our country, which as our colleague says, in promoting civil rights and equal justice and equal economic opportunity, helps make our country grow. So I thank you for that, MAXINE, and to Mr. LEWIS, and I am tempted to call him chairman, I hope I will again, LOU STOKES from Ohio for his great leadership over so many years in this Congress and in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today joining these distinguished leaders and many others in the room to celebrate Black History Month and the history of the civil rights struggle by remembering the life of a man who dedicated his life to peace and civil rights, Dr. Carlton Goodlett, physician, civil rights activist, newspaper publisher, champion of world peace and San Franciscoan. Dr. Goodlett, who was 82 when he passed away just this January 25, established his medical practice in San Francisco in 1945 and also became an aggressive civil rights advocate. He would associate himself with that characterization of aggressive.

His role as president of the local branch of the NAACP represented the start of a long and fruitful public service. Dr. Goodlett denounced police brutality, demanded improvements in public housing, exposed the exclusion of Jews and African-Americans from the draft boards in San Francisco and often single-handedly demonstrated against restaurants that refused to serve people of color.

In 1948, Dr. Goodlett joined with a partner to purchase The Reporter, a community weekly newspaper which then overtook its competitor to become the Sun Reporter. Perhaps you have heard of it. It is a very famous newspaper in our area. Under Dr. Goodlett's stewardship, the Sun Reporter became the main African-American newspaper in northern California. Anybody who wanted to be involved in politics in our area had to go see Dr. Goodlett, and he always, if not his endorsement, always gave very good advice.

Dr. Goodlett juggled many activities and passions but never dropped a ball. In addition to his achievements in medicine, publishing and civil rights activism, he also placed himself directly at the forefront of liberal causes with his activity in the Democratic Party. Are we allowed to say the Democratic Party on the floor of the House? Is that partisan?

In 1950 he joined with my predecessor, the great Representative Phillip Burton, in founding the San Francisco Young Democrats. He put his heart into supporting the campaigns of candidates he believed in, like Phillip Burton, John Burton and Willie Brown, our current mayor of San Francisco.

On Friday, we all participated in Dr. Goodlett's memorial service. Three generations at least of Californians and Americans were present there. It was a joy to see the elderly join with the young people and talk about how they had received hope from Dr. Goodlett. They joined our distinguished colleague, Congressman DELLUMS, who gave the eulogy and summed it up with his usual eloquence when he stated, ''Carlton had zero tolerance for injustice * * * And he helped me understand that I am not only a citizen of the Bay Area or the United States. I was a citizen of the world. Now, I look and wonder, where are the new Carltons? Who will rise to take his place?''

Dr. Goodlett's presence was deeply felt. His absence will be felt equally. He was a man who did many things, all of them well. As we celebrate Black History Month, we need look no further for inspiration than Dr. Carlton Goodlett. He was a renaissance man who mobilized the intellectual resources of his area to fight for civil rights. He was a healer, a mentor, a courageous leader, an activist and advocate and truly a citizen of the world. As the world will mourn his loss, we must remember that he is an inspiration to us all.

He was famous in our area. We have other inspirations, maybe not so famous in their own right. One of them that I would like to recognize today is Louise Stokes, mother of her namesake LOUIS STOKES, because she must have been a very remarkable woman. I have heard our colleague LOU STOKES talk about his mother with great pride and affection, but we know how great she must have been to have produced such a magnificent son, Congressman, chairman and another son Carl Stokes, mayor, judge and ambassador, representing our great country abroad. Carl had passed away within the last year and it was a tremendous loss again to all of us, but Louise Stokes is as much an inspiration and as much a leader in the fight for civil rights and justice in our country because of her role as mother in the civil rights movement.

I mentioned that Carlton Goodlett was a leader in the NAACP, and I was so pleased to see our former colleague Kweisi Mfume, the president of the NAACP now, here in the Chamber this afternoon. He indeed is also another answer to the question, who will take Carlton's place.

As we look around and see our colleagues serving in this House from the African-American community, we can be encouraged that the future is bright and, as our colleague Mr. LEWIS so eloquently said, that you will all help to grow our great Nation.

With that, I once again want to commend Congressman WATERS not only for calling this special order but for your leadership, most recently your speech that you made that was on TV at least three times yesterday talking about our budget priorities in our country and providing the kind of leadership that we truly will need so that the hope and the dream of hope will be kept alive for all Americans, regardless of color. Thank you for allowing me to be part of this special order.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentlewoman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding, and I thank her for her leadership in drawing us together and following and lifting up both the par excellence leadership of my friend and colleague, the honorable LOU STOKES. I hope he will allow me to do so inasmuch as it gives me a boost up in terms of youth, but I know he will challenge that, that I had the privilege to be tutored by him as a member of the congressional staff of which he was a leader on the Select Committee on Assassinations. So a long time I had the opportunity to watch this gentle giant move in the U.S. Congress.

This is a special day, and, Congresswoman WATERS, as I indicated, I am gratified to join my colleagues for this important occasion to commemorate black history, African-American history, to raise it up, not only as a history of a people of which I certainly am a part of, but to raise it up as a commemoration that should be part of the entire United States of America.

I am honored to have this opportunity to speak to the American public during this time that we have set aside to celebrate the enormous accomplishments of African-Americans in the United States. I must say that 2 minutes do not do justice to the enormous contribution given to our Nation by African-Americans, but I am gratified of the kindness of the gentlewoman to allow us to spill over.

I am thrilled to stand here on the floor of the House as an American and as an African-American Member of Congress. I am able to stand today, Mr. Speaker, because other brave African-

Americans stood boldly before me. That is one of the challenges that I offer this afternoon, as the theme becomes a reappraisal to not forget from whence we have come, to never forget that no matter what party you are in, no matter how you may have thought you have achieved, you could not have achieved without the blood and sweat and tears of those who marched before us.

The theme, as I have said, is a reappraisal of the civil rights movement. I want to use my time to herald the accomplishments and contributions of African-American men and women in all facets of our Nation's history.

I can think of no better time than now to let the American people know that it was 126 years ago that the first speech ever delivered by an African-American Representative on the floor of the House of Representatives was given by Jefferson Franklin Long of Georgia on February 1, 1871. He also had the unique distinction of being the first black Congressperson elected from Georgia.

Representative Long probably did not know that in February, 126 years later, we would be informing the American people of his name in honor of his novel achievement. One can only imagine the pride of this former slave as he stood to deliver his speech to his fellow Members of Congress. When he stood he spoke for black people all across America. How proud they were in this period of reconstruction after the Emancipation Proclamation to have someone speak for them.

The subject of his speech centered on his opposition to an alteration of the oath of office for former Confederates who sought to have their political rights restored. Congressman Jefferson Franklin Long set the stage for African-Americans to take their rightful place here on the floor of the House of Representatives, to proclaim to the world their concerns for themselves and the good of the American public.

The voice of Jefferson Franklin Long of Georgia will resound throughout this Chamber for as long as this Chamber exists. It will be a challenge to each and every one of us to recognize that we must never forget from whence we have come. We must always speak for the people that we represent, even though it may be a hard and difficult position to be in. Those who follow in his footsteps continue the spirit of his first breath here on the floor of the House of Representatives. We in spirit echo his voice.

As I take my place here on the floor of the battlefield of democracy to debate the pressing issues that affect every American, I am reminded of the courage that it took for Congressman Long to be the first African-American to speak on this floor. In part it was his courage that today gives me courage to speak on the floor today.

As a female African-American in Congress, I must pause and pay tribute to the African-American woman in whose giant footsteps I now follow. The Halls of Congress were once graced with the presence of Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, who was an African-American woman of many firsts: The first Representative of the then newly created 11th State Senatorial District in Texas, the first African-American to be elected to the Texas Senate since 1883, the first African-American woman ever to be elected to the Texas Senate, the first African-American to serve as the Speaker pro tem of the Texas Senate, the first African-American to serve as Governor for a day in Texas, and the first African-American of the then newly created 18th Congressional District.

As I come to a close, let me point now to the pride that I have in the 18th Congressional District, in Houston, and the State of Texas. First of all we practice and celebrate Juneteenth. That means that yes, we learned of our freedom some 2 years later, but now we have come of age and no one bows their head about celebrating Juneteenth. We are proud to be able to say we learned our freedom in 1865, but we have never, never looked back.

In keeping with the mind of that spirit, let me salute these organizations that have brought about young people and given them the self-esteem that allowed them never to forget their history: The Martin Luther King Center in the 18th Congressional District; Shake Community Center in the 18th Congressional District; the PABA that works with young men who, yes, they want to put on a boxing glove and not put a knife in their hand; and the NAACP, whose first secretary was Christie Adair, a strong and valiant woman; and the Akers Home Citizens Chamber of Commerce that brings about individuals in the Akers Home and all over the city who are interested in economic development.

Certainly let me say that the President called us to challenge education and to have that to be the clarion call. Here is my reappraisal of the civil rights movement as we go forward. It is to challenge African-Americans to remember that now we must do a lot of this ourselves, not go it alone but do a lot of this ourselves.

As endowments are being created all over this Nation by the likes of Texas A&M, Harvard, and Yale, where are we with supporting our educational institutions? I call upon you today to recognize that each of us must support our traditionally black colleges. Why not give $1,000 a year to some college that you support? Why not recognize that in this time of reappraisal we must stand up to the call, we must support education, we must ensure that our young people have the opportunity. Where are you? I hope you are listening.

Finally, as I said, I am glad to join Congresswoman WATERS to be assured that we celebrate black history in a manner that it should be, recognition, commemoration, celebration but also a reassessment and an acceptance of the challenge that we must stand up to the bar. I come to renew my commitment to say that I will not allow institutions to fall, I will support them in the future, and certainly most of all I will be a supporter of our traditionally black colleges and ask all America to support me as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have this opportunity to speak to the American public during this time that we have set aside to celebrate the enormous accomplishments of African-Americans in the United States. I must say that 2 minutes do not do justice to the enormous contributions given to our Nation by African-Americans.

I am thrilled to stand here on the House floor as an American and as an African-American Member of Congress. I am able to stand today, Mr. Speaker, because other brave African-Americans stood boldly before me.

The theme of this years celebration of black history month is African-Americans and Civil Rights: A Reappraisal.

I want to use my time to herald the accomplishments and contributions of African-American men and women in all facets of our Nation's history.

I can think of no better time than now to let the American people know that it was 126 years ago, that the first speech ever delivered by an African-American Representative on the floor of the House of Representatives was given by Jefferson Franklin Long of Georgia on February 1, 1871.

He also had the unique distinction of being the first black Congressman elected from Georgia.

Representative Long probably did not know that in February, 126 years later, we would be informing the American people of his name in honor of his novel achievement.

One can only imagine the pride of this former slave as he stood to deliver his speech to his fellow Members of Congress. When he stood, he spoke for black people all across America.

The subject of his speech centered on his opposition to an alteration of the oath of office for former confederates who sought to have their political rights restored.

Congressman Jefferson Franklin Long set the stage for African-Americans to take their rightful place here on the floor of the House of Representatives to proclaim to the world their concerns for themselves and the good of the American public.

The voice of Jefferson Franklin Long of Georgia will resound throughout this Chamber for as long as this Chamber exists. Those who follow in his footsteps continue the spirit of his first breath here on the floor of the House of Representatives. We, in spirit echo his voice.

As I take my place here on the floor of the battlefield of democracy to debate the pressing issues that affect every American, I am reminded of the courage that it took for Congressman Long to be the first African-American to speak on this floor.

In part, it was his courage that today, gives me courage to speak on the floor today.

As a female African-American in Congress, I must pause and pay tribute to the African-American woman in whose giant footsteps I now walk.

The Halls of Congress were once graced with the presence of Congresswoman Barbara Jordan who was an African-American woman of many firsts:

The first Representative of the then newly created 11th State Senatorial District in Texas;

The first African-American to be elected to the Texas State senate since 1883;

The first African-American woman ever to be elected to the Texas State senate;

The first African-American to serve as the Speaker pro tempore of the Texas Senate;

The first African-American to serve as Governor for a day in Texas; and

The first Representative of the then newly created 18th Congressional District.

This month in which we celebrate black history, let us remember the awesomeness of those that have come before us and renew our commitment to build on their strong foundation on which we stand.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, in light of the reality that this special order will shortly be coming to an end and with the knowledge that before this month will have concluded, I will have had three special orders through which I will specifically address issues of concern to black history.

While there are those of us who would suggest that the civil rights movement, and it was a crucible in our history, our history in this Nation dating from 1619, and every facet of American life during these special orders will be explored.

□ 1615

The first of these special orders, Mr. Speaker, will be this coming Thursday, and it will be an indepth look at our criminal justice system and the role which African-Americans have played. I have entitled this particular special order O.J. and Race Entertainment. But I want to take just a minute or so, and a minute is about all that I will need, to pay homage to a particular Member of Congress who finds himself sitting in the House Chamber on this occasion.

I was born, as a matter of African-American history, on March 11, 1965. On March 7, 1965, in our history it is known as bloody Sunday. It is the Sunday that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], Martin Luther King, Jr., and Jesse Jackson and many others in our history walked across the Edmond Pettis Bridge for the right to vote. Because of the struggle that they engaged in in 1965, I now stand here as the 91st African-American to ever have the privilege of serving in the U.S. Congress. The gentlewoman from California [Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD] has the privilege of being the 92d, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CUMMINGS], the 93d.

Because of a struggle that our foreparents engaged in, it made it possible for us to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives to represent disenfranchised and locked-out groups, whether they are African-American or whether they are white or Asian-American or Anglo-American. So, while we will reflect upon the contribution of those who have come before us to make it possible for us to serve, each and every one of us as African-Americans in this institution.

Mr. Speaker, as women in this institution, as Asian-Americans and Latino-Americans in this institution, we owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] and others who made it possible for us to serve.

And so these are some of the contexts that we will place over the course of this month as we look at our history and as we look at the racial debate in our country, as we move from O.J. Simpson to race entertainment and what race entertainment has really done and taken us off of the course of civil rights and fairness for all Americans. I am particularly honored on this occasion to thank Congressman LEWIS for making it possible for me to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. You know, as a former South African, I have seen great history made, history made by people who refuse to bow down to the horrors of apartheid, and with many of my colleagues in 1994 in Pretoria, South Africa, we saw the wonder of President Mandela taking the oath of office of President of South Africa; finally, a just South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, history is made by people, by individual people, black history is made by black people, black individuals, and I want to speak today of one of those individuals who makes history every day in my community. Her name is Ruby Haughton. Ruby was the first African-American to be named vice president of a large bank in Oregon, the U.S. Bank. This position would be consuming enough to fill any life, but for Ruby it is just a start. She is a national figure in the fight against diabetes. Her passion for a cure and better treatment for this devastating disease is fueled by her love and admiration for her mother who suffers from diabetes. I understand that passion, as my beloved daughter Amanda suffers with diabetes.

Ruby Haughton has been named to the prestigious National Institutes of Health, the board that oversees grants for diabetes research. She chairs the cultural diversity committee of the American Diabetes Association. Ruby is a member of the Urban League of Portland, the NAACP Portland branch and serves on the United Negro College Fund advisory board of directors.

Ruby Haughton is a role model. Her two sons have been guided by her passion for justice, community service, and personal responsibility. But Ruby's influence must not just touch those who know her, she is far too valuable. She deserves to be recognized for her accomplishments so that all, all of our sons and daughters, can learn from her dedication. She is talented, beautiful, humorous, deeply spiritual, unyielding in her commitment to public service, and unlike so many who are quick to criticize, to judge others, Ruby has neither the time nor the interest in pointing her finger at people. She is too busy extending her hand to help them.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to count myself as a friend of this great lady.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. To my esteemed chairwoman and to my good colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], we owe both of you a debt of gratitude for giving us this opportunity. I want to thank you, and I want to thank everyone in this great country of ours, especially black Americans who helped to build this country and are now waiting and hoping that justice and freedom will come to everyone.

Certainly the history of people of African descent is interwoven, Mr. Speaker, with the history of America. Since the first Americans arrived on what is now American soil, black Americans have played an important part in the development of this great Nation.

I want to limit my remarks this afternoon to selective passages from historic speeches from black Americans, and I have chosen quite a few. I will mention them to you, but because of time constraints I will only quote two or three of them.

First is a Congressman, Robert B. Elliott, who came to this Congress, Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, Frederick Douglass, Malcolm X, and the Reverend Jesse Jackson. They are some of my heroes; I have many of them, but they are included, and I want to, as I stand here this afternoon, think about Congressman Robert Elliott. He was one of the 22 African-Americans to serve in Congress during Reconstruction.

His last term in Congress was highlighted by his eloquent support of a civil rights bill designed to secure equality for and prohibit discrimination against African-Americans in all public places. This is what Congressman Elliott said, and I can imagine that each of us could perhaps give this speech now, and I quote him:

> I regret at this day it is necessary that I should rise in the presence of an American Congress to advocate a bill which simply asserts equal rights and equal public privileges for all classes of American citizens. I regret, sir, that the dark hue of my skin may lend a color to the imputation that I am controlled by motives personal to myself in my advocacy of this great measure of national justice. Sir, the motive that impels me is restricted by no such narrow boundary but is as broad as your Constitution. I advocate it because it is right. The bill, however, not only appeals to your sense of justice, but it demands a sense of response from your attitude.

In the end, after a long and very passionate speech, Congressman Elliott's bill was defeated, but he stands in my

memory today as fighting the same fight that we are trying to fight here.

And I mention Shirley Chisholm. You know her very well. She is still alive. Those of you who are as old as I am call her ''Fighting Shirley,'' but now she is in Florida. She worked very hard for Head Start. Well, Shirley Chisholm was a great heroine, and she still is. I will not quote from any of her speeches because of time constraints, but I do want you to know that Congresswoman Chisholm went on to really chastise the Congress to say, it was Calvin Coolidge, I believe, who said that the business of America is business, and she went on to sort of challenge them for spending so much money on things that certainly were not for the benefit of the social significance of black Americans.

And of course I choose Frederick Douglass as well. Most of you know the work of Frederick Douglass who was an abolitionist, but he contributed a lot because he was very active politically in the fight for justice in America. A very intelligent man, he called upon America to make the Constitution its mandate in making its righteous laws. And Frederick Douglass said:

> If liberty, with us, is yet but a name, our citizenship is but a sham, and our suffrage thus far only a cruel mockery, we may yet congratulate ourselves upon the fact, that the laws and institutions of the country are sound, just and liberal. There is hope for a people when their laws are righteous.

Frederick Douglass went on to say:

> Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow.
>
> That is why we are all here today. We do not believe, as we are often told, that we are the ugly child of a national family, and the more we are kept out of sight the better it will be. You know that liberty given is never as precious as liberty fought.

My next hero is Malcolm X. It is shown Malcolm was another great black voice. He was a strong leader with a very revolutionary cause, and in his December 31, 1964, speech to a delegation of Mississippi youth Malcolm encouraged these young African-Americans to think for themselves, to recognize their enemies, and to be assured that they were not standing alone.

And Brother Malcolm said, one of the first things I think young people, especially nowadays, should learn is how to see for yourself and listen for yourself and think for yourself. And he went on with this elegance to the end of a farewell and constructive speech.

My last hero as I move along, and I am not forgetting Martin Luther King or any of the greats, but I choose Rev. Jesse Jackson. I am a great advocate and a great lover of Rev. Jesse Jackson because he is a world famous Baptist minister, civil rights activist, and political leader. I followed him from his first time in politics as he ran for the President of this country. Reverend Jackson said:

> We must continue to dream, but the dream of 1963 must be expanded to meet the realities of these times.

Incidentally, the Reverend Jackson told me that our chairwoman, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], had a lot of input in his speech for that particular convention.

We must dream new dreams, according to Jesse, expand the horizons of our dreams and remove any ceiling or barrier that would limit our legitimate aspirations. Democracy at its best provides a floor for everyone but imposes limits upon no one. The sky is the limit. Let us continue to dream.

Reverend Jackson went on to say, 20 years ago we came to this hallowed ground of the Lincoln Memorial as a rainbow coalition to demand our freedom. Twenty years later, we have our freedom, our civil rights. On our way to Washington today we did not have to stop at a friend's house or a church to eat or use the bathroom. Apartheid is over. But 20 years later, we still do not have equality. We have moved in. Now we must move up.

I was fortunate enough to have participated with Reverend Jackson at that time.

Twenty years ago, he said, we were stripped of our dignity. Twenty years later we are stripped of our share of power. The absence of segregation is not the presence of social justice or equality.

And that is the end of Reverend Jackson's quote.

I am privileged to be here to thank you and Mr. STOKES for holding this special order so we can share with America the richness of our heritage and the richness of our history.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mr. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this year as we observe Black History Month we should reflect on the all-out attack that has occurred on civil rights, voting rights, and affirmative action programs. We need to renew our commitment to progress on these political fronts. We have witnessed the Hopwood case in Texas, the attack on affirmative action, as well as a number of majority-minority districts being found unconstitutional and ordered to be redrawn by State legislatures. This happened in my district, the Third Congressional District of Florida, as well as districts represented by Representative SANFORD BISHOP, Representative CYNTHIA MCKINNEY, Representative EVA CLAYTON, Representative MELVIN WATT, and just late last week Representative BOBBY SCOTT, Representative SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, and Representative EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON. To say the least, the past 2 years have indeed been hostile.

I, and others, would not have the privilege of serving in Washington today, if it were not for the courage and sacrifice of those great leaders who led the way. The progress we, as a race, have made could not have occurred without the groundwork having been laid by great African-Americans like former Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, educator Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune, tennis great Arthur Ashe, poet Zora Neale Hurston, Gwen Cherry, Mary Singleton, and James Weldon Johnson, composer of the Negro National Anthem.

Let me share with you a little information about Florida's first Member of Congress. In 1879, Josiah Wells was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from Gainesville, but his 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 term 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 in the South between 1870 and 1901. Following 1901, Jim Crow tightened his grip and it took over for 70 years before another black person would be elected to Congress in the South.

For the first 100 years of American's history, African-Americans did not have the right to vote because they were enslaved. Eventually the Constitution was amended to change the status of blacks from three-fifths of a person to a whole person. Following the Civil War, some African-Americans were able to exercise their right to vote but this lasted for only a brief time. After Reconstruction, things actually worsened and Jim Crow ruled the South. The civil rights movement exploded because African-Americans were fed up with living as second-class citizens in America, ''home of democracy.''

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and numerous others, sacrificed their lives to have the Voting Rights Act passed into law in 1965. It has, however, taken almost 30 years to implement in the South. The initial reason majority-minority districts were redrawn was because of a long history of violations of the Voting Rights Act.

Following the 1996 congressional elections, many journalists reported that the fact that myself, CYNTHIA MCKINNEY, EVA CLAYTON, MELVIN WATT, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, and SANFORD BISHOP won reelection proved that blacks no longer needed majority-minority districts to be elected to Congress. Therefore, as majority-minority districts continue to be challenged, it is important that we not lose sight of the fact that had it not been for the creation of majority-minority districts through voting rights remedies, it is very likely that many Members of the freshman class of 1992 would not have been elected. Keep in mind it took 120 years before Florida elected another African-American to Congress.

As African-Americans continue to make progress in education, business, and government, there will continue to be attacks. It is important that we continue to press ahead because there are still people who would like to turn back the hands of time and return African-Americans to the back of the political bus. Congress now more closely resembles America than it has in the past.

Furthermore, it is important that African-Americans continue to fight for their right to vote for a candidate of their choice, civil rights, and for affirmative action programs that help promote diversity in the workplace. It is important that we continue to support affirmative action programs because they give qualified minorities and women the opportunity to work in professions they, historically, had not been represented in. While we have made gains, there is still a long way to go.

As we approach the new millennium, it is crucial that young African-American children are prepared and able to walk across that bridge to the 21st century.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great enthusiasm to join in this special order to observe and celebrate Black History Month. Black History Month provides Americans with an important opportunity to educate ourselves and our children about the many important contributions that African-Americans have made to our country. The annual observation of Black History Month should also remind us that the legacy of America's greatest tragedy—more than 300 years of slavery and the racial discrimination that was used to justify it—remains with us and must continue to be addressed.

I want to thank Representatives LOUIS STOKES and MAXINE WATERS for organizing this special order today. This special order has become an annual event. It allows Members of Congress to pay tribute to the many African-Americans who have had prominent roles in our country's history. It allows us to recognize, understand, and appreciate the unique nature of the African-American experience in our history. And it allows us to celebrate African-American accomplishments in the arts, sciences, education, business, and politics that have made our country immeasurably richer and more diverse.

Black History Month was the creation of Dr. Carter G. Woodson, a noted African-American historian and educator. Dr. Woodson established the Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History in 1915 to encourage greater appreciation for the many contributions that African-Americans have made to this country. Dr. Woodson subsequently created Negro History Week as a vehicle for advancing this goal, and this event, which has evolved into Black History Month, has been observed annually since its inception in 1926. Each year the Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History selects a common issue or theme for consideration during Black History Month.

This year, the association has chosen ''African Americans and Civil Rights: A Reappraisal'' as its theme. I think that the association has chosen a most timely and important topic. The history of the United States can perhaps best be interpreted as the history of a people's long and often painful struggle to provide the greatest possible experience of civil rights to the largest majority of its citizens. In our pursuit of a more perfect union, we have repeatedly had to broaden the eligibility for membership in that union and to define more perfectly the rights that accrue to its members. A serious reappraisal of our current civil rights policies requires that we look at where we started and how far we have come as well as what we may need to do in the future. I will attempt to provide my own evaluation of the civil rights struggle here today.

While the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights represented a remarkable advance in democratic self-government—the likes of which the world had never seen before—the society that the early Republic erected around them had a number of major shortcomings. The most glaring and horrifying of these shortcomings was of course slavery.

The next major expansion in civil rights came as a result of the Civil War—slavery was abolished by the 13th amendment, and the 14th amendment to the Constitution was ratified in an attempt to guarantee African-Americans the rights of full citizenship. These constitutional changes, significant and well-intentioned though they were, failed in the end to deliver on their promote of equal rights for all Americans. Despite the temporary gains achieved during the Reconstruction period, African-Americans continued to suffer the ill effects of discrimination, segregation, political disenfranchisement, and—in many parts of the country—outright violence. African-Americans were consistently and systematically denied their civil rights for another 100 years after the abolition of slavery.

World War II marked the beginning of the modern struggle to deliver on the promise of equal rights for African-Americans. In the Civil War, African-Americans had served in large numbers in the Union Army in order to prove their merit and buttress their demands for equality. After some initial and temporary successes, their hopes were dashed. Eighty years later, their descendants still faced discrimination and segregation in the Armed Forces as the United States fought to preserve our own imperfect freedom. Conscious of this glaring inconsistency, the Pentagon began desegregating the military on a trial basis during the war, and President Truman ordered that the Armed Forces be desegregated in 1948.

After the war, the NAACP began an effort to expand civil rights for African-Americans through a series of court challenges. This strategy proved extremely successful in expanding educational and residential opportunities for African-Americans. At the same time, African-Americans brought their civil rights struggle to the attention of the rest of America by directly confronting many of the existing Jim Crow laws. African-American leaders contrasted the accomplishments of African-American servicemen during the war with the discrimination that they still faced at home. Other brave African-Americans risked arrest, imprisonment, and physical violence to challenge such laws. Rosa Parks refusal to abide by such laws in 1955 led to the Montgomery, AL, bus boycott—the first mass protest by blacks in the South. In subsequent years, sit-ins, boycotts, and freedom rides provided important tools for illustrating the need for new civil rights laws.

As the civil rights movement grew and became more successful in the early 1960's, many white Americans began to reconsider their own attitudes about race. Many concluded that Federal action was necessary. As a result of the civil rights movement—and after lengthy and often acrimonious debate—Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibited racial discrimination and called for equal opportunity in employment and education, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which banned poll taxes and provided Federal supervision of voter registration and elections in places where African-Americans had previously been denied the right to vote. In 1968, Congress passed the Fair Housing Act at the President's request. This legislation prohibited racial discrimination in the sale and rental of housing. These three bills effectively abolished most State and local laws that supported discrimination and segregation.

The experience of these previous generations, however, has affected the current generation as well-decades of discrimination have left many African-Americans today convinced that many opportunities are still denied to them. This perception is not without justification. The long history of racial discrimination in this country has also produced a situation today where many African-Americans start life with fewer resources and further to go than many equally capable white Americans. It seems inconceivable to me that we could step back today and say seriously say that racism and discrimination have been eliminated from our society. While the legal foundation of discrimination and segregation has been obliterated, racism and discrimination—as well as the legacy of generations of racism and discrimination—are still pervasive in our society. African-Americans still face civil rights problems like discrimination, police abuse, and an unreliable system of justice. Consequently, the civil rights struggle must go on. And we still need affirmative action. I thank Representatives STOKES and WATERS and the Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History for providing us with a forum and a stimulus for discussing this painful but important issue.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in this special order celebrating Black History Month. It is truly a magnificent history—an heroic history if you will. I thought I would take this opportunity to say a few words about a remarkable chapter in that history which is being retrieved and returned to us by a dedicated band of preservationists in Massachusetts.

That chapter concerns the African Meeting House of Nantucket—once a church, a meeting hall and a school for children prevented from attending public school because of their race.

The one-room meeting house was built in the 1820's, and is one of the oldest standing structures of its kind in the United States. It embodies a rich history. When the meeting house was built, Nantucket was a center of a whaling industry in which blacks played an integral part. Among the whaling ships that set sail from the island was the *Industry,* with a black captain named Absalom Boston and an all-black crew. Absalom Boston later became one of the four trustees of the African Baptist Church which was to become known as the African Meeting House.

Absalom Boston's grandfather was a slave name Prince Boston, who took a whaling voyage in 1770. At the end of the voyage, Prince Boston's white master demanded that he turn over his earnings. With the help of a white shipmate, Prince Boston went to court and won his earnings and his freedom, became the first slave set free by a jury verdict. That year, Nantucket freed its slaves, 13 years before the rest of Massachusetts followed suit.

In 1845, the daughter of one of the founders of the meeting house went to court to demand admission to the public high school, and the next year Nantucket became one of the first districts in the country to desegrate its schools. With its strong Quaker tradition, the island became a stronghold of abolitionist sentiment. It was there that Frederick Douglass delivered his first public address before a mixed-race audience.

Once the public schools had been integrated, the meeting house ceased to operate as a school, but continued to function as a vital institution in the community. In 1910 the meeting house was sold to the owner of a trucking business and eventually it fell into disrepair. Now, thanks to the efforts of the Friends of the African Meeting House and the Museum of Afro American History, this extraordinary landmark is due to open to the

public in 1998. I can think of no more fitting commemoration of Black History Month, and I commend all of those who have brought this project to fruition. I yield back my time.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, one of our great blessings as a nation is our extraordinary cultural diversity. This varied heritage makes the mosaic of American life one of unparalleled richness and beauty. And a key part of that mosaic is our African-American heritage, which we honor and celebrate each February during Black History Month.

No area of American accomplishment or achievement has remained untouched by African-Americans. Educators like Johnetta Cole open minds. Entrepreneurs like Earl Graves create successful businesses. Jurists like Leon Higginbotham protect our rights. And astronauts like Mae Jemison explore the very nature of our universe.

Thie year, Black History Month's theme is ''African Americans and Civil Rights—A Reappraisal.'' Today, as our Nation struggles to redefine its commitment to affirmative action and to ensure that all Americans enjoy equal opportunity, we have the chance to reflect on how far we have come and to judge how far we have yet to go. But even as we honor those whose courage and leadership in the cause of equal rights made their names familiar to every American, we should also recognize those who may not be as well known, but who nonetheless have served well.

Such a man was John Stewart, Sr., who was active in the civil rights movement in my own city of Hartford, CT, beginning in the 1920's. He was an original member of the Hartford Independent Political Club, founded in 1928 to advance the political interests of Hartford's African-American community. In the 1950's, he founded the Citizens Community of the North End. In the late 1960's, he became active in High Noon, a group that reached out from the African-American community to other civic and business organizations. Through it all, he worked with the NAACP and the Urban League. This grandson of a slave lived to see his son become majority leader of the Hartford City Council and the city's first African-American fire chief.

But remarkable as he is, he is just one of many extraordinarily talented individuals who worked in the early days of the civil rights struggle in Connecticut. Collin Bennett, entrepreneur and minister, was the first Caribbean American to be elected to the Hartford City Council. At the University of Connecticut, law professor John Brittain has become a national expert on civil rights law. The late State senator Wilber Smith was an eloquent champion of equality and justice who helped Connecticut become the first State to adopt enterprise zone legislation for urban centers. Arthur Johnson, the first executive director of Hartford's Human Relations Commission, presently serves on the Hartford Inquirer's editorial page, his social commentary as insightful as ever. The late Isabelle Blake, a longtime proponent of elementary education and welfare rights, was one of the founders of the Connecticut African-American Day parade. And Elizabeth Horton Sheff, a former member of the Hartford City Council, continues to blaze trails: along with her son Milo, she is leading the quest for equal educational opportunity and better schools for Connecticut students.

Mr. Speaker, American history contains few chapters as inspiring and uplifting as our Nation's struggle to achieve full civil rights for its African-American citizens. The pioneers of the civil rights movement led all of us not only to a more just society, but also to a better understanding of what America was truly intended to be. The enormous debt we owe them should be remembered, not only during Black History Month, but throughout the year. And the best way to honor them is to continue their struggle. Thank you very much.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, in honor of National Black History Month, I rise today to pay special tribute to the African-American people, both past and present, who have made American a better place to live. it is because of their tremendous sacrifice and faith, as well as their educational, economical, and social contributions, that helped make the United States of America the leader of the world.

Our Nation owes its African-American citizen a debt it can never repay. During the Revolutionary War, African-American patriots fought and died defending the civil rights described in the U.S. Constitution before they were allowed to enjoy these rights themselves. In every war since then, African-American people have fought and died with the utmost valor and courage, yet without equal protection under the law. The segregation of U.S. military troops is just one example in a long line of injustices perpetrated against African-Americans in our Nation's history.

Our country learned invaluable lessons from the African-American people who led the civil rights movement in the 1950's and 1960's to eliminate racial barriers. As a schoolteacher, I will never forget hearing Thurgood Marshall speak after the winning the Brown versus Board of Education Supreme Court decision which declared separate but equal was unconstitutional. His work helped open up our schools so children of all races can learn and grow up together. And I was never so proud than seeing Ms. Rosa Parks refusing to give up her seat on that bus in Montgomery, AL. Or watching James Meredith's courageous efforts in desegregating the University of Mississippi.

Every day I try to live by the principles set forth by one of the greatest leaders in history, Martin Luther King, Jr. His teachings of tolerance and nonviolence profoundly changed America. It was the contributions of these great African-Americans, and millions of others, that made out country realize that we can be a better nation and that we must work to end racial bigotry.

As a member of the Michigan State Legislature, I introduced the very first Open Housing Act which outlawed housing discrimination in Michigan. In my 32 years in public office, I have consistently voted in favor of civil rights legislation because I believe out country must grant every person an equal chance to succeed in America. And while we have made significant progress in eliminating racial discrimination in our country, there is no question we still have a ways to go. During this month of observance of Black History Month, let us rededicate ourselves to eliminating discrimination against all people so our country can reach its full potential, and America can truly be the beacon of light for the world.

Mr. WYNN Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the history and culture of African-American people this month, let us pauses to pay tribute to someone to whom we owe a debt of gratitude for the ''first'' he provided us. This year marks the 50th anniversary of Jackie Robinson's integration of major league baseball. He was the first African-American allowed to play on a major league team—the Brooklyn Dodgers—with white athletes. A Pasadena, CA, native, he effectively paved the way for African-Americans to be active participants in professional sports.

More importantly, his actions on and off the baseball diamond have served as an example for confronting racial hypocrisy in this country and beyond. The dignity with which he handled racism among his teammates, fans, hotels, and restaurants stirred the conscience of America and held people accountable for their actions. Beyond establishing the black man's right to play baseball, he transcended racial barriers and proved that mutual respect is an essential element of sportsmanship. He was not only an athlete, but a person that truly earned the title of role model. His name continues to live on through the Jackie Robinson Foundation, established by Rachael Robinson in 1973 for the purpose of developing the leadership potential of minority and urban youth.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Black History Month.

Since 1976, Americans have celebrated, in the month of February, the accomplishments and heritage of African-Americans. Brought here as slaves, shackled, and beaten, African-Americans now represent 12 percent of the U.S. population, approximately 30 million. Despite many obstacles and hurdles, this large group has made significant achievements in the building and shaping of America.

Most African-Americans have on their list of movers and shakers Crispus Attucks, the first man to die in the Boston Massacre of 1770; Harriet Tubman, the leader of the Underground Railroad; Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a drum major for justice; and Rosa Parks, the mother of the civil rights movement. And, the list goes on.

But, if we stop and reflect on where we have gone since the marches and sit-ins and boycotts of the 1960's, have we really gone far?

Despite African-American contributions to society, African-Americans are still not fully recognized for their worth and potential to this Nation. This is ironically portrayed by the title ''Black History Month,'' the time set aside to learn the history of a people. One month cannot capture the infinite historical treasures that African-Americans have embedded into the fabric of this society. A more appropriate title would be ''Black Emphasis Month'' symbolizing that black history should not be a separate course taught only in February. Rather, we should make daily efforts to correct the history that is taught to our children. Our children deserve to know that their forefathers and foremothers had the creative minds and intellect to make important contributions to this society that we may sometimes take for granted, such as the inventions of the light bulb filament and the traffic light.

Importantly, we should use this month as a time to reflect not only on recognizing the contributions of African-Americans to the American society, but we must also think of February as a month in which we ponder the travesties suffered by an entire race of people.

The battles are not over. Hopwood versus Texas was a blow to many individuals hoping

to further their educations. This decision, which rendered admission criteria which take race into account unconstitutional, shattered the hopes and dreams of would-be legislators, attorneys, and teachers.

To be sure, the decision did not raise standards; the intellectual capacity is ever-present. Rather, it took away the incentive, that extra push needed by someone that may be from a broken home or a first-generation college student. This measure tried to kill the aspirations of our Nation's youths. Affirmative action gives those less fortunate than others the initial opportunity to prove themselves—nothing more, nothing less. We will not need race-based criteria once we have the initial opportunity.

In 1996, the Supreme Court, the highest court in the land, struck another blow to minority voters. Bush versus Vera, which declared unconstitutional congressional redistricting plans that gave black and Hispanic voters more clout was a setback because it could ultimately mean that those constituents may have a harder time gaining representation in Congress. Rising to the challenges they faced, many U.S. Representatives, including myself, were not defeated.

However, you must take note that we won reelection because we first had the chance to serve. Affirmative action is that opportunity. Affirmative action is what is needed to first prove yourself. It is needed as a corrective action to change disparities from the past. When such corrective action is taken away, we may not have any more initial opportunities for success. We got the message out to our constituents, and I want to get the message to you today, to see that now more than ever it is a time to stand up for what so many others have died for—our freedom, our rights.

In light of these abhorrent things that are going on today, we must reevaluate, reappraise our civil rights gains. Glass ceilings are not being removed. Affirmative action is being challenged from every angle. We have the opportunity to use these stumbling blocks and make them stepping stones. But we must be active in order to be instrumental in this struggle.

What underground railroad are you leading? Are you a drum major for justice, for peace, for equality? We must look the grim facts in the face. We must not be passive. We must stand up and take charge of our own destinies and take someone else with us. Then, and only then, can we, as a people rise up and fight the injustices that have plagued our people since we stepped foot on American soil.

Mrs. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] and the other members of the Congressional Black Caucus for allowing me this opportunity.

In celebration of Black History Month, there are literally hundreds of individuals from the past that could be remembered for their achievements for African-Americans. The one I would like to remember today was once a member of this auspicious body, and her work in this Chamber will be remembered throughout history for its honesty and integrity.

Barbara Jordan has often been described as having ''the voice of God,'' one which could shake the rafters if necessary, and one which always weaved a sense of urgency through an audience. Yet Ms. Jordan's legacy lies far beyond her oratorical skills. Her reputation will be one of a role-model for her devotion to public service, her unabashed faith in the Constitution, and her ethical fortitude which is all too rare in today's political climate.

In the summer of 1974, our democracy faced its greatest test, and our Constitution its greatest challenge. As the House Judiciary Committee considered the fate of President Nixon during the Watergate hearings, it was a young African-American woman from Houston, TX, that pointed the way through the fog of the time to the correct path to pursue. Representative Jordan stated in plain language that no one, not even the President, was above the law of the land. Her faith in the Constitution, she said, remained strong despite the fact the Founding Fathers did not originally include her in their definition of ''we the people.'' Subsequently, during one of our Nation's darkest hours, Ms. Jordan helped restore our faith in the foundations of democracy and carried us forward to form a more perfect union.

Following her service in Congress, Ms. Jordan began a second tier of public service by teaching public affairs at the University of Texas. Despite the fact that her body was crippled by multiple sclerosis, her spirit and her mind grew stronger. For over a decade, she taught students at the University of Texas a class on ethics which demanded students search their souls for the answers to tough dilemmas. Ms. Jordan's class was extremely popular despite the difficult reputation it gained, requiring a lottery each semester to select the handful of students to have the honor of taking Ms. Jordan's class. Thus, Ms. Jordan carried on the task of teaching the lessons of citizenship to another generation, and preparing our young people to carry out the tasks so vital to our democracy.

Barbara Jordan passed away a little over a year ago. Her reputation will precede her for years to come. It is important to remember Ms. Jordan today and always as not only a great African-American, but as one of the central figures in American history in the late 20th century. As we took towards the next millennium, with the need for racial harmony and the collective healing of our wounds as tantamount as ever, it is imperative that we look towards the example Barbara Jordan set for all of us. Her standards may have been high on the bar, but they were nonetheless the measuring stick we should all aspire to reach. She defined what it means to be an American for many of us, and her accomplishments will not soon be forgotten.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in this opportunity to join the Congressional Black Caucus and other Members of this body to pay tribute to African-Americans who have contributed enormously to this great Nation. I, too, want to thank the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. STOKES, and Representative MAXINE WATERS, chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus for their efforts in organizing this special order.

As we celebrate Black History Month, we must remember the origins of this celebration, as it dates back to 1926. It was then, that Dr. Carter G. Woodson, a noted historian, and author, initiated the observance of ''Negro History Week.''

Each February, Dr. Woodson, whose own contributions were inestimable, advocated setting aside a week to honor the achievements of African-Americans. The lives of black Americans have improved since the 1950's, and, indeed, there is no doubt that relations between blacks and whites have improved. However, segregation, poverty, discrimination in jobs, housing, and many related problems continue to persist, and continue to erode the so-called American dream.

Today, we celebrate an America that is more culturally enriched, intellectually developed, and technologically advanced because of the contributions of African-Americans. However, as the 20th century nears it close, there is still widespread ignorance about African-Americans and our contributions to this society.

Of the 40 African-Americans elected to Congress this year, many came from districts supported by black voters. However, the districts were ruled unconstitutional if race was the predominant factor in designing them. But, a 90-percent white congressional district in Texas is ruled constitutional, whereas, a 5-percent black Texas district that sent the late Barbara Jordan to Congress is ruled unconstitutional.

Imagine what kind of effect these and other related issues have on the life and mind of a young African-American who knows less about hope and faith than I do.

Mr. Speaker, the acceptance by some Americans of Dr. King's message—that men should not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character has made it possible for blacks to gain considerable influence in various fields.

For example, in politics, blacks now serve in unprecedented numbers in elected and appointed positions in Federal, State, and local government, including this great body. We have won recognition in such art forms as literature, film, and theater. We have received some of entertainment's highest awards, including the Oscar, the Tony and Golden Globe honors. We have reached the highest levels in professional sports such as basketball, boxing, tennis, football, and track and field. And, in music, we have made significant influence by creating new musical categories and delighting audiences at home and abroad.

These accomplishments are all good news. But they are still not enough.

As we continue to debate affirmative action policies, we realize that the struggle to ensure equal opportunity for African-Americans continues. The real issue is civil rights—civil rights that redeem our fundamental American sense of hope and rights that affirm our basic values and aspirations as a Nation.

African-Americans continue to have an uphill struggle. However, it is my hope that this Nation would heed the words of the late Justice Thurgood Marshall who said: ''We will only attain freedom if we learn to appreciate what is different, and muster the courage to discover what is fundamentally the same.''

Today, I call on this society to give the ordinary people of this great Nation an equal opportunity, a quality education, and a fair shot at the American dream. Let history record that we in our time faced our challenges remembering who we are and believing that we are more than our brother's keeper.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate today in this special order to commemorate Black History Month. As we celebrate the great contributions of African-Americans throughout the history of our country, we can look to the civil rights movement

of the 1960's as a pivotal time when what ''was'' and what ''could be'' were brought into striking relief through sometimes violent conflict.

The civil rights movement was a period of enormous growth for our country. As a nation we were forced, by great African-American leaders, such as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Malcolm X, and others, to examine ourselves and confront the forces of hate and ignorance that were cleaving our society. That tumultuous period is now behind us, and many great things have happened as a result of that struggle. The African-American community was strengthened, and as it was, so was the entire Nation.

As we face the present, and look ahead to the future, however, some stark realities exist. The fact remains that much still needs to be accomplished before true equality and racial harmony is a fact of life in this country. Now, more than ever, we need strong African-American leadership. We must have African-American activists, who, like the leaders of the civil rights movement, are able to take action and inspire.

One such activist-leader lives in Indiana's First Congressional District. Mr. James Piggee has been a teacher and coach in the Gary, IN, school system for 30 years, and his activism is unique in that it focuses on educating young black students about their past, while at the same time giving them an opportunity to prepare for the future.

For the past 12 years, Mr. Piggee has been actively involved in organizing and leading the historical black college tour in which over 1,800 students from across the United States have participated. This experience has allowed African-American students to experience various parts of their history and culture as it has developed in traditionally black colleges and universities throughout the country. In addition to gaining an historical perspective on African-American intellectual life, they get a chance to learn about the schools they may one day attend.

One of the many positive results of Mr. Piggee's work is that over 60 percent of the students who participated in one of the tours enrolled at one of the colleges they visited. As part of his work, Mr. Piggee has helped over 500 students secure grants, scholarships, and financial aid to historically black and other colleges and universities in the United States.

Mr. Piggee, who tragically lost his son Marc in a drive-by shooting on November 12, 1996, is an active member in many civic and community organizations in northwest Indiana, including the board of directors of Indiana Black Expo, the State Board of Minority Health Coalition, and Healthy Start. He is a recipient of many distinguished awards, such as the Governor's Voluntary Action Programs and Excellence in Education Award, Indiana University's Outstanding Teacher Award, Gary and Merrillville, IN, Lions Club Teacher of the Year Award, Inland Steel Teacher of the Year Award, Gary Community Corporation Heritage Award, National Council of Negro Women, Gary, IN, Chapter, Outstanding Service Award, and the Indiana State Board of Health Outstanding Service Award.

Besides his continued dedication to teaching, Mr. Piggee is also the coordinator of the developing options opportunity for responsible students, or DOORS, program. This program provides an environment that is conducive to the successful transition from high school to secondary education, the military, or the work force.

Mr. Speaker, activists like Mr. Piggee will ensure that at all levels the fight for equality will not end. His work should inspire us all to look to the future and know that change is always at hand. His work shows us that what is today, can be better tomorrow. In closing, I would like to commend my colleagues, Representatives LOUIS STOKES and MAXINE WATERS, for organizing this important special order on Black History Month.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today with my colleagues in celebration of African American History month. The theme for this year's African American History Month Observance is ''African Americans and Civil Rights: A Reappraisal.'' When we reappraise we take stock, we review, and we measure the value of the item in question. As we reappraise the civil rights laws that we have passed in this body, laws that have helped realize for many of our citizens the promise of equal opportunity embodied in our constitution, I can say without question that they have appreciated in value and are worth more today to our Nation and our people than they were 30 years ago. They are of greater value because we can look back and see how far we have come and recognize that we are a better Nation because of the existence of these laws. Thirty years ago as the fog of racial oppression was only beginning to clear we could not have made such an assessment.

As we made this reappraisal of civil rights we also mark an important anniversary. It was 15 years ago that we passed the 1982 major improvements to the landmark Voting Rights Act of 1965 which extended and strengthened the enforcement provisions of the law. Some have described the Voting Rights Act as our Nation's most effective civil rights legislation, and I count myself among that group. I consider the votes that I have cast in support of the extension of the Voting Rights Act among the most important votes of my 20 years in Congress. Because of the Voting Rights Act there has been a dramatic increase in the participation of African Americans and other minorities in the electoral process at all levels of government. As a result of the Voting Rights Act African American voting participation in some congressional districts has increased by tenfold. I look around this institution and I see the power of the Voting Rights Act. Today there are 39 African American members of this body and if we were to poll them I believe they would tell us that their presence here is due in no small measure to the Voting Rights Act. One of those members is BILL CLAY who in his 28 years of congressional service is the dean of the Missouri Congressional Delegation. He was a civil rights leader in St. Louis, our home town, during the struggles of the 1950's and 60's, and he is my leader in the Missouri delegation. I have had the pleasure of serving with BILL for all the years that I have been a member of this body. This institution is a better place because of the presence of BILL CLAY and the other African American members of the 105h Congress and those who have come before them, and we are a better nation because of the Voting Rights Act.

In addition to BILL CLAY, who was the first African American Member of Congress from Missouri, I would also like to recognize another civil rights leader from St. Louis. In 1977, Gwen B. Giles became the first African American woman elected to the Missouri Senate and the first woman elected to the office of city assessor in St. Louis. Mrs. Giles was a tireless advocate for civil rights and for the rights of the disadvantaged. As an elected official and in her roles as executive secretary of the St. Louis Council of Human Relation, Director of the Civil Rights Enforcement Agency and as a founder of the West End Community Assoc., Mrs. Giles was a builder of community between the races. Mrs. Giles died on March 26, 1986, but she remains a pioneering spirit in St. Louis for her dedication to the principle and the practice of equality for all citizens. Today, I honor her historical achievements and contributions as well as those of other African Americans in Missouri and throughout our Nation.

We celebrate this anniversary of the Voting Rights Act and we commemorate African-American History Month as we approach a new century at the crossroads of civil rights and race relations in our nation. There are those who look at the gains that African-Americans have made in the ballot box, in employment, in business and in education, and they no longer recognize the need for vigorous enforcement of our civil rights laws. They tolerate both direct and indirect attacks on the cornerstones of our most monumental civil rights achievement. We have seen these attacks take many forms. From the wholesale attacks on affirmative action to the more subtle and strategic strikes against the Voting Rights Act through the recent court challenges to minority congressional districts, these attacks have the collective impact of moving us backward toward our past of racial intolerance rather than forward toward the promise of the new century. They could not be more wrong. For those of you who say you support our civil rights laws in principle but through inaction dilute their effectiveness and drive wedges that further racial division and hostility, today I challenge each of you to make your deeds match your rhetoric. I challenge you to stop pulling at the dangling threads of intolerance that threaten to unravel the great blanket of civil rights protections we have all worked so diligently to weave. As we make this reappraisal of civil rights in this month that we celebrate black history, we must all recommit ourselves to supporting the enforcement of our civil rights laws. We cannot fail to leave this important legacy intact and of greater value to those who may stand in this place 30 years from today and make a similar reappraisal.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in honoring the African-American community, as we commemorate Black History Month.

The fabric that is America owes an important debt of gratitude to the accomplishments and genius of the African-American community. We are, in a very real sense, a whole nation due to the untold contributions of African-Americans in the fields of science, education, politics, commerce, sport, culture, and in so many other fields of endeavor.

I am proud to represent thousands of African-Americans in the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey. From Englewood to Maywood, Jersey City to Teaneck, African-Americans represent the very best that our region of

New Jersey has to offer. Hard working and active in the civic life of their respective communities, African-Americans constitute an important part of what makes northern New Jersey such a special place to live.

But while prosperity is increasingly being secured by African-Americans in New Jersey and across the United States, we should not forget the recent past. Racism, embodied in so many aspects of American culture years ago, has still not disappeared. The civil rights struggle, which so honorably sought to erase racism, has not ended. And so today, like every day, all Americans, of all backgrounds, need to take a look at ourselves and recommit ourselves to erasing racial prejudice.

Mr. Speaker, almost 35 years ago Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., spoke to America from Washington, DC. He said, ''I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.'' On this day, February 11, 1997, and every day, let us make Martin Luther King, Jr.'s dream our own, and everyday, let us make Martin Luther King, Jr's dream our own, and work toward a nation that can rid itself of racial injustice.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the African-American men and women who have helped make our Nation strong. Through mutual tolerance and understanding we have made significant strides in acknowledging and appreciating our diversity.

In our Nation's short history we have learned that differences between people can be addressed in one of two ways: either through strong division and aversion, or through understanding and real cooperation. Division solves nothing, understanding is the key. Throughout much of this century, African-Americans have been the driving force in building an appreciation and understanding of diversity.

One cannot look at the United States without acknowledging the contributions African-Americans have made in a variety of different areas. They have been involved in nearly every major event in U.S. history and have enriched American culture throughout. Undeniably, African-Americans have played key roles in the progress and prosperity of the Nation and the world. Only when we recognize these accomplishments can we truly see the richness of our country.

In 1926, Dr. Carter Woodson first called for a period of time to be set aside for the recognition of important historical achievements by African-Americans. Fifty years later, our Nation acknowledged February as Black History Month. With each annual celebration, we find ourselves recognizing new milestones African-Americans have made and barriers that have been broken.

For example, this year for the first time in our Nation's history, seven African-Americans were awarded the President's Medal of Honor for their bravery during World War II. These men were among the bravest of the brave, they risked their lives for our country. These African-Americans gave so much, so that the rest of us might be free. We owe them a huge debt of gratitude. I am only sorry it took so long to give these men the recognition they so rightly deserve. This honor was well overdue. It illustrates well the point that, we have come a long way, but we have a long way to go.

Racial tensions still exist within our borders. It is clear to me that there is still work to be done. In schools, neighborhoods, and communities, we should seek out commonality and celebrate our diversity, instead of looking to separate as a result of our differences.

This is why we need to embrace all cultures and not only recognize, but celebrate the achievements of black Americans. As we trace our history, we can point to African-Americans who have made significant contributions to our country, from authors and sports heroes to political icons, including: Booker T. Washington, Willie Mays, Thurgood Marshall, Marcus Garvey, Barbara Jordan, Langston Hughes, and many other great men and women.

As a nation, let us always acknowledge the accomplishments of African-Americans and celebrate them. Not only today, or during Black History Month, but every day.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, America is a Nation built from the labor, love, and dreams of people from all corners of the globe. Black History Month offers America a chance to celebrate the achievements and contributions of one of her many peoples—African Americans.

To help preserve our history it has taken the herculean efforts of such people as Dr. Carter G. Woodson, a Harvard Ph.D. who started Negro History Week in 1926 and founded the association for the study of negro life and history; Arthur Alonzo Schomburg, a Puerto Rican-born New Yorker who amassed a collection of books, manuscripts, and letters by blacks of the Caribbean, Europe, and America; and Daniel Alexander Payne Murray, a black man hired as an assistant librarian for Library of Congress in 1881 and whose collection of books, documents, manuscripts, and letters laid the foundation for the Library of Congress' current expansive holdings in African American history.

We must continue the work of Woodson, Murray, and Schomburg because, as Dr. Woodson argued in ''The Miseducation of the Negro,'' a greater understanding of black history provides African Americans with potent weapons in the fight against racism and attempts to devalue the contributions of African Americans.

Even more important than just celebrating black history to counter negative views of African Americans or for its academic value, we must continue to celebrate it because current and future generations need this knowledge.

I challenge each of you to talk to a young person and ask them what they know about black history, and I bet you'll find that Martin Luther King, Malcolm X, and slavery will be the majority of answers you receive. As adults we know that the sum total of our history is more than just the civil rights struggles of 1950's and 1960's. However, knowing is not enough. We must continue to impart the story of our history to our youth, whose perspective on life will only be enhanced by learning of the great achievements of their ancestors.

Imparting this history means we must continue to educate ourselves and share the stories of lesser known, but equally important figures in black history.

The association for the study of Afro-American life and history reports that the theme for the 1997 Black History Month observance is ''African-Americans and Civil Rights: A Reappraisal.'' In keeping with this theme, we should examine the progress blacks have made in developing political power.

No study of African-American contributions to American political life would be complete without a recognition of the life and work of Louis Emanuel Martin, who the Washington Post once referred to as the ''godfather of black politics'' and who passed away only a few short weeks ago.

Born in Shelbyville, TN, November 18, 1912, and raised in Savannah, GA, Louis E. Martin attended Fisk Academy High School and received his bachelor's degree in English from the University of Michigan in 1934.

A journalist by profession, Martin joined the staff of the Chicago Defender after completing his education at the University of Michigan. In 1936 he became publisher of the newly-created Michigan Chronicle. During his tenure at the Chronicle, he published a book of poems by Robert Hayden and aided Walter Reuther who was organizing the United Auto Workers.

In 1947 he moved back to Chicago to become editor-in-chief of Chicago Defender publications and helped found the National Newspaper Publishers Association, serving as its president. Three years later Martin was named editor-in-chief of Sengstake Newspapers. During this period he also wrote a weekly column on politics and was an active civic leader, lending his support to black entrepreneurs, artists, and civil rights leaders.

A pivotal moment in Louis Martin's life came when fellow Chicagoan R. Sargeant Shriver asked Martin to work on the election campaign of his brother-in-law John F. Kennedy. Martin, who was named deputy chairman of the Democratic National Committee in 1960, was instrumental in arranging the sympathy call that Kennedy placed to Corretta Scott King when her husband Martin Luther King, Jr. was jailed in Atlanta on a traffic violation.

Louis was an indispensable adviser to Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Carter, playing a key role in garnering support for landmark legislation such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act. He helped open doors for a number of talented African-Americans, influencing the appointments of Solicitor General Thurgood Marshall to the Supreme Court, Andrew Brimmer as the first black member of the Federal Reserve Board, and Robert C. Weaver as Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Probably Martin's most lasting legacy will be the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, which Martin founded in 1970 to provide technical assistance and support for black office holders and scholars across the country. The joint center has blossomed into one of the premier research institutions in the Nation and the only think tank which focuses the majority of its efforts on issues of importance to African-Americans.

Although Louis Martin traversed the corridors of power, he did so without vanity or desire for notoriety. He reveled in working behind the scenes to bring about real opportunities for African-Americans. As his daughter Trudy Hatter of Diamond Bar, CA summed it up, ''he worked hard all the time, but not for himself.''

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in celebrating his life and extending heartfelt condolences to Louis Emanuel Martin's wife Gertrude and their children Trudy, Anita, Toni, Linda, and Lisa. His vision, compassion, intelligence, and courage have blazed trails for his fellow African-Americans and have left an indelible mark upon the history of this Nation.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, we celebrate America as a nation of diverse peoples who

share a common vision: freedom, independence, and liberty. Throughout our history, this diversity has served us well. The fabric of our communities has been strengthened by the contributions of all of our people.

So as we celebrate Black History Month, we should be mindful of the rich history and vast contributions that African-Americans have made—and continue to make—to our society. We marvel at the courage of Dr. Martin Luther King. We are humbled by the eloquence of Barbara Jordan. And we are enriched by the brilliance of Ella Fitzgerald.

And there are thousands more. In north Florida, Rev. R.B. Holmes fights for a better future for all children through his efforts to build the best charter school in our Nation. Al Lawson works hard every day in our citizen's legislature to improve the lives of all of our families. And, at FAMU, JIM DAVIS makes a difference by trying to open the doors to higher education for all of our children.

So, today, we proudly recognize the great role that African-Americans play in every facet of our human society. In that recognition we also seek to build a more perfect America. We seek to work together as leaders, parents, thinkers, artists, and students to make tomorrow's America better than today's. Our common goals are built on the common ground that all families seek: safety, security, and opportunity. We know that we can only realize those goals when we work as one.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to participate in the celebration of Black History Month this year by honoring two extraordinary civic leaders of Minnesota. I rise today to honor Cecil Newman and Gleason Glover, both of whom were influential and notable figures in Minnesota's civil rights history.

Cecil Newman is most noted for founding both the Minneapolis Spokesman and the St. Paul Recorder, the oldest African-American-owned newspapers in Minnesota. In 1935, when the newspapers were first published, Cecil delivered them by foot. Today, the Spokesman and the Recorder are disbursed to over 26,000 Minnesotans.

The newspapers were two among many of Cecil's remarkable achievements before he died in 1976. Mr. Newman was also responsible for persuading many African-Americans to exercise their right to vote and was a prominent leader in the fight for fair employment laws in Minnesota.

I believe Hubert Humphrey's statement about Cecil best sums up the kind of man he was: ''Cecil Newman is a good citizen—responsible, active, wise, and influential. I have been enriched by his friendship, strengthened by his support, and helped by his advice.''

Gleason Glover dedicated his life to bettering the lives of African-Americans. His list of accomplishments and awards is long. I am proud to say I knew Gleason on a professional level and he was a close personal friend.

Gleason came to Minnesota to serve as the executive director, and later the president and chief executive officer of the Minneapolis Urban League, one of the most forceful advocate organizations for African-Americans, minorities, and the poor. The league, which started in New York City in 1910 to help African-Americans in their transition from rural to urban living, has expanded to provide assistance in areas such as employment, housing, education, and social welfare. It has also taken on additional challenges including adolescent pregnancy, single female-headed households, and crime in the African-American community.

By the time Gleason retired in 1991, his strong leadership brought the Minneapolis Urban League from a staff of three and a budget of $45,000 to a staff of over 100 and a budget of $3 million. Before his untimely death in 1994, Gleason was responsible for making the Minneapolis Urban League one of the most important civil rights/social service agencies in Minnesota.

Again, I am proud to recognize the impact and influence both Cecil Newman and Gleason Glover had on the lives of many Minnesotans. Their dedication and commitment to public service made them great community leaders who will be long remembered.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring black history month for 1997. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS.] for arranging the time for this special order.

Black history month is an appropriate time to recognize the outstanding black men and women who have contributed so much to our society. As my colleagues have pointed out, our history books do not yet recount the significant efforts of many African Americans and all they have accomplished to make America the great Nation that it is today.

For example, Crispus Attucks, a free black man who, at the Boston massacre, was the first American to die for the revolutionary cause. After our war of independence was won a black man by the name of Benjamin Banneker laid out our Capitol City of Washington, DC.

African Americans were among the most courageous and determined fighters in the war to end slavery. While thousands of black men and women were dying at the hands of their owners as examples to their peers, thousands more were escaping to the north by way of the underground railroad founded by Sojourner Truth and Harriet Tubman. And of course, let us not forget the tens of thousands of black soldiers who sacrificed their lives to end slavery in the Civil War.

While the Civil War helped to end slavery in policy, it did little to eradicate social slavery. When Jim Crow laws threatened to prevent black men and women from assimilating into the American culture that had been denied to them for so long, leaders such as Frederick Douglass and W.E.B. DuBois fought to end such hypocritical and racist policies.

The struggle for equality throughout the 20th century is one of the great sagas of all time. So many courageous black Americans risked everything in order to pave the path for those who followed. Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier in professional major league baseball, while Marian Anderson became a symbol of equality in the world of music. Mrs. Rosa Parks unwittingly became a great national symbol through her decision not to move to the back of the bus.

A little more than 30 years ago, it was announced that for the first time in history, a black man—a man who until that point had achieved modest fame as a stand up comedian—would costar in a dramatic television series. Within the last few weeks, the entire world saw, as this great entertainer faced a deep personal tragedy, how much love and respect all Americans have for Mr. Bill Cosby. He has done so much single handedly to destroy hate and prejudice in our Nation that the outpouring of grief and sympathy upon the murder of his son has been phenomenal.

So many barriers have been broken that there are very few segments of our society still closed to blacks. Tiger Woods has become the most famous black golf player in history, thus knocking down one of the remaining color barriers left in our society.

Alvin Alley's contributions to the dance; Wilt Chamberlain's revolutionizing the game of basketball; Arthur Ashe teaching the Nation how to play tennis and how to face devastating disease with grace; Barbara Jordan articulating love of our form of Government; James Baldwin breaking new ground with the art form of the novel; Henry Johnson, a black man who was the first American soldier to be decorated by France during World War I; Dr. Mae C. Jemison, our first female black astronaut; William Brown, mayor of San Francisco; Alex Haley, who single-handedly revived the pursuit of family genealogy while instilling pride in black history; anthropologist Zora Neale Hurston; poet and Amnesty International leader Akua Lezli Hope. The list of prominent Afro-Americans in every field of human endeavor in the Untied States is endless.

In the 1960's, the moral conscience of the entire Nation was finally awakened, and our laws were finally brought into compliance with the principles of our own American Revolution, Declaration of Independence, Constitution, and Bill of Rights. Mr. Speaker, I never cease to be amazed at how many young people today have trouble understanding how controversial the quest for civil rights was at the time, and how severe the sacrifices were of those who fought at the time. We must not let future generations grow up unaware that a steep price was paid for equality and justice.

Black history month is an appropriate time to recall and recite the events in which black Americans changed our Nation's policies and attitudes. But we must also remind our students and our citizens that the struggle for equality continues today not only in the United States but also abroad. Fortunately, today we are blessed with heroic black men and women who work to bring our races closer together and set a shining example for our youth.

It is imperative that we not simply acknowledge black history this month, forgetting it in the months to come. The appreciation of black history and its contributions to our Nation should be an ongoing process. The contributions of African-Americans to our society are truly exemplary, yet are too often taken for granted. I urge my colleagues to bear these contributions in mind throughout our deliberations.

Our Nation's rich diversity sets it apart from every other nation on the face of the Earth. It is one of our greatest strengths and will be fundamental in our Nation's future success. If we embrace that diversity and learn from its ideals, then nothing will stand in our way. Black-Americans have significantly contributed to every facet of our society and therefore our culture. This, Mr. Speaker, is the lesson we must teach our children, in hopes that they too will one day teach their children these thoughts and pass along the importance of diversity in the Nation.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our distinguished colleague from California, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, who chairs

the Congressional Black Caucus, for joining me in sponsoring this Special Order. We gather today to mark the congressional observance of Black History Month. The occasion affords us the opportunity to acknowledge the contributions of African American men and women to the building and shaping of this great nation.

We gather in the House Chamber 71 years after the late Dr. Carter G. Woodson proposed the observance of Negro History Week. In 1926, Dr. Woodson understood that African Americans were not receiving proper recognition in history for their contributions. Woodson proposed setting aside one week during the month of February to commemorate the achievements of African Americans. In 1976, the observance was changed to Black History Month. Our theme for the 1997 observance of Black History Month is ''African Americans and Civil Rights: A Reappraisal.'' I am proud to join my colleagues as we reflect upon this theme. It causes us to examine how far we have come in the struggle for civil rights.

The civil rights movement of our time set its roots in the field of education, with assistance from the United States Supreme Court. In 1954, in *Brown* v. *Board of Education,* the Court announced its ruling that segregation in the Nation's public schools was unconstitutional. A year later on December 1, 1955, in Montgomery, AL, Mrs. Rosa Parks was told by the driver on the bus on which she was riding to get up and give her seat to a white man. This seamstress, who was tired from a long day's work refused this order and was arrested.

In protest, black leaders organized a boycott that lasted for 382 days. It ended with the courts ordering integration and the abolishment of a legal requirement that black people had to stand up and let white people sit down whenever both races were riding on public transportation.

The Montgomery bus boycott brought to the helm of the Civil Rights Movement a 27-year old black baptist minister whose name is forever etched in the annals of history. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., used the teaching of Mahatma Gandhi to preach a doctrine of love and nonviolence. During his lifetime, Dr. King's faith, perseverance and determination served as a symbol of the hope for equality for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, history records that on September 9, 1957, President Eisenhower signed a new Civil Rights Act which markedly enlarged the federal role in race relations. It established a Civil Rights Commission and a Civil Rights Division at the U.S. Department of Justice. It also gave the Attorney General authority to seek injunctions against obstruction of voting rights.

One of the most climatic point in the campaign for equality came on August 28, 1963, when over 200,000 demonstrators of all races and religious denominations assembled in Washington, DC, in the largest civil rights march in the history of this Nation. It was at that march that Dr. King delivered his famous ''I Have A Dream'' speech.

The civil rights movement of this century has passed through three phases, each one distinct in character. The first, desegregation, was an effort to break down the barriers of an old and corrupt social order. The second phase, integration, was concentrated on the opening up of opportunities—as in the case of the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which guaranteed the right to vote, access to public accommodations, mandated non-discrimination in federal programs, and required equal employment opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, we gather today to reflect upon our civil rights gain and to measure our progress. What I have outlined is a glimpse of our Nation's civil rights history. Let us turn for a moment to the challenges we face. Two of the greatest challenges to continued progress of the civil rights movement are in the areas of redistricting and affirmative action. Since its enactment over 30 years ago, the Voting Rights Act has altered the face of American government. In 1965, the south had only 72 African American elected officials; by 1976, there were 1,944. Today there are nearly 5,000—68 times as many as when the Voting Rights Act was passed. Then, on the last day of its 1993 term, the Supreme Court again lowered the boom on years of progress with its decision in Shaw versus Reno and Hays versus Louisiana, and Johnson versus Miller in 1995. Each of these cases called into question the constitutionality of remedial race-conscious districting. Against this backdrop, on June 13, 1996, the Supreme Court rendered two more opinions that turned back the clock on voting rights. In Shaw versus Hunt and Bush versus Vera the Court simply nullified four congressional districts held by African Americans.

Despite these setbacks, the struggle continues. My colleagues and I will continue to fight for equal opportunity and equal access for all minorities in the electoral process.

The issue of affirmative action also impacts our civil rights progress. Within the last 2 decades, affirmative action has been the primary tool that has allowed minorities and women to break through the many barriers of discrimination that have contributed to keeping them unemployed, underpaid, and in positions of limited opportunity for advancement.

Unfortunately, despite 3 decades of progress in this area, we are now faced with a new threat. We now face legislative and court initiatives that attempt to turn back the clock by attacking equal opportunity in America.

The Rehnquist Supreme Court struck down a minority set-aside program requiring Richmond, VA contractors to hire minority-owned subcontractors for 30 percent of its contracts in City of Richmond versus J.A. Croson Co. The Court ruled in the Croson case that set-asides by State and local governments were allowed only in cases of past discrimination. On June 12, 1995, the United States Supreme Court decision in Adarand Constructors versus Pena, established radical new standards for evaluating affirmative action programs. While the court does require ''strict scrutiny'' be applied to the review of affirmative action laws, the vast majority of affirmative action programs will easily survive such close examination. The court's opinion clearly acknowledges the value of well-tailored affirmative action programs as an important tool to end discrimination.

On June 19, 1995, in response to questions raised about affirmative action, President Clinton presented a clear, unequivocal statement and plan to support and improve our Nation's efforts to promote equal opportunity and justice through the affirmative action laws of the United States. This support is particularly important because of the confusion and misinformation that is currently being circulated about the status, mission, and future of affirmative action programs.

Mr. Speaker, I take pride in joining my colleagues for this special order commemorating Black History Month. I hope that our remarks will help all Americans to remember the important contributions that African Americans have made to this Nation.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 581, FAMILY PLANNING FACILITATION AND ABORTION FUNDING RESTRICTION ACT OF 1997

Mr. GOSS (during the Special Order of Mr. MAJOR R. OWENS), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–3) on the resolution (H.Res. 46) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 581) to amend Public Law 104–208 to provide that the President may make funds appropriated for population planning and other population assistance available on March 1, 1997, subject to restrictions on assistance to foreign organizations that perform or actively promote abortions, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 2, CONGRESSIONAL TERM LIMITS AMENDMENT

Mr. GOSS (during the Special Order of Mr. MAJOR R. OWENS), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–4) on the resolution (H.Res. 47) providing for

consideration of the joint resolution (H.J.Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the number of terms of office of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE ROLE OF CIVIL RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS IN HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] and also the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] who continues a long tradition of special orders during African-American History Month. I would like to continue in the same set of rules that they were following, whatever they were. If you have a list of people, I will follow that list. I will make a few opening remarks and then go back to the list as you have come because I think that we want continuity between the two sets of special orders.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to open up by saying I thought that the topic chosen by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] relating to civil rights organizations and their role in history is a good focus in terms of our civil rights organizations ought to be congratulated for what they have done up to now.

□ 1630

They are to be congratulated. We ought to use history to sort of reappraise where we are and where we are going.

Ken Burns today, at a speech at the National Press Club related to his forthcoming film on Thomas Jefferson, said that history is a record of everything that has happened up to this moment. Everything is history, whether you are talking about the history of science, the history of technology. So Black History Month is a time when a lot of people are reminded of certain kinds of achievements of individual African-Americans, achievements related to inventions; related to first steps in terms of organizations; first steps related to leadership that has been provided in various ways by African-Americans. All that is in order.

But there is another dimension of black history which I think we have neglected, which I would like to discuss in greater detail later on, and that is our civil rights organizations need some underpinning now and would be greatly strengthened if we were to really decide where we are in history now, what our past history has meant, and how we should use the lessons of our past history.

South Africa has a Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission is designed to help get the country on a smooth path toward the future and not have it become bogged down in its past. I think it is most unfortunate that at the end of the Civil War America did not establish a Truth and Reconciliation Commission, because some of the problems we are facing now are rooted in an unjust history: 235 years of slavery.

What did 235 years of slavery do to a people, and how are the repercussions of 235 years of slavery now impacting upon those same people; and can we go on and really deal with our problems currently if we do not really force America to own up to that history? We need a Truth and Reconciliation Commission in order to get on with the discussion of reparations.

We have had some legislation introduced by JOHN CONYERS and others talking about reparations. That seems like such a radical idea that most people dismiss it right away. We had some steps toward reparations when we voted to try to do something to compensate the victims of internment in Japanese camps during World War II. We made some steps in that direction. I do not want to go into reparations and alienate everybody. Let us just have a Truth and Reconciliation Commission which might come to the conclusion that reparations should also be on the agenda.

But in that Truth and Reconciliation Commission we should talk about some other things, like 232 years of slavery. What did that mean in terms of accumulation of wealth? Wealth is accumulated, certain books have told us recently, by passing it from one generation to another. Most wealth is accumulated that way. People do not really work hard and accumulate their wealth; they do get a break from the previous generation. If you have 232 years of slavery, that means there was 232 years where no wealth was passed on from one generation to another.

Is it any wonder then that African-Americans, the middle-class African-Americans are becoming closer and closer to white Americans, mainstream Americans, in income, the money they earn through salaries and wages, but there is a great gap between white mainstream Americans and African-American middle-class people in terms of wealth. There is a great gap. The gap is explained by the fact that there were 235 years where no wealth was accumulated.

We ought to take a look at that. We ought to take a look at what that means to the very poorest people of course; we ought to take a look at what it meant in terms of the impact on a people where their children were denied education and laws were made to make it a crime to teach slaves to read. All that may be examined in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

Civil rights organizations I think really need underpinning now of, really, where are we? How hard should we fight against laws which take away aid to families with dependent children. How does that relate to race? Is there a race base for demanding that you do something for the poorest people, especially those who are descendents of slaves. Is there a reason why we should make greater demands for education?

The President says he is going to move Head Start by the year 2000 to the point where Head Start will encompass 1 million children. Well, should not something be done in terms of compensation in recognizing the great need for special treatment for the descendents of slaves. Those children ought to be taken into Head Start right away. There are a number of ideas like that which would grow out of an understanding that the civil rights agenda should be broadened and the civil rights agenda should take into consideration what the history of slavery did to the people who are major victims of denial of those rights.

I am going to come back to this later on, but we have several colleagues here who are waiting to speak, and I would be happy to take them first. I am pleased to have at this point remarks on African-American history month from our colleague from New York, the Honorable CAROLYN MALONEY.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Black History Month, and I thank my colleagues, Congressman OWENS, Congresswoman WATERS, and Congressman STOKES, for organizing this Special Order.

There are many black Americans who are important to our history, and I am pleased to speak of four African-American women who hail from the great State of New York. These women, ranging from the early 1800's to the present day, have each left their mark on New York and America.

Sojourner Truth was born a slave in Huron, NY. After receiving her freedom, she moved to New York City where she dedicated her life to the abolition of slavery and suffrage for all women. She was the first person to publicly acknowledge the relationship between slavery with the oppression of all women.

After the Civil War she worked tirelessly for women's rights, gaining the support and respect of fellow suffragettes, Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton. At the Equal Rights Association in 1867 she gave one of the most quoted speeches in feminist history, ''Ain't I A Woman''.

Lorraine Hansberry was the first African-American female Broadway playwright. Her play, ''Raisin in the Sun,'' opened in 1959 to outstanding reviews. It focused on discrimination and family values. She was the first black and the youngest person to win the Best Play of the Year Award of the New York drama critics. Though she died in New York City at the age of 34, Hansberry opened the door for all future young black playwrights.

Shirley Chisholm has the distinct honor of being the first black woman elected to Congress and the first

woman to run for President of the United States. She was elected to the New York State Assembly in 1964 and went to Congress in 1968. She was an early member of the National Organization for Women and the National Women's Political Caucus. A former Head Start teacher, she did a great deal to help the children of this Nation. Congresswoman Chisholm not only paved the way for more black Representatives, but for all women.

Judge Constance Baker Motley attended New York University and Columbia. She worked for the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, where she won seven lawsuits before the U.S. Supreme Court. In 1964 she became the first black woman elected to the New York State Senate. A year later she became the first black woman elected as Manhattan Borough president. In 1966 President Johnson nominated her to the U.S. District Court for the Southern district of New York, making her the first woman named to the Southern District bench and the first black woman named to the Federal bench. In 1993 Judge Motley was inducted into the National Women's Hall of Fame.

From Sojourner Truth to Judge Constance Baker Motley, these women have worked to make our lives better. Civil rights is not just a place in time; it is an outlook we should all strive toward in our life. I salute them and all who are here in our collective appreciation of Black History Month, and I thank my colleagues for organizing it.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to continue this discussion on African-American history to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and my good friend from New York. I also would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio, and Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California not only as the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus, but someone not only as a national leader whom I have the highest regard and respect. I certainly appreciate this opportunity of sharing my sentiments concerning Black History Month.

Mr. Speaker, I too would like to echo the sentiments expressed earlier from the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. JACKSON], as he paid a special tribute to my good friend and colleague from Georgia, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, certainly one of the living giants of the civil rights movement. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago the gentleman from Georgia invited me to join him to visit Selma, AL, to commemorate the 25th anniversary of that famous march from Selma, and it was one of the most spiritual experiences I have ever had in my life. I would like to urge and encourage my colleagues to go to Selma, AL. It will give you a real sense of what the civil rights movement is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for the opportunity this afternoon to speak at this year's congressional recognition of Black History Month. The idea of celebrating black history began in 1926, where noted educator Dr. Carter Woodson set aside a special period of time in February, February because that was the birth month of Frederick C. Douglass and of Abraham Lincoln, to recognize the heritage, the achievements and the contributions of African-Americans.

African-American history is of course, Mr. Speaker, a much larger subject than 1 month could possibly encompass. We all know the names of famous African-Americans, artists, performers, and writers such as Paul Robeson, Lena Horne, James Earl Jones, Cicely Tyson, Imamu Amiri Baraka, Paul Laurence Dunbar, Zora Neale Hurston, Maya Angelou, Jessye Norman, Duke Ellington, and William Grant Still. African-American athletes like Jackie Robinson, Jackie Joyner-Kersee, and Wilma Clodean Rudolph broke records and barriers in their striving for excellence.

African-Americans have expanded all of our horizons as explorers: Guion S. Bluford, Jr. was the first African-American to fly in space. Mathew Alexander Henson, a member of Adm. Robert Peary's fourth expedition, may have been the first person to set foot on the North Pole. From George Washington Carver, recipient of the Roosevelt Medal for Distinguished Service to Science, to George Carruthers, the physicist and the designer of the Apollo 16 lunar surface ultraviolet camera/spectrograph that was placed on the moon in April 1972, African-Americans have made significant contributions in the areas of science and technology.

African-American political activists like Nat Turner and Fannie Lou Hamer changed the course of history. Leaders such as Adam Clayton Powell, Joseph Hayne Rainey, the first African-American Member of Congress, Ralph Bunche and Shirley Chisholm, and activists like Martin Luther King, Jr., Malcolm X, and A. Philip Randolph and Sojourner Truth moved their people forward with them. All of these stories are inspiring to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, the contributions of African-Americans to all aspects of U.S. culture have been significant, and all of us as Americans have been moved forward by the achievements of these great individuals. However, the history of African-American people is much more than simply the stories of great and famous individuals.

The people whose names we never hear, the women who participated in the Birmingham bus boycott led by the late Dr. King, the many individuals who, inspired by the actions of Rosa Parks, refused any longer to sit in the back of the bus; the people who sat in at segregated lunch counters; the people who stood firm in the face of fire hoses and growling dogs; the people who registered for college and went to their classes; the people who registered to vote and came to the polling places on election day, these are also people worthy of celebration and worthy of a place in history.

Mr. Speaker, not all children will grow up to be Martin Luther King, Jr., or Shirley Chisholm, but all children should grow up knowing that their greatness is a part of our heritage, that its celebration is not confined to only 1 month out of the year, and that the dreams and aspirations of African-Americans are as worthy of fulfillment and as likely to come true as the dreams and aspirations of all of our fellow Americans.

So as we celebrate Black History Month, Mr. Speaker, let us also keep in mind those whose names are not in the books, those whose private and unpublicized heroism in word and deed also contributed to this story which all Americans should celebrate and all of which all Americans can be proud.

□ 1645

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentleman from American Samoa. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY].

(Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to extend my thanks and appreciation to the gentleman from New York and the other Members of this Chamber who have organized this special order today.

Mr. Speaker, this year's theme for Black History Month is ''African-Americans and Civil Rights: A Reappraisal.'' It is most fitting, therefore, to take a moment to honor a very special woman, a longtime resident of my hometown, who is not only acclaimed for her glorious God-given voice, but for the historic contributions she made on behalf of all African-Americans.

Marian Anderson, of Danbury, CT, who was the first African-American singer to perform with the Metropolitan Opera, stands out as a leading example of African-American pride and achievement. This month would have marked, or does mark, the 100th anniversary of her birth.

As a young woman developing her singing career, Ms. Anderson faced many obstacles and was often the victim of racism. Probably the most widely known incident occurred in 1939, when, after a triumphant appearance through Europe and the Soviet Union, she was prevented from performing in Washington's Constitutional Hall by its owners. To apologize for that mistreatment, First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt invited Ms. Anderson to perform at the Lincoln Memorial on Easter Sunday, 1939.

Ms. Anderson proudly sang to an audience of 75,000 people, while millions more listened over national radio. Her inspirational performance that April day is considered by historians as the first crucial victory of the modern civil rights movement.

Even after her artistry was recognized in the United States, Ms. Anderson still faced racial prejudice on a

daily basis. Well into her career, she was turned away at restaurants and hotels. Even America's opera houses remained closed to her until Rudolph Bing invited her to sing at the Metropolitan Opera.

Throughout all of her trials and struggles, Ms. Anderson did not give up. Her undaunted spirit fought on and her determination opened doors for future black artists that had been firmly bolted shut.

The soprano Leontyne Pryce, one of the earliest artists to profit from Ms. Anderson's efforts, once said, ''Her example of professionalism, uncompromising standards, overcoming obstacles, persistence, resiliency, and undaunted spirit inspired me to believe that I could achieve goals that otherwise would have been unthought of.''

Soprano Jessye Norman said, ''At age 10 I heard for the first time the singing of Marian Anderson on a recording. I listened, thinking, this can't be just a voice, so rich and beautiful. It was a revelation, and I wept.''

Later in life, Ms. Anderson was named a delegate to the United Nations by President Dwight D. Eisenhower and was the recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom from President Carter. She died in 1993, but her successful fight to give every individual an opportunity to achieve their own greatness helped our country become a stronger nation. Her contributions will live on forever.

As President Clinton pointed out in his State of the Union Address last week, American race relations have certainly come a long way, but our country is still plagued by bigotry and intolerance. Each of us must learn from the example set by Marian Anderson to eliminate hate and violence and create a stronger, more tolerant America.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut, and again congratulate him on his hard-won race in order to get to this House of Representatives.

Continuing the discussion on Black History Month, African-Americans, and civil rights, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. KEN BENTSEN.

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join our Nation in celebrating Black History Month. Today I want to recognize and pay tribute to community leaders in Houston whose vast accomplishments and contributions have helped to revitalize a very large segment of our city.

In 1996, Pastors James Dixon, Harvey Clemons, Bill Lawson, Ed Lockett, and Kirbyjon Caldwell were awarded the Mickey Leland Humanitarian Award by the Houston chapter of the NAACP for their outstanding contributions to the community.

While all are deserving of recognition, Reverend Dixon for his work in north Houston, Reverend Clemons for his work with the Fifth Ward Development Corporation, Rev. Ed Lockett, who runs the Sunnyside Up Corp., and of course, Rev. Bill Lawson, the dean of Houston's clergy, and for many, the conscience of the city as well, I want to pay special tribute and highlight as an example the contributions of Pastor Kirbyjon Caldwell of the Windsor Village United Methodist Church.

Reared in Kashmere Gardens, a low-income neighborhood in Houston, Pastor Caldwell, at age 43, is today one of Houston's most prominent clergymen. Pastor Caldwell has emerged as a strong advocate for civil rights in Houston. His intellect and creativity and caring have made him a leader in the quest for civil rights through economic empowerment and cultural awareness.

Pastor Caldwell is best known for founding the Power Center, a multimillion dollar community service facility located in southwest Houston, in my district. The 104,000 square foot complex meets a tremendous range of community needs, including education through the Houston Community College, financial services through Texas Commerce Bank, a Federal women, infants and children nutrition program, and health care through Herman Hospital, as well as a private grade school. Through the Power Center, Pastor Caldwell is making the connection between economic empowerment and political empowerment.

A former investment banker on Wall Street, Pastor Caldwell used his banking and financial background to persuade the property owners to donate a $4.4 million building, a former KMart, to realize his dream. The Power Center will generate some $26.7 million in cash flow for the Windsor Village/South Post Oak community over the next 3 years. While constructing the Power Center, Mr. Caldwell started several nonprofit ventures, including a shelter for abused children and low-income housing developments. These nonprofit ventures created jobs for more than 125 people. In addition, the Power Center has provided hundreds of jobs, ranking it among the largest black-owned employers in Houston.

In the pulpit, Pastor Caldwell delivers potent sermons filled with the vernacular of modern life. His preaching style, along with a vast variety of community outreach programs, attracts people from all walks of life.

As we reappraise African-Americans and civil rights in 1997, it is also important to recognize the triumphs that have been made in the past by leaders such as Dr. Martin Luther King, the Honorable Barbara Jordan, and Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall.

Nonetheless, we should not forget those present-day leaders such as Rev. Kirbyjon Caldwell, who may not be mentioned in the pages of American history now, but are working just as hard to open the doors of opportunity for all Americans through economic empowerment and cultural awareness.

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. MEL WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I start kind of like the author of the cartoon, Curtis, with the understanding that you really cannot do justice to practice Black History Month in either 3 minutes or a month. The contributions that black people have made to this country require an ongoing education and input about the many facets of the contributions.

So I want to limit my remarks today to a very, very narrow window, and that is some things that came out of my congressional district in Greensboro, NC, starting on February 1, 1960 at the Woolworth lunch counter where the sit-ins started, to give us the right to be able to go into a restaurant and sit down and have a meal. I mean, this is something that in 1996 is so far removed from anything that we can imagine that so many people have started to take it for granted.

It was at the Woolworth's lunch counter that these sit-ins started on February 1, 1960, and they were started by four students who were attending the North Carolina A&T State University in Greensboro, NC. Those four students were freshmen Ezell Blair, Junior; David L. Richmond; Joseph McNeil; and Franklin McCain. Franklin McCain happens to be a personal friend of mine who now resides in Charlotte, NC. But all of these four individuals started a movement that picked up steam, gained momentum, that led ultimately on July 25, 1960 to black people being able to go into the Woolworth's store in Greensboro and sit down at the lunch counter and have a hot dog, buy a drink, things that we now take for granted.

Throughout the South, this kind of movement was going on all across the South to provide that opportunity. To these four gentlemen, we will forever be in debt.

North Carolina A&T is one of six historically black colleges and universities in my congressional district in North Carolina. I could spend hours talking about the contributions of graduates of any one of these institutions, but just to focus on North Carolina A&T, since that is where I started, that is where our current colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. JESSE JACKSON Jr., and the gentleman from New York, Mr. ED TOWNS, your colleague, graduated. They are illustrious graduates of North Carolina A&T.

Former astronaut Ronald McNair, to whom we all owe so much in the field of space exploration, is a graduate of that institution. State Justice Henry Frye, on our State supreme court in North Carolina, is a graduate of North Carolina A&T university. I could go on and on and on talking about these people, but I will end, and reemphasize

what the Curtis cartoons have been saying throughout this year: We cannot do justice to black history by having a month for it. We all have to give it the kind of ongoing respect that the kinds of contributions that our people have made over the years to the history, the culture, the music, the vitality, and the economy of this United States, deserve.

The more we can come to grips with that, the more we can put this, parts of history like the sit-ins, behind us, and we can all become one Nation, indivisible, under God, with liberty and justice for all. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentleman. I hope we will never put the spirit of the sit-ins behind us. I do hope the gentleman will take out additional time. He could spend a whole hour on the spirit of A&T and the first big sit-in.

I think we may need to instruct this generation and this group of people right here, in the year 1997, that there is a time when we must go down, we must confront the authorities. We may have to confront the authorities on the attempt to remove Medicaid as an entitlement. I think there are some points in the history right now that we are going to have to come to grips with that are just as important as our civil rights, such as the importance of the right to life that emanates from having health care for everybody. There may be a number of other issues where we may have to follow history, and understand there is a time when we confront the authorities and tell them we will not accept this.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I will just reaffirm what the gentleman has said, Mr. Speaker, if he will continue to yield. It took a tremendous amount of guts and determination for these four students to stand up and confront a system. The need for us to continue to confront issues head on, without fear of intimidation or being called down by our colleagues, even here in the House, certainly should be apparent to us.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I lived in the South for 20 years. I was born in Memphis, TN. I know all about the kind of courage it took to stand up at that lunch counter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. DONALD PAYNE, the distinguished former chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

□ 1700

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating Black History Month. Let me take special attention to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], who has led us in this over the years and of course our distinguished chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], for organizing this, too, and thank the gentleman from New York for yielding time to me.

Much has happened over the course of the year since we last gathered for this commemoration, had both successes and setbacks. But we stand here today stronger and more determined than ever to continue moving ahead regardless of the obstacles we face.

This past year the Congressional Black Caucus took action on a number of issues, particularly the devastating fires which ravaged African-American churches throughout this Nation, mostly in the southern part of our country, but all over. In response to the caucus, we galvanized forces to focus national attention on the magnitude of this tragedy. Our actions led to the passage of new legislation to strengthen Federal law enforcement so that these cases could be solved.

We convened public hearings and pointed out that during the early days of the civil rights movement, as we heard MEL WATT talk about, the churches were places where we met and the churches were places where we gathered not only for worship but for strategy. We cannot forget the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, AL, in the mid-1960's, four little girls, Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley, lost their lives.

Another young lady, Sarah Collins, was partially blinded, and so that brought back those dark days when there was an attack. This year, the past year we also were disappointed by several court hearings undermining the Voting Rights Act guaranteeing minorities fair participation in the political process. While we remain deeply concerned about the dismantling of majority-minority voting districts, we are pleased at the determination of our colleagues who, in spite of the blatant attempt to turn us back, were still returned to office.

Over this past year there were also assaults on affirmative action, which helps minorities and women move ahead to make this country a greater place. However, despite much misinformation from opponents, we have worked hard to educate the public to understand that affirmative action is about fair opportunity and not about quotas or unfair advantages.

The theme chosen this year for Black History Month is African-Americans and civil rights, a reappraisal. It is certainly fitting during this month that we reassess where we have been, where we are, and where we want to be. We remember with deep respect those in the early history who never gave up in their quest for justice and equal rights for African-Americans. We were inspired by the courage of the great abolitionist and orator, Sojourner Truth. Born in 1797, she traveled across this country in a tireless crusade against slavery.

In that same era, my home city of Newark, NJ, was the home to an abolitionist, journalist, and a minister by the name of Samuel Cornish. He became the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church on Plane Street working for the advancement of the black community.

Another prominent figure who spent time in New Jersey was the famous fugitive slave, abolitionist, nurse, and social reformer Harriet Tubman, who spent some of her retiring days in New Jersey. She made about 19 trips to various States to lead slaves to freedom, and her work with the Underground Railroad brought her to New Jersey between 1849 and 1852.

We remember Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. DuBois as early people who had different ways of going about bringing black people to their final fruition, but we feel that they both earned a place in history.

As I conclude, I just want to mention one last person who will be celebrating her 84th birthday very soon, just celebrated it, Mrs. Rosa Parks, who refused to give up her seat on a bus in Montgomery. She changed the course of history.

Soon we will enter a new era of history with the dawn of the 21st century. President Clinton in his State of the Union Address talked about our Nation finding strength in diversity. As we celebrate the contributions of African-Americans to this Nation, we must also renew our commitment to the next generation, our children. African-American children must get an education, must have skills to compete in the rapidly advancing world of technology. They look to us just as we look to those before us for hope and inspiration. And therefore, it has been a long journey but we will continue to move ahead with faith and determination.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his most appropriate remarks. I think it is very important that you mentioned the burning of the churches.

I would like to point out that the reaction to the burning of the churches, the people who started the burning of the churches know that the church is the center of the black life all across the country. They wanted to get at the core of our organization and inspiration, and it was a devastating blow to go after our churches. But our Government is to be congratulated, our President is to be congratulated, the general public, foundations, and various people are to be congratulated for the manner in which we have reacted.

If only we had had a similar reaction to the Ku Klux Klan and the kind of violence perpetrated after the freeing of the slaves, history might tell a different story. If only our Government had not capitulated, if only it stood behind General Howard and General Armstrong and Thaddeus Stevens from Pennsylvania and Charles Sumner from Massachusetts and resisted the kind of violent response of the white former Confederate officers and soldiers in reorganizing a violent overthrow of legitimately elected black governments in the South and a number of other institutions that were upset by violent and illegal means. If only our Government had stood firmly then, we should congratulate our President for the fact

that he stood firmly, offered leadership from the bully pulpit of the White House and stood firm on the ravages of affirmative action at a time when hysteria was being generated.

It makes a difference and it is a pity that we do not have that kind of leadership from all sectors of the American leadership community during the second Reconstruction. We would not have lost so much so fast. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me just say that it was, I believe, the Congressional Black Caucus coming together, calling a hearing, bringing witnesses together, all-day hearing focusing the attention and then really pushing the administration to really become as involved, visiting black churches.

Mr. OWENS. Not for one moment would I want to minimize the role of the caucus in stimulating, the caucus stimulated the activity from the general community and from the White House. We played a major role. The leadership of the first Reconstruction, we must pay homage to them. They tried very hard. They were up against bullets and fire, and they did not succeed in playing the kind of role that stimulated the rest of the country to do the kind of things they ought to do. But we played a major role. I certainly do not want to minimize that, of the Congressional Black Caucus.

I yield, to continue the discussion on Black History Month, African-Americans and civil rights, to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DELAHUNT]. I want to congratulate Mr. DELAHUNT. He is new here. I welcome him to the floor and congratulate him on his victory.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in this special order celebrating Black History Month. It is truly a magnificent history as has been recounted by previous speakers and a history that is truly a history of heroism.

I thought I would take this opportunity to say a few words about a remarkable chapter in that history, which is being retrieved and returned to us by a dedicated band of preservationists in Massachusetts. That chapter concerns the African Meeting House of Nantucket, once a church, a meeting hall and a school for children prevented from attending public school because of their race.

The one room meeting house was built in the 1820's and is one of the oldest standing structures of its kind in the United States. It embodies a rich history. When the meeting house was built, Nantucket was the center of the whaling industry in which blacks played an integral part. Among the whaling ships that set sail from the island was the *Industry* with the black captain named Absalom Boston and an all-black crew. Absalom Boston later became one of the four trustees of the African Baptist Church which was to become known as the African Meeting House.

Absalom Boston's grandfather was a slave named Prince Boston who took a whaling voyage in 1770. At the end of the voyage, Prince Boston's white master demanded that he turn over his earnings. With the help of a white shipmate, Prince Boston went to court and won his earnings and his freedom, becoming the first slave set free by an jury verdict in this Nation. That year Nantucket freed its slaves, 13 years before the rest of Massachusetts followed suit.

In 1845, the daughter of one of the founders of the meeting house went to court to demand admission to the public high school. In the next year Nantucket became one of the first districts in the country to desegregate its schools. With its strong Quaker tradition, the island became a stronghold of abolitionist sentiment. It was there that Frederick Douglass delivered his first public address before a mixed race audience.

Once the public schools had been integrated, the meeting house ceased to operate as a school but continued to function as a vital institution in this community island. In 1910, the meeting house was sold to the owner of a trucking business and eventually it fell into disrepair. Now, thanks to the efforts of the Friends of the African Meeting House and the Museum of Afro-American History, this extraordinary landmark is due to be opened to the public in 1998. I can think of no more fitting commemoration of Black History Month, and I commend all of those who have brought this project to fruition.

Mr. Speaker, much of this fascinating history is recounted in a superb article by Don Costanzo that appeared in the Nantucket Beacon on January 29, 1997. I include the entire article for insertion in the RECORD.

[From the Nantucket Beacon, Jan. 29, 1997]

RESURRECTING THE HEART AND SOUL OF NEW GUINEA

(By Don Costanzo)

Pending a thumbs-up from their local school board, about 460 children in Florida will be saving their pennies to help restore the African Meeting House on Nantucket.

Last fall Len Kizner, an elementary school teacher at the Bay Vista Elementary School in St. Petersburg, Fla., saw a segment on ''This Old House'' about the meeting house. Last week, he read an article in the New York Times about it.

Today, Kizner has become so inspired by the project he is about to ask a Florida county school board for permission to raise money within the school to give to the Nantucket landmark.

''What better way to celebrate black history month (February) than to tie it into the first schoolhouse for free black people on your island,'' said Kizner. ''It's a great project. We're teaching children, celebrating black culture, and preserving a piece of it too.

''It supports black history heritage, and by doing that supports American heritage.''

Kizner expects to build a scale model of the meeting house, and incorporate the project into geography and social studies classes to help the children better understand where their money is going.

But what is happening at Bay Vista is only part of the impact this restoration project is having nationally.

On Martha's Vineyard, a Black Heritage trail has been developed in direct reaction to Nantucket's initiative. And, Helen Seager, Convener of the African Meeting House, has further inspired the people of Portland, Maine to generate more ideas on how they could save the Abyssinian Baptist Church, considered one of the oldest black churches in the country behind one on Beacon Hill in Boston, and Nantucket's.

''They have said over and over again,'' said Seager, ''that the Nantucket experience was setting an example for them and inspiring them to go on.''

But, there would be no 'Nantucket experience' today had it not been for the tribulations and accomplishments of men and women from another time.

A SENSE OF PLACE

Although Nantucket was 13 years ahead of the Commonwealth in freeing its slaves in 1770, and more than 100 years ahead of the nation in desegregating its schools in 1845, scars from the fight for freedom and equality here are explicit. Just before 1770, Prince Boston, a slave belonging to William Swain, took a whaling voyage with William Rotch, a highly successful entrepreneur. When Boston returned from his working journey with Rotch in 1770, Swain insisted that the black man turn over all his earnings—since, of course, he owned the slave.

But Rotch was well-respected on the island by this time, and decided to defend Boston in court. They won the case and Boston was the first slave set free by a jury's verdict. It is believed that blacks on Nantucket shed the chains of slavery for good following this court decision.

Fifty years later a laborer and mariner named Absalom Boston, Prince Boston's grandson, was establishing his place in history too.

Boston captained an all-black crew aboard the whaling vessel *Industry*; he ran an inn and opened a store in an area on the island known as New Guinea, where he worked hard for the betterment of Nantucket's black community.

By 1821 the nearly 300 blacks who lived on Nantucket had formed a common bond in New Guinea (the name indicated the African roots of its residents, and was used to specify particular section of many cities and towns).

New Guinea—thought originally to be bordered by Williams Land, Prospect, Silver, and Orange streets—consisted of a cluster of houses and gardens, as well as its own stores, an inn, and eventually a school, cemetery, and two churches.

One church, the African Methodist Episcopal Church was established in 1835 in a building (which no longer exists) on West York Lane. Little is known about the activities of this church and the participation of blacks there.

But just a few yards down the street stood another building, which today is a historic testament to the struggle and triumphs of Nantucket's black inhabitants.

One event that defined black/white dissension on the island was the Anti-Slavery Convention at the Nantucket Atheneum in 1842. In a speech, Stephen Foster called Town Meeting voters who had supported segregation in schools ''pimps to satan.''

Foster hurled fierce words at members of many of the island's churches, charging they were guilty of adultery, theft, kidnapping, and the murder of slaves. He called the clergy and church membership a ''brotherhood of thieves.''

The pro-slavery faction, incensed at Foster's accusations, shot back with rotten eggs and stones—a riot ensued. While police did almost nothing to calm the fighting, many blacks sought refuge and prayer in a place

born as the African Baptist Church, but known then as the African School.

It was at that time that the building we know of today as the African Meeting House further distinguished its place in black history on Nantucket.

TRUCKS INSTEAD OF PEWS

Absalom Boston was one of four trustees of the African Baptist Church built in the heart of New Guinea on the corner of York and Pleasant Streets. That said a lot for the church, for Boston was, perhaps, the most respected and wealthiest black man who ever lived on Nantucket.

Though construction on the building likely began in 1824, the land upon which it eventually stood was not purchased until two years later, Jeffrey Summons, a black man who worked as a carpenter on the island, purchased the land in 1826 for $10.50.

The building was used as a school, church, meeting house, for anti-slavery lectures, and even used as a makeshift medical clinic where vaccinations for small pox were given in 1834.

When the Nantucket Public Schools integrated in 1846, the building was no longer needed as the island's only educational center for black children. Yet, it was still used for everything else up until about 1910—about the same time Nantucket was reeling from economic disaster.

Suffering financially, Edgar Wilkes, who had taken over the church in 1888 from the Rev. James Crawford, was forced to sell the building to a trucking business owner named Henry Chase for just $250. Chase needed a place to put his trucks, so he remodeled the former black schoolhouse to accommodate his rigs.

Then in 1933 Florence Higginbotham, who was already living in the house next door on York Street, bought the building and two adjacent outhouses from Chase for $3,000.

''Rumor was that she bought it because she didn't want anybody else between her and the corner,'' said her son, Wilhelm, in a phone interview last week from his home in Oakland, Calif.

Over the next several years the once proud symbol of black life on Nantucket continued to fall into grim decay, used for nothing more than a storage space for bicycles and construction equipment.

Wilhelm, an Afro-Indian, inherited the property when his mother died in 1972. But Wilhelm didn't really have much interest in the property, or Nantucket for that matter. The winters were too harsh and the work was too erratic (he did work at Glidden's Island Seafood market for a time), and 24 years after he arrived, Wilhelm left Nantucket in 1948. He worked as a postal clerk and managed the island property from his home in Oakland.

While Mrs. Higginbotham used the building as a source of income, actively marketing it as rental property, Wilhelm owned it ''free and clear'' and didn't care much about renting it out at all, said Seager.

So it sat there, virtually empty up until about 20 years ago when then Nantucket Bike Shop owner Morgan Levine, who was using the building as a bicycle repair shop, became fascinated with the old relic.

It was Levine who raised the money for a historical study of the building, and after nearly five decades of degeneration, the wheels of transformation had begun for the old Baptist Church because of a man who just wanted a place to fix bicycles.

REVIVAL

It's been called the African School, York Street School, African Church, York Street Colored Baptist Church, Colored Baptist Church, and Pleasant Street Baptist Church. Today, we know it as the African Meeting House on Nantucket.

In 1981 Byron Rushing, then president of the Museum of Afro American History (MAAH) and now a State Representative, wrote a historical summary of the building.

By 1986 a historical and architectural study was performed. Three years later MAAH purchased the building to preserve and restore it, and to help provide education about the history of blacks on Nantucket.

The building's earlier neglect may also have been its saving grace. A full 70 percent of the building was original material when the museum purchased it in 1989.

''You have to remember that neglect is a wonderful preservation strategy,'' mused Seager.

Since last fall, the meeting house has slowly begun to rise again as an icon to the history of blacks on Nantucket. Artifacts have been found, and the architect and builders are finding out what of the structure that now stands can and cannot be used in the restoration.

''We're able to save and use quite a bit of what remained,'' said John James, architect for the project, who added that the building is being restored according to how it looked in 1880.

The wall facing York Street and the east wall are both going to have to be entirely new, said James. The south wall was cut out and a rolling door installed in 1922 to accommodate truck storage. The east wall, bearing the brunt of harsh weather, collapsed and was rebuilt with simple two-by-four construction in the mid 1970s.

Those two walls, said James, are being rebuilt in keeping with framing techniques of the original building, post and beam—not two-by-four. The west and north sides of the building were in much better condition and can be preserved. And though the windows could not be saved, they are, said project foreman Mike DeNofrio, being virtually duplicated. White cedar shingle will, of course, be the exterior's finishing touch.

The Friends and Committee of the African Meeting House are hoping to raise $600,000 to complete restoration of the building (exterior is expected to be finished by April, but funds are still being sought for interior restoration) so that future plans for the meeting house can be realized.

Earlier this month, a group of people involved in the project, community members, and others met to define what the interior of the building should look like and discuss future goals.

''They wanted the integrity and respect for the place to remain intact,'' said Sylvia Watts McKinney, executive director of the Museum of Afro American History in Boston.

McKinney said replicas of the pews will be placed in the building, matching them with markings on the original floor and walls.

Boards on the walls and floors had outlines of the pews, so James knew the length and width of the aisles based on those markings.

''They are absolutely clear,'' said James. In explaining how the markings were made, the architect said to imagine painting a wall a light color, then putting an object, like a pew, up against the wall and painting around it a darker color. When the object is removed, the outline of where it was would be quite clear.

When the building was used as truck storage earlier this century, a reinforcing floor was built on top of the original floor. Yet, oil and gas dripped down through the newer floor and saturated much of the original floor. The stench could force use of new floorboards in place of many of the original ones.

''We just don't know how much of the original flooring we could use,'' said James, who added that pews would still be placed in their original positions even if the original floor cannot be preserved.

Also, a round wooden canopy is on the ceiling where a chandelier had once hung. The original chandelier, donated to the church by a group of whites in 1837, has yet to be found. A raised platform will also be built at the north end of the building, and a stove, originally used for heating, will be installed for ''ambiance of space,'' said McKinney.

Much of the original ceiling has rotted and will need to be replaced.

''Our primary goal has been and will continue to be that this building is restored,'' said McKinney.

A HISTORY WITHIN

Upon complete restoration of the building the African Meeting House will be more than an educational center for black history on the island.

McKinney explained that the nation's oldest meeting house on Beacon Hill is used for such things as press conferences and weddings, and envisions the same on Nantucket.

Also planned is an audio system playing gospel and spiritual music, reenacted sermons on abolition, and more contemporary themes like Martin Luther King's speech.

In the 1940s and 50s the building was used, said Seager, for ''an occasional record hop'' with jazz and blues music.

McKinney said the restored landmark should be ''perceived as a living history where anyone who visits can get a sense of what it was like.

''We don't want people to just point and say 'that's where it used to be.' We want people to feel that they're a part of it.''

And Kelly Hanley Goode, a member of the steering committee, added that the original church was not just the center of black life in New Guinea, but on Nantucket and the country as well.

''We want to be the impetus and motivation for more research, to draw black history within Nantucket's history where it becomes a part of it—not a separate part,'' said Goode.

Seager believes deeply in the project, not just for Nantucket, but also for other communities inspired by what is being accomplished here. She said the African Meeting House restoration project has now caught the attention of a church in Savannah, Ga. The priest there is a Nantucket native.

''The story of the people is preserved,'' said Seager, ''when the building is preserved.''

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the great State of Massachusetts. We should take note of the fact that Massachusetts was one of the first to heed the call of President Lincoln and with great fervor their soldiers went into the lines and the civil rights battles. Also Massachusetts produced Charles Sumner, one of the great defenders of slave rights and later on one of the architects of the legislation that led to 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], a neighbor from Alexandria.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New York.

I gather there are other speakers so I will not take time. I have a statement that I am going to submit for the RECORD that pays tribute to the people within my district that have put so much effort into preserving the memory, the artifacts, the books, recordings of black history in northern Virginia, the Society for the Preservation of Black Heritage, the Parker-Gray Society, we have a number of groups that

have been very successful. I want to honor them within the RECORD.

I would also mention some of the history that cannot help but be recalled at this time. In fact, it is relevant to some of the issues that we deal with today.

For example, in 1846, there was a secession of Alexandria from the District of Columbia and our newspaper reports how African Americans, who had been brought here involuntarily for the purpose of slavery but then had been freed because they were part of the District of Columbia, having lived in Alexandria lined the way to all the polling stations, begging those whites, because white people were the only ones allowed to vote at the time, not to—what it was was a secession from the District of Columbia to make that populated part of northern Virginia part of the Commonwealth of Virginia and thus they would no longer be freed people.

They were unsuccessful in that effort and Alexandria immediately slipped back to some of its darkest days and became a center for slavery. I want to thank the Washington Urban League for purchasing the buildings now that at one point were slave quarters, to remind young people growing up in our community of the relatively recent history that gives us cause to renew our efforts to be vigilant and not to take our freedoms and progress for granted.

□ 1715

Because we are only talking about 150 years. Almost exactly 150 years ago when this occurred. It took a Civil War to restore dignity and freedom to those citizens.

We, today, are in a similar struggle, although it may not be as clear, to establish dignity and opportunity for all of our citizens, particularly within the District of Columbia, our capital city. And so I would hope that as we focus on Black History Month, that we would have more than the African-American Representatives within the Congress contribute to this.

We are all representing districts of our country that have been profoundly affected by the most scandalous era within America's history, and it is up to all of us not just to contribute words but to contribute a sincere commitment to build upon the progress that our African-American brothers and sisters have achieved. We are where we are, in large part, because of the pain, the suffering, the perseverance and the immense contribution they have made to our culture and our history.

Mr. Speaker, the prepared statement I referred to earlier follows herewith:

Mr. Speaker, today, as we come together to celebrate the contributions that African-Americans have made to this great Nation, I would like to pay special tribute to the many African-Americans in my district that have helped northern Virginia grow into the diverse and distinguished place it is today.

Since 1983, the Alexandria Black History Resource Center has been educating northern Virginia about the history of our community. In addition to giving lectures and tours of the center, the Resource Center houses an impressive collection of memorabilia which documents the history of the African-American experience in Virginia. Upon visiting the Resource Center, guests learn of the great efforts made by the Alumni Association of the Parker-Gray School and the Alexandria Society for the Preservation of Black Heritage, Inc. to remind everyone of the contributions that African-Americans have made across the country. Their efforts also remind us that only by working together do we achieve an understanding of who we are as individuals.

The Parker-Gray School and the Alexandria Society for the Preservation of Black Heritage, Inc. both have an impressive history of their own to tell. The society began as the response of African-Americans in the Parker-Gray section of Alexandria to protect the Alfred Street Baptist Church from demolition. This church served as a catalyst for the black community in Alexandria. During an unstable time for African-Americans in this area, the church was not only a place of worship, but it was also a place for blacks to meet, plan, and build the community into what it is today. The Alexandria Society for the Preservation of Black Heritage, Inc. succeeded in its efforts. It continues to use the same perseverance to maintain and expand upon the black community.

The Parker-Gray School, which is named for two African-American principals of earlier schools that added greatly to the community, became the first 4-year high school for blacks in this area. The descendants of those who fought long and hard for the opening of this high school continue to work to build our community.

Another important project in the Eighth Congressional District is the Slave Memorial at Mount Vernon. The memorial, whose design was contributed to by students of the Howard University School of Architecture and Planning, consists of a gray granite column at the center of three concentric brick circles. The center column bears the inscription ''In memory of the Afro-Americans who served as slaves at Mount Vernon.'' The three brick circles around the column are inscribed ''Faith,'' ''Hope'' and ''Love''—to symbolize the virtues that sustained those living in bondage. This memorial serves as a reminder of all of the thousands of visitors who come to Mount Vernon every year that this country was built by the labor of all of our ancestors.

This is the only known monument of its kind. It is a permanent tribute to enslaved African-Americans, whose skills, talents and spiritual strengths were an integral part of America's past. Every year, for the past 13 years, Black Women United for Action, an organization which serves as a strong voice of the black community, and the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, the non-profit organization that owns Mount Vernon, organize a wreath-laying ceremony at the Slave Memorial to honor these men and women.

All of the organizations and people mentioned above have done much to honor the rich contributions of African Americans, not only in northern Virginia but across the Nation. Their hard work is important to all of our communities to grow as one, remembering the struggles of our past and building the blocks to our future.

Black History Month is a time for celebrating the strength and diversity that African-Americans provide to these United States of America. And I thank you for giving me this time to add to the celebration. I only wish I had more time to give thanks to all of the groups and highlight all of the sites in the Eighth District of Virginia which add to the community. I would like to encourage everyone to come across the river to experience this rich environment.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask if there is anyone in the House that has not spoken yet that would like to speak?

If not, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from California to make a closing statement, and the gentleman from Ohio if he would like to make a closing statement, also, after the gentlewoman.

Mr. STOKES. Yes, after the chairwoman.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California, the leader of our Black Caucus.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for the additional time he took out here to ensure that all those who would like to make a statement about the contributions of the history, the development, the involvement of African-Americans in our society, in our country, in our Nation, would have that opportunity to do so.

I would additionally like to thank Congressman STOKES, because we do this today because he engineered this tradition for us in this House. Today he was able to sit here and advise us, and to instruct us and to help us learn protocol and to do all those things that we must learn to do to make these kinds of presentations.

I am grateful to him for his assistance, for his leadership, but I am eternally grateful to him for the role that he played in the founding and the development of the Congressional Black Caucus. It is because of his work that we understand our power. It is because of his work that we understand what it means to be unified. It is because of his leadership and the others that had the vision about where we could go and what we can be that we stand here today and share with the world who we are, what our aspirations are and what our vision is for the future.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership in also organizing this special order, and I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, if he would like to speak.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank the gentleman in the well for having taken this last hour and providing us the opportunity to extend this special order for a 2-hour period. I particularly want to recognize the contribution the gentleman is making as a member of the Congressional Black Caucus and one of the new leaders. So we are particularly proud to have had your participation this afternoon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on Black History Month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the members of the majority for yielding us this time in a way which allowed us to present this special order in a 2-hour format back-to-back.

I want to close with just a few remarks thanking my colleagues and thanking Mr. STOKES again for the tradition that has been established here by the Congressional Black Caucus. This is just the beginning. I hope that we stimulate a more thorough discussion all year round within the African-American community in general, but all of our organizations and all of our leaders ought to take another close look at history.

What we need is more profundity. We need to dig deeper into our history and follow the example of the South Africans. The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission is a model that is still pertinent for America. I think we ought to understand that some of the tensions within our society are there because people do not understand what the history of slavery is all about. They do not understand, even our own young people do not understand, how great their ancestors were.

I talk to young people and I say, all your ancestors were members of an aristocracy, an aristocracy of survivors. Survivors. Just to survive, just to survive the Atlantic crossing, just to get here to these shores alive, to survive 232 years. Two hundred thirty-two years. And remember Shakespeare's phrase, ''Tomorrow, and tomorrow and tomorrow.''

What was 232 years like? What did slaves have to look forward to? Two hundred thirty-two years. What are the economic implications of being in America, a people being in America for 232 years and not being paid for their labor? What are the economic implications of a people not being able to save anything? What are the economic implications of not being able to pass anything on to your children?

Some of our young people are ashamed that it seems that blacks are always at the bottom. They are at the bottom of the economic structure, et cetera. It would take a miracle for us to get to the top when we consider the fact that most wealth is inherited.

The researchers have established the fact that wealth is inherited. It is passed on from one generation to another. Sometimes it may be a small amount, but in order to have a small amount to invest and to make that amount grow you have to have it to begin with.

As I said before, the gap between the black middle class in America and the mainstream middle class is not great when it comes to income, the salaries being earned, the kinds of jobs being occupied; but when we compare the wealth, wealth means property, wealth means stocks and bonds, wealth means cars and things that have value beyond a few years. When we look at wealth, it is not there.

One of the reasons wealth is not there is because 232 years went by without us earning wages, being able to save. Nothing could be passed on to the young people. We need to study that. We need to look at the implications of it.

The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission is dealing with more immediate kinds of things that happened, all of the killings and maiming and murders that took place in South Africa, perpetrated by one group, the minority whites on the majority blacks. In order to deal with that and not have that poison their present, not have the past poison their present, to be able to go forward for the future, they have this Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

I do not have time to talk about it, but, Mr. Speaker, I want to enter into the RECORD an introduction which explains what the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa is all about. I say in introducing this, this background paper on the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa, that I intend to introduce legislation which calls for the establishment of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission in the United States related to slavery and the condition of people of African descent, the descendants of the slaves.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has introduced for several years a bill related to reparations. I am not going to add reparations. That is money. It excites people. It leads the discussion in the wrong direction. I want to talk about truth, truth before reconciliation.

We are not reconciled. We have too many people out there among the descendants of slaves who do not understand where they came from and who do not have the right self-esteem and sense of self-worth. We have too many people out there among the descendants of slave owners who are not willing to admit that there was a great injustice done and that injustice had repercussions.

Some of the people who stand on the floor and yell loudest about welfare and the need to make everybody go out and overnight get a job, et cetera, when the jobs do not exist and the economy does not favor certain kinds of people, they are descendants of slave owners.

We need to put these things in perspective. We need to study in a deeper and more thorough way some of the major documents of our own history, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

And again I want to emphasize the fact that reconciliation is more important than justice. We are not seeking justice. Justice means we have to go fight wars and make people pay us reparations, and really justice would be out of the question.

Just as the people in Haiti have given up on justice, and they are not trying to punish anybody, they want reconciliation. They want reconciliation with the people who perpetrated the murders. In Bosnia and the Balkans they will not get anywhere unless they give up any quest for justice. Seek reconciliation but do not seek reconciliation in a phony way. Do not think you can have reconciliation unless you deal with the truth first.

Let us take a document like the 14th Amendment and deal with it truthfully. The 14th amendment, like the 13th amendment and the 15th amendment, were perpetrated, were created by the Members of Congress in response to the aftermath of slavery. We had set the slaves free. Actually the 13th amendment set the slaves free, and what should we do now? The 14th amendment came along to give the slaves equal rights.

But the 14th amendment has some other things in it, and I want to call my colleagues' attention to the other things in the 14th amendment because it is more than just equal rights. The 14th amendment is now being distorted to take away any programs which offer special treatment for the descendants of African slaves. That is turning history on its head, because the interpretation of the Constitution, most of the time the Supreme Court wants to know what was the intent of the founders.

The 14th amendment says the intent of the founders in the 14th amendment was to correct injustices related to slavery. And there are other parts which go on to talk about getting rid of that three-fifths count and counting everybody whole. Every male is to be counted equally.

And there are other parts that talk about punishing, punishing the people who rose up in rebellion against the Union. That is all in the 14th amendment. I cite those things because that makes it clear the 14th amendment is not about equal rights for everybody. It is about making adjustments in this society to take care of the evils of slavery. And when we set aside laws and voting rights laws which favor the descendants of African slaves, then we are in harmony with the 14th amendment.

We need to study these things in more detail. We will be back in the future, and I hope my colleagues will join me. Civil rights organizations need to update their own quest for the truth in history. We need to support a Truth and Reconciliation Commission in order to move forward toward the year 2000 with a more just society.

There are issues that will be coming up this very year: putting a cap on Medicaid, denying medical services to the poorest Americans. The proportion of the poorest Americans is great

among African-Americans, the descendants of slaves. We are moving in a direction which is refusing to recognize that we ought to take some steps to reconcile with the former victims of slavery.

These things are part of history. The small individual achievements of individuals are part of history, and that has been cited in many cases here, but we need to take a more profound, in-depth look at history, the history of America and the awful institution of slavery; how the repercussions of that institution keep going on.

Mr. Speaker, I thank everybody who has participated today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to enter into the RECORD at this point an introduction which explains what the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa is all about.

INTRODUCTION BY THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE, MR. DULLAH OMAR

After a long process of discussion and debate, inside and outside of Parliament, the scene is finally set for the appointment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. It is important to understand the context in which the Truth and Reconciliation Commission will take place. The Commission is based on the final clause of the Interim Constitution which reads as follows:

''This Constitution provides a historic bridge between the past of a deeply divided society characterised by strife, conflict, untold suffering and injustice, and a future rounded on the recognition of human rights, democracy and peaceful co-existence and development opportunities for all South Africans, irrespective of colour, race, class, belief or sex.

''The pursuit of national unity, the well-being of all South African citizens and peace require reconciliation between the people of South Africa and the reconstruction of society.

''The adoption of this Constitution lays the secure foundation for the people of South Africa to transcend the divisions and strife of the past, which generated gross violations of human rights, the transgression of humanitarian principles in violent conflicts and a legacy of hatred, fear, guilt and revenge.

''These can now be addressed on the basis that there is a need for understanding but not for vengeance, a need for reparation but not retaliation, a need for ubuntu but not for victimisation.

''In order to advance such reconciliation and reconstruction, amnesty shall be granted in respect of acts, omissions and offences associated with political objectives and committed in the course of the conflicts of the past. To this end, Parliament under this Constitution shall adopt a law determining a firm cut-off date which shall be a date after 8 October 1990 and before 6 December 1993, and providing for the mechanisms, criteria and procedures, including tribunals, if any, through which such amnesty shall be dealt with at any time after the law has been passed.

''With this Constitution and these commitments we, the people of South Africa, open a new chapter in the history of our country.

I could have gone to Parliament and produced an amnesty law—but this would have been to ignore the victims of violence entirely. We recognised that we could not forgive perpetrators unless we attempt also to restore the honour and dignity of the victims and give effect to reparation.

The question of amnesty must be located in a broader context and the wounds of our people must be recognised. I do not distinguish between ANC wounds, PAC wounds and other wounds—many people are in need of healing, and we need to heal our country if we are to build a nation which will guarantee peace and stability.

A critical question which involves all of us in how do South Africans come to terms with the past. In trying to answer this important question honestly and openly, we are fortunate in having a President who is committed to genuine reconciliation in our country and to the transformation of South Africa into a non-racial, non-sexist democracy based on a recognition of universally accepted human rights.

The President believes—and many of us support him in this belief—that the truth concerning human rights violations in our country cannot be suppressed or simply forgotten. They ought to be investigated, recorded and made known. Therefore the President supports the setting up of a Commission of Truth and Reconciliation.

* * * * *

AMENDMENT XIII

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

AMENDMENT XIV

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss of emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

AMENDMENT XV

Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

SALUTE TO BLACK HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to join with my colleagues to salute Black History Month in the United States.

Just recently, Mr. Speaker, the Nation held a dual celebration, the inauguration of the President of the United States and the birthday of the late Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. Mr. Speaker, this was a leader who inspired a generation to dream of a society where prejudice has no place and intolerance is without a foothold.

□ 1730

Now as we stand on the threshold of a new century, we must reevaluate how we have held to the principles espoused by Dr. King. His message, in fact his very life, was a call to arms for millions of Americans. During his all too brief life, he raised the conscience of America and, in doing so, made the greatest Nation on Earth even greater. At times it seems as though his dream has been forgotten, it seems as though the differences of race cannot be overcome.

I was shocked and saddened last year, as many of my colleagues were and the citizens across the country, when depraved arsonists burned down black churches throughout the South. This throwback to a dark era hinted at the underlying and unresolved issue of racism in America. But once again America did not allow darkness to reign. Instead, Americans of all faiths and colors came together to rebuild those churches and as the walls rose, so did the promise of America.

Mr. Speaker, the promise of this Nation was born in the belief that we were all created equal and entitled to certain inalienable rights. That promise grew as our Nation grew until we realized that some were excluded from the promise of freedom and justice. Black Americans suffered greatly, not just in the South but also in northern States, where poverty and hopelessness were the norm for free blacks. But it

seems that in our darkest hours, Americans always rise to a new level of decency and honor.

During the American Civil War, it was Abraham Lincoln who gave voice to the truth that America cannot truly be free as long as we excluded men and women based on the color of their skin. As the civil rights movement in the 1960s grew, a new voice was heard, the voice of a preacher who reminded all Americans that only God could determine what was in a person's heart and a colorblind system of justice could establish equality in America.

Now at the dawn of the 21st century, Mr. Speaker, only a free and equal society can shape the future of this great Nation. Only by working together as a unified nation can we truly realize the potential of all of our citizens and the beauty of our more perfect union. Even today we have not reached a place where all minorities share equally in the American dream. President Clinton in his inaugural address issued a challenge to the Nation to reshape our society by creating a new government for a new century, a government humble enough not to try to solve all our problems for us, but strong enough to give us the tools to solve our problems for ourselves.

I agree with his challenge, but I add that all Americans must have access to the tools necessary to solve those problems. And so here in Black History Month, Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from the House on both sides of the aisle and the Senate as well and join with the executive branch and all Americans across the United States to make sure that we rededicate ourselves to the principles of Abraham Lincoln, the principles of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and to make sure that we correct the inequities and to make sure that opportunity for all, whether it be in education, housing, jobs, in training, access to public accommodation, is equal to all, and we will rededicate ourselves to that purpose and to those goals.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN PATENT SYSTEM UNDER THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I am asking my colleagues today to join me in cosponsoring the Patent Term Restoration Act. This piece of legislation is basically the same bill that I offered last year as H.R. 359. H.R. 359 had over 200 cosponsors; 81 of them were Democrats. H.R. 359 had the support of major universities, pharmaceutical companies, energy companies, energy innovators, biotech companies, venture capitalists, and, most importantly, it had the support of every small inventors organization in the country.

Last year H.R. 359, my piece of legislation, never made it to the floor of the House of Representatives for a vote. This year, we have every indication that it should get to the floor and have a vote here on the floor of the House of Representatives by the August break.

Last year there was another patent bill, as well as my own, that was introduced. This was a far different bill. It was introduced by Congressman Carlos Moorhead and Congresswoman Pat Schroeder, who are now, of course, retired from this institution. This bill had a dozen or so cosponsors, but it had the tremendous support, the enormous support, of multinational corporations and those people in the political and economic establishment that are struggling to create what they are calling a global economy.

You see, the Patent Term Restoration Act, H.R. 359, which I will be submitting and asking Members to join me in cosponsoring, takes a totally different approach than what last year's bill by Mr. Moorhead and Mrs. Schroeder was taking. In fact, their bill now, H.R. 3460, has been reintroduced as H.R. 400, which will also come to the floor by the August break.

So we have two different approaches, and I thought that today I would discuss this major decision that Congress will make that seems like it is such an obscure issue and a complicated issue that many Americans will probably not even understand that there is an important decision about to be made that will impact so directly on their lives and the lives of their children.

First of all, let us note that patent protection in the United States of America is something that has reaped tremendous rewards for our people. We have had, in the United States of America, the strongest patent protection of any country in the world.

In fact, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and others of our Founding Fathers insisted that the concept of patent protection be written into the Constitution of the United States. We in fact had the strongest patent protection because our Founding Fathers believed it, it was written into our Constitution, and throughout our history the idea of the ownership of one's creative genius was always supported by the American Government.

Thus, over the years, as people came here from every part of the world, people who wanted to work hard and people who had the creative spirit and a revolutionary spirit about them, these people brought with them new ideas, and they were confronted with a society that protected their ideas and gave them the right to own those ideas, just as we gave people the right to own property.

Many of the countries from which our Founding Fathers and Mothers came from, the right of property ownership for the average person did not exist. In fact, people were repressed, and the right of ownership, just like other rights, the right of religion and speech, were not things that were granted to the common man. These were things that were meant for the aristocracy. That is why people came to the United States of America, because they read Thomas Jefferson and they read Benjamin Franklin and they read Thomas Paine and Patrick Henry and John Adams and George Washington, and they read our Declaration of Independence and they knew something was going on in the United States of America. It was a place where the common man could come, he could raise his family, and a family could expect that their children would have opportunities beyond anything that was accessible anywhere else in the world. Part of this opportunity came from the fact that we recognized property rights. The property rights to own land, as I say, was also protected by the Constitution. The right of contract, and other economic liberties that were only thought of as rights for the elite in these other countries, were turned over to every person who was an American, and every person who came here who wished to become a citizen was given freedom. They were not given any subsidies or any type of welfare, but they were given freedom, and they were given the promise that their rights would be protected. As I say, interestingly enough, one of these rights that is so often ignored and often overlooked was the right to own one's own creative genius, the product of one's own creative genius, the patent right.

Traditionally, this is how the patent system worked in America. As I say, it was the strongest of any place in the world. Someone who had a new idea, whether it was Eli Whitney with the cotton gin or whether it was Samuel Morse with the telegraph or Alexander Graham Bell with his many inventions, the light bulb and others, these people would work on their idea and they would then develop their idea into a patent and take it in the proper form and would submit this idea, submit it to the Patent Office and the Patent Office would consider their idea.

Traditionally, no matter how long it took our Government to act in granting the right of ownership to that piece of property, that intellectual property, the applicant always knew that after the patent was granted that he would have a guaranteed patent term. Well, that was part of the guaranteed rights that we had.

You have a right to freedom of speech, you have a right of freedom of religion, you have a right of freedom of assembly. You have a right to own your property. Well, you also had a

right to a guaranteed patent term. In the early part of our country's history, the patent term was, no matter how long it took you to get it issued by the Government, if it took 10 years, you would still have 14 years of patent protection. They would give you a guaranteed patent term of 14 years once it was issued.

Later on, as America began to realize how important the development of technology was to our well-being, our Government wisely extended the patent term to be 17 years. So for the last 150 years, American inventors would work on their patent and develop new systems and new ideas and concepts and technologies. They would go to the Patent Office knowing, and their investors would see them through, knowing that no matter how long it took for that patent to be issued, they would have 17 years to recoup and benefit from that. From that time that they had put in personally or the venture capitalist who put in the investment, they knew they would have a chance to get a return.

This has served America so well. Technology and the fact that we have been on the cutting edge of technology has made all the difference in our country. It did not make just all the difference for the aristocracy. The fact is they did not have this freedom in other countries. They did not have the freedom of speech, the freedom to own property, the economic freedoms we have, and they also did not have the patent freedom that we had in America in these other lands, but the aristocracy did not care because they had the rights. The aristocracy kept the power and the rights to themselves in other societies.

That is why in the United States of America that we made the blessings of liberty to every person here, was available to every person here. That is the reason why we became a beacon of hope to the world, but also we became a leader in the world in the standard of living of our people, of the average person. Our people were able to outcompete every potential competitor in the world because Americans had, yes, low taxes, which was important, and yes, we had people who were willing to work. But there are other countries with low taxes and other countries that basically had many people willing to work. But what we did was we put our working people in the position of being able to outcompete anyone in the world because they were using superior technology, cutting-edge technology, and it was the American people that were coming up with the ideas to lift the burden of labor from their fellow Americans in a way that would increase the production of their fellow Americans, making us more productive but making us a wealthier society.

This was the vision that Thomas Jefferson had. This was the vision when he retired to Monticello and he was tinkering with his various devices, and if you visit that place today, you will see that Thomas Jefferson believed in that. If you visit Philadelphia and visit the home of Benjamin Franklin and the places where he lived, you will see that Benjamin Franklin was the inventor of the potbellied stove. Now that does not mean much to us today, but it certainly meant an incredible amount to people who lived in cold homes and all they had were fireplaces before this. It permitted the average person to be warm in the wintertime. It was a piece of technology. Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin. Benjamin Franklin invented the bifocal. He experimented with electricity, and how many of us read about that in our childhood when we went to school about Benjamin Franklin flying the kite and experimenting with electricity?

□ 1745

Thomas Jefferson experimenting with balloons in Paris when he represented the United States there, as well as Benjamin Franklin experimenting with flight; they had vision. In fact, when Benjamin Franklin in his waning years thought about the future—there is a famous quote from Benjamin Franklin saying that he is sorry that he is going to die, not because he is sorry for leaving the planet, just for not being alive, but he is sorry to die because he knows that the American people will be inventing so many new things and there will be so many changes in the human condition brought on by devices and technologies that are undreamed of in that day when he was alive, and that he just yearned to be able to see those inventions. Well, he had faith in the American people, and he ensured that the American people's rights were protected. And during the century after his death, the American people did not let him down. We were the center not only of freedom but of innovation.

The Fulton steam engine on the steamboats; we all think of Robert Fulton as being the inventor of the steam engine. He was not the inventor of the steam engine. The steam engine was built many, many years before, but it was the American genius that put that steam engine onto a boat in order to use it rather than having people having to paddle or use the sail in order to propel a boat.

We had inventions, whether it was the initial inventions that permitted us to have mass manufacturing, or whether it was the initial inventions of the telegraph or these other things that help us with communication, or whether it was the great surge of inventions that happened after we actually increased the length of the patent term.

Alexander Graham Bell and others came forth with these new types of processes that propelled mankind into an era when the common man was not just trying to keep warm in the winter, but where average families lived decent lives.

A black American who invented a process of how to bring down the cost of building shoes was issued a patent back in the, I think it was 1870, and this patent man, here he was in a country that basically discriminated against black American citizens, but they so believed in the patent right that they protected his right to that patent, and in doing so that black American was able to contribute knowledge and technology that within a few years reduced the price of shoes for the average American by 50 percent. And what that meant: that Americans were able to have shoes. Americans had clothing, they had shoes, they had full stomachs. They in fact were not slaves to their labor because there were labor-saving devices that were being developed every day by other Americans.

This is what made us. This freedom and this technology is what made us the most prosperous country in the world. It also protected us during those times of conflict when America's safety was in the balance during World War II and during the cold war. It was American technology, not raw manpower that saved America.

You know, if we tried to match, if Americans tried to match the world man for man, economically, we never would have succeeded; we will not succeed in that today. There are many people who think that just, oh, basically we cannot compete against cheap labor around the world. Well, there was always cheap labor around the world, and our people always outcompeted them; and in terms of warfare, we could not have competed against adversaries man to man, we could not put raw muscle power or the numbers of people in the field that adversaries, tyrannical adversaries, could.

What saved us economically and saved us militarily was the fact that our people were superior in the equipment that they had to use to produce goods and services, but they were also superior in the technology that was in the weapon systems they used to protect our country.

Our adversaries understand this. During the cold war, more than anything else it was the concept that the United States of America had technology that was well beyond anything that could have been produced in Communist countries. That unnerved the Communist bosses and led to a disintegration, a disintegration of the Communist empire that threatened us for four decades after World War II.

We can thank our rocket scientists, we can thank our people who went forth to develop a missile defense system, but we could also thank the aerospace engineers who over those 40 years built airplanes that would take our people out to battle and make sure that they were superior to any aircraft in the world. We can also thank our scientists and our other technologists who produced the radar, produced the

electronics, produced the other equipment that enabled us to with confidence tell the Soviet Union, as Ronald Reagan did, that it would be left in the dust bin of history unless it joined the free nations of the world and put away its aggressive aims on the West and its aims at destroying democracy.

So instead, we have ended the cold war without firing a shot at the Soviet Union. Instead of massive destruction, we ended the cold war by insuring that we were ahead technologically and by being strong advocates of human freedom.

Unfortunately, what helped us end the cold war, what has preserved the American way of life and given us a standard of living, given a standard of living to the American people as no one has ever dreamed before, is under attack. It is under attack because a global economic war has replaced a cold war. That is something we cannot get rid of. We cannot escape that. We cannot escape the fact that now we will have global competition because technology has improved communication and transportation beyond anything that could have been believed only 100 years ago.

So we have a global economy, we have a global war economically going on, but our adversaries have launched a sneak attack on the United States of America.

This will surprise many of the American people, but there has in the last 4 years been a concerted effort to diminish the patent protections that we have considered to be a right of Americans over the history of our country. There has been an underhanded effort to change patent law and to undo this great economic prosperity that we have for the common man by coupling, decoupling that is, America from its greatest asset, and that is our technological superiority over our competitors and our adversaries.

Let me say this so that it will be very plain for everyone to understand. The fundamental patent law of our country, which is the reason why Americans from all parts of the world were able to come here and produce these great new technologies, it did not just happen on its own, it did not happen because of our race or religion or anything else, it happened because we were a people that had a Government that was set up to protect intellectual property rights, especially patent rights, and those laws protecting patent rights have been fundamentally changed and there is a move in this country to basically greatly diminish the patent protection enjoyed by our people.

In order to what? Why would someone do that? Why would any American do that? It is being done by many people with a straight face, who come forward thinking they are trying to create a better world in the name of creating a global market. Lord save us from benevolent souls who would restructure our lives and remake the entire world in order to make it a better place by their understanding of what a better place means. Lord help us from people who think that they are going to make a perfect world because what we are facing when you face someone who is going to make a perfect world, you are facing an individual who has all the good intentions in his heart but is willing to destroy your rights in order to achieve his or her objectives. That is what we saw with all the past reformers who were going to make this a global world which was a perfect world.

Well, that is what we are facing here. We have groups of people, powerful individuals who think they are going to build a perfect world, and they are going to guide us into this new era of a global economy, and they are going to regulate the global economy. Well, they cannot even regulate the American economy. Even that does not work. And now they are going to try to create the global economy.

Now I happen to believe in free trade. I am a free trader. I believe commerce between people is a good thing. But I would tell you one thing: I do not believe in free trade with dictatorships because it is only free on one end. What I believe in is free trade between free people, and between free people we will prevail. But one of the things that will make us prevail is the fact that we will continue to protect our own citizens.

We live in a world where there are many countries that are not free, and if in order to create a global marketplace that includes these unfree societies, these dictatorial societies like Communist China, and like I would say probably a quarter of the other countries across this planet where people live in despotism, where they live in deprivation, where they have no rights, where the working people are basically slaves that have no right to organize unions, they have no right to have contracts enforced; they are the pawns of vicious and ugly rulers who side with the elites in their society. If we tried to basically lower the standards of the American protection, our protections that we have had, the protection of our rights as U.S. citizens, in order to create a global economy in which we will be dealing on an equal basis with those kinds of societies, the American people are bound to lose.

And what is happening, and the patent fight is just the first step in this global economy battle that we will see popping up here in Congress over and over again, what we will see, more and more, is that in order to be in a global economy we have to eliminate this, we have to eliminate that, we have to change this, our law, and we have to diminish the rights of Americans.

What we are talking about is that there is an elite at work in the world and in the United States that in order to create a global economy are willing to cast away and diminish the rights that have been protected by the American people, rights of the American people. They are willing to diminish those rights in order to achieve their objective because, once they achieve a global marketplace, their theory is, oh, the dictatorships like that in China and elsewhere, they will disappear because if they just have more contact with the West, well, those dictatorships, those ruthless regimes, will liberalize, they will become more benevolent, and they can become part, in fact, of the benevolent new global order. I guess George Bush called it the New World Order.

Well, this type of nonsense is going to lead to nothing but misery for the American people. This type of logic will lead the American people with the same status as the multitude of people who live in countries throughout the world that were the homelands of our forefathers and mothers. We left those societies to come and live in America to be free. We came here because we knew our rights as human beings would be protected and that America was a special place.

□ 1800

But now we see that those protections are going to be diminished.

In the beginning, they hoped to diminish these rights. Just basically, they do not want to talk about it, and in this first battle, I might say, of the global economy, they tried to do this in a very underhanded way. Let me describe how the patent rights of the American people have already been diminished.

What was our basic right to begin with? Our basic right was, the American inventor could apply for a patent and no matter how long it took the bureaucracy to prove that patent, he or she would still own that patent and have a right to benefit from it for 17 years. That was called the right of a guaranteed patent term.

Well, in order to harmonize our law and to have a global economy, it was determined that the United States should end the guaranteed patent term, that that should no longer be a guaranteed right for the American people. As I say, in a very underhanded fashion the change in the patent law was snuck in, and I say snuck in because I asked repeatedly for any language that would be in the GATT implementation legislation about patents, and was denied the right to know what was in there until the very last minute. I am a Member of Congress asking what language will be in a piece of legislation, and the administration was denying me that right to know what was in it. They put this change in patent law into the GATT implementation legislation.

Let me explain what GATT implementation legislation means. The GATT implementation legislation is the legislation that we passed in Congress in order to fulfill our obligations by agreements that we reached with other countries to establish the general policies on trade and tariffs for around the world. Basically, GATT means General Agreement on Trades and Tariffs.

When this administration and other administrations were negotiating GATT, they were given the right to negotiate GATT by the Members of Congress, and I voted for this, by the way. They were given what they called fast track authority, because there is nobody to negotiate an agreement like this if you are going to have every little thing that is agreed upon have to be voted up and down by Congress.

Fast track simply means that the Congress will be kept informed of what is involved in the GATT agreement, and then the Congress would be given 50 days to examine the agreement and everything that is in the legislation that implements the agreement, and then we would only have an up or down vote on the GATT implementation legislation.

So we gave up our rights here; to look at every little section of the GATT implementation legislation, we gave up that right with the promise that we would have 50 days to examine it and know everything that was in it; and that there would be nothing, and here is the catch, there would be nothing in that legislation that was not required by the GATT agreement itself, and the agreement that we made with all of these other countries.

Well, there was no agreement made as part of GATT that required us to cast aside and to eliminate this traditional guarantee that we had of patent protection important to the American people. There was nothing in there that mandated we had to do that. Yet, the administration snuck this into the GATT implementation legislation, would not even tell me as a Member of Congress until the last minute that it was in there, and then gave us just a few days to pass GATT. Luckily, we beat them back and we were able to postpone that vote on the GATT implementation legislation.

That is really when I became active on this issue of the GATT implementation legislation. What it was was an amendment, a small amendment, obscure, hard to see the importance of it; and in fact, if you read the language it looked like they were actually increasing the time of patent protection for the American people.

The change is, and traditionally, remember, if you applied for a patent, no matter how long it took you to get it, once you got it, it was yours for 17 years, 17 years of a guaranteed patent protection. Now, under the new law which is now in law, they totally betrayed us, they put it in there without it being required by GATT, I was not able to defeat it, now what does the law say?

The law says that someone who comes up with a new idea, new invention, can submit that, but the clock starts ticking immediately. And the clock is ticking not against the government, not against the bureaucracy, not against those people on the outside who would try to interfere, try to interfere with a man's right to have his patent issued as soon as possible; no, the clock is ticking against the inventor. If it takes him 15 or 20 years to get his patent, his or her patent issued, that inventor will have seen three-quarters of his or her patent term eliminated, because the time is ticking, the clock is ticking against the inventor, and he or she only has 20 years.

And if it takes 15 years, and many of the breakthrough technologies that we have had, especially in this last two and three decades, many of them take 5 and 10 years for a patent owner to get the patent issued, because if it is a breakthrough technology—by the way, most of the patents, 90 percent of all patents are very simple, just readjustments of new technology. The breakthrough technologies take a very long time to get through the patent system. Many of them have taken 10 and 20 years themselves.

That means that we are dramatically reducing the amount of time that our inventors have to reap the rewards of their own innovation, and in fact we have eliminated the guaranteed patent term. There is no guaranteed patent term. That was done. That was done basically in a very surreptitious way, and I have been fighting that battle. That is what the Patent Restoration Act is going to be all about, is restoring the guaranteed patent term.

But those people who eliminated that guaranteed patent term, why did they do that? They did it, as I say, as part of this harmonization effort. But who really started the ball rolling? The American people will be surprised to hear, the real reason we have been trying to eliminate the guaranteed patent term by some people here in this body who have been trying to eliminate the guaranteed patent term is because it will harmonize our law with Japan.

Bruce Lehman, the head of our patent office, went to Japan, had a meeting with his counterpart in which he signed an agreement to basically harmonize our law, not to bring up the level of protection in Japan to that of the United States, but to bring down the level of protection in the United States to that of the level of Japan.

That system, where there is no guaranteed term and the clock is ticking against the inventor, has been the Japanese system. That is why they never invented anything. That is why they use our technology, because they have a system where the inventor, once he applies, the clock is ticking against the inventor. The huge corporations come in and they beat down the inventors and they force them to give up their rights, and the creative people in that society are steamrollered by powerful interests who want to have control of the wealth-producing ideas and technology that will determine who has the power in the future.

That is the system they are imposing on us, ladies and gentlemen. That is the system that these planners want to put on the United States.

There is, by the way, another bill, as I say, that is being introduced by the same people who snuck this into the GATT implementation legislation. It is H.R. 400. It is the second shoe that is falling. The first shoe was eliminating the guaranteed patent term for the American people. That helped harmonize law with Japan, except in Japan they also have something else. H.R. 400, and I call this the Steal American Technologies Act, H.R. 400, the main purpose of that bill is to do what?

The bill, by the way, when it was first introduced was called the Patent Publication Act. That is what it was originally titled when they first introduced it in the last session of Congress. But they changed that right away, because they figured out, oh, my gosh, everybody realizes what it is all about. No; H.R. 400 is almost the same piece of legislation, it has the same purpose. It is to harmonize our law with Japan on the last element that we are not the same with Japan on.

In Japan it has been far different than the United States. In the United States, someone comes up with a new piece of technology, patents it, goes to the patent office and applies for a patent. That man is not only guaranteed, no matter how long that man or woman, no matter how long it took them to get their patent through the process, they would have that 17 guaranteed years of protection, but they were also guaranteed that during the time before that patent was issued, that information, all of the creative genius, all of the investigatory work, all of the materials and details about the new technology would be kept secret and confidential. No one would know about it, and in fact, it was a felony for Members of the Government to disclose that information because we protected the rights of that inventor.

Well, guess what H.R. 400 does? It says that after 18 months, whether or not the patent has been issued to the American patent applicant, it will be published for the entire world to see. Do you get what I am saying here? Understand the magnitude of this. Every new idea that Americans come up with technologically will be published for every copycat brigand and everyone who would set up factories in order to destroy us economically. They will have every piece of information about America's new innovative ideas, even before the patents are issued. And do you know why? Because that is the way it is in Japan. That is also Japanese law.

It is Japanese law that you do not have a guaranteed patent term, the clock is ticking against the inventor, and as soon as the inventor puts this patent in, after 18 months it is published so everybody in Japan can see it. That is why no one invents anything in Japan, and that is why the special interests, the powerful lords of Japan, the great shoguns of their economy beat the life out of their own people in order to steal the new technological ideas, and why people just do not invent anything.

But here is the problem: If we change our laws so that we do not have a guaranteed patent term, and that after 18 months these very same shoguns in Japan, and monsters in China who murder their own people, who do not care one bit about human rights, these people in different parts of the world who wish to steal everything that is America's, copycats, these people will now know all of our secrets. They will be able to come here and do to the American people, through people that they have hired, lawyers and lobbyists who they have hired here in Washington, DC, to do to our people what they have been doing to their own people.

We are making the American people vulnerable to the same sort of corrupt power plays that have been going on for centuries in these other societies. We are making our own people vulnerable to it here, and we are doing it in an area that makes America the most vulnerable of all. It is our future ability to compete with the world technologically. It is our achilles' heel. It did not take our economic adversaries too long to realize, ''How do we bring America down? These guys are always one step ahead of us. They are one step ahead of us because they have a system that protects these new inventors, these individuals who come up with all of the ideas.''

The major force behind this move for harmonization is coming from multinational corporations. It is coming from some people who are very well-intended, who have become convinced that there is a problem in our current system. They call it a submarine patent problem. Submarine patents, by the way, are a minor problem that have affected certain industries in a very bad way. The electronics industry, there are some problems in which submarine patents have played a part and have hurt some people. Some people have been unfairly treated economically and businesswise because of submarine patents.

To let my colleagues know what a submarine patent is, it is when it is alleged that inventors try to stall the issuance of their own patent. They manipulate the system at the patent office so that their patent will not be issued until 5 years later or 10 years later, because they want it to be issued later, so then they will be able to have more money coming in because their technology will be a little bit better used in the long term rather than short term.

□ 1815

Of course, this happens maybe in one-tenth of 1 percent, perhaps, at most, of all patents, and it has minimal impact on the overall economy. Minimal impact. What they are telling us is this problem, they believe it will be solved. And how will it be solved? It will be solved by publishing all the information on every patent in America so everybody will know what that inventor is hiding, and to eliminate the guaranteed patent term so that the inventor, all the time will be put against the inventor.

Yes, there is a small problem called the submarine patent problem. By the way, in the piece of legislation I am proposing, the Patent Term Restoration Act, we deal with that. The only thing to solve this problem, it only takes some remedial discipline or basically some remedial reforms within the Patent Office structure itself. We do not even need legislation on that.

The Patent Office, because if you have someone manipulating the process at the Patent Office, the Patent Office can simply change their procedures to prevent manipulation. It is the Patent Office that has to make the decision to grant someone a continuance in their application or whatever. The Patent Office can change this.

But no, no, we cannot do that. We have been told instead, in order to solve this problem we have to destroy the whole patent system. We have to take the system that has served America so well and eliminate the basics of that system in order to get to the submarine patent problem.

I used this example before and I will use it tonight, as well. This is very similar to someone who has a hangnail problem and his doctor says, you have a hangnail; in fact, your hangnail is infected. Every time you go to the doctor, the doctor is saying, oh my gosh, this hangnail; in fact, you are even beginning to limp a little bit because your hangnail is bothering your foot. The doctor says, look at the hangnail; and all the doctor ever talks to you about is how bad the hangnail is.

That is what is happening with the submarine patent. Any time you talk about patent law, the people who are trying to destroy the patent system talk about the submarine patents. It is like that hangnail. They have huge pictures of the hangnail, how ugly it looks; please focus on the hangnail. Then you find out what the doctor really wants to do is amputate your leg. And you say, amputate my leg for a hangnail? You are out of your mind. No, look how bad hangnails are.

I would say that if someone's doctor is suggesting that they amputate the leg because you have a hangnail, that you had better question either the sanity or the motives of your doctor. Something is wrong there. And the doctor says, we have to get the hangnail corrected; otherwise you are going to limp for the rest of your life or as long as that hangnail is there. But you say, wait a minute; if I cut my leg off, I will not even be able to walk. Forget it, hangnails are terrible.

That is what is happening with the submarine patent issue. There is a problem. It can be corrected easily. But it is being used as an excuse to destroy the patent rights that have been part of the American system since the founding of our country.

We had a right to a guaranteed patent term. They are using the submarine patent issue, which I think is a bogus issue, or in fact, a minuscule part of our system, they are using that as an excuse to publish every secret that we have developed technologically to people all over the world who will steal that technology and will use it against us. This is how terrible it is.

Our genius will be used to destroy our standard of living. Our genius will be used not to make the lives of the American people better, not to enable us to compete with the rest of the world, against people with low-priced labor. Our genius will not be used to secure us from foreign adversaries. Our genius will be exposed to the rest of the world, giving it to them on a platter, and they will use it against us. This is a sin against the American people.

People say, how can this possibly happen? How can it happen? We are dealing with powerful interest groups. These multinational corporations, many of them who control American corporations now, these people are the ones who hire lobbyists. They determine the policy of these big companies.

Is it any wonder that these big companies perhaps do not have the best interests of the American people at heart, when they are owned and controlled by groups of who knows who; somewhere, people who perhaps have absolutely no, they have absolutely no commitment to the ideals that we think of as Americans?

I have been told over and over again in the debate, Most Favored Nation debate about China, that if we just deal with China for so long that this rotten Communist regime is going to liberalize and it is going to become more mellow, and actually we are teaching the Chinese how to respect human rights.

That is not what it is all about. We know that. These businessmen are out to make money and they do not care if it is blood money or not, and they do not care if they have to put out of work all their American workers; they are going to go over there and make a 10-percent or 15-percent profit, rather than a profit here with 5 or 6 percent, in which the American people would be able to have jobs, to have decent families.

These same people get involved in economic relationships. They have no ideals. They never go to the Communist bosses in China and say, by the way, now that I am here doing business, I would like to tell you that, you know, you should respect people's right to have their own religion. You should not be enclosing those Christians in jail or those Buddhists over here in prison camps, or you should not be wiping out villages in Tibet. We should live with respect towards human rights. They do not do that in China. These very same people now are trying to change our law so that the inventions we come up with as American people, within 18 months they will have every detail, and it will be faxed to their companies in China, and they will be producing it over there.

I was in the office here in the Rayburn Building when last year's bill, which I call the Steal American Technologies Act, H.R. 400, the equivalent of that was going through committee last year. There was a man from a solar energy company. He said, Mr. Congressman, if this passes and they publish all the information about my patent applications after 18 months, I will tell you what will happen. The Japanese will have all that information, and they will have it in production, with my new technology, before I am even issued my patent. They will take that profit that they have used from my technology and they will use it to destroy me. They will hire lawyers in the United States and elsewhere to destroy me and take away my rights to what I have developed with millions of dollars. That is what will happen. This will be a catastrophe for my company.

It is not hard to understand. They are going to publish everything for every brigand in the world to see. Yet they say it with a straight face; we have to do that because you have a hangnail. There is a little submarine patent problem here. We can solve the submarine patent problem. Do not let anybody talk about amputating your leg for a hangnail. Do not let anybody talk about destroying your rights as Americans because there are some problems in our country.

We have had problems with people who abuse their free speech. We have had problems with people who abuse the freedom of religion. We have had problems with our freedom in this country because some people misuse it. But that is no excuse to diminish the protection of these freedoms that are enjoyed by the American people. That is what we are being told we have to accept now, economically. They will win, unless the American people rise up and talk to their Members of Congress.

This is what will surprise everyone. Most Members of Congress have no idea this is going on. I would say 75 percent of the Members of Congress have no idea about this battle. If they do, they just heard a little bit about it, and it is only one thing they have heard in passing, and they have no idea of the magnitude of the decision that is going to be made. But they are being visited by lobbyists, and they are being visited and pressured by huge corporations that have connections to this international, global dream of a global marketplace, by multinational corporations who they emulate or are in economic relationships with.

These Members of Congress might go along with the pressure. But one thing I can tell you, in America, when the American people talk to their Members of Congress, when the American people watch how their Congressmen vote and let their Congressmen know that, let their Members of Congress know how important it is to you and to the future of our country about certain issues, this Congress responds.

Lobbyists and paid adversaries can be overcome when people who live throughout our country contact their Congressman and say, you have to defeat H.R. 400, the Steal American Technologies Act; you have to defeat that. It is going to hurt our country, it is going to hurt the standard of living of normal people. You have to support this restoration of America's patent rights. You have to restore the patent term to the American people, as we have had in our country's past, because this will give us what we need to maintain the standard of living of regular people, not just the elite.

The elite has lost touch. I will tell Members something. If we had to depend on the elite of the business community to save American freedom, we would all be in chains right now. Most of the business elite of this country are looking for that extra 5-percent profit at the expense of every value and expense of the freedom of other people in the world. They do not care, because they want that extra 10-percent profit. We are not talking about the entrepreneurs who built American industry 100 years ago, people who knew what it was like to come from humble beginnings.

We are talking about people who have been educated at Harvard and educated at all these elitist schools who really do not identify with the American people. They identify more with the elite of other societies. They would rather hobnob with these people in other societies in their guarded, gated communities.

The American people need to express themselves, that they will not see their rights diminished in order to establish a global marketplace, or anything else. Yes, we will correct any abuses that exist. We are not a perfect country. But we will not see our freedoms diminished because some people abuse them.

We will enter this global marketplace with the protections we have had. We will win the competition, just the way we have beaten the competition before. We have beaten them because we had freedom and we had technology on our side. That is what our Founding Fathers saw so long ago, that people would come to this country, and that is why our country would prosper, that is why our people would be safe. Here we are, with a little obscure issue like patent law, a little issue like that, that has been discovered as very pivotal to the well-being of our country in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will pay attention, and I know they will, pay attention to calls from home when people call to say, for goodness sakes, do not support this H.R. 400, the Steal American Technologies Act, and please, cosponsor DANA ROHRABACHER's bill that will restore patent protection for the American people, and protect us.

By the way, one other part of H.R. 400 I need to tell you about. That is something that is going to shock you more than anything I have said. It eliminates the Patent Office from the U.S. Government. It takes our patent examiners and turns it into a quasi-private corporation. It is like they are proposing in the Steal American Technologies Act to basically make the judges who determine who owns the technology, take them away from their civil service status and Government status now, which means they have to answer to us, and they are going to make it a quasi-independent organization.

They are going to publish all our secrets to the world. They are going to take away the guaranteed patent term. Now they are just going to obliterate the Patent Office as part of the U.S. Government. Does that not tell us something? We have to act. We would not let our courts be privatized by somebody who we did not know, who was going to run the show. We would not let that happen.

These hardworking patent examiners, these people are making decisions that affect not only the course of our country's future, but affect billions of dollars of wealth. They should be part of the Government. I believe in privatization, but you do not privatize something like that.

I would hope that people gather together and say we will not stand for this diminishing of our rights. I know we will come through, and America will not only survive, but America will prevail and America will be free, because that is the way God intended America to be.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HOEKSTRA) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LATOURETTE, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANDREWS.
Ms. WOOLSEY.
Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut.
Mr. FAZIO of California.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. VISCLOSKY.
Mr. MURTHA.
Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mr. STOKES.
Mr. RICHARDSON.
Mr. TOWNS.
Mr. ORTIZ.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOEKSTRA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROGERS in two instances.
Mr. DICKEY.
Mr. GOSS in two instances.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. RAMSTAD.
Mr. LIVINGSTON in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OWENS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COBLE.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. SANDERS.
Mr. TOWNS.
Ms. WOOLSEY.
Mr. HOUGHTON.
Ms. DUNN.
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROHRABACHER) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. GALLEGLY.
Mr. BAKER.
Mr. CASTLE.
Mr. HILLIARD.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 12, 1997, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1732. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Glufosinate Ammonium; Tolerances for Residues (FRL 5585–8) received February 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1733. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule—Sale of HUD–Held Single Family Mortgages [Docket No. FR–3814–F–04] (RIN: 2502–AG42) received February 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1734. A letter from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Hamilton County, Tennessee [TN–178–1–9707a; FRL–5682–9] received February 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1735. A letter from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Tennessee and Memphis-Shelby County, Tennessee [TN–155–1–7178; TN–MEM–149–3–9701; FRL–5669–3] received February 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1736. A letter from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Modification of the Ozone Monitoring Season; Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi [FRL–5683–4] received February 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1737. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Approval and Promulgation of Carbon Monoxide Implementation Plan for the State of Alaska: Anchorage and Fairbanks Emission Inventory (FRL 5686–2) received February 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1738. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Indiana (FRL 5678–5) received February 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1739. A letter from the Director of the Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Changes in the Operator Licensing Program [NRC Generic Letter 95–06, Supplement 1] received February 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1740. A letter from the Senior Attorney, United States Copyright Office, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1741. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Reemployment Rights of Certain Merchant Seamen (Maritime Administration) [Docket No. R 169] (RIN: 2133–AB28) received February 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1742. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Operational Measures to Reduce Oil Spills from Existing Tank Vessels Without Double Hulls (U.S. Coast Guard) [CGD 91–045] (RIN: 2115–AE01) received February 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1743. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; Hillsborough Bay; Tampa, FL (U.S. Coast Guard) [CGD07–96–074] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received February 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1744. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, FL (U.S. Coast Guard) [CGD07–96–054] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received February 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1745. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Facilities Transferring Oil or Hazardous Materials in Bulk (U.S. Coast Guard) [CGD 93–056] (RIN: 2115–AE59) received February 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1746. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone Regulations: Southeast end of Vieques Island, PR (U.S. Coast Guard) [COTP San Juan 96–077] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received February 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 46. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 581) to amend the Public Law 104–208 to provide that the President may make funds appropriated for population planning and other population assistance available on March 1, 1997, subject to restrictions on assistance to foreign organizations that perform or actively promote abortions (Rept. 105–3). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SOLOMON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 47. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the number of terms of office of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives (Rept. 105–4). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 666. A bill to amend the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 relating to welfare and public benefits for aliens; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 667. A bill to amend the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to provide for an exception to limited eligibility for SSI and food stamps for totally and permanently disabled permanent resident aliens; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 668. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate the airport and airway trust fund excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DREIER, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. FLAKE):

H.R. 669. A bill to enhance competition in the financial services sector, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska:

H.R. 670. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to permit States to impose fees to finance programs for providing air services to small communities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, MR. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. LUTHER):

H.R. 671. A bill to prohibit the use of certain assistance provided under the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 and the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 for employment relocation activities; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 672. A bill to make technical amendments to certain provisions of title 17, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 673. A bill to provide for the extension of surcharges on patent fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELAY (for himself, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUYER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TANNER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. CARSON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. SALMON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. FROST, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. PEASE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MICA, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRADY, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. JOHN, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. HULSHOF):

H.R. 674. A bill to authorize funds for construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 675. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Education with respect to eligibility standards for short-term educational programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 676. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to limit the penalty for late enrollment under the Medicare Program to 10 percent and twice the period of no enrollment; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. BASS, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey):

H.R. 677. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to provide that no funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out that act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GILLMOR (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GOSS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. NEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FROST, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SABO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HORN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. STABENOW):

H.R. 678. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the sesquicentennial of the birth of Thomas Alva Edison, to redesign the half dollar circulating coin for 1997 to commemorate Thomas Edison, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. HAMILTON (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Mr. MCINTOSH):

H.R. 679. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to exclude beverage alcohol compounds emitted from aging warehouses from the definition of volatile organic compounds; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 680. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the transfer to States of surplus personal property for donation to nonprofit providers of necessaries to impoverished families and individuals; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. ROGAN):

H.R. 681. A bill to designate the U.S. Post Office building located at 313 East Broadway in Glendale, CA, as the ''Carlos J. Moorhead Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. KOLBE:

H.R. 682. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess up to $2 per person visiting the Grand Canyon or other national park to secure bonds for capital improvements to the park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FROST, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINTOSH, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEY, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SNOWBARGER, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 683. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the unified estate and gift tax credit to an amount equivalent to a $1,200,000 exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 684. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of funeral trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLVER (for himself, Mr. SABO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 685. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to raise the minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RAMSTAD (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. VENTO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SABO, Mr. MANTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. EWING, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. MINGE, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. CAMPBELL):

H.R. 686. A bill to extend certain Medicare community nursing organization demonstration projects; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SABO (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OLVER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. VENTO, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Ms. MCKINNEY):

H.R. 687. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny employers a deduction for payments of excessive compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SKEEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. KLUG, Mr. PARKER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. GILLMOR, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GEKAS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. MCCRERY):

H.R. 688. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to require at least 85 percent of funds appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency from the leaking underground storage tank trust fund to be distributed to States for cooperative agreements for undertaking corrective action and for enforcement of subtitle I of such act; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr.

MCNULTY, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island):

H.R. 689. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to continue full-time equivalent resident reimbursement for an additional 1 year under Medicare for direct graduate medical education for residents enrolled in combined approved primary care medical residency training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 690. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify that the Government in the Sunshine Act applies to the Federal Open Market Committee; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 691. A bill to provide for a three-judge division of the court to determine whether cases alleging breach of secret Government contracts should be tried in court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 692. A bill to amend the independent counsel provisions of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the appointment of an independent counsel when the Attorney General determines that Department of Justice employees have engaged in certain conduct; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey:

H.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself and Mr. DICKEY):

H.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POMEROY:

H.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require a balanced budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. GILMAN):

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution congratulating the people of the Republic of Nicaragua on the success of their democratic elections held on October 20, 1996; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the German Government should investigate and prosecute Dr. Hans Joachim Sewering for his war crimes of euthanasia committed during World War II; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. DUNN of Washington (for herself, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. FOWLER, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mrs. CARSON, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FROST, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H. Res. 48. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the need for further studies and accurate guidelines regarding the use of mammograms and other technology to screen women between the ages of 40 and 49 for breast cancer; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. HAMILTON, and Mr. MANZULLO):

H. Res. 49. Resolution expressing appreciation for the life and service of Ambassador Pamela C. Harriman; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H. Res. 50. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that aviators who meet the qualification standards of the Air Forces Escape and Evasion Society should be granted recognition for meritorious service by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on National Security.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1: Ms. NORTON, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. PEASE, and Mr. HASTERT.

H.R. 14: Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 41: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 53: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 100: Mr. STUMP, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

H.R. 135: Mr. FORD, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 156: Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 157: Mr. GEKAS, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 158: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 162: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 163: Mr. PARKER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. TALENT, MR. ROHRABACHER, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 169: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. WEXLER, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 180: Mr. WEXLER and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 230: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 306: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 337: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 338: Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H.R. 340: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 343: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 406: Mr. GEKAS, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 407: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 410: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 411: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. LOFGREN, MS. FURSE, Mr. DIXON, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 418: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 420: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 443: Ms. NORTON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. WEYGAND.

H.R. 446: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. BAKER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. PAPPAS, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 450: Mr. COLLINS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. TALENT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H.R. 464: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 465: Mr. WYNN and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 477: Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado.

H.R. 493: Mr. CASTLE, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. CAPPS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 495: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 498: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 500: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 539: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 554: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 561: Mr. GREEN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FROST, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. FORD, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 612: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. NEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. FAZIO of California, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 615: Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 627: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 633: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 664: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.J. Res. 1: Mrs. EMERSON and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. COBURN.

H.J. Res. 27: Mr. CLYBURN.

H. Res. 22: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. KLUG, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H. Res. 23: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mr. COBURN.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.J. RES. 2

OFFERED BY: MR. HUTCHINSON

(Amendment in the Nature of Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

''CONGRESSIONAL TERM LIMITS AMENDMENT

''SECTION A. No person shall serve in the office of United States Representative for more than three terms, but upon ratification of the Congressional Term Limits Amendment no person who has held the office of United States Representative or who then holds the office shall serve for more than two additional terms.

''SECTION B. No person shall serve in the office of United States Senator for more than two terms, but upon ratification of the Congressional Term Limits Amendment no person who has held the office of United States Senator or who then holds the office shall serve more than one additional term.

''SECTION C. This article shall have no time limit within which it must be ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states.''.