

math teachers for the Interactive Math Program. In addition to this Connecticut Teacher of the Year award, Mrs. Cavanaugh was a finalist for the Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching in 1998 and 1986, the 1998 Glastonbury Teacher of the Year, the Connecticut Association of School Superintendents' Middle School Teacher of the Year finalist in 1997, and Celebration of Excellence winner in 1986. As a resident of Marlborough, Connecticut, she and her husband Roy Cavanaugh have four children, Lindsey, Matthew, Shannon, and Kevin.

Again, I would like to commend Mrs. Cavanaugh on this achievement. She displays the kind of dedication, determination, and enthusiasm that make our public school system work. With teachers of Mrs. Cavanaugh's caliber, this next generation of Americans will surely reach the stars.

IN MEMORY OF WILLIAM CAFARO

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1998

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember William Cafaro, a brilliant entrepreneur, a generous philanthropist, a political activist, and a good friend.

Mr. Cafaro changed the way America shops by pioneering the shopping center industry. He built some of the nation's first strip plazas and enclosed malls. His privately owned company has consistently ranked in the top ten largest commercial real estate developers in the nation. Mr. Cafaro emerged as a real estate developer and entrepreneur in the 1940's and soon revolutionized the industry nationwide.

This self-made man never forgot his roots. He has been recognized by countless organizations for his generosity and philanthropic work in the community. Among numerous other civic activities, Mr. Cafaro was especially involved in his church and in education. He was recently awarded a lifetime achievement award for humanitarian service from the National Italian American Foundation and was honored by President Clinton.

Mr. Cafaro was active in politics as well. He was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention for three presidential elections and was a member of the Electoral College. He was friends with several Presidents including Harry S. Truman, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton and visited the White House many times.

Above all, Mr. Cafaro never lost sight of what was most important to him: his family, church, company, and community. His leadership and generosity are a great loss.

HUMAN RIGHTS SPEECH

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1998

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached excerpt from a speech I gave to the Columbus Human Rights Commission on April 4, 1998.

ADDRESS TO THE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
ANNUAL DINNER, COLUMBUS, INDIANA, APRIL
4, 1998

(By Lee H. Hamilton)

I want to talk with you tonight about the challenges we face in advancing human rights. A deep concern for human rights is a basic and fundamental expression of the values of the American people. It is part of who we are and what we are.

In one sense, the history of this country can be told as the story of the advancement of human rights. Our ancestors fought a War of Independence to secure civil and political liberties, and a Civil War to ensure that all of its people, black and white, should be free and enjoy the basic rights of citizenship. In this century, Americans have struggled to secure political, social, and economic rights for women, minorities, and working people.

American has also been a model, a guide to other countries in its concern for human rights. With some success, and with some failures, too, we have sought to promote democratic institutions and the observance of human rights at home and abroad.

How would you respond if I asked you to define for me in one sentence what this country is all about? Most of you—I think—would say: At its very core, this country is about giving its people the opportunity to be the best that they can be. Our country does not provide equal opportunity to all its citizens. It does not assure success. But, at the very least, it does provide opportunity and it tries to remove barriers that deny us a fair chance to succeed. Human rights are about removing those obstacles, and ensuring that all of us are treated fairly, equally, and justly in our individual pursuit of happiness.

The Columbus Human Rights Commission is so important because it does precisely that. In fighting discrimination and human rights abuses at the local level, this Commission works to ensure that the magnificent ideal of the Declaration of Independence—that all men are created equal—becomes reality. It serves to help this community be a place where everyone has an opportunity to become the best they can be.

I. CIVIL RIGHTS AT HOME: CHANGING ATTITUDES, CHANGING ISSUES

Our country is today in the midst of a national debate about civil rights and race relations, perhaps for the first time since Congress passed landmark civil and voting rights laws in the mid-1960s. I have cast over 5,000 votes in my years in Congress, but few, if any, have given me more satisfaction than to support these laws. Much of the current debate has focused on affirmative action (more on that later). The debate, however, also goes to more fundamental questions about race in America: do we continue to be two Americas, one black and one white? and if we do live in two Americas, is that acceptable? and if it is acceptable, what does that say about the future of this country?

Someone asked me the other day how public views on race relations have changed since the Civil Rights Era. Three things come to mind.

a. Public consensus

First, there was broad public consensus in the 1960s on what was wrong in our country and what needed to be done. Americans were outraged by the treatment of Civil Rights marchers in the South, and demanded that Congress take steps to secure basic civil and political liberties for all Americans in every part of the country. Today, we have strong anti-discrimination laws on the books, and an overwhelming majority of Americans agree that racial discrimination is wrong and must be proscribed.

Consensus quickly breaks down, however, once you scratch beneath the surface. Blacks

and whites, for example, may agree that racial discrimination is wrong, but they have sharply differing views about how prevalent such discrimination is today in our society. In a recent poll three in four white Americans said blacks in their community are treated the same as whites. Only 49% of the blacks agreed. Whites really see very little problem when it comes to opportunities for blacks in jobs, education, and housing. Many blacks see racial discrimination as a fact of life.

Whites have generally become more optimistic that progress toward equality has occurred and that racial discrimination has declined. Blacks, in contrast, are increasingly discouraged about race relations and discrimination.

The debate over affirmative action provides another example of the breakdown in the consensus. Supporters of affirmative action say that while the situation has improved, racism persists in this country, and that affirmative action is needed to remedy the effects of discrimination. Affirmative action programs, they will note, have provided opportunities for millions of minorities, expanding the American middle class and strengthening our political system and economy. Opponents respond that affirmative action is fundamentally unfair, that people should succeed or fail based on character, talent and effort, not race. Either they say that we now live in a colorblind society so race-based policies are unnecessary, or they say that, while racism may persist, affirmative action leads to double standards which heighten rather than reduce racial tensions.

b. sense of optimism

Second, during the Civil Rights Era there was a strong sense of public optimism about tackling problems associated with race. I don't suggest it was a Golden Age. We then lived in a segregated society, where minorities were denied political and civil rights as well as economic and educational opportunities.

What has changed, however, is our outlook on the future of race relations. Back then, many of us took to heart Dr. King's vision of an integrated America, where people would be judged not by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. We, blacks and whites, believed that anti-poverty efforts could wipe out the inner city slums and lift the poor into the great American middle class. We believed—perhaps naively—that anti-discrimination laws would lead to a society with fully integrated schools, neighborhoods and workplaces.

We have made remarkable progress toward racial equality over the last 30 years, seen, I suppose, most conspicuously in the expansion of voting rights and of a black middle class, educated and affluent, that has taken advantage of new opportunities. But, in many other respects, this is not the world we dreamed of 30 years ago. White and black America are, in many respects, drifting apart. Many blacks feel aggrieved. They observe that black incomes are still only 75% of white ones; 40% of black children live in poverty; black unemployment is more than twice as high; and the life expectancy for black males is more than eight years less than for white men (65 years vs. 73 years). They say whites have lost interest in their plight, cutting federal programs that benefit their communities and eliminating affirmative action programs that have created educational and job opportunities. The response of a growing number of blacks is not a call for more integration with white America, but separation and self-help.

c. demographic changes

Third, the debate on race in the 1960s was straightforward. It dealt almost exclusively

with relations between whites and blacks. The civil and voting rights laws and affirmative action were a response to the terrible legacy of racial discrimination, particularly towards blacks, in this country.

Our civil rights agenda has changed over the years, first in response to the demand for women's rights and, more recently, in response to the changing demographics of the country. More women are in the workplace than ever before, and the nation has become more diverse, ethnically and racially, in the last 30 years as immigration from Asia and Latin America has swelled. According to the most recent Census estimates, our population is roughly 25% non-white; that figure is projected to reach 50% by the middle of the next century, easily within the lifetime of my grandchildren. As early as next year, whites will no longer be the majority in California.

The range of new civil rights challenges is astonishingly broad. Among them:

Discrimination and harassment claims have increased as more women enter the workforce. Whole new rules are being worked out in the era of increased gender equality.

Our school systems are educating a more diverse student population, many of whom will enter school lacking basic English language and learning skills.

Many states and local communities are challenged to absorb immigrant groups into their economies and address their social and cultural needs.

Minority populations are becoming more active in the political process, seeking greater representation within all levels of government and within political party structures.

II. WHERE ARE WE TODAY?

Where are we today in civil rights in this country?

On the positive side: We have made progress in enacting laws to promote equality—in voting rights, public accommodation access, and non-discrimination. A genuine positive change has taken place in the attitude of most Americans toward racial issues. More of us understand that we should accept equality among the races as a matter of principle. Finally, the black middle class has grown, black business has expanded, and the number of black public officials has increased.

And yet there are many problems. We understand now that racial issues cannot be solved by laws alone. Inequalities, rooted in feelings of prejudice and distrust, permeate our culture and society. I also find a lack of urgency about racial issues. For example, I rarely hear from constituents about race at my public meetings today. Many feel that the major wrongs have been righted, and they have other things on their minds: balancing the budget, improving schools, creating good jobs, fighting crime.

Hence, while we have worked hard to tear down racial barriers and promote equality, we all know—as Jim Henderson reminded us last year before this gathering—that our work is not done—in Columbus or in the country. Much has been done, much is still to do.

III. WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

The question, then, is where do we go from here on civil rights? How do we build on our successes of the last generation? How do we make for a more inclusive, more just society which affords every American the opportunity to be the best he or she can be?

a. affirmative action

I am one who continue to believe there is an appropriate role for affirmative action, properly defined. Affirmative action programs are being challenged successfully in courts and legislatures across the country.

The U.S. Supreme Court has worked to limit the use of race-based preferences in the workplace, on contracts, in legislative redistricting, at all levels of government. The federal government is in the process of retooling its affirmative action programs in response to these Court decisions. The overall effect of these changes will likely be to curtail government contracts flowing to minority and women-owned businesses.

I am also concerned by efforts to bar affirmative action in college and graduate school admissions. One federal appeals court has said that the University of Texas cannot use race as a factor in law school admissions. California voters approved a state referendum to similar effect at state college and graduate programs. As a consequence, minority enrollment for incoming classes at these schools plummeted last year. The long-term effects on enrollment remain to be seen.

The goal of public policy should be to make sure that all of us have the opportunity to develop our talents to the fullest. The rapid rollback of affirmative action programs will, I think, disserve that goal. While I oppose quotas or rigid preferences, I see affirmative action plans as a tool to create a more inclusive work place and open up opportunities for all persons. Real equality of opportunity is the key to minority advancement. Where discrimination has existed, it is fair to provide an equal opportunity to catch up. Affirmative action can promote equal consideration, and not reverse discrimination.

My view is that compensating for past discrimination is acceptable if done by using special training programs, talent searches and targeted financial help, and by helping disadvantaged groups compete. I do not, however, want to predetermine the results of competition with a system of quotas. Government can act to promote racial integration, help disadvantaged persons improve their circumstances, and proscribe intentional racial discrimination, but it cannot assure outcomes in hiring, contracting, and admission for higher education.

b. integration vs. separation

Affirmative action and other government-led efforts may provide opportunities to blacks and other minorities, but they will not bridge the divide between the races. Blacks and whites may work in the same place, but they often live in separate neighborhoods, go to separate schools, socialize in different circles. Some of this separation can be traced to discrimination, but increasingly, I think, it is by choice.

I recently read a comment of a black woman, a professional who works with whites, but lives in a predominantly black community. She said: "It's hard to grow up in white neighborhoods. There are always doubts about you, about your intelligence. This is what America is supposed to be about, total integration, but the reality is that most of us keep to our own in this country, and not because there is specifically some race factor, but because we feel more comfortable that way."

Some will say there is nothing wrong with people of a particular race choosing to live and socialize with their own. That if this country stands for anything it is individual liberty, and if someone chooses to live in an all-black community or an all-Hispanic community or an all-Korean community, that is their choice and who are we to criticize it.

Others worry that separation of the races will lead to the balkanization of America. That we have built our nation on a shared set of values, beliefs and traditions. And that separation tears at the very fabric of our society and institutions.

We can argue all day about the causes of this separation—the lack of economic opportunities; racism; the burden of history—but the question Americans must answer is whether this trend toward separation is desirable. I think it is not.

I am an integrationist at heart. I believe in the motto of this country: *E Pluribus Unum*, out of many, one. We can't compel people to move to integrated neighborhoods. We can't force them to socialize with people of other races. Integration should, nonetheless, be our goal. We don't have to reach that goal today, but we should strive to take steps day-by-day to get there. We are, after all, one nation, one family, indivisible.

c. individual and community-based action

My own experience is that the best way to improve relations among races is to have people work together at something they both believe to be worthwhile and important. If you get two adult women, for example, of different races together to talk about the future of their children, you can see the making of harmony and consensus. People who may not believe they have very much in common learn that they really do. A dialogue that simply leaves people feeling that we remain far apart doesn't get us very far.

We must talk frankly, listen carefully, and work together across racial lines. We must all take responsibility for ourselves, our conduct, our attitude—and our community. We must talk less about separation and bitterness, and more about unity, reconciliation and shared values. We must do everything to assure that every person in our community has real opportunity. Give every child in the community, every adult, too, the opportunity to get a good, decent, safe, fulfilling education to get ahead in life.

On a personal level, I urge you to get to know well a person of another race, and try to see the world through their eyes. Reach out to persons of a different race. Speak to them; listen to them, as I know many in this audience do. When people do this, they find a lot more in common than they thought.

I also urge you to learn more about the remarkable civil rights history of our nation. Two recent books, "Pillar of Fire" by Taylor Branch and "The Children" by David Halberstam, give us stirring accounts of this era. One of the most memorable experiences of my congressional career was getting to know Martin Luther King, Jr. at Washington National Airport as he was emerging on the national scene. Both us were waiting for delayed planes, and for an hour or so I visited with him. I caught from Dr. King—as I have from my colleagues in Congress, John Lewis and Andy Young, two other civil rights heroes—a glimpse of their courage and vision.

Thirty years after Dr. King's death, we can say that we have torn down many of the legal barriers in the country, but we have not been as successful breaking down the barriers in our hearts and minds. No one should cling to the illusion that the battle for equal opportunity and equal justice has been won.

Tolstoy said that many people want to change the world, but only a few want to change themselves. He had the right perspective as we think about race. You and I have to engage each other, learn from each other, endure the pain of reflection and candor, and move on to higher ground. Progress in race relations is not simply a matter of economic statistics or survey data, but it is measured to a large extent through interaction of people, with acts of brotherhood, tolerance, and understanding.

The work of the Columbus Human Rights Commission is instrumental to this process of discussion, healing and growth. The Commission provides a forum for people of diverse backgrounds and races to air their

comments and concerns, to debate the issues in a frank manner, and to find solutions which will make our community more inclusive and more just.

IV. CONCLUSION

Our success in meeting these challenges will depend—in large measure—on our commitment to human rights. This evening has been a success if it causes each one of us to renew our commitment to human rights and to act in specific ways on that commitment.

The stakes are high. This country has been dedicated to the cause of human rights from its inception. If you and I do not lead in human rights, who will? Surely those of us who have been given so much—good parents, good education, good health, a marvelous country—and all of our many blessings—must take the lead for human rights into the 21st Century.

So when you leave here in a few minutes, what are you going to do? May I suggest you and I renew a simple pledge: We stand for justice. We combat injustice wherever we may find it—at home or abroad, in our own community or across the world. Leaders and legislation may be important, but what happens in your life, in your home, in your heart is more important than what happens in the White House.

We join hands in support of the Human Rights Commission in Columbus in a noble cause: contributing to the direction and success of a free society and a humane world.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOEL FORT

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1998

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to invite my colleagues to join me in recognizing the accomplishments and contributions of a truly remarkable man, Dr. Joel Fort.

Dr. Fort was an early visionary in the field of public health. He was one of the first professionals to understand that social problems such as substance abuse and violence were not going to be solved by the criminal justice system alone, but rather required a collaborative approach which included public health expertise. Dr. Fort's personal commitment to this field brought about the creation of the San Francisco Department of Health's Center for Special Problems and the Center for Solving Special Social and Health Problems. These Centers have reached thousands of individuals, and serve as a model for replication throughout the United States and abroad. Not satisfied to stop there, Dr. Fort influenced a generation of public health and social service professionals by taking his philosophy into the classroom—teaching at several universities on subjects of drug abuse, criminology, ethics and conflict resolution. Dr. Fort's many achievements have earned him numerous accolades, most notably the recent completion of Oral History of Joel Fort, M.D.: Public Health Pioneer, Criminologist, Reformer, Ethicist, and Humanitarian by the Regional Oral History Office of the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Throughout this rich and varied career, Dr. Fort always held his family as his top priority. Therefore, it is only appropriate that we join with his wife of 46 years, Maria Fort, and his three children and three grandchildren, in cele-

brating his life and his legacy. Dr. Joel Fort is an undeniably outstanding member of our community, and I speak for the entire U.S. House of Representatives in this tribute to him.

COUNCIL OF KHALISTAN CALLS ON PAKISTAN TO RECOGNIZE KHALISTAN

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1998

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Council of Khalistan, which leads the struggle to liberate the Sikh homeland, Punjab, Khalistan, from Indian rule, recently wrote an open letter to the people and government of Pakistan urging Pakistan to recognize Khalistan to stop India from achieving hegemony in South Asia.

The letter pointed out that two leaders of the ruling BJP recently called for Pakistan and Bangladesh to become part of India. It has been fifty years since India and Pakistan achieved their independence, agreeing to partition at that time. For leaders of the ruling party to call for that agreement to be undone reveals India's imperialist aims in the region. The atrocities committed against the Sikhs, the Christians of Nagaland, the Muslims of Kashmir, the Dalits ("black untouchables," the aboriginal people of the subcontinent), and so many others also show India's drive to establish Hindu Raj throughout South Asia.

An independent Khalistan can serve as a buffer to prevent war between India and Pakistan. Khalistan is committed to freedom, denuclearization in South Asia, and economic cooperation to assure prosperity for all. It is time for the United States to promote freedom, peace, stability, and prosperity in South Asia by supporting a free and fair vote on the political status of Khalistan and for Pakistan to recognize the legitimate aspirations of the people of Khalistan, Nagaland, and all the nations of South Asia.

I am putting the Council of Khalistan's open letter into the RECORD.

COUNCIL OF KHALISTAN,
Washington, DC, April 8, 1998.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PEOPLE AND GOVERNMENT OF PAKISTAN: TO STOP INDIAN HEGEMONY, RECOGNIZE KHALISTAN

To the people and Government of Pakistan:

Your recent missile test is an unfortunate reminder of the tensions in South Asia. While it was a necessary response to India's drive to establish its hegemony over South Asia, it is still an unfortunate event. We all hope that South Asia will not once again erupt into a war.

India's drive for hegemony shows in the recent statement by two BJP leaders that Pakistan and Bangladesh should become part of India. It shows in India's military buildup. And it shows in India's ongoing repression of the minorities living within its artificial borders. It has already murdered over 250,000 Sikhs since 1984. It has murdered almost 60,000 Muslims in Kashmir since 1988, over 200,000 Christians in Nagaland since 1947, and tens of thousands of Assamese, Manipuris, Tamils, Dalits ("black untouchables," the aboriginal people of South Asia), and others.

You can help to end India's drive for hegemony by recognizing Khalistan. Your rec-

ognition will be a major boost of the movement to bring freedom to the oppressed Sikh Nation. It will also carry strategic advantages for you, as Khalistan can serve as a buffer between you and India. If there is a war, Sikhs will not fight for India. The Sikh Nation can also use the fact the over 60 percent of India's grain comes from Punjab, Khalistan to deter India from pursuing its dream of Hindu Raj throughout South Asia. I ask you to recognize Khalistan immediately. We seek to establish an Embassy in Islamabad and four consulates in Lahore, Karachi, Peshawar, and Quetter.

Khalistan is committed to the denuclearization of South Asia and to the establishment of a South Asian common market to bring greater economic prosperity to all the countries of South Asia. Khalistan will also sign a 100-year friendship and defense treaty with Pakistan. Only the liberation of Khalistan and the other oppressed nations of South Asia will bring true peace and stability to the subcontinent.

The Indian government has been talking to Naga leaders about the status of Nagaland. Yet India has failed to live up to its obligations under the 1948 U.N. resolution in which it agreed to a plebiscite in Kashmir and it has refused to hold a free and fair plebiscite in Punjab, Khalistan. India is not one country. It is a collection of many nations thrown together by the British for their administrative convenience. The collapse of India's brutal, corrupt empire is inevitable. By recognizing Khalistan, you can help bring that about sooner and help bring freedom, democracy, peace, and prosperity to South Asia. I call upon the people and government of Pakistan to take this step immediately.

Sincerely,

DR. GURMIT SINGH AULAKH,

President,

Council of Khalistan.

HONORING THE 80TH BIRTHDAY OF JOSEPH GIGUERE

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1998

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I have this opportunity to stand on the floor of this great Chamber and acknowledge the celebration and occasion of the 80th Birthday of my constituent, Joseph Giguere.

Mr. Giguere of Southbridge, Massachusetts was born in St. Aimée in the Province of Quebec, Canada on March 19, 1918. His early years on his family's homestead in the countryside surrounding Montreal instilled within him a sense of hard work and determination, and loyalty to friends and family. These admirable qualities were carried with him when he emigrated to the United States at the age of eleven and helped him to persevere and fully acclimate himself to the American society that he proudly became a citizen of. His eagerness to learn a new language, while still observing and respecting the strong French-Canadian heritage that had been ingrained in him, enabled him to attain an education and skills necessary for trade of a woodcraftsman. Though it was the Depression, his father was an entrepreneur and successfully started numerous enterprises, including broom factories, butcher shops, and woodworking establishments. The skills that Mr. Giguere learned allowed for him to always find work to sustain and contribute to his family.