

stand at the Lincoln Memorial and I read the words of President Lincoln's second inaugural address that say, "Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled up by the bondsmen's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said 'the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.'"

Abraham Lincoln's second inaugural address, the central part being: If the price to be paid was until every drop of blood drawn by the bondsmen's lash be paid by another drawn with the sword, Mr. Speaker, that is the powerful vision that there was a sin on this Nation, and Abraham Lincoln understood that. And 600,000 Americans died in the conflict to free the slaves.

I brought with me, this is my great, great, five times great uncle's Bible. This is the Bible that he carried in his shirt pocket for 3 years during the Civil War. If I open it up, I can show you fly specs and verses that are written in this Bible. His sister presented to it to him on the eve of his departure for the war, and he returned with it in his shirt pocket 3 years to the day. I found his grave when I was trimming grass around the gravestones for Memorial Day. No one knew where he had been buried. This is John Richardson's Bible. My great grandfather five times great was killed in the Civil War. All of his artifacts are lost. This remains. This remains as a connection to me, to my family members who were strong and powerful and committed abolitionists, and some of them gave their lives to free the slaves.

So as I read this resolution today, Mr. Speaker, I don't see a reference of gratitude for all the blood that was given by people to end slavery. I think that needs to be part of this record as well. The horrible price that was paid to pay back in blood drawn by the sword for every drop of blood drawn by the bondsmen's lash. That is a point, too, that the next generations need to learn and need to hear.

And then with the balance of this discussion, Mr. Speaker, I just would emphasize that this Nation threw off the yoke of slavery. We rose above it because we had a strong conviction as a people, we had a strong religious faith that rejected slavery as a sin against this Nation. We can be proud of the price that was paid to free the slaves. And it was a struggle of 100 years to pass the Civil Rights Act that lifted another level. And here we are today at a point where I look forward to the time when we can say we are fully integrated and there is no vestige of slavery and no vestige of racism, and an understanding that we are all God's children created in his image. And because he has blessed us with enough distinctions that we can tell each other apart, it is no reason for us to discriminate for or against anyone, as Ward Connerly says and as the Civil Rights Initiative in Michigan says so.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 194, a resolution that apologizes for the enslavement and segregation of African-Americans.

This is a significant moment in our nation's history when the nearly 20-year fight to consider federal legislation that apologizes for slavery has at last become a reality. Indeed, it is fitting that we consider legislation of this content and caliber at this time. A global trend has emerged within the 21st Century in which governments have apologized for slavery and discriminatory laws and promised to work toward a better future.

Within the past year, states that were once members of the former Confederacy and were a cesspool for racist and bigoted laws and practices did something that no state had done before: they apologized for the enslavement of black people in this country. More than 240 years after the abolition of slavery and more than four decades after the abolition of Jim Crow, it is time for the federal government to do the same.

In 1988, Congress apologized to Japanese-Americans for holding them in concentration camps during World War II. Congress expressed regret for its policies on Hawaii a century after the native Hawaiian kingdom was overthrown. And just five years ago, the Senate apologized for not enacting anti-lynching legislation that would have saved the lives of thousands of black people across the South.

America's greatness is exemplified in part by our ability to evolve. Under federal and state laws and customs, African Americans were denied their fundamental rights from 1619 until 1965. Today, we show our growth by officially acknowledging the wrongful actions and policies that were targeted toward African-Americans during slavery and Jim Crow.

Sadly, there are some who continue to oppose Congress apologizing for slavery and segregation. They see apologizing as a futile action that is too little too late. Others contend that an official apology would do more harm than good and would conjure painful images from the past that would fuel resentment. These assertions miss the point.

Failure to pass this resolution that acknowledges the wrongness of slavery and segregation would send the dangerous message that America is unwilling to come to terms with one of the first and last great atrocities that it placed on its citizens through the rule of law. Slavery and racial segregation were permitted through federal law and our government must express the appropriate and long-overdue remorse for its tolerance of this injustice.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, words matter. "All men are created equal," is perhaps one of the most famous phrases in American history. In our nation's infancy, this statement encompassed the principles of a country that promised to protect the freedom and well-being of its new citizens. Yet it was written when hundreds of thousands of black men, women and children were enslaved and counted as only $\frac{3}{5}$ of a person under the Constitution. Nevertheless, President Abraham Lincoln later used this phrase to argue that the institution of slavery contradicted our nation's most fundamental values. This statement proved that

America had the potential and duty to become a fairer and more equal nation.

The legal abolishment of slavery did not translate into the end of racial inequality. Equally, the legal abolishment of Jim Crow has not translated into the elimination of disparities. The reality is that although the men, women and children who were enslaved in this country are long gone, the wealth, culture, and even the congressional buildings that they helped construct remain.

Indeed, in the years following Jim Crow, blacks have undoubtedly taken advantage of increased opportunities and have achieved in every imaginable sector. 246 years after emancipation and 43 years after the abolishment of legal segregation, the United States has made serious improvements in drafting and implementing policies that encourage equality. However, it would be wrong to conclude that these successes negate the fact that 346 years of oppression have contributed to the economic and health disparities that continue to affect much of the black community.

On this historic day, we must recommit ourselves to bringing about an end to these disparities and injustices. And in passing this resolution, the House will send a message to the American people and others that the most powerful nation in the world is willing to look honestly at some of the most shameful parts of its history, accept responsibility, and apologize for its actions. Together, we will continue to lay the necessary foundation to build a stronger future.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. I thank the gentlemen for their cooperation along with this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 194, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECOGNIZING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL LIBERTIES ACT

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1357) recognizing the significance of the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 by President Ronald Reagan and the greatness of America in her ability to admit and remedy past mistakes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1357

Whereas President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942, which authorized the forced exclusion of 120,000 Japanese Americans and legal resident aliens from the west coast of the United States and the internment of United States citizens and legal permanent residents of Japanese ancestry in confinement sites during World War II without the benefit of due process;

Whereas no person of Japanese ancestry, who was confined during World War II under the authority of Executive Order 9066, was convicted of espionage, treason, or sabotage against the United States;

Whereas Japanese American men proved their loyalty to the United States with battlefield valor serving in the 442d Regimental Combat Team, the 100th Infantry Battalion, Army Air Corps, and the Military Intelligence Service, and Japanese American women served with distinction in the Women's Army Corps and Army Nurse Corps;

Whereas President Gerald Ford formally rescinded Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1976, in his speech, "An American Promise";

Whereas Congress adopted legislation which was signed by President Jimmy Carter on July 31, 1980, establishing the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians to investigate the claim that the incarceration of Japanese Americans and legal resident aliens during World War II was justified by military necessity;

Whereas the Commission held 20 days of hearings and heard from over 750 witnesses on this matter and published its findings in a report entitled "Personal Justice Denied";

Whereas the Commission's report concluded that the promulgation of Executive Order 9066 was not justified by military necessity and that the decision to issue the order was shaped by "race prejudice, war hysteria, and a failure of political leadership";

Whereas the Commission also discovered that the United States Government expanded its internment program and national security investigations to conduct the program and investigations in Latin America;

Whereas according to the Commission, the United States Government financed relocation to the United States, and internment, of approximately 2,300 Latin Americans of Japanese descent, for the purpose of exchanging the Latin Americans of Japanese descent for United States citizens held by Axis countries;

Whereas some of these Latin Americans of Japanese descent were deported to Axis countries to enable the United States to conduct prisoner exchanges;

Whereas during World War II, the United States Government deemed as "enemy aliens" more than 600,000 Italian-born and 300,000 German-born United States resident aliens and their families and required them to carry Certificates of Identification and limited their travel and personal property rights;

Whereas during World War II, the United States Government arrested, interned, or otherwise detained thousands of European Americans, some remaining in custody for years after cessation of World War II hostilities, and repatriated, exchanged, or deported European Americans, including American-born children, to European Axis nations, many to be exchanged for Americans held in those nations;

Whereas Congress enacted, with bipartisan support, the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, in which it acknowledged the "fundamental in-

justices" resulting from Executive Order 9066, apologized on behalf of the people of the United States for those injustices, and vowed to "discourage the occurrence of similar injustices and violations of civil liberties in the future";

Whereas President Ronald Reagan signed the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 into law on August 10, 1988, proclaiming that "Here we admit a wrong. Here we affirm our commitment as a Nation to equal justice under the law"; and

Whereas the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 provides an opportunity for all United States citizens to appreciate the greatness of our Nation in having the willingness to admit and remedy its past mistakes and for political leaders to learn from those past mistakes by not adopting racially motivated governmental policies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms our Nation's commitment to equal justice under the law for all people in celebration of the 20th anniversary of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988;

(2) continues to support the congressional goal embodied in the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 that all persons living under protection of the United States Constitution have a right to enjoy freedom and equality without the constraint of prejudice and discrimination or the lack of due process; and

(3) shall review the wartime treatment of Latin Americans of Japanese descent, German Americans, and of Italian Americans, to determine whether they should also receive an apology and reparations similar to that provided in the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 for Japanese Americans interned during World War II.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Born of war hysteria and racial prejudice, Executive Order 9066 would come to represent a stain on America's reputation for fairness and justice.

128,000 Japanese Americans were ordered to leave behind their entire lives and property and bring only the bare necessities to an unknown place with an unknown future, and they spent 3 long years in internment camps in Arizona, Northern and Central California, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and Arkansas. At the conclusion of World War II, they attempted to return home, but many found that their houses were looted and destroyed. They could not find jobs to feed and shelter their property. And, sadly, it took our government nearly 50 years to formally apologize for this serious Constitutional mistake and offer compensation to

those who suffered through internment.

On February 19, 1976, President Ford rescinded Executive Order 9066. On July 21, 1980, Congress established the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians to investigate the internment of World War II. A few years later the Commission reported its finding and recommendations, and on August 10, 1988, the Civil Liberties Act was signed into law authorizing reparations to each person wrongfully interned.

Although there is hardly anything that can replace 3 years lost to internment, an official apology and compensation provided some solace to those who suffered, and helped heal a Nation stained by this terrible mistake made during the Second World War. One of the leaders in that effort was the late Robert Matsui of California.

□ 1530

And so it is today that this resolution introduced by his widow, DORIS MATSUI, we have come to recognize the significance of the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Civil Liberties Act and how America came to admit and remedy past mistakes. Let's hope that will help the Nation remember this mistake and to prevent similar occurrences like that from happening in the future.

We remember others who suffered similar internment or forced deportation in exchange for United States citizens held by axis countries. In its review, the commission also found our government financed relocation to the United States and internment of 2,300 Latin Americans of Japanese descent for the purpose of exchanging Latin Americans of Japanese descent for United States citizens held by axis countries.

I commend XAVIER BECERRA, our distinguished colleague from California, for working to bring this matter also before us today.

In addition, serious allegations have been made that our government also interned German Americans and Italian Americans during World War II. Our distinguished colleague on Judiciary, ROBERT WEXLER of Florida, has worked for years to bring to light this forgotten group of people who also suffered the plight of internment.

This resolution also resolves that Congress will review these claims to determine whether they too should receive and be eligible for similar reparations and apology.

I, of course, urge strongly the support of this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield myself so much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support House Resolution 1357, recognizing the significance of the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988.

Executive Order 9066 was signed by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt to authorize the tragic internment of

Japanese Americans at the beginning of World War II. In 1942 President Roosevelt authorized the Army to evacuate more than 100,000 Japanese Americans from the Pacific Coast States, including Washington, Oregon, California and Arizona. This grossly broad approach to maintaining America's security serves as a continuing reminder that the civil rights of American citizens should never be lost, even in the midst of the chaos of war.

President Roosevelt authorized the mass expulsion and incarceration of Japanese Americans by signing Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942. He took this ill-fated action, even though, in the words of Stetson Conn, a historian with the Army's Office of Military History, he said, "The only responsible commander who backed the War Department's mass evacuation plan as a measure required by military necessity, was the President himself, as Commander-in-Chief." Even Attorney General Francis Biddle and FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover advised against it.

That tragic misuse of power was met with an equally powerful response but, unfortunately, much too late.

In 1976 President Gerald Ford issued Proclamation 4417, in which he said, "Learning from our mistakes is not pleasant, but as a great philosopher once admonished, we must do so if we want to avoid repeating them. I call upon the American people to affirm with me this American promise, that we have learned from the tragedy of that long ago experience forever to treasure, we have learned that we should forever treasure liberty and justice for each individual American, and resolve that this kind of action shall never again be repeated.

Congress eventually enacted the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, which this resolution before us recognizes. It apologized on behalf of the Nation for "fundamental violations of the basic civil liberties and constitutional rights of these individuals of Japanese ancestry."

President Ronald Reagan signed that action into law on August 10, 1988, proclaiming it a great day for America. 20 years later we stand here today to renew our Nation's commitment to remember the past, and to shepherd its lessons into the future.

I have in the past, and I would again today, Mr. Speaker, address the subject matter of how we should understand history. And quite often I find that we, in this Congress, are judging our ancestors with contemporary values and trying to put their actions into a modern context, rather than for us to try to understand the context in which they made those decisions.

And even though I have made the case that J. Edgar Hoover advised against and the Attorney General advised against, Franklin Delano Roosevelt did go ahead with the Executive Order that began the internment of 100,000 or more Japanese Americans here in the United States. It was just

months after the Japanese had attacked Pearl Harbor, very much the same scenario, from a national apprehension standpoint, as we had just post September 11, 2001.

And so I think history should not judge our ancestors harshly. We should seek to learn from these examples of history within two contexts; one context being looking back upon it, and another context would be try to place ourselves into the shoes of the people that had to make the decisions in that environment.

I am convinced that Franklin Delano Roosevelt had the best interest of America in mind. I think he was very afraid that there would be some lost intelligence. That was the mind set of the time.

But we have come a long, long way since then, Mr. Speaker, and so far that one of our most important trading partners is Japan. One of our most important strategic partners is Japan.

We have come so far that my father, who spent 2½ years in the South Pacific and forbid rice to be in our household, this young man had dinner with the Minister of Defense of Japan 60 years later. This Nation has many times shaken hands across the Pacific with our good friends in Japan. And this resolution that is before us today acknowledges the history and says that if we had it to do over again we would have done it differently. But it also builds upon it so we can expand our relationships with our good friends, the Japanese.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I now recognize the distinguished gentlelady from California, DORIS MATSUI, who has picked up the baton from her late husband, who formerly represented California from the same district, for as much time as she may consume.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time and I rise in support of H. Res. 1357.

Mr. Speaker, on August 10, 2008, this Nation will acknowledge the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Civil Liberties Act. This anniversary is an opportunity for all Americans to appreciate our Nation's willingness to admit and remedy its past mistakes, and for Americans to learn from these past mistakes. We must never forget that from past injustice can come great awakening. And today, we remember the past to preserve our future freedoms.

On February 19, 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, which led to internment of over 120,000 Americans of Japanese descent, including my mother and my father, my grandparents, my aunts and my uncles and all their friends. During that moment, our government, at all levels, was blinded by war and made decisions that are contrary to our Constitution.

The failure of each branch of government to uphold the rights of individuals must be taught so that future gen-

erations resist succumbing to the politics of fear.

It took nearly three decades before the government began to acknowledge this failure. President Gerald Ford formally rescinded Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1976. And shortly after, Congress passed legislation which was signed by President Jimmy Carter on July 31, 1980.

The bill established the Commission on Wartime Relocation and internment of civilians. Its charge was to investigate the internment of Japanese Americans and legal resident aliens during World War II.

After hearing from over 750 witnesses, over 20 days of hearings, the Commission published a report entitled Personal Justice Denied. And I might say that for many of these individuals, that was the first time they ever talked about the internment.

The Commission concluded that Executive Order 9066 was not justified by military necessity. It went on to find that the decision to issue the order was shaped by race prejudice, war hysteria and a failure of political leadership.

Because of these compelling findings, Congress passed the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 with bipartisan support. The bill granted reparations for interned Japanese Americans. It also formally acknowledged the fundamental injustices resulting from the Executive Order, apologized on behalf of the people of the United States for those injustices, and vowed to discourage similar injustices and violations of civil liberties in the future.

And today, 20 years later, we can reaffirm this commitment because of one of the darkest periods of our Nation's history, we learned of the damage that can be done when we let the politics of fear cloud our judgment.

Our efforts to preserve this painful period of our country's history continue to this day. Many of my colleagues are working to support internment site preservation as a physical reminder of past inequality. It is important that future generations will be able to visit the internment camps to gain understanding of the burdens of past generations that have allowed us to live in a free and just society today.

But there is still work to be done. During the interviews the Commission discovered efforts of the United States Government during World War II to relocate and intern approximately 2,300 Latin Americans of Japanese descent. These individuals were not only taken from their country to be interned in another country, but they were also exchanged for United States citizens held by axis nations.

Additionally, the government classified German-born and Italian-born immigrants as enemy aliens and required them to carry identification. They restricted their property rights and travel rights during this time period and arrested, interned and detained thousands of European Americans.

All of those who suffered from misguided government policies during

World War II deserve to have their stories come to light. Their experience should be fully recognized and preserved for future generations to learn from.

I hope every American will take this anniversary to reaffirm their commitment to our Constitution and the rights and protections it guarantees all of us. This commitment is a way to prevent such injustice from ever becoming a reality again.

As you look back on a time in our Nation's history and how our country has responded since, we should have hope for the future.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill. Twenty years ago I was privileged to be the only Member of Congress selected to serve on the commission that was referred to just a moment ago, and I served as the vice chairman of that commission.

I accepted appointment to that commission because, as someone who grew up in Southern California, born shortly after World War II, I was one of those many Californians who, frankly, grew up knowing very little, if anything, about the treatment of Japanese nationals and Japanese Americans during World War II.

And yet I was from an area in which we had a mature Japanese American community on Terminal Island prior to World War II. When I grew up, Terminal Island was actually part of the Navy complex in the San Pedro Bay, the Long Beach part of San Pedro Bay. There was nothing left of the Japanese community on Terminal Island at the time I was born and at the time I was growing up.

And while there were many Japanese Americans in our community, there was not much discussion of what took place during World War II. On a number of occasions, there was an attempt to bring up a Commission, and finally, we garnered enough votes to support the commission with the idea that it was important for us, not only to acknowledge what went on during World War II and have a historic examination of what occurred there, but as importantly, if not most importantly, it was a concern of mine and other members of the Commission that we have a continuing remembrance of that experience, not to sort of wallow in the mistakes that were made in the past and to point our finger back at a previous generation, but rather to try and extract lessons from that experience so that it would provide us an understanding of how we made mistakes there, and provide us an opportunity to learn from that, such that we would not make similar mistakes in the future.

□ 1545

It was an interesting time to be on that Commission to hear the accounts of so many who had gone through that experience and to learn that history can be a strange and often an experience that brings you surprises.

For instance, a great civil libertarian in his future years, Earl Warren, as Attorney General and Governor of the State of California, was probably the strongest advocate for the executive order. In his later years, he accepted responsibility for that mistake.

Among the top counsels of government of the Roosevelt administration, there was one individual who stood out from the others who opposed the executive order and believed it was unnecessary and, frankly, overreaching. That person was, interestingly enough, J. Edgar Hoover. J. Edgar Hoover said, "We don't need to bring all of these Japanese nationals and Japanese Americans away from the coastline. We don't need to have any camps to hold these people in and their families." He said, "We think we have sufficient intelligence for those who may be reasonable suspects and we can just concentrate on that." And that was rejected by the national leadership on a bipartisan basis except for one place, Hawaii. The executive order was not carried out in Hawaii because the military leader in Hawaii, when he received the order, responded back to Washington that it would basically cripple the workforce in Hawaii.

And so in Hawaii we had the only place where they followed the suggestion of J. Edgar Hoover not to round up everybody because of their ethnicity.

And the only reason I bring this up is that it is so easy for us to look forward and say we will never repeat anything like that and only this group would do that, and that group wouldn't do that, and that leadership wouldn't do that, but this leadership would. And you will find when you go back in history, under the pressure and stress of a threat, sometimes we do things that we ought not to do.

So I appreciate the kindness of the gentlelady from California. In fact, it was her husband, among others, who convinced me they ought to actually sit on that Commission. And I think that it is extremely important for us to not only remember what happened 20 years ago but more importantly what happened some 60 years ago and to take lessons out of that that will help us ensure that we don't repeat those mistakes in the future no matter what our political philosophy, no matter what our political identification.

I think this is a very worthy bill that we have here today. I thank the gentleman for his time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to now recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), who at the time was chairman of the Subcommittee on Judiciary that first reported out the measure that we consider today.

I yield him as much time as he may consume.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank my friend from Michigan who then and now has been a leader in the effort to protect the civil liberties which are so important to us.

I had the distinct honor of standing on this floor and presenting that bill as chairman of the subcommittee, and I remember today the emotion I felt then and feel now when I read the words "on behalf of the Nation, Congress apologizes."

The ability to admit a mistake is a sign of greatness, and I felt privileged then that we did it.

People have talked about the lessons, and they are important. And we should draw on some of them.

One is that abandoning your principles in the face of a threat is a temptation which ought to be resisted. It's easier for us today than it was in 1948 to be very critical of those who locked up our former colleagues Bob Matsui and Norm Mineta and many, many other totally innocent Americans, Americans of Japanese descent, but we're talking about Americans, people born in this country, American citizens.

But at the time, the notion that the security of the Nation trumped everything else looked like a pretty good argument. J. Edgar Hoover was right, but he wasn't running for office; Earl Warren was. Franklin Roosevelt was. Very few elected officials stood up against that. And that's one of the lessons we ought to draw.

It is much too easy to give in to the temptation to say, "Well, we're in trouble. Protections of individual rights, civil liberties, they're for the good times." And obviously, there are some analogies to today. Now, things are much better today. We haven't done today anything like that. But there are lessons still that we have to look at.

Another is that if you are going to try to protect yourself, as you have a right to do, don't do it en masse, don't say there is this whole group of people, and we're not going to stop and decide whether this or that individual did something wrong; we're going to look at some essential characteristic of their being, and on that basis we're going to penalize them. We're going to restrict them. We're going to segregate them.

Now, obviously, being locked up in a camp for years is a far, far greater wrong than not being able to fly on an airplane. But the fact that it was much worse to lock people up doesn't justify us restricting people's travel rights because of the ethnic group they belong to or because of a mass fear.

So yes, we should be proud of having realized this mistake. Talk about history. I was in college in the 1950s when I read the case, I think it was Korematsu, in which the U.S. Supreme Court said it was perfectly constitutional to do what was done. And I was

appalled. I was a college junior, and I said, "Boy, this is my country. I didn't know we did things like this."

And I came here eager to participate in its undoing, and I felt I was very lucky to be chairman of the subcommittee, along with my colleague from California who was then on the Judiciary Committee, Mr. LUNGREN, to be able to bring that bill forward. But I also understand that I had the benefit of hindsight. I had the easy decision to make.

As we legitimately congratulate ourselves today for having recognized 20 years ago a mistake that we made 65 years ago, let's leave a little energy for resolving that we don't do it again. Let's, as we talk about the folly of 1943, be very determined not to repeat it even in a smaller measure and with fewer people.

I believe that we have had government policies in the past couple of years since the terrible mass murders of 2001 that have also failed to live up to our ideals of protecting individuals. Not on the same scale, I acknowledge that, and I think it's a mark of progress. But let's do what we can from this day forward so that no one 20 years later or 40 years later has to apologize to any extent because we let our legitimate need for self-defense diminish us from our principles.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the remarks from the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), and particularly we do have the benefit of hindsight; and I don't know that there is a generation that's compelled to apologize for a previous generation or its ancestors. And I would question the real value of descendants of people who had to make decisions in that context apologizing for their actions.

And I look across at some of these that we've done. I remember President Clinton apologizing to Africa for slavery—and we have a resolution that's going to come up for a vote a little bit later on slavery—and I regret those things. I would point out that if indeed these are the sins of our fathers, they're not necessarily visited upon the sons and daughters unto the second or third generation and that we should learn from history. And we do have the opportunity to be Monday morning quarterbacks, to have the perspective of hindsight, as the gentleman from Massachusetts said. I definitely agree with that emotion that's there and that thought process.

But I would caution us that I am watching us move down a path of apologizing for one thing and another, and I'm not watching us stop and give thanks for the wonderful and noble things that this country has done. And I think when we look across the globe at the results of that great effort of World War II, that wonderful victory of the Greatest Generation that this country has ever produced, that we can

see that millions of people breathe free air today because of the prices that were paid. And there's never been a war that's been fought without mistakes. There's been mistakes in judgment and in political judgment and military miscalculations, and lives have been lost over and over again in those miscalculations. But we had to find ways to persevere and we have.

And what came out of World War II was the United States emerged as a global power. Our industry was the most powerful industry in the world, unchallenged, because ours was not destroyed and the carnage that visited the competing ideology, so to speak. And our currency became the currency of the world, and American-made products became dominant throughout the world. The American culture spread throughout the world. And our sense of freedom and our language and our civilization rose up to be predominant.

And it was unchallenged at that time until such time as the Soviet Union was quickly formed and came up against the United States. And we saw the Cold War begin within years of the Second World War. That fought for 40 to 45 years, and our way of life succeeded.

All of that flowed out of something that had some mistakes along the way. And anyone that's ever done anything in life knows that there are mistakes, whether you raised a family or fought a war or started a business or entered into public life. All of us made mistakes along the way, but I do not believe that we carry guilt from preceding generations.

But we do have a responsibility. If we fail to learn, then we would carry guilt ourselves if we fail to learn from those actions of our ancestors whom today we judge to be wrong. And I do believe they were wrong, and I do support this resolution. And I support it with the spirit that I have articulated here.

I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the remainder of our time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I'm going to pass up the opportunity for the last word because I have had it. I would urge the adoption.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the passage of H. Res. 1357, which commemorates the 20th Anniversary of the signing of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988. This law officially acknowledged the "fundamental injustices" that resulted from Executive Order 9066, which authorized the exclusion and internment of Japanese Americans during World War II.

In 1942, some 120,000 people of Japanese ancestry were rounded up and sent to internment camps by the United States Government—not out of military necessity, but as a result of racial prejudice, war hysteria, and the failure of political leadership. Families were torn apart and property was lost. My family experienced this injustice first-hand, and I spent part of my childhood at the Amache internment camp in Colorado.

Our Government made a mistake when it ignored the civil liberties of Japanese Americans during World War II. That is why passage of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, which provided for a formal apology from the Government, along with compensation to the victims, still resonates strongly with us today. The significance and meaning of this legislation allowed our community to move forward.

Redress would not have happened without the work of many leaders in the Japanese American community. Senator DANIEL INOUE, Senator Spark Matsunaga, then Congressman Norm Mineta and Congressman Bob Matsui were integral to ensuring that the Civil Liberties Act moved forward.

I would also like to acknowledge the role played by the Japanese American Citizens League, the oldest and largest Asian American civil rights organization in the United States, and a group I have a long history of involvement with. The JAACL worked hard towards achieving redress, and recently passed a resolution also commemorating the 20th anniversary of the passage of redress at their National Convention in Salt Lake City. I commend the JAACL for their dedication to our community.

Our country draws strength and greatness from our ability to acknowledge and remedy past mistakes—a virtue that has not only benefited the Japanese American community but has shaped me as a policymaker. Despite our flaws, the United States is looked upon as the nation with the strongest and fairest form of government.

Recognizing and commemorating the significance of the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 is still meaningful and relevant today, as this resolution reaffirms our commitment as a nation to equal justice under the law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1357, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 1361

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Resolution 1361.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.