

further tests will be unnecessary. I respectfully suggest to President Chirac that the eight underground nuclear tests to be conducted between September and May are themselves unnecessary.

The threat of nuclear war that once cast a large shadow over national and international affairs has been considerably diminished since the end of the cold war. One hundred and seventy nations agreed recently to extend the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in the expectation that the nuclear powers, including France, would ratify a comprehensive nuclear test ban by 1996 and refrain from conducting any nuclear test. France's planned nuclear tests conflict with the designation of the South Pacific as a nuclear-free zone. In spite of these developments and designations, President Chirac has decided that France will become one of only two nations—the other being China—still conducting nuclear tests.

In announcing the resumption of French nuclear tests, President Chirac waved away the criticism of ecologists by stating that the eight planned underground tests on Moruroa Atoll would have "no ecological consequences." President Chirac also indicated his decision was "in the higher interest of [the French] nation" and also "irrevocable." While President Chirac's decision appears intended to reinforce France's stature as the world's third nuclear power, it also revives the dismissive attitude of past French Governments toward the concerns of scientists and South Pacific Islanders.

As our colleague Congressman FALCONE has noted, South Pacific Islanders are acutely aware of the lingering effects of nuclear testing. Certainly, the Marshall Islanders who were exposed to radiation when the United States Government conducted nuclear weapons tests over Bikini Atoll in the 1940's and 1950's could tell President Chirac a thing or two about the consequences, ecological and otherwise, of nuclear tests.

Nuclear tests release two types of radioactive isotopes. The first type, radioactive iodine, is relatively short-lived and decays rapidly within several months. The second type, including cesium-137, strontium-90, and plutonium-239, is very long-lived, and if present in the food chain, even in low-levels, could be responsible for producing increased risks of cancers of all types. The fact that an excessive number of thyroid nodules and birth defects have been observed among residents of the northern Marshall Islands suggests strongly that long-lived radioactive isotopes are present in the environment of the northern Marshall Islands.

Of course, President Chirac could—and probably would—dismiss these observations about the lingering effects of nuclear tests on Marshall Islanders on the grounds that the 66 nuclear tests conducted by America during the 1940's to 1950's took place in the atmosphere whereas the eight nuclear tests that France plans to conduct will take place deep under Moruroa Atoll.

President Chirac has made it abundantly clear that he is both determined to resume French nuclear tests and confident that the planned series of underground nuclear tests pose absolutely no risk to the ocean, the marine life, and surrounding environment.

I must respectfully point out to President Chirac that his decision to resume nuclear tests under Moruroa Atoll is appalling to envi-

ronmentalists, scientists, nuclear disarmament supporters, and the people who live in or around the South Pacific. I strongly and earnestly appeal to President Chirac to rescind his decision to resume these French nuclear tests. They constitute a needless assault on our ocean habitat as well as an open violation of the test ban treaty.

The world should not have to tolerate any more tests. The Just-One-More-Test-Before-We-Sign-the-Treaty stance taken by President Chirac is sheer hypocrisy.

□ 2300

A REPORT FROM INDIANA

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I would like to share with my colleagues in the House a report on what I learn when Ruthie and I go home to Indiana each weekend—a Report from Indiana if you will.

This weekend I had the privilege of attending the "promise keeper men's conference." We have talked a great deal about how this new Republican Congress is keeping our promises made to the American people to change Washington by reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government cutting taxes and balancing the budget.

This conference was about keeping promises at a much more fundamental level.

And the results are phenomenal 62,000 men came from throughout the midwest to the Hoosierdome in downtown Indianapolis to reaffirm their faith and their commitment to their families.

There is nothing quite like joining in with 62,000 men singing church campfire songs at the top of their lungs.

Tony Evans—who was chaplain to the Dallas Cowboys—spoke about how committed individuals are the building blocks of our society.

When we keep our promise to live the standards of our faith, we become leaders. As strong individuals we can lead our family—and pass on these values to our children. Strong families make up healthy communities—where we live out the commandment to love our neighbors and ourselves. And, Tony Evans pointed out healthy communities are the building blocks of good States and good States build strong Nation. A United States, committed to the moral principles that have always made our country strong, will lead the world and establish freedom for all mankind.

I was profoundly struck by Tony Evans' message—as I realized that each of us, by keeping faith with promises we make are an integral part to restoring, strengthening, and building the American dream.

And I was even more profoundly struck on Sunday morning when I attended a 25th wedding celebration of

two friends who have and are living out this principle.

Anne and Max Smith invited their friends to join them at a service at Westfield Friends Meeting, a quaint little county church just outside Hagerstown, IN.

Max is a full time farmer; Anne works at the local welfare office helping children. They both have a strong faith that has been the touchstone of their busy lives. On that faith they built a strong family—raising two children, Brent and Shellie, of their own.

Their strong family let them reach out to help others in their community. At a testimonial lunch after the service, three different young people spoke about how Max and Anne had "adopted them" into their family and given them a chance in life.

Max serves the community as county commissioner, spending countless hours worrying about county services, from fixing back roads in rural Wayne County to administering relief to the poor.

Anne and Max have both been promise keepers. Their commitment has made their church, their community, their county, the State of Indiana, and America a better place to live. And I was honored to be a small part of their celebration of 25 years of marriage.

Mr. Speaker, that's the report from Indiana for this week.

THE SUPREME COURT RULING ON REDISTRICTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12th, 1995, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for a period of time not to extend beyond midnight, as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to talk about a decision that was handed down by the Supreme Court today. I find it very ironic that the Supreme Court would rule in a case that affects the District, the 11th District of Georgia, to be unconstitutional, and it is ironic that we stand at a time in our history that we are trying to bring about a color blind society. We are trying to bring about a democracy to represent all of the people, and the Supreme Court ruled today that the 11th District of Georgia is unconstitutional, and ruled that the Fourth Congressional District, the district which I represent, did not rule on that district at all, simply because the plaintiffs in that case did not have standing.

Tonight I wanted to take just a moment to talk about some of the districts that are majority districts across this country that look just as irregular as the majority minority districts in this country, and try to give some sense of understanding as to why would courts and why would people across America, even entertain the thought that districts, simply because of their shape and simply because of their appearance, are unconstitutional.

I wanted to start by talking about the Fourth Congressional District in Louisiana, the district which I represent. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district that is a very diverse district. The district that I represent is in fact the district of the future. It is a district that is comprised of about 55 percent African-Americans and about 45 percent are white citizens. Therefore, this district in my opinion is a very diverse district, and it really bothers me tonight that the Supreme Court would even consider striking down a district that is as diverse as the district that I represent.

If you look at the shape of the Fourth Congressional District in Louisiana, one may say on its face it is irregular. One may say that it looks somewhat different from the form, because it does move from the northern part of the State of Louisiana, to those who are not familiar with the Fourth Congressional District. This district moves from the northern part of Louisiana, which is the Shreveport-Bossier area, and then it goes down to the more southern part of the State, which goes a little bit past Baton Rouge and goes into St. James Parish.

This district in my opinion is a pretty nice looking district. Most people when they look at this district on a map, they say, that is an irregular-shaped district. It looks bad, it looks bizarre and it ought to be unconstitutional, and it ought to be unconstitutional because it is a majority black district, and why would anybody in their right mind draw a district like that? However, when you really look at the facts of the matter, Mr. Speaker, you see that many districts all across this country look the same and look just like the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana.

For example, if you take the Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee, which was created in 1990, this district, Mr. Speaker, is 96 percent majority, 96 percent white. This district is not under attack tonight, it probably will not be under attack tomorrow, and probably will not be under attack in the future of this country.

I often wonder, why would one allege that the Fourth Congressional District and the 11th Congressional District of the State of Georgia are unconstitutional because they look irregular and the majority of the voters in those particular districts are black.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Ms. MCKINNEY. If one had a pejorative perspective about this kind of district, one could say it looks like Batman spreading his wings.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Without question. If you look at the Fourth Congressional District from Tennessee and the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana—as a matter of fact, I am going to try to see if I can put the two

districts side by side. I mean these two districts, if you look at the two districts side by side, you see that these two districts do not look too much different from each other. I mean, this is the Fourth Congressional District. The only difference is this district is much more diverse than the 11th Congressional District in Tennessee. This district in Tennessee is 96 percent white; this district is 45 percent white, 55 percent black. The only difference is, if you want to look at it from an appearance perspective, is this district is more diverse than the Fourth Congressional District in Tennessee, and it amazes me tonight that this district would be in question as an unconstitutional district simply because it is majority minority.

Ms. MCKINNEY. If the gentleman would continue to yield, during the reapportionment process, as you know, you were part of the Louisiana Legislature, I was a part of the Georgia Legislature, and people would go and look at these maps on the wall and they would try and affix the names and shapes and all kinds of pejorative terms to these districts that were majority minority.

However, I am astounded to see, and this is my first time seeing this, the Fourth District in Tennessee that looks—I mean if I wanted to be pejorative, I would call it all kinds of names, too. However, that is not what we are about. Was this an effective district in electing someone to represent the people of Tennessee?

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Without question, and I am glad the gentleman makes that distinction. I mean, I am certainly not being critical of the Fourth District of Tennessee. I feel it is a beautiful district, because first of all, it is not a beauty contest we are in today in terms of determining how districts look, because none of them look like perfect squares and perfect circles, they all look like animal cookies, if you really want to know the truth.

The fact of the matter is this district encompasses urban and rural Tennessee, I mean it moves to Kentucky, so when people talk about the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana and other majority minority districts in this country, they ought to look at some of the majority districts in this country and see that those districts are no better than the majority minority.

Ms. MCKINNEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, they call them monstrosities, they call them sprawling, they call them all kinds of names, and here we see that we have white districts that can also be termed as sprawling and huge and monstrosities of districts as well. Districts are districts. The bottom line is do they elect competent people to represent the people of the area of these districts, just as the Fourth District of Louisiana works.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. That is right. This in my opinion is very much constitutional, it should stand in any court of law. No one should challenge

this district, because this district was the district that was drawn by the State legislature in the State of Tennessee, and it ought to be upheld and not challenged.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to applaud the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] for their hard work in this matter, and simply cite to both of you the dissenting opinion of Stevens that really said what you have just said.

Justice Ginsberg, according to Stevens, has explained why the district court's opinion on the merits was erroneous, and why this court's law-changing decision will breed unproductive litigation. He joined in the opinion without reservation.

This decision will result in unproductive litigation, because there are districts all over the Nation that have varying shapes. Why should anyone want to open up a Pandora's box of challenging all of those districts, of which people are pleased with their representation and comfortable with their representation. He added and said that he believes that the respondents of these cases, like the respondents in the United States versus Hayes, have not suffered any legally cognizable injury, that these people have not been hurt.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield.

Are you suggesting then that a Pandora's box has been opened, and so now we see that districts that are a majority black and majority minority across this country have been subjected to lawsuits, so we could also now find the majority white districts that look like this, drawn on the basis of race, also subjected to lawsuits?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Well if the gentleman would continue to yield as well, let me say that I can only read the plain black and white language here of the court. Justice Ginsberg, who answers that question yes, by saying that this law-changing decision that was offered today will breed unproductive litigation. If these are examples of districts across the Nation, which by the way, we have not heard a rising up of constituents in these different districts who happen to be, I believe, satisfied with their representative, which is what this Congress is about, a representative body. It appears to me that even the court believes that now we have opened to the world that if one person in the corner of that district or in the corner of a district in Montana or South Dakota or Michigan feels that they have a funny shape, but have not been denied representation, it appears that we have the Supreme Court, at least in the dissent by a very able Justice Ginsberg saying, yes, we have opened up this legal system to unproductive litigation with this decision today.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentlewoman a

few questions. I am going to place on the top of district No. 4 district No. 11, which is the district that the court ruled as being an unconstitutional district, the 11th District of Georgia. From an appearance perspective, would the gentlewoman agree with me that both of these districts pretty much look irregular, if you want to use the term irregular?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, someone would say in the eyes of beholder. I think that there would be the reception by many who looked at that and said yes, on both of those districts.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, in my eyes that is the most beautiful district in the State of Georgia.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Let me ask the gentlewoman another question.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I understand.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Let me present another scenario to the gentlewoman. If I would suggest to the gentlewoman that this district is 60 percent black and 40 percent white, and this district is 96 percent white and 4 percent black, which of the two districts would the gentlewoman suggest would be the most diverse district?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Obviously, the top district that you have, the 11th District of Georgia, and as well, I would imagine that you might be able to point out several communities of interest in that district.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I would ask the gentlewoman, which would be the most segregated districts of the two?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, it would certainly seem to be the last one, which is, I believe, the fourth district.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. So if this district would be declared unconstitutional and segregate voters, then one would have to just make the fair assumption that this district would have to follow under the same rules and regulations; would you not agree to that?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I think what that does is absolutely affirms the comments made by Justice Ginsberg which say, you have now then opened a door to lawsuits all over this country, for districts all over this country.

□ 2315

And I frankly think this is not what the American people want. They want to be able to elect a Representative of their choosing. They want to be assured that that Representative will represent them and their interests. I do not think they want to find themselves in courthouses across this Nation challenging districts on the basis of shape.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I would also suggest that the American people do not want a second occurrence of the situation that occurred after reconstruction. And that is that the American people

do not want the elected Representatives of the people of choice, of color, expelled because of their color.

But it appears to me that if we are not careful that is where we could end up. Tens, hundreds, thousands, of city council people, school board members, county commissioners, legislators, Members of Congress expelled for no other reason than the color of their skin. Is that the future that we want for this country? And is that the kind of democracy that we are supposed to be marching toward?

I think this Supreme Court decision has done a tremendous disservice to the people of this country, because instead of moving forward together, now we have the real chance of moving backwards.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I think the gentlewoman makes a very good point. One of the problems that we have in this country is how we integrate the institutions of power, the institutions that make decisions. How do we integrate this institution that we call the U.S. Congress, the House of Representatives?

You know, in one State, when one uses the term House of Representatives it connotes representatives of the people. I just have the view that when one puts a mirror in front of the U.S. House of Representatives it ought to represent to some degree the citizens of the United States of America. And if the court continues to go on the trend it is going on today, it is going to eliminate many of the majority-minority districts in this Congress, which means that you would not be able to see the kind of representation in this Congress that you see outside of this Congress, and that is among the American people.

I think it is encouraging to see Hispanics in the U.S. Congress and African-Americans and women in the U.S. Congress. I think that is what representation is all about. But we are clearly going to have a problem in obtaining a good representation of this country right here in the Halls of Congress if we continue to eliminate districts like the district from Georgia and other districts that are majority-minority districts.

I want the gentlewoman to bear with me a moment. I have a few more maps I want to show here, because this is, in my opinion, very important.

I am now placing on the easel the Third Congressional District from the State of Tennessee, which was created in 1990. This district is 87 percent majority.

Now, if the 11th Congressional District of Georgia, which is 60 percent minority, is unconstitutional, I can't see much difference between the 11th Congressional in Tennessee, other than this district is much more diverse than the Third Congressional District in Tennessee.

So I just think the Court is about to open up the floodgates of litigation as the gentlewoman knows, if they con-

tinue to go on the this trend of judging districts based on their appearance and not judging districts based on any real constitutional standard. Because none of these districts can win a beauty contest, and I do not think that is the purpose of the Voting Rights Act, and I do not think there is anything in the Constitution of the United States of America that says that a district must look a certain way.

I just find it ironic that the United States Supreme Court will take the amendment that was used to protect minority voters, the 14th amendment of the Constitution and the equal protection clause, and instead of using that as a shield to continue to protect minority voters, they use it as a award to insure the. I just find that to be hard to believe today, that the court would make that kind of ruling.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Ms. MCKINNEY. You know, we are talking about beauty contests, but the beauty of these districts is that they provide effective representation for the people who reside in them. And I know that we perhaps would not have even had to have an 11th Congressional District of Georgia as a majority-minority district had the residents of the district been properly taken care of when they had other representation.

But you can immediately ride into the 11th District and know that you have crossed some kind of threshold, where you have people who live in homes without running water, you have people who are suffering from environmental contamination and dying, you have people who still have their voting rights violated in 1994 and 1995.

We cross some kind of time threshold, we cross some kind of socioeconomic threshold, we cross a neglect threshold. And now, for the first time, particularly in Georgia, outside of the city of Atlanta, people have a strong voice fighting for them, providing some relief from their suffering.

And the Supreme Court now says that that is unconstitutional. The question, I guess, is not what about CYNTHIA MCKINNEY, but what about those people? Because CYNTHIA MCKINNEY may be gone, but the problems that those people have to endure day after day as they mete out a meager existence will endure. What is going to happen to those people? Who will serve those people? I do not have lobbyists coming into my office asking me to please provide running water for the people who do not have running water in their homes in your district, CYNTHIA.

The lobbyists come by and they have their hands out and they are asking for government largess, but it is not on behalf of the people who are in need. I was sent here by the people who are in need, and I do my darnedest to represent them, as I know you do, and

that is the appropriate balance in this place; that is the appropriate balance for government, that we have all of the people who are in need and all of the various needs represented. And their in the marketplace of political ideas they clash and their values assume a certain kind of value, and some win and some lose, some come out on top, but everybody should not always have to come out on the bottom all the time.

That is what these districts were designed to prevent. That is why I believe all of these districts are beautiful districts.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I thank the gentlewoman for that analogy. I mean the gentlewoman has done such a great job here in this Congress for the people that she represents back in Georgia and it would be just, in my opinion, a big calamity for the many people in Georgia to lose a Representative like you.

That is why the point of shape should be such a nonfactor, to even opine a thought that a gentlewoman like you might not be able to serve in this body simply because the district looks a certain way. In my opinion, I agree with you, I think the district is absolutely beautiful. First of all, there is no constitutional standard for beauty. I have read through and through the Constitution and I have not seen any beauty contest requirement for the shape of a district. One of the reasons for that is because the districts, I mean the States are not perfect squares and perfect circles.

You take the State of Louisiana, for example, it is shaped like a boot. So you cannot get a perfect district out of the State of Louisiana when the State itself does not, is not a perfect square or a perfect circle, but I think the State of Louisiana is a beautiful State.

I take issue with anybody who would say the State of Louisiana is not a beautiful-looking State. I am proud of that boot shape of the State of Louisiana, because it is not how the shape of the State looks, it is what is within the State. We have great people within the State of Louisiana.

Let me, if the gentlewoman would bear with me just for a moment, I know the gentlewoman has been up all night representing her constituents.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Two nights.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Two nights in a row on the floor of this House not being able to go to sleep, not one ounce.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Not 10 minutes of sleep.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Not 10 minutes and still on the floor tonight fighting for the damned, the doomed, the disenfranchised, the have-nots, and I just want to commend the gentlewoman from Georgia for just being here, because she has often said the issue is not whether or not CYNTHIA MCKINNEY will serve another day in Congress, but the issue is whether or not a person like CYNTHIA MCKINNEY will have the opportunity to serve in

Congress. These are not guaranteed districts, these are opportunity districts.

I want the gentlewoman to look at the Sixth District of Chicago. This district is in existence today. This district is represented by a very able Member of this body. I would dare not say that this Member of Congress has not represented his constituents. This district is separated.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Discontinuity.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. This is not even contiguous. This district is separated not by water, not by some island, this district is separated by another district. If you look, another district, a congressional district actually runs in between this district and this little island here, which is a part of this district.

Now, if this district, which is all contiguous, not one part of this district is noncontiguous, and this district, which is—let me give you the numbers of this district, 95.2 percent white.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Looks like that district could be subject to a lawsuit.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. If this district here is unconstitutional according to the Supreme Court of the United States of America, then what do you think this district here is? You are talking about a district that is not even contiguous. There are three different islands on this district here, and this district here is certainly all intact and all contiguous.

Ms. MCKINNEY. What kind of mischief has the Supreme Court now made? Can you imagine the 50 States of the United States engaged in redistricting in the middle of the 10-year period? What kind of political chaos could result in something like that?

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. It would be absolute disruption. It would open up the floodgates of litigation. It would be unmanageable. If every one citizen in America who feels that their district does not look a certain way and will not pass any beauty contest runs to the courthouse and files a lawsuit, we are going to be dealing with this issue of reapportionment for a long period of time.

That is why I think the courts must be very careful when they come down on these districts simply because they are majority-minority, one; and, two, they do not look a certain way and do not pass the course of beauty contests and fail to look at all these districts that are majority-majority districts, that do not look a certain way and do not fit into a perfect square, in a perfect box scenario or syndrome. Those districts which are overwhelmingly one race and not diverse, like these districts that the courts are making, calling unconstitutional, have to be subject to the same kind of scrutiny that these districts are subject to.

I only have three more districts I would like to share with the gentlewoman because I know it is getting late in the hour.

Ms. MCKINNEY. But you know, Congressman, I would also like to say

something about this notion about districts are supposed to look a certain way, people are supposed to look a certain way. I have had a particular problem since I have been elected because I do not quite look the way most Members of Congress are supposed to look. Security guards stop me, elevator operators stop me, you name it, I have problems. I was stopped even last week because I do not look the way some folks think a Member of Congress is supposed to look.

When we start judging by how we think folks are supposed to look or things are supposed to look, and then discriminating against them based on the fact that that does not quite look like what we think it ought to look like, the stereotype we have in our minds, then we really are engaging in something else that is very harmful, and that is what we want to avoid as well.

So there is some preconceived idea, I guess, that a good district is a circular district, or maybe it is a square district, but it certainly cannot look like that district and be a good district. It can look like that district if it produces somebody who looks like the way a Member of Congress is supposed to look, but if that district produces somebody who looks like me and says I do not look like the kind of person who ought to be walking the Halls of Congress as a Member of Congress, then something is wrong with the district. Highly suspect reasoning.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I would like to share with the gentlewoman just three more maps. I want to thank her for her patience. While we talk about appearance, I would like to share with the gentlewoman the 14th Congressional District of Texas.

This was a 1920's. You can see that that district was not contiguous. It had an island, and that was not because of water, it was because another district actually ran between that district, and this district was actually created to disenfranchise minority groups. It was gerrymandered for the purpose of excluding minority groups, Hispanics and blacks, so that they would not be empowered and so that they would not be the majority, so that they could not elect a candidate of their choice.

The courts saw absolutely nothing wrong with this district. Citizens did not file complaints, of course. But it just goes to show you how districts that look just like districts that are being declared unconstitutional are suspect, and the Supreme Court was very much constitutional in the past and in fact in the present.

Now this next district I am about to show the gentlewoman is probably the one that I have the most fun with, to be quite honest with you, because if the 11th District of Georgia is irregular, according to the courts, then I would like to know what you call this district. Now, this is the Sixth District of Texas, Dallas, TX. This is one district and no one has filed a lawsuit in

this district. Why? Because this district is not a majority-minority district. It is not Hispanic, it is not black. So I guess it is constitutional. But this district runs all over the place. I mean, they criticize a district in Louisiana saying it is only so wide. They criticize a district, the 12th Congressional District in North Carolina, represented by a very able Member of Congress, Mr. WATT. They said his district is as wide as an interstate. How wide is this district at certain points?

Now, let us do a comparison test. Let us do a little beauty contest. This is the district that was declared by the Supreme Court in its infinite wisdom as being unconstitutional, the 11th District of Georgia, which is at the top, and there is the Sixth District of Texas at the bottom. Now, you tell me which district in your opinion, if you want to talk beauty. There is a portion of this district that is not even contiguous. As a matter of fact, there are three or four portions of this district that are not contiguous. Take this portion here which is not contiguous. This little island over here to the left is not contiguous.

It just goes to show you you cannot develop an appearance standard to determine the constitutionality of a district.

The last district, which is probably the district that started this whole term gerrymandering, is a district of Massachusetts. A very able member of this body, a person who works very hard, represents the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts. This district is the real district because it comes from the State that brought about the term gerrymander as a result of their great Governor at that time. This district is not under challenge. It is not a majority-minority district; it is a majority-majority district. A very able member of this body represents this district, represents his constituents well, and no one asks questions about the constitutionality of this district. It is just suspect to me that only districts that appear to be unconstitutional are districts that are majority-minority.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Based on shape.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Just the other day in New York, I forgot what congressional district, but it is represented by a very able female member of this Congress.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Absolutely.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. A Hispanic district.

Ms. MCKINNEY. The Nation's first Puerto Rican American Congresswoman.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. First Puerto Rican American Congresswoman walking into the halls of Congress, now being challenged because her district looks a certain way, and it is majority Hispanic.

I just thought we would take a few minutes tonight to talk about this. And I also wanted to tell you how much your leadership has meant to

this body and will continue to mean to this body. Because I certainly have no plans of the gentlewoman leaving this body. But it really hurts me to my heart to know that the Supreme Court would rule that this beautiful district, this beautiful district, and to show you just how beautiful this district is, this absolute perfect beautiful district would be declared as an unconstitutional gerrymander, and this district here goes untouched. I want you to know that the people of Savannah and the people of all parts of Georgia who are under your great leadership, you know, have nothing to be ashamed of, and they ought to stick their chests out and be proud of the fact that they are members of this beautiful district.

I do not know what will happen in the future, but people like you are the kind of people that this country needs to make this country really project what it talks about on a day-to-day basis and even tries to get other countries to talk about, and that is democracy. Because now when we put a mirror in front of this Congress and we see a Congresswoman, a gentlewoman like you, then there are people all across America who can poke their chests out and say I am proud to be an American and I am proud to be in America because our Congress, our House of Representatives, is inclusive and not exclusive.

On a closing note, while people talk about the number of minority Members who are now Members of Congress and they talk about this uproar and this increase in numbers, there are only 40 black Members in the whole U.S. Congress, not the House of Representatives, mind you, but in the entire U.S. Congress. That is the House and the Senate.

Ms. MCKINNEY. There are 535 Members.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. There are 535 House and Senate Members, and of the 535 House and Senate Members, there are only 40 blacks. For anyone to even opine the thought that these Members are here because they were guaranteed some safety or were guaranteed seats, is absolutely wrong. The only thing they were guaranteed was an opportunity, and that was an opportunity to be able to plead their case before voters in the most diverse districts in the whole United States of America.

□ 2340

And it really frightens me today that this court would find the most diverse district in the country as a district that may be unconstitutional, and it really falls square. I mean, it just falls square on the shoulders and slaps the Voting Rights Act in its face, and it also slaps those people who have worked so hard, those people who have worked so hard to fight for the passage of the Voting Rights Act, people like Martin Luther King, people like Thurgood Marshall and people like President Kennedy, I mean, people who

just gave it all to make sure that this Congress would reflect this country.

And I want to thank the gentlewoman for her willingness to come here tonight after being up for 2 nights in row and standing on the floor of this House and talking about a significant issue like reapportionment.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I commend the gentleman for his leadership on this very important issue, and I would also just like to commend you for being able to prevail in such a dark period of uncertainty when I know all of the clouds of doubt and sometimes a little bit of disappointment were trying to rain on your parade, but you were able to keep your head up high, maintain your dignity and continue to function, lead in this body. I appreciate your leadership. I appreciate your leadership on this issue, and I certainly appreciate the enduring friendship that we will have as a result of our time here together.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I thank the gentlewoman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 8 p.m., on account of illness.

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 members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SANDERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK, of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. SEASTRAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, 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 Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOORHEAD, in two instances.

Mr. FORBES.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. COX.