

of ironic time, our national Independence Day, to be running around waiving this provision. I urge him not to waive this. This is title III of the Helms-Burton bill, the Libertad Act. It is critical that this be enforced. Because our allies by the encouragement and the not saying anything to their businesses and companies that are operating and benefiting from U.S.-owned businesses in Cuba are encouraging the use of stolen property and they are encouraging contributions through this method to Castro's economy which otherwise would not be able to sustain this dictator in power. I think it is abysmal and abominable that the President would choose to thumb his nose at this piece of legislation and continue to not let these lawsuits go forward.

Our allies in Europe and in Canada are crying about this. We have seen a lot in the media lately over the last few months that this is terrible, that somehow we are doing something against them and their businesses and that we are interfering with trade and we are doing all kinds of things. Mr. Speaker, it is really not the case.

The case is that there is nothing unfair in my judgment, and I would not think anybody else's, to allow a business interest in the United States that is properly and legally owning, and recognized by international law as owning a business in Cuba from suing in United States court a foreign business, not the government but the business, from Canada or Europe or wherever who is doing business here in the United States as well, that is why the courts of the United States would have jurisdiction, suing them in United States Federal Court for the unjust enrichment, for the gains, the profits they are making on the American businessman or his business's property that he owns. It just makes common sense to. It is good foreign policy. It should be good economic policy. The world should adopt it as part of the international accords that exist out there. Certainly it should be our sovereign right, and what Congress is intending to do and was intending to do with the Helms-Burton Act, to let American businesses collect rightfully what is theirs in United States courts if they have the right to do so, if they have jurisdiction to do so.

I know it is a little complicated, but if a foreign business is doing business in the United States, the law that Mr. Clinton is saying he is not going to let happen, that we passed out here, if he would let it happen, would allow American businesses that own property in Cuba, internationally recognized that they still own it, that was confiscated years ago, would allow them to sue for this extra profit, this unjust enrichment being made on their property, with contracts these businesses in the other countries have in Cuba, that they have to operate or run or manage or sell products through the businesses that are American-owned but not in American hands that are still in Cuba.

If the President does not change his ways, if he waives for the third consecutive time the title III provisions, it is my intent when this Congress reconvenes after the July 4 recess to introduce legislation that would abolish his right to make this waiver. I am all for giving the President tools to operate under, but when he abuses it as he apparently is about to do for 3 consecutive times without making a case that I think is justifiable or this Congress should think is justifiable for doing that, then it is time for this body to withdraw the power of the President to make that waiver. It is time to let the American national interest prevail over the interests of some of our allies and their rather belligerent voices that are about all we are hearing today in the media. America first in this case. There is no reason why it should not be first. There is no reason particularly when we have got a dictator like Castro ripping us off and then having our allies' businesses stick it in our faces even more and rip us off a second time to the benefit of Castro. That is absolutely the height of absurdity. I cannot see how waiving this provision and letting them continue to do this is in the national interest of the United States or in any way furthers democracy in Cuba. I just cannot see it. I would suggest tonight as we are talking about crime and drugs and heinous things that it is perfectly appropriate to talk about trying to do something to get rid of Castro, free the people of Cuba and help the American businessman and citizen recover some of his lost property that is down there right now. I am again announcing that I intend to introduce such legislation.

To bring this back full scope before I yield back my time, I want to say again that as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime in the House, I took out this time this evening to paint a broad big picture on the issue of crime in America today. I would repeat for my colleagues who may not have picked up all I have been saying this evening that there is a big picture out there. While the rate of violent crime has slightly declined in the United States marginally over the last 4 years, it is still way too high. We had 160 violent crimes for every 100,000 people in our population in 1960. In the last measurable year, in 1995, we had 685 violent crimes for every 100,000 people; 685 compared to 160 for the same number of people in our population. Now this reduction, this tiny fraction of that, in our country. We have an enormously large proportion of those violent crimes being committed by juveniles under the age of 18, more murders by 18-year-olds than any other age group, more rapes by 17-year-olds, a huge proportion of the violent crime in this country by juveniles, and we are about to see a big, big increase, a 23 percent increase in the number of juveniles in the age group most likely to commit these violent crimes over the next 10 years. I think that if we do not

make steps that correct the problems of a broken juvenile justice system and give law enforcement more tools and get with it on the war on drugs and actually define how we win that war and provide our Coast Guard and our Customs and our law enforcement community, our military with the resources necessary to accomplish those goals and objectives to win the war on drugs, unless we do all of those things, unless we put consequences back into the juvenile justice system so that when a kid vandalizes a store or home they know they are going to get some sanction for that misdemeanor crime, as well as if they commit a violent crime of murder or rape or assault with a gun that they are going to be tried as adults more likely than not and given long sentences, unless we put consequences back into the acts of our criminal laws, both for juveniles and for adults, and mean something about swiftness and certainty of punishment and mean there is a deterrent out there, all of the other things we may do to try to control the problems of drugs and crime in our streets today will be wishful thinking. It does not mean I am against prevention, it means I am for a balanced approach; \$4 billion in prevention programs, I think we should continue a lot of those, we should consolidate them, we should do them, but we should also correct and repair a broken juvenile justice system and we should do something to make certain that we have a war on drugs that is winnable, define the mission and the goal, charge the right individuals with the responsibility to carry out that war in a way that is designed to win it rather than tying their hands behind their backs, give them the resources necessary, put all of this into a comprehensive program over the next 3 or 4 years and just get the job done. It can be done.

We are drowning in a sea of violence, we are drowning in a sea of drugs. America deserves better. We can have it better. We need to pass H.R. 3 in both the House and in the Senate, but we need to do a lot more than that as well.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to bring this message to my colleagues.

RACE RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today there was a little bit of history that meant a great deal to me. The last bill we passed was a bill sponsored by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS], called the Joint Resolution Celebrating the End of Slavery in the United States. I think it is a small gesture, maybe, but it is a very important one for me. It is an important one for a lot of Americans, both black and white, and I was pleased to see that not

a single Member of the House of Representatives who was present voted against this joint resolution introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS].

It is a joint resolution celebrating the end of slavery in the United States. It reads:

Whereas news of the end of slavery came late to frontier areas of the country, especially in the American Southwest; and

Whereas the African-Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest thereafter celebrated Juneteenth as the anniversary of their emancipation;

Whereas their descendants handed down that tradition from generation to generation as an inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas Juneteenth celebrations have thus been held for 130 years to honor the memory of all those who endured slavery and especially those who moved from slavery to freedom; and

Whereas their example of faith and strength of character remains a lesson for all Americans today, regardless of background or region or race; Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that, one, the celebration of the end of slavery is an important and enriching part of our country's history and heritage; two, the celebration of the end of slavery provides an opportunity for all Americans to learn more about our common past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped our Nation; and, three, a copy of this joint resolution be transmitted to the National Association of Juneteenth Lineage as an expression of appreciation for its role in promoting the observance of the end of slavery.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS] and the cosponsors of this resolution. It does not appropriate any dollars for anybody. It does not command or mandate anybody to do anything. It just calls attention to the fact that there are a large number of people in the country who have been celebrating the end of slavery on Juneteenth, they call it. Even I as someone born and raised in the South, went to school in the South, did not know much about Juneteenth because I was in the wrong part of the South.

It is the Southwest and farther out West that they celebrate it because they got the news last. They learned last that the Emancipation Proclamation had been issued and the people were set free. They did not learn it, they did not hear about it and celebrate it until late June in that part of the country.

I learned about it when I moved to the Northeast and there were groups that made an issue of having a ceremonial observance on Juneteenth, so I learned about it then. I think it is an interesting phenomenon to have the Congress recognize it, that this has been going on in certain parts of the country for 130 years. The Emancipation Proclamation, of course, was issued by President Abraham Lincoln, and later on the Congress of the United States passed the 13th amendment which in the Constitution ended all slavery forever in this country.

This resolution was passed as the last item of business today. As I said before, not a single House Member voted against it; everybody voted for it. I want to thank all the Members who voted for it, and I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS]. It ushers in a spirit that is a good spirit and it does not cost anybody anything.

It is happening at a time when there are a couple of other developments that have caught the attention of the American people. The President has issued a statement that he is establishing a new initiative on race relations in the country. He is appointing a Commission on Race Relations, and that has caused some discussion, as he wanted it to. The primary purpose of the commission is to stimulate discussion, to promote dialogue, to have more people talk about race relations in America. I think that is commendable, a commendable act on the part of the President.

At the same time, our colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has called for a resolution which would apologize for those who suffered as slaves under the Constitution and laws of the United States until 1865. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] is a colleague. We all know the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] as being a person of sterling integrity. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has never been a person who ran for any limelight and wanted to get attention. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has been the kind of hard worker, behind the scenes, that has dedicated himself to issues like hunger where very few people get headlines. Hunger; making efforts to feed hungry children in America, efforts to feed hungry children across the world.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] picked up the legacy of Mickey Leland. Mickey Leland, who had made an issue of traveling all over the world in an effort to bring relief to hungry children, was unfortunately killed in an airplane crash on the side of a mountain in Africa.

□ 2015

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] was Mickey Leland's successor, and TONY HALL has dealt with that issue in every way you can possibly deal with it, on an international level, national level, locally here in Washington. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has worked to see to it that the very basic need of people for food was met. So TONY HALL, you know, is a kind of person we all admire and love and appreciate. We are grateful for the kind of work TONY HALL does.

I do not know why TONY HALL decided to sponsor this amendment to apologize for slavery. I got a copy of his "Dear Colleague" order, "Dear Colleague" invitation, to join, and I certainly would like to have my name added to his resolution. If it has not been already added by my staff, I would

like to have my name added. I want to congratulate TONY. His resolution is a very simple one, but it is relevant to the President's commission and to the Juneteenth resolution of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS].

The Hall resolution is a resolution apologizing for those who suffered as slaves under the Constitution and laws of the United States until 1865. It reads simply: Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, that the Congress apologizes to African-Americans whose ancestors suffered as slaves under the Constitution and laws of the United States until 1865.

That is the simple Hall resolution. He introduced it on July 12, and when he introduced it he sent the following letter to those Members of Congress he was asking to support it:

Dear colleague, Generations have passed since the end of slavery, and in that time Congress has done much to address the effects of that legacy. But there was never an official apology for the horrible wrong. Today we are introducing a resolution in which we, on behalf of the United States Congress, apologize to African-Americans whose ancestors suffered as slaves. Our resolution will not fix any lingering injustices resulting from slavery. The reconciliation begins with an apology. We hope this apology will be a beginning of a new healing between the races. No one alive today is responsible for slavery. However, as Americans we share a common history, which includes a long era when slavery was acceptable. Therefore it is fitting for the Congress, as a representative of the American people, to offer this apology. This apology is long overdue, but it is never too late to confess that we were wrong as a Nation and ask for forgiveness.

On the reverse side of this letter is a copy of the resolution, and he asked that anyone who wants to cosponsor it do so.

I think it is very commendable, and I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL]. I congratulate him on his wisdom. TONY HALL is not an African-American. TONY HALL is not a member of the Congressional Black Caucus. Over the years some of us have cosponsored or sponsored legislation asking for the appointment of commissions to study reparations, and some of us have sponsored or cosponsored bills which have called for reparations to be provided by the descendants of African slaves. Some others have called for various kinds of programs, programs to be initiated which are compensatory in nature to understand the legacy of slavery. And therefore they would, by doing certain things through public policy or through public programs, compensate for some of the evils and horrors of slavery.

Now I do not think that either one of these items, the Juneteenth resolution of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS], which was passed already, or the Hall resolution which has been introduced and sponsored but has not

been passed, and already some Members of Congress have indicated that they think that the Hall resolution is a bit too much. It is emotional symbolism, the Speaker said over the weekend, emotional symbolism, and therefore it is undesirable.

Well, let me agree with the Speaker. It is emotional symbolism. So is the Juneteenth resolution that we passed today.

The emotional symbolism is very important. It is very important to have emotional symbolism. Symbolism is very important. Symbolism is a beginning of a process, can be the beginning of a process, that has very concrete results.

The women of Korea who were subjected to enforced, mandated prostitution, they were forced into prostitution by the Japanese; they were called comfort girls or comfort women, and they are insisting to this day that they get an apology. You know, yes, the Japanese government agreed to pay some people, some of them could be identified, et cetera, but they still are not satisfied that they have not gotten a full-scale apology from the Japanese Government.

This whole matter of apologies has become, you know, a major issue with certain nations who feel that they were wronged by other nations. You know, perhaps more than apology will be asked for or is being requested, but the process begins with the apology.

You know, why is it painful to apologize? And of course there are people who say, well, and I got calls in my office this morning. Some people said: "I did not do anything to anybody, I have never enslaved anybody, I would not enslave anybody; so I feel insulted by this request for an apology."

Well, No. 1, I have not requested an apology from any individual, and I will not request an apology from any individual. I think it is a little silly to request any individual to make an apology for slavery. It is an apology that is being requested on behalf of the Nation, on behalf of the Government and everything else that makes up a nation.

I am not sure what makes up a nation. I am not sure they must fully understand what makes up a nation. When we stick out our chest and say we are proud to be Americans, what are we talking about? When we say we are proud to be American, are we going to dismiss the history or we stick out our chests and say we are proud to be Americans, or are we very much concerned with history? We are proud of the Constitution. We are proud of the Bill of Rights. We are proud of the bravery and the courage shown by the men who died on the beaches of Normandy, you know, unexcelled courage and unselfishness, thousands of miles away from their own land. They did things that are unbelievable on behalf of the liberation of people they did not know.

They were Americans, you know. We are proud of that. When we say we are

proud to be an American, we call ourselves Americans. We are claiming that. We are claiming the good things that Americans have done.

The Marshall plan, which was celebrated last week, and we discussed that as being unprecedented, too, in terms of unselfishness. You know, this Nation reached out to the war-torn nations of Europe. There are cynics who say, well, we only wanted markets for our products, and we are only looking for a way to relieve capitalism of its excess equipment and materials, whatever. It was an unprecedented unselfish act, and we reached out to war-torn Europe. Billions of dollars flowed from America to Europe, and we rebuilt the continent. We rebuilt Western Europe. And, yes, we stopped communism in the process. But one thing that people have not acknowledged or realized, and I did not realize it until recently, is that the Marshall Plan was laid out there for the Russians, too.

When the Marshall Plan was conceived by General Marshall under President Truman, they made it available to the Soviet Union and all the countries of Europe. The Soviet Union could have been a part of the Marshall Plan. All the war-torn countries were given the opportunity to be a part of the Marshall Plan.

You know, no other nation has behaved that way. When we say we are Americans, and we talk about America, you are claiming and bringing in all those unparalleled feats of national heroism, of national unselfishness, of national implementation of the Judeo-Christian tradition in a monumental way. So if you are taking all the good, then we cannot turn our backs on the things in the Nation's history which are also not so good. We cannot say we are Americans, but we have nothing to do with, we do not want to even hear about, the fact that the Native Americans were swept off their land in large numbers. They were not compensated justly. They were treated very badly, and the Native Americans still have not been compensated for all that happened to them. We cannot turn our backs on that, say that is not part of America.

We cannot turn our backs on slavery which lasted for 232 years on the North American Continent; 232 years it lasted. It was part of America. It was part of the process of a nation becoming what it is. Yes, slavery did contribute to the economy, it contributed to the building of a frontier America, it enriched the Nation. It did a lot of things that were good for America, but it was a heinous institution. There is nothing probably in the history of mankind which parallels 232 years of enslavement of one people by another, dragging them from their homes, sailing them across the oceans and dropping them into a new world where, in order for them to function efficiently and for them to carry out their task and be profitable, they had to be dehumanized. There had to be a policy of

cutting them off from their traditions of making them not speak their language, of not allowing them to form families.

And I use the word families, you know, with emphasis. Families are very important in the history of mankind. The most important institution probably that He has ever created are families. But slaves were not allowed to maintain families. They could not be a part of any family brought over. They could not be a part of any group that came over and keep the traditions and the mores and the ceremonies of that group because part of the preparation of the slave to be an economic force that paid off was to break him loose from his past and not let him associate with the people who spoke the same language, not let him associate with the people who had the same tradition.

So right away they were set adrift with no institution, no traditions, no past, and then they were not allowed to create anything new.

Slave families were not respected. There was no such thing. In fact, the largest slave owners discouraged the forming of slave bonds.

Slaves struggled to put together their own sense of some kind of family. They had a custom for getting married, and since their marriages were not recognized and nobody would issue them a marriage license or recognize the marriage, they started a custom of jumping over the broom. To get married 2 people jumped over the broom. Well, they could jump over the broom, and maybe they would be allowed a few weeks together. Maybe they would stay in the same place for a few years. But the masters and their owners had no respect for the fact that they were man and wife in their own eyes, so they might be sold away at any time from each other.

Of course the bond between mother and child was also not respected. Very young children would be snatched from the bosoms of their mothers and sold away.

The whole purpose of slavery was to obliterate the humanity of the African, obliterate.

You know, the Nazi Holocaust, you might say, was crueler, more cruel in the sense that Hitler and the Nazis actually murdered and cremated the Jews. They destroyed them totally, and there is nothing worse than being destroyed totally when you are a human being because you are no more. You cannot have any hope. You cannot have children who might get free in the future who might have a better life. You are gone.

So to be obliterated, to be completely incinerated, destroyed, is the worst thing that could happen to human beings. But also there might be a second worst thing, and that is to have your humanity obliterated, for the masters to want to keep you alive because you are a machine or a work animal, a burden of beast. They want to keep you alive.

□ 2030

They do not want you to recognize, to have a wife or family. They do not want any bonds between two people. They do not want mothers to have recognition of their children, and bonds to exist. All that had to be destroyed.

Slavery was a heinous institution. It did not only happen in America. There was the African slave trade that also went to South America and other places, but for 232 years we had slavery in America. We cannot be Americans embracing everything that is good about America and not embrace or recognize that the other negative things are also part of America.

When the apology is made, it is not your apology. I do not know how you deal with those things. Maybe it is an apology that goes up to the ages, across eternity. Maybe it is an apology that only God can hear, but it is an apology; thank you for the apology, if we receive it. Do not be afraid to apologize. Do not be afraid of the process of reconciliation, which begins with an apology. Reconciliation, the healing process, is something that we have begun to learn more about from strange places.

The healing process through reconciliation, it is probably being exemplified and illustrated, implemented, in no better way than it is in South Africa. South Africa and Nelson Mandela are showing us the way to deal with reconciliation. Instead of revenge, you have reconciliation.

Where you had a situation where a population of 20-some million people was oppressed by a population and a minority of between 4 million and 5 million people, the whites were about 4 to 5 million people, the African-Americans were between 24 million and 29 million people, they were the majority. They were oppressed by the minority for years. They were the original occupants of the area, the territory.

The white minority came in with superior technology, et cetera, and subdued and oppressed them. They had to fight a violent struggle. It was not a non-violent struggle like the one we had here in the United States during the sixties. The South Africans had to go to violence.

Everybody predicted that you would have fire and blood at the end of this process, that it could not end, you could not reverse the situation and have the black majority in charge and the white minority be allowed to live in peace with the black majority. But South Africa under Nelson Mandela has proved that this is not the case. South Africa is moving forward peacefully. Whites are not fleeing in large numbers because they are white and afraid, because they are in the minority and afraid. They are building.

One of the reasons they are doing this is because they set up a thing called a truth and reconciliation commission. They went so far as to say we will not even punish a murderer, if he was involved in murder during the vio-

lent episodes that took place. A murderer on either side will not be punished if they come forward and if they tell the truth. And let us get the record straight, including those people who were part of the official South African police, and they were in charge of the systematic murder of large numbers of people, they were allowed to come forward. And if you confess, automatically your confession means that you will not be punished.

A lot of people on the side of the African-Americans said this is ridiculous, this is not justice. But what they were saying is that reconciliation is more important than justice. That has a familiar ring to anybody who is a member of the Christian religion. If you are a Christian, you heard that before.

It is hard to believe that business about turning the other cheek, and if a Roman soldier asked you to carry his bag for a certain distance, then offer to carry it further. All this philosophy of reconciliation, love overcoming hate and good overcoming evil has been a hard struggle for people who say they believe in Christianity. How can it be that a Nation can operate on that principle?

Here is what is happening in South Africa. The Nation is saying it is more important that we have love and attempt to bond with you in order to overcome the past than it is to have justice, which means somebody ought to be punished. We will forego that.

So here we have all these developments taking place, and there are people in the country who are upset because we may follow the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. TONY HALL and his recommendation. We may end up voting an official apology for slavery.

That upsets some people. Please do not let it upset you. It is a good beginning. It is consistent with the Judeo-Christian tradition. It will not cost anybody. There will be no appropriation. Taxpayers will not have to pay anything. You individually are not placed on the spot, because you do not have to admit guilt before you apologize. It is the Nation, the Nation, whatever constitutes a Nation, the good and the bad, everything that has happened in America, that is the Nation, the Nation apologizes. This administration, this Congress, may apologize on behalf of the Nation.

Beyond that, the President's Commission is a good step. Some people have said, well, if it does not do anything except talk, if it does not do anything except set up dialogue, then what good is it? Dialogue is good. In the beginning was the word. Words are important. Discussion is important. Human beings are very much influenced by what they hear and what they say. Let us not underestimate the power of the word, the power of discussion, the power of study.

Study may produce some new facts. Even Ward Connelly may come to agree with the gentleman from New

York, Mr. MAJOR OWENS, if the facts are really laid out. If he understands what the legacy of slavery has meant in terms of African-Americans and how the legacy of slavery makes affirmative action necessary, Ward Connelly might understand. Or maybe in the dialogue I will finally be convinced by Ward Connelly that he is right and that affirmative action is an evil. But let us have a dialogue. The President's Commission is a first step.

In case Members do not know, the President announced that he has appointed a 7-member advisory board, which some people are calling the commission. He calls it an advisory board, because commissions in the past have been notorious for being ignored by Presidents. So his advisory board is closer to him. It is kind of a personal thing.

The advisory board will provide advice and counsel to the President to improve the quality of race relations. The board will advise the President on the means to promote a national dialogue on race issues, to increase our understanding of the history and future of race relations, to identify and create plans to calm racial tension and promote increased opportunity in child abuse, housing, and health care and to address crime and the administration of justice.

President Clinton is determined "to improve the ability of all Americans to realize their full potential so we can, as one country, equal and indivisible, move forward into the 21st century."

The advisory board members will reach out as surrogates for the President to create and implement solutions to improve race relations. Among the advisory committee members are the chairman, John Hope Franklin of Durham, NC. He is a retired historian and educator, a very famous historian, the last word on the history of slavery in America. Dr. Franklin has once received the Presidential Medal of Freedom. He is kind of one of the most respected scholars of history in the country.

Along with Dr. Franklin there are six other people. William F. Winter of Jackson, Mississippi, is a former Democratic Governor of Mississippi. He was born and raised in the South, Governor of Mississippi.

Linda Chavez-Thompson of Washington, DC is executive vice president of the AFL-CIO. Robert Thomas of Corte Carza, CA currently serves as president and CEO of Nissan Motor Corp.

Angela Oh, O-H is the last name, of Sereno, California is an attorney with the Los Angeles law firm of Bente, Corson, Daley, Berera and Oh. They specialize in State and Federal criminal defense. Ms. Oh received a B.A., and she is a lawyer.

Suzan D. Johnson Cook of New York is a senior pastor of the Bronx Christian Fellowship in the Bronx. I served in the legislature with Ms. Cook's brother, and I have heard her preach on

a couple of occasions. She is one dynamic minister and a very deep and profound person.

Thomas H. Kean of Madison, NJ, is a former Governor of New Jersey. The Governor is held in high esteem by both Democrats and Republicans, of course.

As a consultant to this group is Christopher Edley of Cambridge, MA, who is a well-known professor at Harvard Law School since 1981 and a co-director of the civil rights project.

Mr. Speaker, this advisory board has become the target of a lot of journalists and other people who have already talked about a do-nothing advisory board, because most commissions and advisory boards do not do anything.

I think that the President has not laid out lofty goals for it. It has a very practical agenda. It should be given a chance to do what it can do, and that is to stimulate discussion and dialog. It is an embryonic enterprise. It is an embryonic enterprise, and it does not depend on what the President does for it to develop and grow into a full-bodied enterprise. It can be a full-bodied enterprise if all of the rest of us take a positive approach to it.

In the private sector, the legislators and various other leaders across the country all can decide on other ways to do what the President is trying to do. This is a time when we do not have demonstrations in the street.

There is no reason why the President should take on this task. He does not need it to calm down the waters, to meet a crisis. This President certainly cannot be accused of using this commission to try to change public opinion so he can get reelected. He is not running for reelection. It is a noble cause, a noble exercise.

It is not going to be easy. There are going to be obstacles. He is not going to win a popularity contest by promoting a commission or an advisory board to deal with race relations. But his sights are much higher than what the commentators and the columnists are saying. His sights go beyond a dialogue about race as it affects African-Americans. The President's sights go beyond the concerns of the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. TONY HALL and an apology for slavery.

I am all in favor of the apology for slavery. I support the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. TONY HALL. It is a positive step. I do not agree with Jesse Jackson. On Sunday he said on television, he trivialized it. It is wrong to trivialize it. It is a good step for us. Let us not make it into something that it is not, though. Nobody expects any miracles from it. But it is a good first step, the apology for slavery.

But the President is looking beyond. The President is looking at the whole diversity problem in America. At the core of the diversity problem in America may be relationships between African-Americans and other Americans, but that is only a small part of the bigger problem. The bigger problem is diversity.

We are a very diverse Nation already. We are becoming more diverse. As he said before, by the year 2050 there will be no majority in America. No one group will have a majority. There will be many components to make up the total population of America. We have to learn to live with that. We ought to be proud of that fact, as the President is. He has referred to it many times.

Even in my district, in New York, I used to say it was good to live in New York because if you wanted to see samples of all kinds of people, you could just take a trip up to the United Nations, which is located in New York, and you could go to the United Nations and you would see all kinds of people from all parts of the world.

I also said the United Nations had a school. If you want to send your child to a school and have them exposed to young people from all races, religions, nationalities, let them go to the United Nations school.

There are schools in my district which do not have all the nations of the world represented, but they have a good, good sample, I assure you. We have Cambodians, we have Pakistanis, we have Koreans, we have Laotians, we have a whole array of people from the West Indies, we have the South American countries. It is amazing to go into a school in my district, and the range of nationalities that you will find in a district just in the center of Brooklyn. It is not near the United Nations, but almost anywhere in New York City now you have a wide range of people who are from many different backgrounds, ethnic groups, countries, and religions.

America will have to run to catch up with New York City, but you can go to California and find another range of people equal in diversity maybe from different backgrounds, many coming from more Asian countries, but eventually all of America is going to look this way. We ought to be proud of that. The President said it offers opportunities of many kinds. He is proud of it. That is what he is looking at, the future. We ought to try to stay with the President's vision.

Of course, none of this is unrelated: The President's vision and his advisory board, the resolution of the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. J.C. WATTS, the Juneteenth resolution; the gentleman from Ohio's, Mr. TONY HALL apology for slavery, none of it is unrelated to what we are doing here in the Congress. None of it is unrelated to the basic business of this week and this month.

The taxes and the budget and the appropriations coming, all of it would be better served if we had had better dialogues in the past on the issue of race and diversity, certainly on the issue of slavery and the implications of slavery, the legacy of slavery.

□ 2045

Large numbers of people who were victimized by slavery never got off the

plantations. They had to settle and become sharecroppers and live in a system which was not as bad as slavery but in many cases, in the early days after freedom, they could not afford to leave because there were armed guards that forced them to stay on the plantations. They did not know where to go.

So you had large numbers of people held in bondage in the South for a long time until World War II, when the need for large amounts of labor in the cities of the North allowed them to come in large numbers into the cities of the North.

So you have a large number of people who moved directly from the worst rural situation in the South to the crowded cities of the North. As long as the war was on and the factory needed labor and you had work for everybody, in many cases lots of overtime, they prospered and they did well. They did like other Americans. They married, had children. They moved in some cases out of the cities into the suburbs. They bought homes. All kinds of great things happened.

But then the cities economies collapsed and you have, as a result, numerous problems related to the massive unemployment that resulted, problems in terms of disintegration of society, where you do not have jobs and you do not have income. I am oversimplifying a little bit, but jobs and income are at the heart of all the problems in the African-American community.

If you had jobs and income on a regular basis, you could revitalize those communities and end all the other problems and all the other controversy, the welfare controversy, the controversy about children, girls having babies out of wedlock. There are a whole lot of things that would fall in place. The appeal of drugs as an escape mechanism, all that resulted from the collapse of the economies of the inner cities.

So what we do with respect to the tax bill and the budget and the appropriations bill does relate to the legacy of slavery; our refusal to recognize that the inner cities have a special problem, our running away, we have run away from the problem for several reasons which I will not go into.

One of them is that we have the other body that is made up of people who are elected by statewide office, and they do not have an allegiance to the people of the cities who are congregated in the big cities in large numbers. We have neglected the cities, and we still are.

I am very concerned about an economic empowerment zone for central Brooklyn. An economic empowerment zone for central Brooklyn has to be part of the legislation before the Committee on Ways and Means. It is part of the tax package. They have to create more economic empowerment zones before we can compete for one, and in that discussion it looks as if they are jettisoning any discussion of new economic empowerment zones. That is a

big blow to the hope that I have raised in my community about the possibility that they will create more economic empowerment zones and we can compete with other cities in order to get an economic empowerment zone which combines government grants with private sector tax writeoffs. It was supposed to be a model that was approved and recommended by both parties. It has not so far emerged in the deliberations on the tax package.

So what is going on on the floor this week, next week, for the rest of the summer, between now and the time we adjourn is very much related to the situation that we are discussing with respect to apologies for slavery, discussions of race relations, et cetera.

It is important that we understand that an apology can indeed be positive. It can indeed drain a great amount of emotion from the issue of slavery. For young Americans on both sides of the fence, the descendants of slaves and the nondescendants of slaves, to hear a national apology discussed may have a great effect on their attitudes, because there is a lot of tension. The younger generation does not get along better than the older generation. There is a lot of tension out there. There is a lot of bitterness among African-American youth about the fact that they are in the position they are in, and they blame slavery. They need to know more about the history of slavery. They need to know that if you really discuss slavery, you also have to discuss the heroics of white Americans in the abolitionist movement who brought an end to slavery. You have to discuss the heroics of the soldiers of the Union Army who fought to set slaves free. White soldiers, white abolitionists and white soldiers, the freedom of black Americans was in the hands of whites. Abraham Lincoln was white.

Any African-American youth that wants to hate all whites needs to know and reflect on the fact that slavery was created, yes, by the worst elements of the white society and community, but slavery also was ended by the heroic efforts of whites. The commission, if it does no more than to begin the discussion among ordinary people of these kinds of things, it would be very useful.

If I was President, I would do it another way. I would not go this way. But this is the President's idea. Since he originated this idea, I applaud him for doing it any way he deems necessary. I am convinced that he will take it and move forward with the results after the commission or the board advisory group ends in a year. So I applaud the President for this use of the bully pulpit. He could use the bully pulpit, the high visibility of the White House, he could use it for a number of purposes. He could line up a whole list of issues instead of the issue of race relations, but he has chosen this one and I applaud that.

Compared to what is needed, the President's commission is a minuscule effort, just a beginning, but little mar-

bles make big boulders roll. They can even set landslides and earthquakes in motion. Let the chain reaction begin. Any open discussion, I think, is a step in the right direction.

The power of the White House bully pulpit is about to be displayed in dimensions that we have not seen since FDR's speeches during World War II. This highly visible process of dialogue, debate, study and reflection on race relations and diversity in America could have a monumental impact on the next few years and the opening years of the 21st century.

It was W.E.B. DuBois who warned that race and color would emerge as a major problem of the 20th century. We now know that DuBois was right. However, DuBois did not go far enough. Not race or color alone but the inability of human beings to cope with diversity, ethnic differences within races, religion, language and regional differences, diversity is the major problem now and diversity will continue as a gigantic challenge for the 21st century.

Racial diversity is the largest and most obvious challenge of the *Homo sapiens* species, we human beings, the deeply rooted and instinctive animal fear of outsiders, strangers, of different ones is manifested most directly and abundantly in the reaction to racial differences.

We say that children have to learn hate, but we are oversimplifying a bit. Children are subjected to this discomfort in any situation where strangers appear. So it is natural that strangeness creates discomfort among animals. They do not associate with strangers. They identify, they are familiar by smell. Among animals they do not associate with animals that do not look like them. Even among cows, tests have shown that brown cows stay with brown cows and white-faced cows stay with white-faced cows.

If you leave them alone in a normal situation, the immediate reaction is always that you are worried about what is different. So let us understand that differences are a danger. People instinctively react to differences in a negative way. All the more reason why we should make certain that those early reactions of discomfort are not translated into hate. They have to be taught to hate, yes. To translate that discomfort into hate, they have to be taught that. And we have to make a concerted effort to see that the opposite happens, that they understand that people who are different are going to rouse some feelings of discomfort and, therefore, they have to work at overcoming discomfort.

Civilization is a process of confronting these deeply rooted instincts. Civilized men and women wrestle with their primitive and base instincts every day and in many other ways. If we get hungry and we pass a place which is serving food and we do not have money to buy any food, we do not reach for the food because we are hun-

gry. Civilization restrains us in numerous ways, our instincts, our appetites are restrained. Our instincts with respect to strangers and people who are different have to be restrained and guided. Civilized men and women wrestle with these problems and they will solve them. What the President's initiative will do is call upon us all to struggle harder to control and redirect our fear and discomfort with racial differences.

To confront racial frictions and tensions, the systematic attempt to promote greater understanding and tolerance with respect to race is merely the first step. This is an obvious first step and it may be the easiest first step. But we ought to take this first step.

I think clearly we can see all around us that some of the bloodiest conflicts since World War II have not pitted one race against another. We can understand in Korea, Cambodia, the Gulf War, Vietnam, Somalia, Haiti, Northern Ireland, the former Yugoslavia, Angola, Liberia, Rwanda, Zaire, Sierra Leone, the world has witnessed people who appear to be of the same race but they get locked into intense conflicts.

Perhaps the war between Israel and the neighboring Arab countries could be classified as a war between different races, however it is not so simple. The problems of space, land, water, history and religion far outweighed the physical differences between Israelis and Arabs. Only in South Africa can you easily identify the scene as one of clearly racial conflict.

Racial conflict is what occurred there with Caucasians against the original Africans or whites against blacks. But ethnic differences among black Africans sparked the massacres in Rwanda, ethnic differences among people who are of the same color, same race. Ethnic and religious frictions exploited the demagogues who also continue to fuel conflict in Bosnia, Croatia and Serbia.

Ethnicity and tribalism still threaten the unity in the Congo. Ethnicity and tribalism are at the heart of the Congo instability and the oppression of Nigeria. Even South Africa lingers under the deadly shadow of tribalism while it struggles for reconciliation between the two races. The problem of reconciliation between whites and blacks in South Africa is not nearly as difficult as some of the struggle between tribes that are taking place at this point.

So the President has his eye on the whole problem of diversity in the world. The President has said that America is an indispensable Nation. We have to provide leadership in many ways. He does not mean just leadership in the area of military security. He wants to provide leadership in terms of where the world should go on this whole issue of how we live together.

The problem of the 21st century will be intolerance to diversity and the President wants to provide leadership on that problem. We want to be a

multi-racial, multi-ethnic, multi-religious and politically diverse America, and we want to serve as a role model. That is what this President is saying. I applaud him for his ambition. I applaud him for attempting to leave this kind of legacy.

Let me quote the President in his own speech at San Diego. A few quotes will bear out what I am saying.

Consider this: We were born with a Declaration of Independence which asserted that we were all created equal and a Constitution that enshrined slavery.

That contradiction was there.

We fought a bloody Civil War to abolish slavery and preserve the Union, but we remained a house divided and unequal by law for another century. We advanced across the continent in the name of freedom, yet in so doing we pushed Native Americans off their land, often crushing their culture and their livelihood. Our Statue of Liberty welcomes poor, tired, huddled masses of immigrants to our borders, but each new wave has felt the sting of discrimination.

In World War II, Japanese Americans fought valiantly for freedom in Europe, taking great casualties, while at home their families were herded into internment camps. The famed Tuskegee Airmen lost none of the bombers they guarded during the war, but their African American heritage cost them a lot of rights when they came back home in peace.

To be sure, continuing to quote the President's speech in San Diego, To be sure, there is old, unfinished business between black and white Americans, but the classic American dilemma has now become many dilemmas of race and ethnicity. We see it in the tension between black and Hispanic customers and their Korean or Arab grocers; in a resurgent anti-Semitism even on some college campuses; in a hostility toward new immigrants from Asia to the Middle East to the former Communist countries to Latin America and the Caribbean, even those whose hard work and strong families have brought them success in the American way.

We see these tensions continuing.

First, we must continue to expand opportunity. Full participation in our strong and growing economy is the best antidote to envy, despair and racism. We must press forward to move millions more from poverty and welfare to work; to bring the spark of enterprise to inner cities; to redouble our efforts to reach those rural communities prosperity has passed by. Most important of all, we simply must give our young people the finest education in the world.

□ 2100

The President proposes remedies and the commission, we can see, is headed in a certain direction.

On many occasions I have stood right here talking about the answer, one of the key answers to the problems of the

inner city, which generates large numbers of people who are forced to go on to welfare, which generates large numbers of babies being born out-of-wedlock, which generates a large amount of unemployment. Even the jobs available, they are jobs that people cannot qualify for.

One of the answers, of course, is education, and the commission certainly is probably going to end up recommending a great deal about education. I would like to go further than the President. I think some of my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus would like to have this commission aiming its sights higher.

We have talked in past years about reparations, and I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. JOHN CONYERS, who is the oldest member of the Congressional Black Caucus, join him again this year in sponsoring a bill which calls for the commission to study reparation proposals for African-Americans. He introduced this in January of this year.

This is the description of the Conyers Commission: This legislation forces the United States to acknowledge, after over 100 years of silence, the fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery in the United States and the 13 American Colonies between the years of 1619 and 1865. The legislation requires that an official inquiry be made into the lingering negative effects of the institution of slavery on living African-Americans and on the United States larger societies.

A commission will be established to examine the institution of slavery, studying the impact of subsequent and continuing discrimination against African-Americans resulting directly and indirectly from the institution of slavery, not only during that time in which it was legal and Government-sanctioned but during the periods of reconstruction, desegregation and to the present date. The commission will make recommendations, among others, as to methods of recompense for the descendants of slaves.

This is a bill which is out there. It has been introduced. The gentleman from Michigan has introduced it every year since November 1989, and it is part of the dialog. We could go that far.

I think reparations, in terms of individuals, is out of the question. There was a time when, shortly after the Civil War, General Armstrong, a Union general, proposed that every slave family be given 40 acres and a mule, and he actually started the process and gave out a few mules and acres. Of course, the Congress, under Andrew Johnson, came behind him and said "No, you cannot do that."

So 40 acres and a mule was promised. If we were to take the promise of the 40 acres and a mule, which was to compensate people that had been slaves for 232 years, and if we take the value of 40 acres and a mule and try to translate that into what it means now, we would have some very wealthy descendants of slaves.

That is impractical. We are not looking for cash handouts, but we could have "opportunity to learn" standards in schools, so that every school had a first class school building. We would not have the problem of asbestos and lead poisoning and broken windows and roofs that are leaking and boilers that still burn coal in the inner city where descendants of slaves go to school.

We could compensate by guaranteeing a first-class education in terms of facilities, in terms of the best teachers, in terms of the right amount of equipment, in terms of the supplies that are needed. Just take the inner-city schools and make them the way the suburban schools look and act and operate. Give them the same that they have, and we would compensate for the past by guaranteeing equality of opportunity through education.

There is a great argument for affirmative action, and the President challenged everybody who does not favor affirmative action to come up with something different. Well, opportunity to learn is the answer. If we really provided everybody with an opportunity to learn, we would not need affirmative action. It would clearly not be necessary in future years.

But we will not do that. Our schools are in worse shape now in the inner-city communities than they were 10 years ago, and there is nothing on the horizon to make them any better. We just took out of the budget bill the \$5 billion for construction. So this discussion is relevant when we talk about the legacy of slavery, apologizing for slavery, and we look at the inability and refusal of the Congress and the Government apparatus to come to the aid of children in the inner cities just in terms of providing them with decent schools. We can see where the two things are not unrelated. Let us understand that we have a long gap there.

If we study slavery and look at what happened in the breeding farms, what was a breeding farm all about, where young ladies were required to have babies? They did not eat if they did not have a baby. Were the breeding farms regulated by the States? Were females in breeding farms below the age or 13 protected from having to produce babies? How many months of rest were females given before they were required to get pregnant again on breeding farms? Were there any regulations?

All these kind of things, the horror of it. There were day care centers on plantations. They deposited babies in huts with the oldest slaves who could not do anything else, and they took care of babies in large numbers, the same way they did in the orphanages in Romania.

We found that the kids in the orphanages in Romania, because they had no constant contact with human beings, their brains had actually atrophied. Their brains had shrunk. They took photographs of the brains of the Romanian children brought over here who had problems, and they found their

brains had shrunk. They could not establish human contact in a certain way because of what had not happened to them in terms of human interaction.

So millions of slave babies over the years were put into hovels with a few human beings caring for them. What did that do to their brains? These are some of the things we should look at as we study slavery, as the commission looks at the past and connects the past with the present.

What about property inheritance? A slave could not inherit. Did any State allow slaves to inherit anything? When a slave died, the few belongings they had, could they pass them on to anybody? They could not even recognize their own children, so they did not know any children they had. So where did their little bits and pieces go? When a slave died, he could not pass anything on.

The primary way in which wealth is accumulated in America, or anyplace, handed down from one generation to another, no matter how small it is, a few pots and pans, a wagon, a mule, the little house, maybe an acre, maybe a big farm, things that had been handed down over the years were not there to be passed down. For 232 years nothing could be passed down.

So is it any wonder that African-Americans are the poorest people in America, even poorer than the immigrants that came over, who brought some tools with them in a bag, who brought some know-how with them, who brought contacts? They had contacts with relatives who lived here. They had more than the slaves ever had.

All of that can be put in perspective if we really begin to talk about it and look at it, and we will see there is a need, there is a need to treat African-Americans and maybe native Americans different from the way we do other people, to try to make up for what did not happen in the past and for some of the negative things that happened in the past. All of this should be put on the table and examined.

We do not want the equivalent of 40 acres and a mule. Forty acres and a mule might translate into, the mule might be, in 1997 dollar terms, that might be a jet plane by now. One might have enough money to buy a jet plane. The 40 acres might be the size of an airfield.

So we are not going to deal with those kinds of solutions, but we ought to think about our inability to formulate a policy which provides opportunities to learn for all children; our inability to get a construction program going, \$5 billion is all the President asked to stimulate construction which would help inner-city communities; our inability to pass a Ways and Means bill which would provide for the establishment of a lot of empowerment zones in cities. All these are directly related to the fact that we have no sense of the past and no sense of where we can go in the future.

We are the richest Nation that ever existed on the face of the Earth. We have a lot of options and opportunities. We have a lot of wealth. We helped Europe a great deal with the Marshall plan. Billions of dollars. We should help the inner-city communities where descendants of slaves live in large numbers with the same kind of generosity.

We should put it all together. The President is on the right track, and I hope we will all step in line and be positive about race relations and what it means in the context of today's America.

NATIONAL DEBT REPAYMENT ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about a bill which will be introduced later in this week. It is called the National Debt Repayment Act of 1997. But before I begin, I want to just pause and recognize some very special people in this country.

Sunday was Father's Day, and children all across America, myself included for my own father, we paused to say "thank you" to our dads for what they have done.

Tonight, I want to pay special tribute to some other very important people in this country, and that is father-in-laws. Many times father-in-laws provide the insight and wisdom that contribute so much to the success of our families all across America.

So before I start the debate on the National Debt Repayment Act this evening, I wanted to just start by paying tribute to a very special person in my life, my father-in-law, and to others like him all across this country who have done so much to make it the great country that it is.

Having said that, I want to address the national debt, where we stand and what we can do about it, and how the National Debt Repayment Act might have something to do with it.

To begin with this evening, I want to take a look at how the debt has been growing. The debt facing this Nation from 1960 to 1980 did not grow very much. It is a pretty flat line from 1960 to 1980. But from 1980 forward it has been growing at a very, very rapid rate.

And to all my colleagues out there, I know the Democrats say, well, 1980, that is the year Ronald Reagan got elected, so let us blame him. And to all the Republicans out there, I know they say, well, in 1980, there was the Democrat-controlled Congress and they spent too much money, and so all the Republicans blame the Democrats.

Well, the bottom line on this thing, when we look at this chart, we are way up here on this debt chart right now. Here is 1999, 1998, 1997. We are way up near the top of that debt chart. It is

time we stop blaming Republicans and Democrats, depending on which side of the aisle we are on, and start addressing this for the problem it really is, a problem that is facing the American people, a problem that has the potential to bring this great Nation to its knees if it is not addressed.

For the folks that have not seen how serious this debt problem really is, we currently stand about \$5.3 trillion in debt. The number looks like this, and it is a pretty big number, but let me translate that number back into English. Before I came to Congress, I was a math teacher. And here is a math problem we used to do in our math classroom.

We took that total debt and divided by the number of people in the United States of America. That is to say, every person in the United States of America is responsible for \$20,000 of this debt. Or put another way, the Federal Government has borrowed \$20,000 on behalf of every man, woman, and child in the country.

For a family of five like mine, I have three kids at home, one is 20 now, another 18, another one 14, for a family of five like mine, they have borrowed \$100,000 basically over the last 15 years. It is a staggering sum of money.

The kicker in this whole thing is really this number right down here. The average family of five in America today, or any group of five people in America today, they are paying \$580 a month, every month, to do nothing but pay the interest on the Federal debt. Let me say that once more, because it is important to understand how much money is being taken out of the pockets of American citizens and sent to Washington, DC to do nothing but pay the interest on the Federal debt.

The average family of five in America today sends \$580 a month to Washington to do nothing but pay the interest on the Federal debt.

I know a lot of my colleagues out there go, "Well, a lot of the families I know, they do not pay that much in taxes." But the reality is every time we walk into the store and we buy a loaf of bread, the storeowner either makes a small profit on that loaf of bread or he is going out of business. So we hope he or she is making a profit. When they make a small profit on that loaf of bread that we just bought in the local grocery store, part of that profit gets sent to Washington and it is used to pay this interest on the Federal debt.

So the reality is we are currently in a situation in this country where an average family of five is sending almost \$600 a month to Washington to do nothing but pay the interest on the Federal debt.

The American public seems to be a little cynical about what we are doing about this. And in fact they have had so many promises made to them in the past that, frankly, I understand why they are cynical.

In the 1980's, I was not in politics. In fact, I had never been to a political