

I conclude by reiterating Secretary Albright's remarks that Cyprus is a valued partner in the fight against the new global threats of proliferation, terrorism, illegal narcotics, and international crime. Cyprus and the United States share common values and are committed to building a world based on open markets, democratic principles and the rule of law. These ties demand that the United States continue to work towards assisting the two Cypriot communities in reaching a just and secure peace.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1031

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1031.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2169, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mrs. MYRICK (during the special order of Mr. BILIRAKIS), from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-189) on the bill resolution (H. Res. 189) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2169) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

A MESSY DAY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, it has been a messy day here in the House of Representatives. Today is July 17. We are certainly midway through the work of this first year of the 105th Congress, and it was most unfortunate that we started the day by pulling a bill which would have reauthorized vocational education assistance, and stopped the forward movement of that bill because there was an amendment on the bill which called for a retention of provisions in the bill which would have encouraged local governments and local education agencies to continue to emphasize vocational-technical education for women.

It was most unfortunate that with the overwhelming support that that amendment seemed to have, which merely wanted to continue what was going on already, that it led to the majority suddenly pulling the bill from the floor and refusing to let the House

work its will on a bill which would have provided fair treatment for women in vocational education and technical education programs. In an era when technical education is very much in order, and women certainly can do as well as men in some of the high tech areas that offer the most opportunities for the future, the highest pay, we are not willing to have our own Vocational Education Assistance Act reflect the fact that we want maximum opportunities for women.

So that was an unfortunate start of the day. It has been an unfortunate week in that same manner.

Two days ago we refused to allow the House to work its will on a vote, up or down, on the National Endowment for the Arts. The National Endowment for the Arts seems to upset a small band of Members in the House of Representatives. They insist on harassing and pursuing the National Endowment for the Arts, despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of the American people support the National Endowment for the Arts and support the National Endowment for the Humanities, overwhelmingly.

And the Members of Congress, if given a chance to vote yes or no on the funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, would certainly keep its funding at the present level. We were not allowed to do that. This is a week that the majority chose to use its overwhelming powers, because it is the majority, to manipulate the process, and by one vote we lost on a procedural vote that would have given us the opportunity to vote up or down on that important matter.

Later on today we also experienced the intense annoyance and anger of the minority, the Democrats in the minority of the House, because in the agricultural appropriations bill that was about to come up, the same kind of treatment we had received in some other bills this year and in the NEA vote was being manifested. The ranking member of the agriculture subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the ranking Democrat was not allowed by the Committee on Rules to present an amendment that she had requested.

The power of the majority is certainly great enough to stop on this floor most of what they want to stop and to promote and push what they want to push, past it, but we ought to at least have the opportunity to go on record on certain votes, and we are being denied that. So we had a very messy end to the day, at a point where really we do not have much time left before we adjourn on August 1st.

We are moving to pass appropriations bills. Appropriations bills are most important bills, probably, that we pass, in that they are the ones that provide the funding to keep our government activities going, and we are going to be rushing through those things in the next 10 working days of Congress.

We also have in the background negotiations going on which are very im-

portant, vitally important negotiations on the expenditure plan that was passed by both Houses, negotiations on the tax package. That is ongoing.

We know that those important processes are in the works, and worry about the fact that we are going to be pushed against the wall and stampeded at the last minute on those packages if we do not change the way this House operates. The majority does not, again, respect the will of the minority.

There is another problem also beyond the procedural questions, and that is, I lament the fact and a number of my colleagues lament the fact that the tax and expenditure package, the appropriations bills, as they come up are zeroing out or refusing to even discuss and consider certain important matters that ought to be on the agenda. In this 105th Congress, when we enter a situation where we started out with a lot of talk about bipartisan cooperation, especially in the area of education, I suppose one of the most disappointing absences is the fact that the education initiatives that have been proposed have been watered down so and some are not even on the agenda.

The most important, disappointing absence, in my opinion, is the one related to the school construction initiative. That is not even in the tax package or the expenditure plan which the President and the two Houses are negotiating now. We are grateful for the fact that the President at least has kept the school construction initiative alive by listing it among his priorities. The trouble is that the President has a long, long list of priorities, and we wonder how high on the list the school construction initiative will be.

We also wonder about the fact that the empowerment zones which mean so much to our urban areas, since nothing else has been offered in the last 10 years to deal with very pressing problems in our urban areas, the empowerment zones were considered to be a reasonable answer because both parties would support it since it was a combination of the private sector, the government sector and there was a lot of talk about this is the way of the future, but empowerment zones are not in the package either at this point, except for the President's priority list.

So I guess we will have to be grateful for the President at least keeping these things in the discussion. They are not in the House bill or the Senate bill. Therefore, they would not be on the conference table. So the fact that the President has tax incentives for school construction on the list of items for his tax cut proposals, and he has deductions for K through 12 computer donations on his list, and he has brownfields empowerment zones and enterprise zones, expansion of these in his package, we are grateful for that. We are holding on by a thread.

These are very important matters and I think to shift to the most important area, that is the area of education, not only the most important but the

most universally approved area, the area that everybody agrees we need some forward movement on by the Federal Government, that area also has been pushed into the background. It is almost a certainty that very little is going to happen except in the area of higher education, because the President has made that his highest priority and certainly something very new, however inadequate it might be, is going to happen with respect to higher education.

Our concern for K through 12, however, grows greater because we see less and less discussion or talk about how to move to provide more Federal Government encouragement of the improvement of schools, even in the area that the President, this administration has staked out great interest, and that is telecommunications, education technology and computers.

Even in this area the present movement is kind of feeble. They are going to allow deductions for K through 12 computers. The President has in his list an allowance for deductions by corporations and businesses for K through 12 computer donations. About \$300 million is proposed to be allowed over a 5-year period. That is a far cry from what is needed in this area.

□ 1800

In other words, education, I had great hopes for because there was great agreement between the two parties that education should be a priority. So I thought the fact that education is considered a priority by both parties would mean that it would be reflected in the tax package and also in the expenditure package, and it really is discouraging to find that that is not the case.

Maybe we should not give up hope. In fact, I will not say maybe. I want to urge all of those who care about education, which is the overwhelming majority of the American people, not to give up hope, because we were in worse shape, probably in July 1995 when proposals were being made that the Department of Education be totally abolished.

At that time proposals were being made to cut certain federally funded education programs by as much as almost \$4 billion. So we held on, we persevered, we insisted that the will of the people be honored. And finally, in the election year 1996, there was a turnaround and education did get a great deal of attention. Instead of the \$4 billion cut that had been proposed in 1995, there was a \$4 billion increase in 1996.

Some people might say, if they are listening, that they have heard me say this many times before. I cannot say it too often. It was an amazing feat that the party in power decided in an election year, but before the election of 1996, to increase funding for education by \$4 billion. It was an amazing feat because it represented the triumph of common sense.

We had been talking all along about the fact that we needed to give more attention and more funding and more support for education. The polls had shown it all along, but the leadership, those who were in charge, refused to recognize it until they were faced with the possibility of losing an election. And, of course, it is to their credit that they understood that at the last minute they had to turn around.

So we had an increase of \$4 billion for education programs in the fall of 1996, which leads me to encourage my colleagues to hold on. Because in the fall of 1998 we may witness the same kind of resurrection of an understanding of what the priorities are. We may witness the Republican majority being born again in 1998. In order to do that, we have to be diligent. We have to persevere.

We never let up in 1995 and 1996 on the issue of education. We followed the issue right through the proposals to cut the school lunch programs, all the way down to the various proposals to cut Head Start, to cut title I. We brought the issue to the public again and again in order to let the public know what was happening, and they responded with common sense that got through to the majority and they turned around.

Let us stay on the message of the need for a school construction initiative. Let us stay on the message that it is a small amount compared to the total need. Five billion dollars is what the President proposed. Five billion dollars was under discussion for school construction, mainly in loans, low-interest loans that go to localities and States. It was not adequate, but it was at least a beginning.

To have that beginning snuffed out is not acceptable. So keep it in mind. It is a matter of common sense that the deteriorating schools represent one of our greatest problems. The physical deterioration of schools is not just a New York problem.

I have talked before about the fact that in New York it is astonishing that we still have almost 300 schools that burn coal. They have coal furnaces, and the coal is spewing smoke and substances into the air, which are toxics, of course, and New York has a high rate of asthma among young children.

We have a clear correlation between something that is being done by government-owned buildings, and in this case government-owned buildings that are a part of a program to help children, which are very detrimental to the health of children. We have at least 300, almost 300 of 1,000 schools in New York that still have coal-burning burners.

There is an initiative, which I have just read about in the New York State Legislature, which I want to applaud, to float a bond issue for school construction. I hope that that moves beyond talk in the legislature. It is not as much as is needed, but it may be that the States can prime the Federal Government.

We cannot go it alone. Most States and localities cannot go it alone. But if there are some initiatives at the State level, it might embarrass the Federal Government, it might embarrass the majority here in the House and Senate in order to make them begin to reconsider and move forward.

But the public, the voters, the people with common sense must continue to hold on and understand the seriousness of the situation. There are schools, of course, that have lead poisoning problems, there are many schools which have asbestos contamination, and there is a great space problem, which I have enumerated many times here in connection with New York City. And what happens in New York City is not so different from other big cities.

The fact that these things are pushed aside is very disturbing, because it is not a matter of it costs too much money. The \$5 billion over a 5-year period, when compared to other programs, does not amount to much money. They are almost not even arguing the issue of it is too much money anymore.

There are philosophical arguments offered, like the fact that if the Government gives help to States and localities for school construction, it is an unprecedented intervention and an intolerable intervention into the local and State government matters. I think that is ridiculous. Education is not merely a local and State government matter. Education impacts on everything, including our national security.

We have gone through those arguments, and we have had a great deal of involvement of the Federal Government in the jawboning about school improvement. It is time we continue to increase the resources that are provided by the Federal Government.

There is no need to worry about the Federal Government taking over education. At this point the Federal Government only spends between 7 and 8 percent of the total expenditure for education overall. That includes higher education. So the percentage of the Federal Government's involvement in local education is less than 5 percent. And if it was increased greatly, even to 15 percent, it certainly would not mean that the Federal Government could control what happens in terms of decisions, or even up to 25 percent.

I advocate strongly that we move in the next 5 years toward a 25-percent involvement of the Federal Government in education funding. That would be a radical increase, but it is necessary. Even if we had 25 percent of the expenditures, and 25 percent of the funds were provided by the Federal Government, it still leaves 75 percent to be provided by the States and the local governments.

If we want to divide power along the lines of money, that means that the State and local governments would still have 75 percent of the power to make decisions. If they have 75 percent of the power to make decisions, they

would not have to worry about anybody else. So I do not think the argument that the Federal Government's involvement in providing resources means that they would take over or be a detriment to decision-making at the local level holds any water at all.

What it is, unfortunately, at the other end, is kind of an abandonment of the issue of the problem of education, abandonment of schoolchildren, while, at the same time, we are spending enormous amounts of money for other kinds of things that are far less necessary.

For example, the B-2 bomber. One of the votes that took place last week, which would be upsetting to most of us, common sense would dictate that we did the wrong thing, was a vote on the B-2 bomber. The B-2 bomber is not needed, according to the President. The B-2 bomber is not needed, according to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The B-2 bomber is not needed, according to the head of the Air Force. The person in charge of the Air Force says we do not need it, the President says we do not need it, the Joint Chiefs of Staff say we do not need it. Still, we come to the floor and disregard all of that and vote to keep funding a B-2 bomber, the cost of which will escalate as they move into production, and it increases.

My colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], stood on the floor and outlined how we are talking about \$28 billion that will be needed more in the budget in future years at a time when the budget will be set. And if we are to balance the budget, that means that \$28 billion worth of other programs would have to come out of the budget in order for the B-2 bomber to be accommodated. Despite the fact that we clearly understood the mathematics and the arithmetic, the B-2 bomber was voted for continued funding.

So it is not a matter of money, it is a matter of attitudes. And those attitudes are what we have to confront. The attitudes have nothing to do with common sense. The attitudes have nothing to do with scientific reasoning, certainly. They have nothing to do with logic. Logic would dictate we do not continue to build bombers that military authorities do not want.

But of course there are some Neanderthal considerations, like the fact that contracts are given out to factories and manufacturing firms and so forth who produce the B-2 bombers and they have spread around the production of the parts in various States and localities. Everybody sees themselves as having a piece of the pie. Whether the pie is good for America or not, they have their piece so they vote to continue the funding of the B-2 bomber, while we do not fund or refuse to provide even a measly \$5 billion over a 5-year period for school construction.

Two weeks ago, I think it was June 28, there was a documentary on television. It was not national, unfortunately. I think it was a local television

station in New York, Channel 7. I wanted to congratulate Channel 7 on that excellent documentary. It was just a 30-minute documentary about Class 104. Class 104 is in some school in New York, an actual school.

I want to congratulate the board of education for letting Channel 7 come in and film what was going on in the school. It is a first grade class that is overcrowded, 42 children in a first grade class, and they were documenting the dilemma or the problems faced by a teacher of 42 children in a first grade class.

Just to move around the room was a problem. And then, of course, they very sensitively zeroed in on three children, to talk to their parents, and to get an example of what does it mean to be in this class with 42 children competing for the attention of one teacher.

And it was an excellent production and I urge that my colleagues contact Channel 7, which is an ABC affiliate in New York, and maybe they will send a copy of the documentary on Class 104 and what it means to have children in an overcrowded situation who are that young.

There was one very sensitive young man who was totally lost and beginning to hate school despite the fact that he had a high IQ, very intelligent. He was off to the wrong start and beginning to hate school.

There was another young lady who was very aggressive, and she was only becoming more aggressive because of the fact that in order to get the teacher's attention she had to be aggressive and do things that forced the teacher to pay attention to her. She was doing much better than the sensitive young man who was not aggressive.

Children should not be put into a position where they have to fight for the attention of a teacher. That kind of abandonment represents a kind of institutionalized brutality, a child abuse that is institutionalized. We know if we put 42 children in a first grade class it means that children will be kind of brutalized and yet we do it.

I want to make a connection here at this point with another issue, and that is the issue of the apology that I talked about some time ago that received a lot of very intense response. The apology that was proposed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] in a resolution that the Congress apologize for slavery. It caused a lot of furor.

These issues that are taking place right now in terms of appropriations and budgeting, of tax expenditures, the abandonment of certain areas, certain populations, the abandonment of certain programs, the willingness to run and vote for a B-2 bomber while we cannot find it possible to vote for school construction, while we cannot find it possible to vote for empowerment zones. It all relates to the fact that we have sort of stumbled and lost our way at this point in America.

There is a connection between the furor, and there was a lot of upset peo-

ple about the proposal by the gentleman from Ohio that we apologize for slavery, that Congress apologize for slavery. I have connected the two.

And I was shocked to find that a poll cited on "Nightline" stated that more than 60 percent of whites were angry about the idea and said there should not be an apology for slavery. At the same time more than 60 percent of the blacks said, yes; it was a good idea. Even though it was not originated by blacks and the Black Caucus is not the sponsor, it is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] and a group of well-meaning individuals, who deserve to be applauded for what they have done.

It is not a power play, but a very sensible kind of approach to providing healing and reconciliation in a situation that needs more healing and reconciliation. But it set off a furor. And the fact that 60 percent of whites in America, their first reaction, and I hope that that reaction will change, I hope that was the first reaction and that they will stop and consider and that that will not be the reaction a few weeks from now, or certainly a few months from now, after more thought is given to the power of the apology exercise. But the fact the initial reaction was that way is part of the problem in terms of decision-making here in the Congress.

□ 1815

This is a reaction which tells me that people are ready to move to forget anything related to a special sector of the population. Anything that you attach to the descendants of slaves, the African-Americans, anything you attach to them gets hostility. And that is an even greater argument for having the apology exercised, for having a discussion of it, because we still are getting this automatic, almost instinctive hostility.

Why should we do it for the blacks, for the African-Americans? Why should we have a school construction initiative which is primarily going to benefit the inner-city communities where African-Americans go to school? It may not be the indication, but that is the reasoning. Why should we have a welfare program which really provides jobs and training and moves people along the road to establishing some dignified connection with the mainstream economic system? Why should we have that if it is going to blacks?

That is the underlying current there that needs to be dealt with, that we still think that there are deserving Americans and undeserving Americans. And anything that relates to African-Americans, the first reaction is that they are undeserving Americans; they do not deserve empowerment zones, they do not deserve school construction initiatives that might benefit them in education, they certainly do not deserve an apology. Apology means we have got to recognize the problem.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] did not talk about reparations or anything complicated, just a apology. But

the instinctive reaction means that they understand the apology needs recognition, they recognize that there was a problem, and if they have a problem, they might have the obligation to seek a solution.

Well, so be it. Apology does mean that we recognize that there was something that happened in the past that ought to be recognized as a problem. The impact of that on people in the present is something we can debate. As we debate it, we may come up with an obligation to seek a solution to the fact there was a great impact.

Two hundred thirty-two years of slavery had an impact on the descendants of slaves. I mentioned before that the first impact is that none of them could inherit anything. Two hundred thirty-two years, from one year to another, one generation to another, nothing was handed down.

We know from studies that have been documented that most wealth is accumulated from inheritance. Big millionaires and lucky guys who find gold mines and oil fields, that is something else. Most wealth in the world is generated by one generation passing on to another, handing them down, sometimes in small amounts. Small amounts accumulate. People have capital and then invest it.

But if we go back in the genealogy, trace economic genealogy of people, we will find that those who have the benefit of this, which is just about all Americans except two categories, they have been the beneficiaries of inheriting property, inheriting pots and pans, of accumulating enough to use that as a jump-off point for something else; and that is the way wealth in America has moved, and most nations have, moved in the same way. It is passed down from one generation to another.

The native Americans, of course, who owned the land when the Europeans arrived here, that is not the case. It was kind of a reversal. The land was taken away from them in many cases and they could not pass it down. Certainly the African-Americans whose ancestors were born in chains against their will, and then they were forced into labor and the accumulation of wealth, none of that wealth was shared with them. They were not paid for their labor.

So nothing was passed down for 232 years by African-Americans, the descendants of a people who, in the long chain of the Nation, could not pass down that kind of wealth. So it means that we arrive at this point in history with a deficit that has to be recognized.

All these kinds of complicated issues would not be put on the table if we recognized that there was a great criminal enterprise called slavery and it generated these kinds of problems. We can have a search for a solution now, however, in an atmosphere which is not so tense and stressful.

We could not propose such an apology after the end of the Civil War. We could not propose it even 100 years

later as we moved into the fight to end legalized segregation and Jim Crow. But why can we not propose it now? Why can we not entertain a discussion of apology for slavery and the implications of it at this point of history?

We are sort of at a pinnacle right now. Consider what is happening right now in 1997 in America. The stock market, Dow Jones Industrial index at 8,000, unprecedented activity on the market. The dollar is stronger than ever before against the yen and mark. We are rated against our competitors economically, doing much better. Our economy is outperforming. We have licked inflation. Employment is moving forward despite the low inflation.

We are on a mountaintop. America is on a mountaintop. We do not have an evil empire to fight anymore. Peace might exist for many decades to come or maybe even for hundreds of years. This is a point in our history where we should not be squabbling about the NEA's funding or about vocational education not having a provision which takes care of women and peculiar problems that they have had in the vocational education area. We should not be squabbling about those things.

We should not be passing legislation which obligates us for billions of dollars for B-2 bombers, while we at the same time cannot conceive of the fact that we should have more money available for education in the form of school construction.

We ought to be able to relax, to use our reason to its maximum. We ought to be able to relax and have the leaders in Congress listen to the people. The polls out there show that the people, with their common sense, still think education is the high priority. I do not think that they have defense as high as education at this point on the polls.

Nobody is more familiar with the polls than the people who are in the political leadership here, or we politicians in general. We know what polls are all about. We listen to polls. And yet the polls that clearly show the popularity of education and the Federal Government's involvement in education are being ignored systematically all the time. Only at election time in 1996 did they bother to listen in order to save their skins at the polls.

Now that we are a year and a half away from an election, nobody wants to deal with the problems of education that the rest of the American people overwhelmingly want to deal with. So we are at a pinnacle, we are at a very advantageous spot.

Why can we not listen to the polls, listen to the mind of the American people? Why can we not entertain and even invite a discussion of very controversial issues that might open the door for reconciliation and healing?

The whole matter of the apology for slavery is one of those things that might open the door that takes us forward into the 21st century with a new kind of mind-set. The present mind-set, as I said before, is unfortunate when we

have 60 percent of whites who automatically think it is a bad idea.

It is all right for the Germans to apologize to the rest of Europe for what was done in World War II. It is all right for the Swiss to apologize to the Jews for their conspiracy with the Nazi government to take their gold and their deposits away from them. It is all right for the Japanese to apologize for what they did in Asia. But suddenly the idea of apologies upsets us a great deal.

I want to just drive this home by reading a very disturbing article that I read, by a top-flight columnist for the New York Times. I have read other columnists who also thought the idea of the apology was ridiculous and attacked it with great passion and vehemence.

Mr. Russell Baker's column of July 1, 1997, in the New York Times follows in the same vein. Mr. Baker is a brilliant writer, and although I often do not agree with him, his writing is always entertaining. Mr. Baker is extremely competent, intelligent, knowledgeable; and that is why his article is even more disturbing.

I am just going to read a few quotes from Mr. Baker's article about apologizing, because I find it very, very interesting about these people who get upset and outraged by the notion that they are being asked to apologize. I do not know what kind of family values they have or what kind of upbringing they have.

But I remember very well my mother once told me, after I had stepped on a little girl's foot as I was rushing to get, I think it was a church picnic and they had ice cream. I was rushing and stepped on a little girl's foot and she started crying. I hurt her foot, and my mother said, "Go apologize." Well, my first thought was, apologizing is something that is not going to help her. I stepped on her foot. It is hurting. My apology will not help her at all. I said to my mother, "I'm sure she's all right. Why should I apologize?" She said, "Go apologize."

If I had not gone and apologized, I probably would have been sort of slapped across the mouth or roughed up a little bit, because my mother would want her child to acculturate in that way to understand apologizing is part of the process of being a civilized human being. It is not a time to get into the logic of apologizing will not help her foot, apologizing will not ease her pain.

But here arguments are saying apologizing will not ease pain, so it is ridiculous. Do we raise our children that way? But the argument comes across from a number of columnists that it is ridiculous because it cannot go back and undo the hurt.

Anyway, let me just do Mr. Baker the honor of quoting from his article, straight from the New York Times, July 1, 1997. It is entitled "Sorry About That," which is already a little sarcasm introduced. It is arguing that

apologizing for slavery would show great sensitivity. "Why anyone would propose such an aimless exercise, except to demonstrate great sensitivity, is hard to say."

Now, if I had said to my mother, "Why should I go back and apologize? All I am doing is demonstrating great sensitivity," she would have thought that she made a great error in the way she raised me, or she would have thought it was time to get to work disciplining me to show great sensitivity, part of being a human being. Why do we want to say it is an aimless exercise? But that is what Mr. Baker says here. "Why anyone would propose such an aimless exercise, except to demonstrate great sensitivity, is hard to say."

To continue quoting Mr. Baker: "Both parties to the slave and owner relationship being long dead, there could be nothing more grotesque than the generation of white yuppies apologizing for the sins of long-buried ancestors."

I do not know where he got the "generation of white yuppies." The U.S. Congress is not a generation of white yuppies. We are the government. We are representatives of the government. Everybody is the government, but we are the spokespersons for the government; the government that was there in 1776, however different it might have been; the government that was there in 1865, when the Emancipation Proclamation was signed. I mean not the Emancipation Proclamation, when the Civil War ended. This government was there when the 13th Amendment that freed the slaves was passed. We are still part of the same government, so I do not know why we suddenly have become white yuppies.

But to continue quoting from Mr. Baker: "Surely, no sensible descendant of slave forbearers look on such a spectacle without disgust for the hypocrisy of it." Again, "Surely, no sensible descendant of slave forbearers look on such a spectacle without disgust for the hypocrisy of it."

Well, Mr. Baker is clearly wrong. Sixty percent of the descendants of slaves said they thought apologizing was a good idea. According to the polls that had been reported, 60 percent of the slave descendants, I being one, see nothing wrong with apologizing.

□ 1830

We do not look upon it with great disgust. We do not consider it hypocritical.

But continued Mr. Baker, "No sensible white American could countenance it without feeling embarrassed by its shabby theatricality."

He may be right, because after all I just told you 60 percent of white Americans said we should not apologize. I do not know whether they were worried about shabby theatricality or something else, but he says it is shabby theatricality that they are worried about.

To continue quoting Mr. Baker, "Apologizing for the country's past can

only gratify the apologizer's desire to feel good about himself. It invites the audience to compare his moral tone to that of his ancestors, so derelict in their respect for humanity, and come out a winner."

I do not know what is wrong with having anybody feel good about themselves if that is the only benefit. I think there are many other benefits but feeling good about yourself is a first step toward feeling good about others and reacting to others in a positive way. I have no quarrel with people feeling good about themselves.

Continuing with Mr. Baker's article, "It not only enhances the apologizer's self-esteem, it doesn't cost him anything. This is an important consideration nowadays when government's chief goal is to avoid spending money on life's losers so the rest of us will have more to spend on ourselves."

I agree with Mr. Baker wholeheartedly. Apologizing does not cost anything. All the more reason of why we should not hesitate to do it in my opinion. But he is saying that because it does not cost anything, we should not do it. There is a lot of contradiction and conflicts here. We should do things that do cost money. The whole Congress is running away from doing things that do cost money. I suspect that a lot of people are afraid to apologize because they think the next step is that somebody will want some compensatory programs or reparations or those kinds of things, but not Mr. Baker. If all we did was apologize, of course, it would be kind of hypocritical, but why not take the first step and we will take our chances. Let the Congress go forward with the resolution of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] and vote to apologize. Let there be a first step. It would not hurt.

Continuing with Mr. Baker's article, "Like every country, the United States has a lot of history to apologize for. After apologizing for slavery, we could move ahead to apologizing for what our forebears did to the Indians."

I am quoting Mr. Baker. I agree, Mr. Baker, why not go ahead and apologize for what was done to the Indians? Who would it hurt?

"Was it genocide? No, the word hadn't been invented until it was all over," according to Mr. Baker. "The words that had Americans spellbound back then were 'manifest destiny.' Destiny had given us a continent to populate. The Indians were in the way. Destiny demanded their removal. Such was the argument, anyhow. With that nasty history now far behind, would an apology not be civilized? Would it not show modern Indians how much nicer than our forefathers we are?"

"Sorry, folks, for the brutality of our morally inferior ancestors. If it had been us in charge with our enlightened new age sensitivity, instead of those immoral old-timers, it would never have happened."

"Couldn't we garnish the apology with some substance?"

"Come on, guys. Be reasonable. It's too late to give it back. Anyhow, we gave you a legal crack at the gambling rackets." He is talking to the Indians now.

"Few will quarrel with the government for apologizing to Americans of Japanese ancestry who were put in concentration camps during World War II. Since many who had suffered this monstrous assault are still alive, the apology was not just another piece of posturing."

In other words, he has introduced the idea of apologizing to the Indians. Then he ridicules the idea of apologizing to the Indians because, after all, the people who did the terrible things to the Native Americans are now dead and we have at least given them a crack at the gambling rackets through the casinos so why do we not just forget it.

I think it is most unfortunate that Mr. Baker in this little three paragraphs is ridiculing the whole idea of diplomacy and negotiations, the fact that our ancestors might have taken a different route. There was plenty of land and plenty of everything. The Indians, the native Americans did not have to be treated the way they were in order for America to be great. Maybe there is a lot that would have been different if we had the same sensitivity then that we do have now. Let us not trample or trivialize our present state of morality and our sense of what is right and what is wrong, how different it is now from then. Unfortunately, it came too late in the case of the slaves. It came too late in the case of the native Americans. But understand that there was a different option, a different route and the fact that our ancestors did not follow that route is something that might be worthy of apologizing for.

We can apologize, however, for the Japanese and the concentration camps because some of them are still alive. That is kind of weird reasoning. These things stay alive in the conscience of a people forever. They never go away. I am going to point that out in a few minutes from his own examples.

To get back to quoting Mr. Russell Baker, "Many others are still alive who lived in that time and admired Franklin Roosevelt, the man who authorized those camps."

My father thought Franklin Roosevelt was the greatest man in the world, that ever lived, except for Jesus Christ, I guess, and I almost place Franklin Roosevelt in a similar category. I still think he is a great man, the greatest of all American Presidents. But he made some mistakes. That was one of the mistakes that he made. Anybody who had to make so many decisions for such a long period in such a critical and stressful situation would make mistakes. Franklin Roosevelt made a mistake. We should apologize as we did officially apologize to the Japanese Americans for what happened in World War II. That, we can be proud of.

"For those of us who in 1942 patriotically accepted the camps as necessary for the country's defense, the apology forced us to admit that even we can be terribly wrong when being tossed around by the storms of history."

That is the kind of reasoning that Mr. Baker applies to the apology to the Japanese for the concentration camps in World War II. Why can we not take the same logic and the same argument and apply it to any mistake that is made in history and that we as a matter of hindsight can see was a mistake? What is wrong with saying that slavery was a grave mistake, a very costly mistake, a very dehumanizing mistake, a very deadly mistake, but it was a mistake that is worthy of at least an apology.

Going back to Mr. Baker, "Where history is concerned, saintly judgment is rarely possible until a century or two has passed."

Again I agree with Mr. Baker. "Where history is concerned, saintly judgment is rarely possible until a century or two has passed."

Now he is contradicting himself in a wholesale manner, because if saintly judgment is only possible after a century or two has passed, then you can only apologize with integrity, with great vision, after people are dead for a while. He began his argument by saying why apologize for something that people did years ago and all of the victims and all of the oppressors are dead. Now he says you can only judge after a century or two has passed.

A century or two has passed. Slavery lasted for 232 years but it has been over for more than a century, almost two centuries. Now it is time to reflect and to look at the mistakes and to look at the residue of problems that were caused by the mistakes and to deal with it in a forthright, scientific, logical, reasonable manner. But he says that on the one hand because everybody is dead, why deal with it and on the other hand, you can only pass reasonable judgment until they have been dead for a century or two.

"England may be infected, too, with the apologizing fad." Now he is back to his sarcasm and his *reductio ad absurdum*. Apologizing now is going to be a fad.

"England may be infected, too, with the apologizing fad. There is talk there of apologizing for Britain's indifference to starvation in Ireland during the 19th century potato famine."

Why not apologize for the indifference of a government? The government made a mistake. A lot of people suffered and died as a result. So why not apologize.

"Tony Blair," according to Mr. Baker, "the new Prime Minister has suggested something of the sort might improve relations with Ireland. Yes, it sounds ridiculous. Northern Ireland is a place where one of the most passionate events of every year is the celebration of a battle fought in 1688 between Protestants and Catholics. The Protes-

tants won and have never for an instant dreamed of apologizing. Ireland seems an unlikely country to relinquish its hatreds after a dose of feel-your-pain sensitivity."

In other words, he is saying if Tony Blair, the new Prime Minister, should decide to apologize to Ireland for the conduct of the British Government during the potato famine, then it is ridiculous because the Irish would never accept it. They do not believe in apologizing. That is why in Northern Ireland the Catholics are at the necks of the Protestants and this conflict between Protestants and Catholics rages on and on.

I would take the opposite approach and say maybe we can break the cycle if Mr. Blair would apologize first and if it would encourage the Catholics to apologize to the Protestants or the Protestants to apologize to the Catholics, maybe you would end this blood-bath in Northern Ireland. Maybe you would begin to have healing and reconciliation in the place of violence.

Ireland defies all logic. Northern Ireland defies all logic. All these people are white and they are at each other's throats. All of them are of the same nationality, they are all Irish, and they are at each other's throats. All of them belong to the same religion. They are Christians. Why does the fighting go on and on in Northern Ireland? Probably because no one has dreamed of apologizing. Probably because the old Neanderthal caveman reaction that you must forever and ever consider your enemy an enemy, you must get revenge, you must seek justice, probably because that dominates the thinking of the leadership so much that they cannot entertain another approach.

In South Africa, 25 million blacks were dominated by 4 or 5 million whites. The blacks have now taken over. They are the majority. They have control of the government. They chose a different path. Instead of trying to punish, instead of seeking justice and retribution, they have a Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Their society is taking a very positive movement forward because they are refusing to go for the old Neanderthal caveman reaction of I must punish those who did wrong to me. The whole Judeo-Christian tradition of moving in a different manner has been accepted in South Africa but not in some other places, like Northern Ireland.

In Haiti, they have chosen not to go for revenge and justice but to go for reconciliation. Therefore, Haiti is not adding on top of its other many economic problems the problem of a new kind of violence between those who had the upper hand before and those who have the upper hand now.

To get back to quoting Mr. Baker, to end his article, "Apologies for slavery, famine, the Indian wars, can these have any purpose beyond asserting, in a smugly self-congratulatory way, that we are better people than our ancestors? They surely cannot undo the

past. A lot of every nation's past is terrible, atrocious, barbaric, but there it is, inescapable, monumental, the work of our dead ancestors many of them no doubt hateful, a few perhaps almost as genteel and high-minded as you and I. Apologizing for them would be as useless and absurd as shaking a fist at the Atlantic Ocean. It is painful to see them patronized by the pious sensitivity crowd."

Anybody who wants to apologize is now a part of a pious sensitivity crowd. The pious sensitivity crowd is engaged in a fad of apologizing. This does not take us anywhere but back into the caves. It does not move our civilization forward at all. Reconciliation is more important than revenge. That is the lesson that they are learning and South Africa is illustrating. Haiti. In Bosnia we will not have any forward movement until they also accept the principle that reconciliation is more important than revenge. Reconciliation is even more important than justice. Revenge and justice usually require more conflict and more bloodshed. Reconciliation and healing require that victims and injured parties accept the losses of the past and the present as a way of fertilizing the future with promise and hope.

Of course in the case of slavery, if we do not recognize anything was done wrong in the past, we cannot complete the healing process. There is an understanding that is not stated in our culture, in our national life, that accepts the fact that slavery was wrong. We fought a great Civil War, and the lives of many white men were lost in the process of setting the slaves free. We recognized that it was wrong and that Abraham Lincoln, under his leadership and those who fought in the Civil War, we have corrected that great national wrong.

□ 1845

But on the surface we still need to have greater recognition and discussion of it and not just bury it in our subconscious.

If the descendants of the victims of injured parties can accept their losses, then certainly those who were the oppressors ought to accept it and move toward healing and reconciliation. Surely the descendants of oppressors who inflicted the injuries and the atrocities should be able to move on to seek reconciliation and healing.

Let me just conclude by saying when Jesus of Nazareth declared that if a man strikes you on one cheek you should turn the other cheek he introduced a radical formula for human behavior. Many Christians insist that this is one instruction they find it hard to follow. It is unnatural, it is a demand or a command for extreme discipline. Turn the other cheek is an acceptance of suffering that mutilates one's masculinity. It destroys one's normal concept of dignity. This is exalted advice that must have come from outside the Earth, for it requires that

honor and common sense be surrendered, traded in for a profile of pacifist courage which will probably be labeled as cowardly weakness. The man strikes you on the cheek, then turn the other cheek; we are not asking that kind of activity, that you engage in that kind of activity and you have to suffer when you apologize. It is far easier to apologize than to suffer being struck on the cheek or to carry someone's bag an extra mile when they ask you to carry baggage the extra mile.

Instead of Mr. Baker's opposition to apologizing, I propose that in the style of a Vietnam Memorial Wall we should erect a wall that is called the International Monument of Apologies. In the past we have glorified great warriors and conquerors. Now let us lift up and pay homage to all those who apologize. Let us usher in a new era of civilization with ceremonies of apologies.

Yes, it is true that most of the apologies will be emotional symbolism. However, symbols and symbolism are life and death matters among human beings.

Perhaps at the top of this International Monument of Apologies the Greeks, who have left us so many other symbols, could lead off with an apology. Let the Greeks begin by apologizing to the ghost of a Trojan nation that no longer exists. The Greeks assembled vast war mongering states, and they marched into Troy, they wrecked the place, and when they could not win the battle, they abandoned all international conventions and standards of diplomacy and they tricked the Trojans into getting inside the wall, and then they massacred the women and the children, especially all the males, and they ought to apologize for that. It may be only mythology, it may be fiction, but still it would symbolically lead off the apologizing.

Let the Italian Government apologize for the destruction of the ancient land of the Jews and dispersal of their population by the Romans. Let the Italian Government apologize for what Nero and the citizens of ancient Rome did to the early Christians. Let the Spanish and Portuguese apologize for their initiation of the Atlantic slave trade, African slave trade. Let all the nations who participated in slave trade apologize. Let the British apologize for the open war against the Chinese. Let the Japanese apologize for Pearl Harbor. All the nations of ages.

You know, why not go forward and build a new kind of civilization on apologizing? There is nothing wrong with having a great wall of international apologies for us to come and contemplate what our Governments have done in the past and are willing to own up to in the present.

Let us take our civilization to a new dimension. We readily go to Mars and we land on Mars and applaud the technology and science and how radical that is. Let us in the area of human behavior strike in a new direction. Let us follow the precepts of Judeo-Christian

religion. Let us look at that turn the cheek proposition. Let us look at it and build on it and understand that reconciliation and healing are more important than revenge and justice. Let us understand what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] is trying to do. He is trying to open the door a little wider. Apology comes first, and after that acknowledgment, recognition, more reconciliation and more healing.

Our society as a whole and our whole decision making process are on social issues and critical educational issues will all benefit if we recognize that nothing is lost by beginning with a process of apologizing. We have conquered overwhelming external enemies, and now it is time to grow again in America. The stock market and the evidences of prosperity are at an all time high. This is a time for us to strike out for a new moral high ground, a new moral high ground which would be beneficial to all of us in America and to the whole world.

PROGRESS REPORT ON THE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 this evening to bring America some good news for a change and to talk to my colleagues about some of the progress that has been made out here in the last 3 years because it is significant and it really brings us to the question of what next.

We came here, many of us came here, out of the private sector with no political background, myself included, and we came here in 1995 set on the idea that it was our responsibility to do something about the deficit to get us to a point where this Government spent no more money than it brought in, to get us to do something about the high tax rates in this country, and we were very concerned about Social Security and Medicare as it related to our senior citizens.

It has been a great day in Washington because today we actually introduced a bill that deals with the next step, and in order to deal with the next step; that is, paying down some of that debt, you first have to recognize we are in the third year of a 7-year plan to balance the budget, we are on track and ahead of schedule, Medicare has been restored so our senior citizens can rest assured that Medicare is safe for at least another decade, and good news for virtually every American all over this country:

Taxes are coming down. We have got a \$500 per child tax credit coming through. If you own stocks or bonds or have a retirement fund of any sort, the capital gains tax reduction will affect you and allow you to keep more of your own money instead of sending it to Washington. The death taxes are coming down.

And of course there is all sorts of other tax provisions in there: the \$1,500. If you have got a student in college right now, the \$1,500 to help you get that student through college.

But the good news, and we will see more of this as we go forward this evening, is there are more tax cuts coming in the plan.

The logical next step is to talk about paying down the debt, and before I get into this I think it is real important we pause and just make sure that we talk a little bit about the difference between the deficit and the debt.

Every year since 1969 the Federal Government has been spending more money than what it has in its checkbook. It is not a lot different than our home. In our home we have income, we get a paycheck every month or every week, depending on what kind of setup you have, but at any rate you get a paycheck, you put it in your checkbook, and you write out checks to pay your bills.

Well, in your home you cannot write out checks for more than is in your checkbook, or of course the checks are going to bounce. Well, what the Federal Government has been doing since 1969 is collecting taxes, putting those tax dollars that they take out of your pocket into the government checkbook and then writing out all kinds of checks.

The problem in the government is it is very different than in our homes. When the government writes these checks out, they write out checks for more than what is in their checkbook. That is called the deficit. Since 1969 every year the government takes money out of your pockets, puts it in their checkbook and then writes out checks for more money than they have in the checkbook. That is the deficit.

Well, what happens with that deficit? Since their checkbook is overdrawn, they really only have one thing that they can do; they go and borrow the money to put in their checkbook.

And here is what has happened over the course of the last few years:

From 1960 to 1980, the growth of the debt was fairly small. But from 1984 forward, you can see that government has been overdrawing their checkbook by a substantial amount.

So what happens?

Well, in the year 1980, for example, they wrote out more checks than what they had in their checkbook, and they borrowed the money, and the debt started growing. By 1985 you can see the debt was growing more and more, and every year they kept writing out more checks than what they had money in their checkbook, and the debt just kept growing.

Now I point to this chart because it is about the best picture that I have seen to show just how serious this problem of debt is, because every year when they go out and borrow that money to make their checkbooks solvent, of course, it just gets added on to the debt.