

much in the way of added patient safety. In addition, the bill has a new formulation on the issue of health plan liability. I continue to believe that health plans which make negligent medical decisions should be accountable for their actions.

But a winning lawsuit is little consolation to a family who has lost a loved one. The best HMO bill ensures that health care is delivered when it is needed, and I also believe that the liability should attach to the entity that is making medical decisions.

Many self-insured companies contract with large managed care plans to deliver care. If the business is not making discretionary decisions, they should not face liability. This is true of folks like third-party administrators if they merely perform administrative functions. But if they cross the line and determine whether a particular treatment is medically necessary; remember, this brings us back to the medical necessity issue that I started this speech about. If they cross that line in a given case, then they are making medical decisions, and they should be responsible for their actions.

To encourage health plans to give patients the right care without having to go to court, my bill provides for both an internal and an external appeals process. But unlike last year's Republican bill, the external review is binding on the plan.

□ 1700

It could be requested by either the patient or the health plan. The review would be done by an independent panel of medical experts. Frequently, patients pursuing cases through appeal win. They win their treatment. But many times, also, the plan's decision is proven to be the right one.

My bill provides that, if the plan follows the definition of the external review panel, there could not be punitive damages liability on either the health plan or the business. After all, there cannot be any malice if they have bound themselves to the decision of an independent panel of experts.

Madam Speaker, I suspect Aetna wishes they had had an independent peer panel available, even with the binding decision on care, when it denied care to David Goodrich. Earlier this year, a California jury handed down a verdict with \$116 million in punitive damages to Teresa Goodrich, his widow. If Aetna or the Goodriches had had the ability to send the denial of care to an external review, with a binding decision on the plan, where that independent panel has the authority to determine clinical standards of care as medical necessity, then they could have avoided the courtroom. But more importantly, David Goodrich might be alive today.

That is why my plan should be attractive to both sides. Consumers get a reliable and quick external appeals process that will help them get the care that they need. They can go to

court to collect economic damages like lost wages and future medical care and noneconomic damages like pain and suffering.

If the plan fails to follow the external reviews decision, the patient can sue for punitive damages. But if it has gone in a timely fashion through the review process to that independent panel for a binding decision on the plan, that plan then knows that it has no punitive damages liability. That is the big unknown to an insurance company. That eliminates for them the risk of a \$50 million or \$100 million punitive damages award. But they have to follow the recommendations of that independent review panel.

I have heard from insurers that they fear that this legislation will cause premiums to increase. I think there is ample evidence that this would not be the case. Last year, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that a similar proposal, which did not include punitive damages relief, would only increase premiums around 2 percent over 10 years.

When Texas passed its own liability law 2 years ago, Scott and White Health Plan estimated that premiums would have to increase just 34 cents per member per month to cover the cost. These are hardly alarming figures.

The low estimate by Scott and White seems accurate since only one suit has been filed against a Texas health plan since Texas passed legislation similar to this. That is far from the flood of litigation that opponents predicted.

Madam Speaker, I have been encouraged by the positive response my bill has received. I think this could be the basis for a bipartisan bill this year. In fact, I spoke with the CEO of a large Blue Cross plan who confided to me that his organization is already implementing virtually all of the recommendations of the President's Health Care Quality Advisory Commission for little or no cost.

One part of the health care debate that concerns him is the issue of liability. He has indicated that shielding plans from punitive damages when they follow an external review body would strike an appropriate balance.

Madam Speaker, passage of real patient protection legislation is going to require a lot of hard work, dedication, and some compromise. My new bill represents an effort to break through this partisan gridlock and move this issue forward.

I hope to work with all my colleagues to help break the logjam keeping patient protection legislation from becoming law. This issue is vitally important to families across this country.

To my fellow legislators, please do not let the insurers define "medically necessary" or someday my colleagues or a family member or a friend will find themselves defined out of a treatment that is a clinical standard of care that could save their life or the life of somebody else.

#### RACISM, DEADLY DIFFERENCES AND DIVERSITY PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I would like to address a number of issues that I think are very much related to the problem of racism, of deadly differences, and diversity problems that have broken out all over the world and we are part of trying to resolve.

A lot of them occur right here at home. In my own city of New York, a poll was taken that showed, and the New York Times announced today, that one-fourth of all New Yorkers, white and black New Yorkers, believe that the police of New York City behave quite differently with people of color, with minority groups, African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians, they behave quite differently with them than they do with whites. Whites as well as blacks have come to this conclusion. One-fourth of all the citizens of New York believe that this is the case.

So we have a serious problem right at home with a very crucial body of people, the police, who are so vital to the law and order of the city for everybody, everybody's protection.

Then we have far-ranging problems like those that are taking place in Kosovo and Yugoslavia where this government is spending large amounts of money, we have spent about \$9 billion, to try to work through situations in Yugoslavia which evolve out of racial and ethnic and religious differences. Whereas I was all in favor, of course, of extending the resources of this country into that situation, I think that the Yugoslavia situation is totally out of hand. And \$9 billion, more than \$9 billion is enough to invest.

Our Nation is an indispensable Nation available, and I think that is important to help with trouble spots anywhere in the world. But we should not let ourselves get sucked into any trouble spot for so long that it absorbs an inordinate amount of resources and takes away the possibility of helping with other problems.

I think it was right that we went into Haiti to help liberate Haiti from people who had taken over from a duly elected democratic government. I think it was important that we went into Somalia. I think it is important that the President has shown great concern, and there are some resources now deployed in Rwanda. All of these situations, Rwanda, Somalia, Kosovo, Serbia, Bosnia, Northern Ireland. Our President did not dispense large amounts of military aid in Northern Ireland, but his own personal commitment there and the use of American diplomatic skills have helped to abate that situation.

But all over the country, all over the world, we have these conflicts based on differences and diversity. They are probably going to go on for a long, long

time. We have to learn how to live with them and to try to abate them and try to lessen them. Hopefully over the long period, decades and centuries, we can eliminate some of them.

First we have to understand how difficult it is and how deeply entrenched it is and how it is important that governmental resources be invested in the effort to lessen the amount of racism, hate crimes, ethnic rivalries that exist and might explode at any moment. It is important.

It is important that we understand the need to deal, first of all, with those that are closest to us. One of the closest conflicts and ongoing problems in America is racism related to the long history of African Americans who were held in slavery for 232 years.

We do not like to think that 232 years of slavery had any consequences or that there is anything special about this particular group and their relationship with the rest of the Americans, just as we do not like to think there is any special relationship between the Native Americans and the rest of the American people, that there should be any special consideration.

But surely there ought to be some special consideration about the relationship between the descendants of the Native Americans and the rest of the Americans in view of the fact that history was quite brutal with respect to the Native Americans.

History was quite brutal with respect to African Americans who are a group of people in this country, in this hemisphere, only because they were transported to this hemisphere against their will.

So I want to talk about all of these things. In the news today, there was also an account of a new effort to try to fight slavery in the Sudan and slavery in Mauritania. We have some groups that are American based that are actually raising money to buy slaves from the Sudanese.

The Sudanese are practicing slavery in a very cruel and inhuman way even to this day. They say it is all part of the Civil War. Only the women and children of the enemy are captured, and they have a right to take them and use them for bounty and whatever. Whatever the reason given, it is still slavery.

In 1999, in Sudan, which is a country of people who are of dark hue, one might say black, a lot of black people, whatever range of color they may have, there is slavery.

There is slavery in Mauritania. Arabs and people of an Arab descent and African descent, all in Mauritania. But in Mauritania, there are some black people who are still enslaved in 1999.

I thought that was interesting that that appeared on the news today. At the same time I heard on the news this morning, and I listen usually to National Public Radio, and there was some bad news about Northern Ireland. A civil rights lawyer in Northern Ireland, Catholic civil rights activist law-

yer was assassinated with a fire bomb. A fire bomb blew up her car.

So we have reminders of many kinds of how these ethnic tensions, religion. In the case of Ireland, it is religion that has divided people. It is very interesting how human beings seem to look for reasons for conflict. They want to accentuate differences. So we have people who are ethnically pretty much the same, racially the same in Northern Ireland, but the religious differences have set off a long time feud which is quite violent and bloody.

In Somalia, we could not understand what the problem was in Somalia. They were all most of the same religion, same race. There were no deep tribal divisions. They all spoke the same language.

Yet, in Somalia, the human beings there found ways to accentuate some differences. That was generally based on pure politics, people having power ambitions in one area and organizing their own gang; and over here, they would organize another gang. There were no tribes, but they created tribes out of interests that were really power interests.

Of course here is the crux of the problem. Most of the time, these ethnic tensions, racial tensions and divisions are accelerated and exacerbated by people who do want power, demagogues who exploit the situation for power reasons.

We have 232 years of slavery in this Nation because, for economic reasons, which also are power reasons, for economic reasons, it was beneficial to enslave a population and provide the free labor from one end of the country to the other. It was mostly in the south, the plantations. There was a long-term need for free labor and large amounts of labor there.

But in New York, large amounts of slaves were used to build the original city. Slavery was just as cruel there as it was anywhere else. The third largest slave port of the country at one time was a New York slave port. So all of these things still have their long-term fallout on history. It would do well for us to pay more attention to history.

I applaud President Clinton and his appointment of a commission on race relations to at least stimulate a set of discussions and dialogues among the American people about the issue of race and differences in relationships.

Some people say it got out of hand and it was not very productive. It only had a year's life. For whatever the problems were, it was still a positive, constructive action. I hope the President will follow it up with further action. But more importantly, here is an area where I think foundations and philanthropists could make a contribution.

□ 1715

There are a lot of controversies that are inevitably associated with anything related to race relations. The controversies could probably better be

handled by the philanthropic sector. And the kind of controversies they are, they are not so much current but scholarly discussions and discussions of positions and attitudes, and I think they ought to be handled more with foundations and other philanthropic organizations financing those areas than the government. But the government should stimulate that discussion. President Clinton started the discussion, and I think we ought to, as a government, follow up on that.

I think that the resolution of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TONY HALL), that called for the government of America to apologize for slavery, which aroused so much controversy and ill feeling across the country, I think that is still a pertinent item of discussion. I think it is a lightning rod that we should really discuss.

Why should the American government not apologize for slavery when we are seeing the governments of Japan and of Germany and various other governments that exist now that were not really there, the German government was not there when Hitler was there, but the present government has apologized in certain areas; as well as the government of Japan has apologized to the Korean women who were forced into prostitution and to some others; and other apologies are taking place.

The Swiss government just apologized and set up a fund to the victims of greed the holocaust victims of greed, where they put the money in Swiss banks and the Swiss banks used various maneuvers to keep those people from getting money.

So it is a discussion which carries civilization forward, and a discussion of an American apology for slavery would do a great deal in that direction.

I think the South Africans set an example for civilized nations of today and the future that should not be ignored. The Government of South Africa today, the new Government of South Africa today, that took over just 4 years ago, insisted that it would not seek justice, it would seek reconciliation. That was a very important and unprecedented move by a national government.

Here is a government made up of a new majority. The majority of the people, about 40 million black Africans in South Africa, had been oppressed for many decades by the white South Africans. The black majority took over in South Africa. The government was made up of a government elected by the people and most of the people in power were black. Instead of seeking justice, which would have resulted in large numbers of trials, executions, and a whole lot of revenge-seeking, the South African government that took power proclaimed that it wanted reconciliation. And no matter how horrible the crime was, no matter how horrible the political crime was related to the politics of the long years of oppression and the fight against apartheid, they would allow people to come

forward and, if they would tell the truth, they would offer amnesty to those folks who told the truth.

More important than the individuals who came forward and the testimonies that took place and the whole unprecedented kind of activity that they developed, is the spirit that that sent out throughout the whole country; that we are not going to look at the past, we are not going to live in the past to the point where it becomes a noose around the throat of the future and the present. We are not going to seek justice to the point where it destroys the possibility for reconciliation and progress.

So reconciliation. And this was a new idea to me, I never thought of it that way before Nelson Mandela and the Government of South Africa today put it forward. Reconciliation is more important than justice. Reconciliation is more important than justice.

We hammered home this same theme when Jean Bertrand Aristide was restored to his rightful place in Haiti. The government of the United States insisted that he also follow the same policy. We made an official request that the Aristide government not seek justice but, instead, emphasize reconciliation.

That whole approach, of course, is being carried out in Bosnia and Serbia and Croatia. We are paying billions for that, too much in my opinion, but we are leading the way to a process of reconciliation, which will provide for building for a future rather than justice.

I do not say justice is not important, and I do not think human society can exist unless we have forms of punishment. People must be punished, and there must be an understanding that individuals will be held accountable for crimes. I do not think anybody would ever say that Hitler should have been treated the way some of the leaders of Haiti were treated.

The United States Government actually paid the rent, leased the homes of the dictators in Haiti that they deposed. Cedras and the other two who were at the top of the official terror apparatus in Haiti were treated like princes and helped to get out of the place and given enough income to maintain themselves for a long time. They are still out there alive, and may come back. That is a danger. Instead of justice, it was important that they be moved from the scene peacefully in order to facilitate reconciliation.

Now, I do not think the Nuremberg trials were wrong, I do not think the trials of the Japanese perpetrators of massive violence in Asia, the people who attacked Pearl Harbor, I do not think it was wrong to punish them. That is going quite far. But it is something to consider, this whole reconciliation process. And in the case of the nations now that participate in reconciliation, we are seeing a more positive result as a result of reconciliation being placed above justice.

But the South Africans in the process of seeking reconciliation felt it was very important to have truth. Truth was a very important part of establishing reconciliation. I think in America we have missed that point with respect to race relations, and certainly relationships between the Native Americans and the rest of the American population, and certainly with relationship between the African Americans and the rest of the American population.

We have never admitted, as a government, that great crimes were done to the African Americans who were enslaved, and that the consequences of 232 years of slavery need to be studied. The truth needs to be laid out, and we need to take steps to combat some of those consequences.

A very interesting individual specific development is taking place which I think we ought to focus on as part of the way to get more truth thrown on the whole phenomenon of American slavery. There is a controversy which is made for America because it is very individual, it is very personal, and it involves a love story. It is the story of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings.

Sally Hemings was a slave at Monticello under Thomas Jefferson. For many, many years there has been a controversy about whether or not there was a relationship between Sally Hemings and Thomas Jefferson which produced some children, four or five children. The controversy is not about whether Thomas Jefferson might have had sex with Sally Hemings. Many slave owners had sex with their slaves, and there are millions of mulattos that resulted from those unions to provide concrete evidence that many slave owners had sexual relationships with their slaves. The problem with Jefferson is that it appears that he had a long-term relationship with Sally Hemings, that he treated her as if she was his common law wife.

For 38 years, Sally Hemings was on the scene, starting from the time that she went to Paris as a nurse and maid for Jefferson's youngest daughter, to the time that Jefferson died. She was there all the time. She was there in Paris. She could have gone free; stayed in Paris and been a free person. She did not. She came back to Monticello. She was in Monticello during the whole time that Jefferson was President. And when he left the Presidency, she remained at Monticello, and she was there when he died.

There was a big public scandal related to the relationship between Sally Hemings and Thomas Jefferson. A man named Callendar, who had been a so-called friend of Jefferson, Jefferson had gotten him out of prison when John Adams, with his alien and sedition laws put large numbers of people in prison who were accused of treason on the basis of what they wrote and the criticisms they made of the government, Callendar was imprisoned. And, of course, Jefferson was against the alien

and sedition laws and against the federalist dictatorship that was being generated.

Once Jefferson was elected as President, Callendar was set free. Callendar had written articles and done some things with Jefferson's party and Jefferson, and Callendar wanted to become a postmaster. When Jefferson would not make him a postmaster, Callendar turned on Jefferson and went to Monticello and got all the gossip together, and he was the one who accused Jefferson of having a mistress with children at Monticello.

It became a big public scandal. It was in newspapers from one part of the country to the other. Jefferson was ridiculed. John Quincy Adams wrote a ballad making fun of him, et cetera, et cetera. Jefferson never admitted anything, of course. He never even commented. But the relationship was not ended. Sally Hemings was not sent away from Monticello. She remained there. She remained there during his Presidency, and then after he went back, she remained there, and until his death, as I have just said several times. So Sally Hemings and Thomas Jefferson, the questions remained.

A historian recently, not so recently, about 15 years ago, documented the fact that Jefferson was at Monticello every time that Sally Hemings conceived children. The period before the birth of her children, he was at Monticello at all those times. They had other various things that they documented in his notations in his farm books, et cetera, which indicated that Sally Hemings was very much a presence at Monticello.

There are certain letters, of course, and other kinds of things that are missing from Jefferson's numerous writings that were also timed at a time when he had some kind of important relationship that might have had a record of some kind of relationship with Sally Hemings. Many of those letters are missing. No documentation.

Sally Hemings is erased from history. We do not have any photographs of her or any descriptions of her, except the one or two from her son and from a man who had been a slave at Monticello, Isaac Jefferson.

So I will talk about the controversy that has now mounted to the point where so much documentation existed which confirmed the fact that there was a relationship between Jefferson and Hemings that a DNA test was developed. A scientist who happened to be residing at Monticello carefully put together a DNA test. He secretly got permission from Jefferson offspring, known offspring of the Jefferson family, and he got permission and DNA from the offspring of Sally Hemings. And after putting it through a very rigorous set of tests, the confirmation is that it is very probable. The DNA tests bear out the other kinds of documentation that Jefferson was the father of Sally Hemings' youngest child and, therefore, it makes all of the other evidence more credible.

I am going to quote from an article that I wrote on this whole matter, and I think I will save some time and make the point that I am trying to make tonight better if I read from this article. It is entitled "Kingpins for Truth and Reconciliation, Thomas and Sally".

"DNA evidence confirming Jefferson's relationship with Sally Hemings could open the door for a more profound dialogue on slavery and race relations."

If that strikes my colleagues as strange, let me read it again. "DNA evidence confirming Jefferson's relationship with Sally Hemings could open the door for a more profound dialogue on slavery and race relations".

This portion of slavery that has never been discussed fully is related to the fact that there were intimate relations between the races. From a power point of view, it usually was the slave owners and the overseers and the people who had privileges and power who interacted with the female slaves. But out of that is a set of truths that come concerning myths about inferiority, myths about abilities to coexist, a number of things which not only are documented and reinforced by the new evidence of Jefferson's relationship with Sally Hemings, but there have been several books written lately which I think also fall into this same pattern.

I am going to read first from my article to make things shorter.

□ 1730

I will read some excerpts from it. "Only a few months after the release of the report of the Advisory Board of the President's Initiative on Race, and that report is entitled 'One America In The 21st Century: Forging a New Future,' a scientific report has confirmed the likelihood that President Thomas Jefferson was the father of the children of his slave and long-time companion, Sally Hemings. These two events can be constructively related."

Let me repeat. "Only a few months after the release of the report of the Advisory Board of the President's Initiative on Race, and the report is entitled 'One America In The 21st Century, Forging a New Future,' a scientific report has confirmed the likelihood that President Thomas Jefferson was the father of the children of his slave and long-time companion Sally Hemings. These two events can be constructively related."

And again, I want to point out that two new books have come out which talk about slave owners and their children by slaves. And I read only the review of this. I have not had a chance to read the book. The review appeared in the Washington Post. It is called "The Hairstons, an American Family in Black and White," published by St. Martin's Press. And it talks about a family where slaves and slave owners and the personnel of the plantations were intermixed, and it singles out one tragic story of one slave owner who de-

cided that he loved his slave wife, common-law wife. Some would call it a mistress or concubine. I do not think he thought of it that way. He loved her so much that he willed her daughter a large part of his property. And there was a big fight to take that property away, which succeeded of course, and she was left in slavery. But a very concrete tragedy there.

Another book that recently came out is called "Slaves in the Family." The author of that one is Edward Ball. "Slaves in the Family" by Edward Ball goes back and deals with a South Carolina based huge plantation and a large family over several generations and he shows how the intermarriage and the mixtures came down to the present.

I think it is important, another book that also talks about this in more general terms and had the advantage of being part of a public television series is "Africans in America." "Africans in America" brings out some very interesting facts that are little known about slavery and the freed men and the whole relationship with the general population, etcetera.

So returning to my article, "The new discussions of the life, philosophy, and politics of Thomas Jefferson might do more to facilitate an honest assessment of black-white relations in America than the report which is laden with facts."

The report is the "One America in the 21st Century" that was put out by the Initiative On Race. I thought it was an interesting report. But, as my colleagues can see from my remarks here, I do not think it went nearly far enough. But if we took the report together with the new facts, together these two developments could greatly enhance our understanding of an extremely complex phenomena.

"The weakness of the report of the President's Advisory Board is that it is thorough about obvious kinds of things that we all know about but it lacks the vital ingredient of profundity. The report is competent, respectful, universal in its coverage, balanced, and not at all an embarrassment to the White House. However, when the depth of the deliberations of that report are measured against the complexity of the mission and the intensity of the challenge, the appropriate grade for this noble but feeble effort would be B- or C+. Our national dialogue would be greatly benefited by the establishment of several adequately financed commissions on group relations.

"Native Americans certainly deserve their own separate historical documentation and analysis. African-Americans require no less than an objective statement of history, a thorough and comprehensive study as a basis for the unraveling of the many complexities of our present interaction with mainstream society.

"Contrary to the beliefs of many African-Americans, as well as others, current policy-making would be greatly enhanced by a world-class study of

American slavery and the thwarted reconstruction effort that followed the Emancipation Proclamation and the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments. Such a study would be useful if it is done in the spirit of truth and reconciliation.

"The noble embryo that the President's Initiative has planted should be allowed to sprout and grow. Using the bully pulpit of the White House, the President should call on private foundations to finance such a world-class project and he should recommend that the world's top scholars and thinkers, including Nobel Prize winners, be recruited to provide research and editorial guidance for such a study.

"One of the first items that should be placed on the research and analysis agenda is a controversial question of the relationship between Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings. It would be a human interest case study offering great illuminations for American history. It could also be an educational landmark love story that captures the attention of a mass audience and forces them to confront the institution of slavery in all of its dimensions.

"The scientific validation of Jefferson's paternity with respect to Hemings' children is a historical blockbuster. DNA evidence has exposed the fact that respected academicians and historians have promulgated or tolerated a dangerous and suffocating denial of certain self-evident truths about American slavery. This same distortion process applies to too much of American history as it relates to slavery, the Civil War and reconstruction.

"Unlike the very civilized behavior of the new rulers of South Africa, the United States has never had a truth and reconciliation commission. As part of a larger effort, the story of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings could provide a potent spark to generate a bonfire of new revelations which will increase the possibility of long-term, improved black-white reconciliation."

Most people would say that they do not see how any probing of such a relationship could lead to anything but more controversy, more hostility, and more antagonism between the races, starting with the numerous African-Americans who want to throw Thomas Jefferson down from his throne because now it has been confirmed that he took advantage of a slave woman. Well, I do not think the evidence confirms anything of the nature.

Slave owners were in a position to take advantage of all their slaves. That is true. But the evidence with respect to Thomas Jefferson is that this particular woman he cared a great deal for. He maintained her near him in Monticello, in the mansion, for 38 years despite a scandal that normally would lead a politician to distance himself from such a person.

"The story of Thomas and Sally may be summarized as follows: While Jefferson was serving as the American ambassador in Paris, Sally Hemings arrived as a maid for his younger daughter who sailed from Virginia to join her

father. Jefferson seduced her, and the pregnant Sally returned to America only after he promised that all of her children would be set free. Under French law, she could have remained a free person in France.

"During the first year of his presidency, a journalist exposed the fact that Jefferson had a 'slave mistress' who was the mother of his children. The third president of the United States refused to answer this charge. He also never removed Sally Hemings from Monticello. They were together for 38 years at Monticello until Jefferson died.

"Three of their children were allowed to 'run.'" Jefferson noted in his farm books and his accounts that whenever one of the Hemings children left the plantation they really were set free with his consent, he would just note in his book that they were allowed to run. Because to set them free required certain kinds of filing of papers; and in Virginia, once you were set free, you had a limited amount of time to get out of the State. There were complications. So they were just allowed to run and the notations were made.

Nevertheless, these same children who were allowed to run always ended up in urban settings where they got new footing and it was assumed that Jefferson, and his friends had helped to establish his children in those new settings to enable them to thrive. Two of the children were set free in Jefferson's will.

"With the DNA testing confirming Jefferson paternity, the journey so competently and eloquently begun by Fawn Brodie with her best selling book entitled "Thomas Jefferson: An Intimate History" has now reached its peak."

That is more than 15 years ago that Fawn Brodie, who was a professor at one of California universities, wrote a book called "Thomas Jefferson: An Intimate History." The book was denounced by the Regional Daughters of Virginia, and a number of other historical groups denounced Fawn Brodie. But her set of facts, her documentation, was used to set in motion a process that has continued to today. And finally we have the DNA testing.

"Despite vicious criticisms from the establishment historians still prolonging the Confederate view of American history, Brodie's scholarship propelled the search for truth forward. While the relationship between Jefferson and Hemings was not her primary preoccupation, Brodie provided this story with a rightful proportion of the space," and she integrated the story of Sally Hemings with the rest of her narrative.

"Brodie's thorough account of Jefferson as a failing businessman on the brink of bankruptcy alongside the documentation of the continuous presentation of Sally Hemings may both raise and answer an obvious question: Why didn't Jefferson marry a wealthy widow or a daughter of a wealthy per-

son to end his financial woes?" I repeat. "Brodie's thorough account of Jefferson as a failing businessman on the brink of bankruptcy alongside the documentation of the continuous presence of Sally Hemings may both raise and answer an obvious question: Why didn't Jefferson marry a wealthy widow or the daughter of a wealthy person to end his financial woes?

"With an eye more focused, and operating from a courtroom point of view, a more recent book by Annette Gordon-Bennett updates the work of Brodie, and with her remarkable presentation of the evidence, has stimulated the more recent debates which has helped produce the DNA testing. Now all sides must respond to the scientific evidence. In her book, 'Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings: An American Controversy,' Gordon-Bennett goes on to indict the establishment historians for their gross neglect of vital records.

"Barbara Chase-Riboud in the novel entitled 'Sally Hemings,'" which was written based on facts related in Fawn Brodie's nonfiction work, the novel by Barbara Chase-Riboud "offers a uniquely constructed and very ambitious fictional account to interpret the relationship between Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings. Her point of view repeatedly emerges crystal clear throughout the novel. Although her writing is often laborious and strained, she sometimes reaches dramatic heights in her depictions of emotions of her imagined victims of Jefferson's patriarchal and slave-owning powers. Chase-Riboud is able fictionally to occupy the bodies not souls of Sally and her children, and from within them she confronts what she imagines to be the cold blue insensitive eyes of the master of Monticello."

Chase-Riboud depicts Jefferson as a patronizing anti-woman, cruel oppressor.

"From this novelist, Jefferson is a white, southern aristocrat trapped within the personality parameters of his class and his time." That is her point of view. "He is also a male chauvinist pig who raped and ruined a young slave girl who is left with no alternative except to 'love him to death.'

"Chase-Riboud forces Sally to become a drug to afflict the addict Jefferson til death parts them. The merits of Jefferson's public achievements and historic accomplishments can never offset his intimate behavior flaws in the opinion of Barbara Chase-Riboud," who is a female story teller of African descent.

□ 1745

Each day since the new DNA discovery, I read or hear the same kind of intense condemnations of Jefferson, although they are usually more blunt and crude and they lack the redeeming eloquence of Barbara Chase-Riboud.

I hear them from African-American females who want to dismiss Jefferson and forget about the fact that Jefferson

son was a precursor to Lincoln and the whole idealistic bold advance of Jefferson made it possible to create an America which would later emancipate its slaves.

I am compelled personally to register intense disagreement with Chase-Riboud and all those others who want to knock Jefferson off his pedestal for that reason. There are people on the other side, the conservatives and the Confederates, who want to dismiss Jefferson now because, if he did have a serious relationship with a slave, then he does not deserve to remain in their pantheon. But let me deal with those who are African American who refuse to accept Jefferson for what he really is and what he did contribute both to America and to the emancipation of the slaves.

Any interpretation of the Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings relationship that discounts or trivializes Jefferson as an idealist, a visionary, an intellectual, a pragmatic statesman and a crafty Machiavellian politician is not acceptable in my view. He was an idealist and his ideals are still very important to what happened, the sequence of events that took place in America, even those that led to the Emancipation Proclamation. The fact that such a giant as Thomas Jefferson chose to keep Sally Hemings at his side for 38 years opens the door to a myriad of magnificent questions: Does the length of the relationship despite the inconvenience caused by public exposure and scandal clearly show that it was not a lust but a love relationship? If he did not "love" Sally Hemings, then why did he not just keep her as a concubine while he married a woman of wealth to solve his ever present financial problems? Would a confirmation of his deep love for Sally Hemings not also clarify a number of the other riddles and contradictions which are related to this so-called "sphinx"? The last great book on Jefferson was called "The Sphinx."

The same youthful Jefferson who wrote the Declaration of Independence, with an original draft that condemned slavery, also set forth a racist platform in the book called "Notes on the State of Virginia." I repeat. The same youthful Jefferson who wrote the Declaration of Independence, with an original draft that condemned slavery, also set forth a racist platform in "Notes on the State of Virginia." As a young Congressman, however, Jefferson led the fight to stop the spread of slavery into the new States. He led the fight to stop the spread of slavery, and he lost that by one vote, by the way. He lost that bill by one vote. He stated that slaves had a limited capacity for learning. Nevertheless, Jefferson urged at one time that slaves should be educated and then set free. In the oppressive social and political environment of Virginia, why did Jefferson speak out of both sides of his mouth? Why were there contradictions? Why did Jefferson not just settle down comfortably as a pure acknowledged slave owner and

racist? In his philosophical restlessness and his discontent with his own public positions, one can find the wellsprings of Jefferson's greatness. The politician in his pronouncements surrendered to his peers while privately he subscribed to greater truths. His love for Sally was probably a constant internal irritant. This lifelong reverence for his chambermaid is also a vital and legitimate clue to what he personally believed with respect to the equality of the races.

I said that Jefferson was an idealist, he was a visionary, he was an intellectual, but he was also a pragmatic statesman and a crafty Machiavellian politician. Jefferson founded the first political party in America. Jefferson united with a guy called Aaron Burr who most people did not trust to form the first political party in America. Aaron Burr, true to his reputation, later betrayed Jefferson, but that was necessary to get an opposition party going to the Federalists. Jefferson pretended he was not interested in being elected President, while he was plotting all the time to become President and successfully managed to become President. Jefferson was a politician, and I do not find the fact that he made contradictory statements to be a great puzzle. He is not a sphinx to me. Politicians do make contradictory statements all the time. Unfortunately that happens and we say it is in order to achieve some more noble goal that we distort the truth or we do not tell what we really think. But Jefferson was not only a politician, he was a southern politician. He was rooted in the plantation culture of Virginia. Consider all that and consider the fact that he still led the fight on the floor of the House of Representatives to stop the spread of slavery into the other States.

In the Virginia environment where slavery escalated downward into an ever more savage and criminal institution, did Jefferson's attachment to Sally and her children keep the embers of his antislavery sentiments burning? If there was some way that we could miraculously recover the missing letters of Jefferson, would we find corrections of his most racist utterings? Would we find apologies to Sally Hemings? Would we find expressions of his great love for Sally in his own insightful words?

Jefferson, while he was President, also later narrowly fought for and narrowly passed the legislation which ended the importation of slaves into the country. That was very difficult. It took his son-in-law, Randolph. His son-in-law Randolph had to help him a great deal to pass that legislation. It is probable that the recent DNA clarification will generate more than new scholarly debates among academicians. More fictional interpretations in poetry and novels and drama are inevitable in the quest to fill in the gaps of a tale that is about both love and power. I think that the accounts of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings,

the story of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings, the history of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings is now at the point where it is a bit of a legend and it will take on all the trappings of a legend, and Barbara Chase-Riboud's novel will not be the last novel. There will be many novels, there will be many plays, there will be other kinds of things done in connection with this love story which also tells a whole lot about power in America and about the idealism and the kind of people who helped to make this Nation great, the kind of person who helped to twist events in a way which led the way, established the prerequisite for what later happened with Lincoln and the Emancipation Proclamation.

As much as he was the author of the Declaration of Independence, the third President of the United States and the purchaser of the Louisiana Territory, Thomas Jefferson was also the concerned father of several children of African descent. With unfortunate limitations and restraints, the evidence is that Jefferson loved his common-law wife and his children. He was not a brilliant, cold-blooded beast. The hypocrisy he felt compelled to perpetrate certainly created a personal life wracked with intense conflicts.

Jefferson's public statements on race and slavery often stand in opposition to his private passion and compassion. However, when his intimate relationship with Sally is affixed to selected public actions, it is clear that he consciously made a vital contribution to the abolition of slavery. There are many who contend that without Jefferson, there could never have been an emancipating Abraham Lincoln. Congressman Jefferson attempted to halt the expansion of slavery into new States and failed by one vote in the House of Representatives. As President he narrowly won a victory for a law that finally ended the legal importation of slaves. It is also important to note that Jefferson's advocacy for the rights of the common white man had to take roots before Lincoln could fight the war that freed the slaves. Let me repeat. It is also important to note that Jefferson's advocacy for the rights of the common white man had to take roots before Lincoln could fight the war that freed the slaves.

Jefferson was quoted by the slave mongers as well as by the abolitionists as they made their cases during his time, or shortly after his death and up to the Civil War, into the Civil War. Both sides claimed Jefferson. Until today he is still cited by racists as well as progressives. The new DNA clarification of his paternity of Sally Hemings' children may finally end this ideological tug of war. In a superficial response, the races may jettison the man who treated the slave mother of his children as if she were his common-law wife.

A more profound response from progressives in general and African Americans specifically would be a new cele-

bration of Jefferson as the prerequisite to Lincoln. It is an historical fact that one of Jefferson's proteges, Edward Coles, took his slaves from Virginia to Illinois where he gave them their freedom and acres of land. Edward Coles later became governor of Illinois, he defeated a referendum seeking to make Illinois a slave State, and he was an active politician in Illinois at the time of Lincoln's election and at the time of the Civil War. More than mere words and ideas connected Thomas Jefferson to Abraham Lincoln.

Celebrations of the new Jefferson discoveries and expressions of gratitude to the science of genetics which produced DNA testing I think are very much in order. What the historians and the researchers of several generations refused to examine objectively has now been determined to be almost certainly true. The white male southern academicians who have dominated the interpretation of pre and post Civil War history have now been thoroughly discredited. Their refusal to accept overwhelming evidence with respect to Jefferson, of necessity, raises serious questions about the integrity of the rest of their scholarship.

Some obvious indictments of these proponents of the Confederate view of history are now in order. The establishment historians are guilty of ignoring the record of widespread miscegenation fostered by white men and its implications. Mainstream scholars have refused to offer any meaningful expositions of the "breeding farm" industry, for example. On the other hand, post-Civil War terrorism and violence by the defeated rebels has been glorified. "The Birth of a Nation" movie was an interpretation that has never been answered by academicians with a true and thorough story of the terrorism, the murder and the mayhem which returned the blacks of the South to a state of semi-slavery. I am talking about what a Truth and Reconciliation Commission could have accomplished. Instead of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission, we had John Wilkes Booth. We had Booth assassinating Lincoln. We had Andrew Johnson, who took over at that point, the last thing he wanted was truth, and as a result we had a downward slide back into the era when terror, murder and mayhem for the blacks in the South returned, and it took us another 100, or more than 100 years to get back to restoring the civil rights of the African-American population, certainly of the South.

If we had some truth, if we had some honest historians to shed some light along the way on some of these things, we might have made different kinds of public policy decisions and, of course, the reason I am here today is because there is a definite connection. Our present race problems, our present serious race problems as far as African Americans are concerned are rooted in 232 years of slavery. There are still people who make speeches about African Americans being inferior, African

Americans are prone to criminal activities, African Americans are generally not as well off as other people. Even immigrants who came to this country much later than the African Americans have accumulated more wealth. There are answers to all of these assertions, to all of these misstatements of fact. There are answers, but unless you have a concerted, systematic pursuit of truth, you are never going to be able to establish the answers which will allow us to have meaningful public policymaking.

In summary, the recent kingpin discovery which confirms the common-law marriage relationship between Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings has generated new demands for more historical truth to support current reconciliation between whites and African Americans. I am saying that the recent kingpin discovery which confirms the common-law marriage relationship between Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings has generated new demands for more historical truth to support current reconciliation between whites and African Americans.

□ 1800

Madam Speaker, I believe that the truth can support reconciliation. I do not think the truth has to be a generator of more hostility and ill will.

Since there was no Truth In Reconciliation Commission established following the Civil War, it would be wise to currently create a substitute project. That has come as close as we can to a Truth In Reconciliation Commission. We did not have the advantage of the South African Nation has when it tried to get rid of a large part of the baggage and the garbage related to racial oppression, the victimization, the response to the victimization, the people seeking revenge. All kinds of poison existed that the South African government is trying to get rid of by establishing a Truth In Reconciliation Commission. We had no such commission following the Civil War.

Instead of a comprehensive approach similar to the Truth In Reconciliation Commission and instead of a comprehensive approach, which was attempted by the President's Commission on Race, it is recommended that smaller components of the overall problem of U.S. race relations be explored separately. I recommend that we have this kind of Nobel Prize guided winner, guided truth-seeking group who would write an objective history for us of slavery. I would recommend that it be explored in segments. An objective rewrite of the history of slavery in America constitutes a productive beginning. They may want to go back and write the history of slavery for all times. They may want to write the history of the exploitation and the destruction of the Indian Nations, the Native Americans, on this continent. They may want to get segments in order to help tell the whole story. But certainly the history of slavery in

America would constitute a productive beginning, an objective history of what it was all about. You know, what does it mean to keep people for 232 years in bondage, what was the cruelty, and the abuse of children and the attempt to obliterate the humanity of human beings? What were the consequences of that?

And as I said earlier, a consortium of foundations could finance such a sweeping study, and Nobel Prize winning scholars throughout the world could be recruited to supervise such a study and to guarantee the objectivity of such a study. In that demonstration of extraordinary and original insight into the dynamics of civilization development and nation building the recently formed government of South Africa, the government of Nelson Mandela, has pointed the way out of contradictions, the way out of conflicts and enmities which heretofore had seemed to be inevitable. To avoid the endless sufferings and social retardations inflicted by lies, guilt and pre-occupations with revenge, nations must labor vigorously. The process of striving must be supported systematically and with adequate resources by governments. Since America has not yet matched the South Africans in their recognition of the power of this approach, let us imagine the ghost of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings holding hands as they hover over us. We must strive harder to acquire insights from the emotion laden and sociologically complex legend of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings.

Madam Speaker, let me close by saying that I applaud and congratulate the University of Virginia and the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation for a conference which they held on the weekend of March 5 which brought together 20 scholars from all over the Nation to explore the meaning of the relationship of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings for American history, and they intend to publish an entire series of writings on this subject. The University of Virginia and the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation are moving in the right direction to take an objective fact of history and use that fact of history for a very positive purpose. If it helps America to seek reconciliation among the races, then it will have made a great contribution.

Madam Speaker, before we can have reconciliation, we need to have truth, and the truth of the relationship between Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings is a magnificent truth that should be thoroughly examined.

The article referred to follows:

KINGPINS FOR TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION:  
THOMAS AND SALLY

DNA EVIDENCE CONFIRMING JEFFERSON'S RELATIONSHIP WITH SALLY HEMINGS COULD OPEN THE DOOR FOR A MORE PROFOUND DIALOGUE ON SLAVERY AND RACE RELATIONS

Only a few months after the release of the report of the Advisory Board of the President's Initiative on Race entitled One America In The 21st Century: Forging A New Fu-

ture, a scientific report has confirmed the likelihood that President Thomas Jefferson was the father of the children of his slave and long-time companion, Sally Hemings. These two events can be constructively related.

The new discussions of the life, philosophy and politics of Thomas Jefferson might do more to facilitate an honest assessment of black-white relations in America than this fact laden official report. Or reviewed together these two developments could greatly enhance our understanding of an extremely complex phenomenon. The weakness of the report of the President's Advisory Board is that it is thorough about the obvious, but it lacks the vital ingredient of profundity. The report is competent, respectful, universal in its coverage, balanced and not at all an embarrassment to the White House; however, when the depth of the deliberations is measured against the complexity of the mission and the intensity of the challenge, the appropriate grade for this noble but feeble effort would be a B- or a C+.

Our national dialogue would be greatly benefitted by the establishment of several adequately funded Commissions on group relations. Native Americans certainly deserve their own separate historical documentation and analysis. African Americans require no less than an objective statement of history, a thorough and comprehensive study, as the basis for unravelling the many complexities of our present interaction with mainstream society. Contrary to the beliefs of many African Americans as well as others, current policy making would be greatly enhanced by a world class study of American slavery and the thwarted reconstruction effort. Such a study would be useful if it is done in the spirit of "truth and reconciliation". The noble embryo that the President's initiative has planted should be allowed to sprout and grow. Using the bully pulpit of the White House the President should call on private Foundations to finance such a world class project, and he should recommend that the world's top scholars and thinkers, including Nobel Prize winners, be recruited to provide research and editorial guidance.

One of the first items that should be placed on the research and analysis agenda is the controversial question of the relationship between Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings. It would be a human interest case study offering great illuminations for American history. It could also be an educational landmark love story that captures the attention of a mass audience and forces them to confront the institution of slavery in all of its dimensions. The scientific validation of Jefferson's paternity with respect to the Hemings children is a historical blockbuster. DNA evidence has exposed the fact that respected academicians and historians have promulgated or tolerated a dangerous and suffocating denial of certain self-evident truths about American history.

This same distortion process applies to too much of American history as it relates to slavery, the civil war and reconstruction. Unlike the very civilized behavior of the new rulers of South Africa, the United States has never had a Truth And Reconciliation Commission. As part of a larger effort the story of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings could provide a potent spark to generate a bonfire of new revelations which will increase the possibility of long-term improved black-white reconciliation.

The story of Thomas and Sally may be summarized as follows: While Jefferson was serving as the American Ambassador in Paris, Sally Hemings arrived as the maid for his youngest daughter who sailed from Virginia to join her father. Jefferson seduced her and the pregnant Sally returned to

America only after she promised that all of her children would be set free. Under French law she could have remained as a free person in France. During the first year of his presidency a journalist exposed the fact that Jefferson had a slave mistress who was the mother of his children. The third President of the U.S. refused to answer this charge. He also never removed Sally Hemings from Monticello. They were together for 38 years at Monticello until Jefferson died. Three of their children were allowed to "run" and two were set free in Jefferson's will.

With the DNA test confirming Jefferson paternity, the journey, so completely and eloquently begun by Fawn M. Brodie with her best selling Thomas Jefferson: An Intimate History, has now reached its peak. Despite vicious criticisms from the establishment historians still promulgating the Confederate view of American history, Brodie's scholarship propelled the search for truth forward. While the relationship between Jefferson and Hemings was not her primary preoccupation, she provided this story with a rightful proportion of the space, and she integrated it with the rest of her narrative. Brodie's thorough account of Jefferson as a failing business man on the brink of bankruptcy alongside the documentation of the continuous presence of Sally Hemings may both raise and answer an obvious question: Why didn't Jefferson marry a wealthy widow or daughter and end his financial woes?

With an eye more focused, and operating from a court room point-of-view, Annette Gordon-Bennett updates the work of Brodie, and with her remarkable presentation of the evidence, has stimulated the more recent debates which have helped to produce the DNA testing. Now all sides must respond to the scientific evidence. In her book, Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings: An American Controversy, Gordon-Bennett goes on to indict the establishment historians for their gross neglect of vital records.

Barbara Chase Riboud in the novel, *Sally Hemings*, offers a uniquely constructed and very ambitious fictional attempt to interpret the relationship between Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings. Her point-of-view repeatedly emerges crystal clear throughout the novel. Although her writing is often laborious and strained, she sometimes reaches dramatic heights in her depictions of the emotions of her imagined victims of Jefferson's patriarchal and slave owning powers. Chase-Riboud is able to occupy the bodies and souls of Sally and her children, from within them she confronts what she imagines to be the cold blue insensitive eyes of the master of Monticello.

For this novelist Jefferson is a white, Southern aristocrat trapped within the personality parameters of his class and his time. He is also a male chauvinist pig who raped and ruined a young slave girl who is left with no alternative except to "love him to death." Chase-Riboud forces Sally to become a drug to afflict the addict Jefferson til death parts them. The merits of Jefferson's public achievements and historic accomplishments can never offset his intimate behavior flaws in the opinion of this female storyteller of African descent. Each day since the new DNA discovery I read or hear such intense condemnations of Jefferson although they are usually more blunt and crude, and lack the redeeming eloquence of Ms. Chase-Riboud.

This male writer of African descent is compelled to register intense disagreement with Chase-Riboud and any interpretation of the Thomas and Sally relationship that discounts or trivializes Jefferson as an idealist, a visionary, an intellectual, a pragmatic statesman and a crafty Machiavellian politician. The fact that such a giant chose to

keep Sally Hemings at his side for thirty eight years opens the door to a myriad of magnificent questions: Does the length of the relationship, despite the inconvenience caused by public exposure and scandal, clearly show that it was not a lust, but a love relationship? If he did not "love" Sally, then why didn't he just keep her as a concubine while he married a woman of wealth to solve his ever present financial problems? Would a confirmation of his deep love for Sally not clarify a number of other riddles and contradictions related to this "Sphinx"?

The same youthful Jefferson who wrote the Declaration of Independence, with an original draft that condemned slavery, also set forth a racist platform in Notes On The State of Virginia. As a young Congressman he led the fight to stop the spread of slavery into the new states. He stated that slaves had a limited capacity for learning, nevertheless, he urged at one time that slaves should be educated and then set free. In the oppressive social and political environment of Virginia why didn't Jefferson just settle down comfortably as a pure acknowledged racist? In his philosophical restlessness and his discontent with his own public positions one can find the well springs of his greatness. The politician in his pronouncements surrendered to his peers while privately he subscribed to greater truths. His love for Sally was probably a constant internal irritant. This lifelong reverence for his chamber maid is also a legitimate and vital clue to what he personally believed with respect to the equality of the races.

In the Virginia environment where slavery escalated downward into an ever more savage and criminal institution, did Jefferson's attachment to Sally and her children keep the embers of his anti-slavery sentiments burning? If there was some way that we could miraculously recover the missing letters of Jefferson would we find corrections of his most racist utterings? Would we find apologies to Sally Hemings? Would we find expressions of his great love for Sally in his own insightful words?

It is probable that the recent DNA clarification will generate more than new scholarly debates among academicians. More fictional interpretations in poetry, novels, and drama are inevitable in the quest to fill in the gaps of a tale that is about both love and power. The long term fascination of this writer with Jefferson and Hemings has inspired a play which is presently being considered for production and publication. All quotes utilized below in this exposition are taken from the manuscript of the play, Thomas and Sally.

In Act I, Scene 9 of Thomas and Sally, Jefferson recalls his initial seduction of Sally following his wrenching breakup with Maria Cosway in Paris:

Jefferson: Your mind is as splendid as your beautiful face, Sally. Soon, you may become my French teacher. But not today. In my present condition your energy would be too much for me.

Sally: I am so sorry that you have no time to talk to me. When we sit and chat, for a tiny while, you make me feel that it is Christmas morning.

Jefferson: How interesting. You think of Christmas when you talk to me. But always when I see you it is the image of Easter that rises in my mind. Always you remind me of Spring with seeds bursting and flowers blooming. I have been leaving early and I have missed you. Tomorrow we will practice French together again. But not now. Today I am like a dog exhausted after chasing a bone that finally had no meat on it. For some women the ultimate excitement is to lead a man through a maze, forever pulling him at a faster pace until . . . Set the tea down

here, Sally, and leave me. I want to be alone. . . .

Sally: Yes, Marse Tom, I will go. But you look sick, sir. (Begins to walk slowly toward the door while Jefferson lowers his head into his hands again.)

Jefferson: Wait, Sally! (He suddenly raises his head and calls after her.) Come and sit for a minute. (Motions toward a chair near him.) Just for a minute. It is so cold in here.

Sally: (Pushing into the chair.) Yes, Marse Tom, I will sit with you.

Jefferson: It is cold and your eyes are like two suns. Always they seem so bright and full of heat.

Sally: No, Marse Tom, your eyes are bright. I see the sun coming out of your eyes.

Jefferson: What you see in me is the reflection of your own eyes.

Sally: Slaves are not supposed to look into the eyes of masters, but you always make me look into your eyes, Marse Tom. I try hard to turn away, but you make it so hard for me not to look into your eyes. Please excuse me, sir. . . .

Jefferson: I did not mention Maria Cosway. Aha! You have been spying on me, Sally. You are a naughty child.

Sally: Please, Marse Tom, do not call me a child. And I am sorry that I called the name of the English woman. I do not spy on you. But I do watch you. I watch everywhere you go, whatever you do. I listen to everything you say.

Jefferson: I am not angry, Sally. I called you a spy in jest. I have seen you watching me. And you have my permission to call the name of the English woman. We have seen the last of Maria Cosway. I will never follow her through that mysterious maze again.

Sally: Maze? Is that the same as the labyrinth thing, Marse Tom?

Jefferson: A maze, a labyrinth, a wolf-trap, a deadly bear hug, a snare, quicksand in a swamp. She was all of these crushed into one.

Sally: She fiddled with your heart. She led you around the mulberry bush. Maria Cosway was a mean woman, Marse Tom. Marse Tom! Your face is turning red like fire! . . .

Jefferson: (Raising his head abruptly.) Please, Sally, lay your hands on my head again. Massage the back of my neck. Your hands are so warm.

Sally: Yes, Marse Tom, I will rub your head; I will rub your neck. Come back to life, Marse Tom. Do not leave me!

Jefferson: (Abruptly standing and pushing Sally down until he towers over her and gazes down at her with a look of astonishment.) Two suns are set in your eyes. And those same eyes are filled with Virginia. There is no limit to what your eyes can hold. I see the world when it first came. I see the world going on forever. It is all there without embellishment, without ornaments. It's all there shining in your eyes. It shines even through your tears. (Bends down to kiss her head. She responds by throwing her arms around his long legs.). . . .

At the end of a failed attempt to separate him from Sally by banning her from the Monticello mansion the two lovers are united:

Scene thirteen: Sally joins Jefferson in the bedroom. Jefferson is first alone. He has placed a light in a small window above his bed.

Jefferson: Come, sweet Sally, and bring me peace. The force of my feeling gives me direction. Let it be disease, affliction, addiction; you are a habit I will pursue. No surgeon can cut me free of you. If I am blind then I never want to see. If this is rape then I declare that all husbands, with their wedding night madness, are similarly guilty. Thomas and Sally are one. In what language

does God require the marriage license? Is he satisfied to see the vows written on men's hearts; or do only wedding gowns and hypocritical ceremonies move him? Am I condemned because of my oath of monogamy is unregistered? Is it some base perversion that leads me to discern that nothing is more devious than fidelity?

(Sally emerges from the floor climbing up from the stairs at the foot of Jefferson's bed. She is draped in a black cloak on the upper part of her body but below the knees a white night gown can be seen.)

Jefferson: (Throwing open his arms as he moves toward her.) Ma Cherie! My magnificent flower!

Sally: (Leaping into his arms.) Like a baby rabbit racing for its mother I came running. Please excuse me but my legs leaped forward all on their own. I could not hold back one minute more. I have waited so long for the lamp in the window to light my way back to you.

Jefferson: Please forgive me. You have been humiliated for the last time. I beg you! Forgive me! (Falls to his knees and throws his arms around her legs.)

Sally: Mon Cher, please don't greet me on your knees. Don't drown my mind in fancy pleas. Just squeeze me close. (He rises and envelopes her in his arms.) Speak to me with the strength in your hands and arms. I have been a lost orphan without your love to surround me.

Jefferson: My Sweet Angel, look at Monticello. (Begins to speak French.) C'est un château très incomplete. Mais un jour, je le finirai totalement. Monticello est ton château, Sally. You will never be driven from your castle again. I swear it to you sweet Sally. You demand nothing but this is my gift to you. No one, not even Martha, shall ever take Monticello away from you again. I swear it!

Sally: Please do not swear again. I do not need another oath. Make no promises except one.

Promise you will love me like the green grass grows. The grass is forever.

Jefferson: I will love you forever, Sally. We are one. Now, tell me that you forgive me. Promise that you will love me forever.

Sally: Oh my sweet Cher, how can I answer you? I can't match your basket of fancy words. Just look into my eyes and read all of your answers. You see my pain. You alone know how much I hurt. I can see the understanding in your eyes. The heavy beating of your heart is sending me a message. As much as I have missed you, you have missed me. You still Love me. The election, your daughters, the planters, the guests; nothing has been enough to block your path back to me. The message is so simple, Mon Cher. You still love me. And I promise to love you forever.

Jefferson: The world is as it is. Let the violent variables swirl around us in chaos. You, sweet Angel, shall be my constant. Everlasting you are mine!

Sally: You have recited enough of your sweet speeches tonight. Take me to our bed. Your cold sheets are waiting to be warmed. (Sally takes off her black cloak and stands in her white nightgown before Jefferson carries her to the bed.)

In Act I, Scene 25, Jefferson is forced to justify his love for Sally to his jealous daughter, Martha:

Martha: I did not like her. Perhaps I was jealous of every female in your life. But Maria Cosway was an elegant lady. Sally was nothing. You remade Sally. Why did you select Sally?

Jefferson: An architect can read his own blueprint easily; but it is not always possible for a man to decipher his soul.

Martha: You told her the right books to read in your library. You coached her until

she learned to speak French better than me. You let her reign supreme over all the servants. Sally was nothing but mud. But you diligently molded her into your favorite statue.

Jefferson: To some degree maybe I did mold her. But God alone could teach her to burst into a room like a morning glory; to bloom as the reddest rose commanding every eye; to stand as the sunflower in every crowd; to always be the lily who lights up a dark pond of tears. Sally is what nature and God and I have made together. And so is Patsy. You are separate and distinct but blessed be the priceless two of you. Sally extracts nothing from Patsy.

Martha: Why love, Father? Why not just let it be lust? The South is littered with mulattos but white men don't treat their mothers like wives.

Jefferson: Tonight, Patsy, I beg you to be my daughter. I have only two of you. I have hundreds of inquisitors. Do not insult me. Do not degrade me with conventional accusations. If you have ears, then hear me. I need more than pleasure! Watching loved ones die maims the spirit, cripples the soul; even the strongest among us are never fully rehabilitated. There is but one antidote to such despair and most men never find her. Life and joy are for the living (pauses) but we disabled souls require magnificent assistance. Sally is my magnificent assistance. Inspiration is that which completes a man; supplies drive and ambition; stimulates vision; absorbs despair. She who inspires is sacred. Sally is sacred.

The fact that an aging Jefferson could not separate himself from Sally raises questions less about sexual addiction and more about the magic and magnetism of Sally Hemings. She obviously had more than her beautiful body to offer. Why are all records of Sally so thoroughly and meticulously missing? In his seventies and eighties why did Jefferson still find her company indispensable? Since her continued existence posed an obvious embarrassing threat to Jefferson's heirs, how did Sally manage to outwit them and survive? And is it not obvious that both the father and the mother had to be involved in the arrangements made for the big city survival of their children who were allowed to "run"? For a lifetime Thomas and Sally did more than merely sleep together. But what was it that made Sally "sacred" in the eyes of Jefferson?

All traces of Sally Hemings have been scrubbed from Jefferson's writings and from history. Fiction writers thus have great latitude in the challenge to recreate this central character. She may be glimpsed through her own speeches:

In Act I, Scene 16, on the day she learns of the public charges that she is the President's mistress and the mother of his children:

Sally: Marse Tom don't want to know what's happening here. Marse Tom won't look down at the dirt. Marse Tom rather gaze up at the skies. He always goes in person to buy slaves. But you won't see him around when slaves are sold. But Marse Tom is many men all squeezed into one. He is the owl and the eagle, the fox and the sheep, rose and thorn, still pond and flooding river. God was straining hard the day he made Marse Tom . . . The closer you watch Marse Tom, the less you understand him. I have seen him wave his hand at heaven and thumb his nose at the angels. But some days he takes oaths and swears under the watchful eyes of God. So much about him stays in the dark. But why must we figure out the puzzle? Why do you ask so many questions Millie? I just know in my bones that Marse Tom is the grandest man that walks on this earth. . .

Preacher Zeke: They say Marse Tom could be pushed out of office. They say nobody will

vote for him a second time. This is bad, Miss Sally. Look right there in the paper. They called you a concubine!

Sally: Our love is right, Preacher. Your God, our Jesus smiles down on Thomas and Sally. The newspapers are all wrong and our love is right. He will not bend, Preacher. Marse Tom will stand and fight.

Preacher Zeke: Chief Justice Marshall, Patrick Henry, John Adams! They have all come out against Marse Tom.

Sally: You hear a hundred dirty puppies howling at the heels of a mountain lion. My Master will never bow to them. You watch, Preacher Zeke. Watch and see him strike with quiet lightning. He will leave the puppies scattered across the woods. He will stand in this storm. Pray to make him strong. The God who gave me my love will not tease me and then take him away. The Almighty who made me a slave would not torture me twice. Pray the right prayer, Preacher. Make him like David against Goliath; like Daniel in the lion's den; let him be Samson. Give him the jawbone of an ass and let him beat the Philistines down. For our love he will go up to the gates of heaven and wrestle St. Peter himself. Pray, Preacher, pray!

Millie: Preacher Zeke, do they put concupines in jail?

Sally: Concubine, Millie? Not concupine! The word is concubine! Any woman that is used but not loved is a concubine. Many waives are concubines. I am not a concubine . . .

In Act I, Scene 24, Sally confronts Jefferson's daughter:

Martha: You are both reckless! Love has nothing to do with it. My Father is first of all a man and men are prone to allow their lust to place everything else in jeopardy.

Sally: Be careful what you label lust. Lust is an easy pig to feed. Men can drop their pants anywhere. My love gives life to him. He says that he can sometimes only heal his headaches by placing his head in my hands. He calls me his magic and his medicine. . .

Martha: Yes, I hear you as a woman, tonight. But all these years I have worked so hard to make you a thing. I could not admit my Father had succumbed to a mere woman. You had to be a soft, fuzzy, lustful creature that he took to bed to keep himself warm; a witch to cure his manly madness; a slop jar for his boiling male juices; a submissive sheep; a ravishing werewolf; I made you anything in my mind but a woman. You could not be human.

Sally: Not human, Martha? But we played together as girls. We have lived for twenty-three years within each other shadows. I am your mother's slave sister, her half sister. The father of your mother was my father. You are my niece, Martha.

Martha: Stop it! Don't remind me of the disgusting lust of my maternal grandfather. Let me forget how our lives are intermingled, miscegenated and tied together like insane serpents.

Sally: Consider the serpents, Martha. In the Spring when certain snakes mate, they wrap themselves around each other with passion. And neither snake supplies the poison to ruin their great hug. You come to the love feast with fangs, Martha! You bring the poison!

Martha: Stop judging me! We are not as the gates of heaven—and you are not St. Peter. You are not an angel merely because you are a slave. Other women suffer too!

Sally: Yes, Martha, admit it. We are both women. But after tonight we will never suffer together again. Thomas Jefferson is your Father. I give him all to you. To take him from me, day and night you tear at him with sharp hooks in his mind. Every axe and dagger you use. Sometimes you dump a heavy

load of reminders about your mother. Sometimes you paint me as a demon. I am unlawful, illegal, sinful, the Jezebel dragging him down to hell. But your spray of poison has not put out my Master's passion. Our love is like an iron rock against all of your heavy hammers. I win the battles but you keep fighting the war. You can not take him from me. No woman can take him from me—no daughter, no Washington ladies with all of their lace and lovely speeches. No ghost of a wife long gone. You have all failed. You can not take him, He is mine! And since he is all mine I have the power to give him to you. (Begins to cry.) For his sake I give him to you. Take your Father and let me go!

Martha: Sally, Father will be here soon. Perhaps you should rest. You should not meet him with tears.

Sally: Take him! To get at me you are driving him mad. You will split his soul right down the middle. Preacher Zeke tells the story of two women before King Solomon both claiming a baby. Like the real mother standing before Solomon my love is bigger than yours. Your Father has been split in half too long. Take him! He should not have to wake up each day and choose between me and you. I am my own butcher. I choose to cut him free. I want him made whole again. The country still needs him undivided. I stand on one side and all the world weighs down against me. So heavy a sin will surely drag me to the bottom of hell. . . .

In Act I, Scene 26, declaring that she will leave Monticello, Sally confronts Jefferson:

Jefferson: Liberty and freedom are necessary to guarantee the opportunity to love. Around your waist in a pouch are the papers that validate freedom for you and each child. You are not my slave, Sally, You don't have to stay if you do not love me.

Sally: In the dark you whisper over and over again that you love me; at night I am your adored wife. But in the morning I am again just a slave. At night I am everything. In the morning I am nothing. Monticello you declared to be my castle but when company comes I am the pussy cat who must crawl into a corner or go hide in the bushes.

Jefferson: You stab with a long rusty knife!

Sally: Hear me til the sound of my voice makes you want to puke. And then maybe you will never ever want to hear my voice again.

Jefferson: You speak from great pain, Sally. I honor your suffering.

Sally: To be a slave, night black or mulatto, is to live always in pain. The days creep by so slowly for a slave—and there is nothing to look forward to but more misery tomorrow. If we slaves were wise we would punish all slave owners by killing ourselves and destroying their property. If slaves had a democratic government we would all go to the polls and cast our ballots for a holiday of destruction; a grand day of death. . . .

Jefferson: Forgive me, Sally. I have written in riddles and traveled in evasive circles for too long. I swear I will someday set these matters straight.

Sally: If you are truly my champion—and since you are the powerful President of the United States, I most reverently appeal to you to publicly whip the man who wrote these words that I have copied from his book: (She reads from a piece of paper.) "Among the blacks is misery enough, God knows, but no poetry; in imagination they are dull, tasteless, and anomalous on. They secrete less by the kidneys, and more by the glands of the skins, which give them a very strong and disagreeable odor". . . .

Sally: And you will promise never to be mad at me for doing what it was right to do. (Pause) I have a gift for you, Mon Cher, a gift I bought in a Paris flea market. I bought

this from an old African who was selling carvings. He had a big head and a face that could only have been chiseled by a very strong angel. He was tall with big hands and long bony fingers. (Pulls the cloth covering from a small black stone carving.) See, it is a tiny family of a man, his wife and two children—the way families must have been before the slave catchers came. Take it! It was dreamed up by an inferior "dull, tasteless" black mind, and carved with inferior black physical fingers. Take it and always remember that the Sally you once adored was first of all a slave. I am Black Sally!

Jefferson: Thank you Sally. But please do not remind me that the trial is over.

Sally: I sentence you to one day write that any being able to bear the daily burdens of slavery and still be able to laugh and to love is surely superior to all other human beings.

Jefferson: I swear that I shall truthfully instruct posterity and work to shield them from the errors committed by my generation.

Sally: Say no more. (Holds a finger up to her lip.)

Jefferson: As you wish, my divine inquisitor. The nobility of Adam is best reflected by the fact that he made no attempt to argue with his God. Adam quietly acknowledged his guilt and he left the Garden of Eden. . . .

In Act I, Scene 27, Sally reverses her decision to run away from Monticello:

Sally: I could take my children and live anywhere. I could mop floors as a maid, or melt away in sweat cooking in some lady's kitchen; or I would do well as a seamstress. I could put plenty of food on my table for my children. Black Sally could survive. But there would be no thread tough enough, no needle big enough to sew up the aching hole in my heart.

Martha: I promise you peace Sally. I shall never again harass or insult you. In no way will I ever block or handicap you in your pursuit of happiness at Monticello.

Sally: The slave in me is beaten down and bitter, but I can never be happy unless I stay hostage to my heart. Against the hurricane of the heart the head is like a crippled fly. This morning when I got out of bed I knew in my bones that I had lost the battle. No woman can love him, be loved by him, and them pick up and run away from Thomas Jefferson. It would take an angel or some other being able to work miracles to carry out such a deed. I'm only a woman. I love him. I can't abandon him. (She takes up a pen and begins scribbling a note.)

Martha: In the end we must always remember that we are only women; incomplete and not fully made without our men.

Sally: We are women, and men are not fully finished until we make them so.

In Act II, Scene 3, Sally comforts an old, sick and dying Jefferson:

Jefferson: My dearest Magic Woman, now you are so kind as to assign me another son when I have refused to claim the sons you gave me.

Sally: I didn't come to talk about that. Your morning is cloudy enough already. Accept Edward Coles as a son from you soul and celebrate.

Jefferson: Why accept a son who publicly chides me and privately mocks me with flattery.

Sally: Sons do sometimes rebel and challenge their fathers.

Jefferson: And sometimes children hate their fathers. I have given ample cause to your Thomas and Harriet and Beverly and Eston and Madison. Toward my own flesh I have behaved abominably!

Sally: (Screaming) Stop it! The world is as it is. In a great burst of love you gave my children life. And later you gave them their freedom. I asked for nothing else. You must

not torture yourself! If my children have suffered it is because they were abandoned by their mother who wouldn't carry them all at once to freedom because she couldn't bear to leave her lover.

Jefferson: My loud and powerful queen, I beg you not to scream at this old man. My conscience is crammed with sins that break out like blisters. Brains overloaded with living and learning become grotesque. That I sometimes become unhinged should not surprise you. Wrinkled hearts and musty minds are not good company. Wise women do not waste their love on old men.

Sally: (almost whispering) Then I never want to be a wise woman. Let me die a fool! Loving an old man is like loving a baby. It is the best used time of your life. No need to have a reason. The love just swells up all inside you and then runs over in a flood. (She kneels beside his chair and begins to caress and kiss him). . . .

As much as he was the author of the Declaration of Independence, the third President of the United States and the purchaser of the Louisiana Territory, Thomas Jefferson was also the concerned father of several children of African descent. With unfortunate limitations and restraints the evidence is that Jefferson loved his common-law wife and children. He was not a brilliant, cold blooded beast. The hypocrisy he felt compelled to perpetrate certainly created a personal life wracked with intense conflicts.

Jefferson's public statements on race and slavery often stand in opposition to his private passion and compassion; however, when his intimate relationship with Sally is affixed to selected public actions, it is clear that he consciously made a vital contribution to the abolition of slavery. There are many who contend that without Jefferson there could never have been an emancipating Abraham Lincoln. Congressman Jefferson attempted to halt the expansion of slavery into new states and failed by one vote in the House of Representatives. As President he narrowly won a victory for a law that finally ended the legal importation of slaves. It is also important to note that Jefferson's advocacy for the rights of the common white man had to take roots before Lincoln could fight the war that freed the slaves.

Jefferson was quoted by the slave mongers as well as the Abolitionists as they made their cases. Until today he is still cited by racists as well as progressives. The new DNA clarification of his paternity of Sally Hemings' children may finally end this ideological tug of war. In a superficial response the racists may jettison the man who treated the slave mother of his children as if she was his wife.

A more profound response from progressives in general, and African Americans specifically, would be a new celebration of Jefferson as the pre-requisite to Lincoln. It is a historical fact that one of Jefferson's protégés, Edward Coles, took his slaves from Virginia to Illinois where he gave them their freedom and acres of land. Coles later became Governor of Illinois; defeated a referendum seeking to make Illinois a slave state; and was an active politician in Illinois at the time of Lincoln's election and the Civil War. More than mere words and ideas linked Lincoln to Jefferson.

Celebrations of the new Jefferson discoveries, and expressions of gratitude to the science of genetics which produced DNA testing are very much in order. What the historians and researchers of several generations refused to examine objectively has now been determined to be almost certainly true. The white male southern academicians who have dominated the interpretation of pre and post civil war history have now been thoroughly discredited. Their refusal to accept overwhelming evidence with respect to Jefferson,

of necessity, raises serious questions about the integrity of the rest of their scholarship.

Some obvious indictments of these proponents of the Confederate view of history are now in order: The establishment historians are guilty of ignoring the record of widespread miscegenation fostered by White men and its implications. Mainstream scholars have refused to offer any meaningful exposition of the "breeding farm" industry. On the other hand post civil war terrorism and violence by the defeated rebels has been glorified. "The Birth Of A Nation" interpretation has never been answered by academicians with a true and thorough story of the terrorism, murder and mayhem which returned the blacks of the South to a state of semi-slavery.

#### WHERE ARE THE DRUGS COMING FROM?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come again tonight to the floor of the House of Representatives as chair of the new Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources to talk about a situation that is confronting our Nation, Congress and has touched almost every household in America, and that is the situation dealing with illegal narcotics. The situation basically is out of control and affects our young people. Some 14,200 Americans died last year because of drug-related deaths. This is a problem that has been swept under the table by Congress, by this administration and not really addressed adequately in my opinion. As chair of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources responsible for developing at least the House side of our national policy, I intend to continue my efforts to bring this situation to the attention of the American people and to my colleagues here.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is so bad relating to narcotics, particularly among our young people, that the statistics are absolutely staggering and should shock every American, particularly in the area of hard drug use by our young people. The statistics since 1993, when this administration came into power, of drug use among our teens and our young people, the instance of use of heroin by our teenage population has soared 875 percent.

In the area that I come from, Central Florida, a relatively prosperous area, an area that has economic stability, growth, viability, no inner city problems, our area has been absolutely wracked and ravaged by deaths, particularly again among our young people, our teenage population and young adults by heroin deaths. In fact, in the Orlando Sentinel, a headline at the end of last year said that the drug overdose deaths in Central Florida exceed homicides.

One of my first duties and responsibilities as chair of this new subcommittee to deal with drug policy was to conduct a hearing in Central Florida

on the issue, and I was told by the father of one of the young people who died of a drug overdose, a heroin overdose, "Mr. Mica, those who have died from drug overdoses are in fact homicides." And that situation is repeating itself across our land.

Not only do we see increased use of heroin among our young people and in my area and other areas, we are now seeing more and more Mexican black tar, high purity heroin, coming across the border into Texas and other border States. Additionally, the amounts of methamphetamines coming into middle America, the western States and across this land are soaring dramatically. The episodes in our emergency rooms from overdoses across the land are increasing, not decreasing, and again we are seeing more and more of the drug abuse of these hard, high-purity drugs such as cocaine, heroin, methamphetamines among our young population.

Tonight I wanted to spend most of my time talking to my colleagues that are listening and the American people that are listening about where those drugs are coming from, and it is very easy for me to identify where those drugs are coming from.

If I may, if we could pay attention to this chart, it is very easy to see that the drugs are coming from South America, primarily Colombia where heroin and now cocaine from coca production have increased since this administration has stopped equipment or stopped in the last few years equipment reaching Colombia, helicopters, ammunition, eradication equipment reaching that country. Incredible fields of poppies are being grown in Colombia, and now we are told that Colombia is also the largest source of coca production in the world, exceeding even Peru and Bolivia, which both countries have managed to curtail some of their production. But it is coming through Colombia and then transiting through Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, today 60 to 70 percent of the hard drugs entering the United States of America enter through Mexico, and this chart shows the pattern of Mexican and Colombian based organized crimes, crime in the 1990's and currently. So, again we know exactly where these drugs are being produced, and we know who is producing them, and we know who is trafficking in those drugs.

Let me use, if I may, a quote that disturbed me as chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, and this is a quote from our chief DEA administrator. He said, and let me repeat it, in testimony: Recently in my lifetime I have never witnessed any group of criminals that has had such a terrible impact on so many individuals and communities in our Nation. Mr. Constantine said corruption among Mexican anti-drug authorities was unparalleled with anything I have seen in 39 years of police work.

This is our chief drug enforcement officer for the Nation, and these are his comments.

Now it would be bad enough to hear that from our DEA chief enforcement officer, but all we have to do is as a Congress look at the statistics about what is happening with Mexico. We look to see how our partner, how our friend, how our ally is cooperating in the war on drugs in the effort to stop the trafficking and production of illegal narcotics.

Let me address two fronts. First of all, Mexico, which was a minor producer of heroin, has now become a major producer of heroin, so they are producing heroin and in larger quantities than they ever have and at a higher deadly purity rate than we have ever seen before. The second area that we would judge countries' cooperation with the United States in dealing with the drug problem would be the amount of drugs that are seized in that particular country, and that is how we base our certification of a country in cooperating and making them eligible for foreign assistance, international finance and international trade benefits.

What are the other measures? As I said, first of all, again production and then trafficking. In trafficking the statistics are absolutely startling. In 1998 the seizures for heroin fell in Mexico, the seizures for cocaine and coca products fell in Mexico. So the major hard drugs in Mexico actually in the area of seizures decreased in Mexico, so they were actually assisting us less in seizing hard drugs coming across the border.

Then if we look at the other dangerous deadly drug that we have talked about as methamphetamine, we find that not only the drug, but the ingredients and the precursors to produce and traffic in methamphetamine, another deadly hard drug today that is taking its toll on so many young Americans, is also up, production is up, incidents of finding this across our land are up.

Now I spoke very briefly about the process of certification of a country, and there is confusion among the Congress and lack of knowledge about the certification process. I was able in the 1980's, as chief of staff for Senator Hawkins, to work with Senator Hawkins, Members of the other body in Congress and this side, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and others who were here, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), and the Congress adopted a drug certification law. That is a simple law, and what it does again is it says that any country who deals in illegal narcotics shall be certified annually by the Department of State and the President of the United States as, and the terms in the law are very specific, as fully cooperating to do again two things. One, to stop the production; and two, to stop the trafficking.

Now that is the certification. The administration and the President must certify to Congress that these countries that are dealing in illegal narcotics are in fact cooperating with us,