

statement upon the occasion of the historic visit by Cardinal William Keeler, Archbishop of Baltimore, to the congregation on October 8, 2000. His words, at this time of upheaval in the Middle East, are an important call for rapprochement and reconciliation between the religions and peoples of the world.

What a job and what a blessing to welcome into our grateful midst His Eminence Cardinal William Keeler, Archbishop of Baltimore, accompanied by our long-time friend, Bishop Walter Sullivan of Richmond. Particularly significant is the Cardinal's gracious presence on the eve of Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, the holiest day on the Jewish calendar, when we view our historical experience through a veil of tears, and our vulnerability and loneliness are so poignantly evident.

The Cardinal's heartfelt acceptance to join us, at a time of mounting tension in the Middle East and his prayer for the peace of Jerusalem, are testimony to the great vision of the Roman Catholic Church which he so eminently represents, to offer God's essential gifts of healing and reconciliation to two world faith groups so intimately linked, yet so painfully separated for so long, too long. His friendly, thoughtful and reassuring words will long echo.

We recall with reverence the revolutionary strides made by the remarkable Pope John XXIII and the Second Vatican Council, along with the historic acts of the much beloved Pope John Paul II. New hope has been breathed among those holding Abraham to be their common father, respecting the Jewish covenant with the Divine while honoring its adherents whose suffering on its behalf extended for two millennia, culminating in the Shoah's immense tragedy. The Pope's recent visit to Jerusalem's Yad Vashem Holocaust Memorial and his profound message of compassion and consolation, along with the Holy Father's prayer at the Western Wall, the holiest Jewish shrine, are powerful symbols deeply appreciated and never to be forgotten, following upon the Vatican establishing diplomatic relations with the state of Israel in 1994.

Even as we pray for the well being of the aging and ailing Pope, loving and courageous witness to Poland's vineyard of the Jewish people turned into its graveyard during the Nazi onslaught, so do we appeal for fortifying and safeguarding his vast legacy of embrace with its boundless promise to finally transform the human family. Too much is at stake.

All religions have a golden opportunity to join forces for infusing a secular world and a materialistic environment, through moral persuasion, and never again through physical coercion, with an aspiring sacred call of the indivisible dignity of all God's children; affirming that indeed each one of us has been created in the Divine's own sacred image, which is the greatest human rights statement we share through the Hebrew Scriptures' eternal gift. Let us faithfully assert together that true freedom is born of spiritual responsibility.

TRIBUTE TO THE EXPERIMENT IN INTERNATIONAL LIVING PROGRAM

HON. EARL POMEROY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2000

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, last weekend more than 450 alumni of the Experiment in International Living, a global student exchange

program, gathered for their first-ever annual reunion in Brattleboro, VT. The reunion commemorated the Experiment's 68 year history of helping young Americans break down national and cultural barriers and forge relationships that have sustained them over years and across thousands of miles.

Founded in 1932, the Experiment in International Living is now a program of World Learning, a widely respected international educational services organization. Every year, Experiment students travel to countries in Africa, Asia, the Americas, Europe, and Oceania as part of a summer abroad program. Through this exchange, Experimenters are immersed in the daily culture of a single place and its people as they embark on journey of cultural and personal discovery.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally invested in the success of the Experiment in International Living in part the program made a personal investment in me over 25 years ago. In 1973, I traveled to Yugoslavia and spent ten weeks with a host family through the Experiment in International Living program. Even as a 19-year-old college student, I recognized the life-changing effect this experience would have. Today, as a member of the House International Relations Committee, I can trace my strong interest in the Balkans in particular and international affairs more generally to those wonderful ten weeks. It is my great hope that I, along with my colleagues in the House, can help make it possible for thousands more young Americans to join the Experiment and participate in the life-changing journey that it embodies.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate World Learning, the Experiment in International Living and its alumni for their remarkable success in forging international connections. As attendees of last weekend's reunion can attest, the Experiment in International Living teaches young people to understand the differences that sometimes divide us while recognizing the common bonds that make us all part of the human family.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN E. PORTER, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SPEECH OF

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 2000

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for arranging a special order to honor an outstanding colleague of mine, Congressman JOHN EDWARD PORTER, for his twenty years of service in the U.S. House of Representatives. It has been an honor and a privilege to serve alongside him for 14 of those years.

In my time working with JOHN, one thing became perfectly clear and that's his dedication to improving medical research. Serving as Chairman of the Labor-HHS Subcommittee on Appropriations he has been the greatest champion of this cause. JOHN knows the important role the NIH plays in saving lives and conquering diseases such as diabetes, cancer, AIDS and alzheimers, and has made it a

top priority to ensure the NIH has all the necessary resources to achieve these goals.

JOHN has also been one of the most fiscally responsible members of this House. In fact, when I was a new Member, there was a three-year period when JOHN offered budget plans to try and impose a sense of fiscal responsibility on Congress. I am pleased to say that as JOHN leaves us, the fiscal outlook of the federal government has never looked better.

Although it is often overshadowed by his dedication to medical research, JOHN has been an important leader of the "Green Republicans" in the House. He has been a staunch supporter of the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts, and has helped to enact important legislation to halt the unregulated export of waste and the destruction of tropical rainforests, as well as helped to set new standards for recycling and energy efficiency. He has also been an advocate for his district residents suffering from flood damage. For his leadership on these issues, John has received numerous awards from environmental organizations all over the world.

Speaking of world issues, I have had the opportunity to serve as a member of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, which JOHN co-founded and currently chairs. This is an important association of Congressmen that work together to monitor and end human rights violations around the world.

While it is true that JOHN has been a strong advocate for each of these causes, more importantly, he has been the people's champion in his service of the 10th District of Illinois. He has addressed countless infrastructure needs, most recently bringing Metra rail service from Chicago out to Lake County. He has been a great supporter of the Palwaukee and Waukegan Airports by securing FAA improvement grants to provide better service for his constituents. And he has obtained funding to clean up and restore Waukegan harbor and the Skokie Lagoons.

JOHN EDWARD PORTER has served this House with the utmost distinction and will be forever remembered for his work on behalf of biomedical research, environmental and human rights, and fiscal responsibility. He will be deeply missed by his constituents in Illinois, the Illinois delegation, and everyone who's known and worked with him over the last twenty-plus years. I wish him and his family the very best in the upcoming years.

RECOGNIZING JOSEPH EMERSON OF ROME, GEORGIA

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2000

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Joseph Emerson, who has recently been appointed Postmaster of Rome, Georgia.

Postmaster Emerson began his postal career in Rome, Georgia as a PTF carrier in 1961. He was promoted to Assistant Carrier Station Superintendent, and since his promotion he has served as a supervisor in mail processing and delivery, Superintendent of Postal Operations, and Officer-in-Charge assignments.

Mr. Emerson's dedication to excellence makes him a role model for his family and co-workers, and I am pleased to honor his impressive accomplishments and wish him well as he begins his service as United States Postmaster in Rome, Georgia.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIVE AMERICAN EQUAL RIGHTS ACT OF 2000

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2000

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the "Native American Equal Rights Act of 2000."

Most Americans believe that ours should be a color-blind society in which an individual's merit, not his or her race, is the determining factor in whether that individual climbs the ladder of success to achieve the American dream. Most Americans, therefore, oppose any racial preferences in our Nation's laws. Most Americans would be surprised, therefore, to learn that non-Indians may be lawfully discriminated against under what are known as "Indian preference laws."

The Federal Indian preference laws do three things. First, Federal law allows discrimination against all non-Indians with respect to employment at the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service. Second, Federal law allows discrimination against all non-Indians with regard to certain Federal contracts. Third and finally, Federal law provides an exception to the civil rights laws that allows discrimination against all non-Indians in employment at the two Federal agencies and with respect to contracts.

Mr. President/Mr. Speaker, African-Americans, Asian-Americans, and white Americans should have the same rights to compete for jobs at the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service that Indians do. Likewise, all Americans should have equal rights, regardless of race, to compete for Federal contracts. Finally, the civil rights laws should protect all Americans equally from the scourge of discrimination. That is why I believe that the Indian preference laws are wrong.

A recent decision by the Supreme Court of the United States has called the constitutionality of Indian preference laws into serious question. On February 23, 2000, the Supreme Court handed down its decision in *Rice v. Cayetano*. The case involved a challenge to a law of Hawaii that limits the right to vote for trustees of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs to persons who are defined under the law as either "Hawaiian" or "native Hawaiian" by ancestry. Harold Rice, who was the plaintiff in the case, is a citizen of Hawaii who nevertheless does not qualify, under the Hawaii law, as "Hawaiian" or "native Hawaiian." Mr. Rice sued Hawaii because he believed that this law deprives him of his constitutional right to vote because of his race.

The U.S. District Court for Hawaii rejected Mr. Rice's claim. In doing so, the District Court argued that the Congress and native Hawaiians have a guardian-ward relationship that is analogous to that which exists between the U.S. government and Indian tribes. Based on this analogy, the District Court determined that

the Hawaii is entitled to the same constitutional deference that the Supreme Court has shown towards the Congress when it enacts laws under its authority over Indian affairs.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit affirmed the District Court's decision. Mr. Rice asked the Supreme Court review his case. The Court agreed to do so.

By a vote of 7-2, the Supreme Court reversed the decision of the Court of Appeals and ruled in Mr. Rice's favor. In his opinion for the Court, Justice Kennedy rejected the lower courts' use of the analogy of the Hawaii law limiting voting rights to the Federal laws granting preferences to Indians.

Under the Federal Indian preference laws, individuals who have "one-fourth or more degree Indian blood and... [are] members of a Federally-recognized tribe" are given preferences with respect to hiring and promotions at the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the U.S. Department of the Interior, as well as with regard to employment and subcontracting under certain Federal contracts. The Supreme Court upheld the Indian preference laws in its 1974 decision in a case called *Morton v. Mancari*. Even though the Indian preference laws clearly have the effect of giving one race an advantage over others, the *Mancari* Court held that they are "political rather than racial in nature" because they are not "directed towards a 'racial' group consisting of 'Indians,' but rather only to members of 'federally recognized' tribes."

In his opinion for the Supreme Court in *Rice*, Justice Kennedy said that Hawaii had tried to take the *Mancari* precedent too far. "It does not follow from *Mancari*," Justice Kennedy wrote, "that Congress may authorize a State to establish a voting scheme that limits the electorate for its public officials to a class of tribal Indians, to the exclusion of all non-Indian citizens."

In a technical legal sense, in the *Rice* case the Supreme Court did not reconsider its ruling in the *Mancari* case that the Indian preference laws are constitutional. Instead, the Court avoided the issue by attempting to draw a distinction between the Indian preference law from the Hawaii voting rights law.

In a broader philosophical sense, though, the *Rice* decision seriously calls into question the constitutionality of the Indian preference laws. The racial preference for voters in Hawaii that the Court held to be unconstitutional clearly was politically and not racially motivated. The Court found, however, that a well-meaning political motivation behind a law that has the effect of favoring one race over another does not make it constitutional. Likewise, it is clear that what motivated the Congress to pass the Indian preference laws was not racism, but rather political favoritism. The effect of the Indian preference laws, though, is no less to favor one race over all others than was the case with the Hawaii voting rights law. Under *Rice*, this political motivation should not save the Indian preference law from being found to be unconstitutional for the same reason as was the Hawaii law.

In an insightful opinion article in *The Washington Times* on May 5, 2000, Thomas Jipping, Director of the Free Congress Foundation's Center for Law and Democracy, recognized the inconsistency between the Supreme Court's decisions with respect to the Indian preference laws and the Hawaii voting rights law. "Either it is legitimate to avoid the

Constitution," Mr. Jipping wrote, "by relabeling a racial preference [as a political one] or it is not." "Gimmicks such as relabeling or declaring the context in which a case arises as 'unique' [are] simply not sufficient to overcome a constitutional principle so fundamental and absolute." "Both the U.S. District Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals in this case believed that Hawaii's relationship with Hawaiians is similar to the United States[s] relationship with Indian tribes," Mr. Jipping noted. "They were right and the U.S. Constitution applies to both of them," he asserted. "Rather than preserve a precedent through verbal sleight-of-hand," Mr. Jipping concluded, "the Supreme Court should have said the fundamental constitutional principle that decided *Rice* also calls its precedent in *Mancari* into question."

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely clear to me that statutory provisions that grant special rights to Indians with respect to employment, contracting, or any other official interaction with an agency of the United States are racial preference laws. Racial preference laws are fundamentally incompatible with the equal protection of the laws that is provided to all Americans by the Constitution. The Constitution simply does not tolerate racial preferences of any kind, for any reason.

The Congress, no less than the Supreme Court, has a duty to uphold the Constitution of the United States. We should not wait for the Supreme Court to recognize the very serious constitutional mistake it made when it upheld the constitutionality of the Indian preference laws. Congress should repeal the Indian preference laws now.

The legislation that I am introducing today, the "Indian Racial Preferences Repeal Act of 2000," does just that. I ask unanimous consent for the full text of my bill, as well as a section-by-section analysis, to be printed in the RECORD immediately following the conclusion of my remarks.

IN HONOR OF THE CYPRIOT PARTICIPANTS IN THE WORLD MARCH OF WOMEN 2000

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 2000

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the 75 Cypriot women participating in this week's World March of Women 2000. The World March of Women is an annual event that occurs in my district that focuses on ending worldwide poverty and violence against women. Women from around the world participated in the march and a great number of them were from Cyprus, representing twenty-four Cypriot Women's Associations and Labor Syndicates. The march took place in front of the United Nations Building where the participants met with U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan. On October 17, 2000, the official International Day for the Eradication of Poverty, was a time to acknowledge the grave disparities in economic prosperity throughout the world as well as the disturbing issue of violence against women.

The Cypriot participants, hoping to bring attention to the twenty-six year conflict on their Mediterranean island, urged the U.N. and its