

rates, and increase women's educational opportunities and earnings. Hundreds of thousands of women in the developing world—many of whom are young adolescents—die from complications of pregnancy or inadequate reproductive health care. Few of these girls and young women have equal rights, much less the abstinence option viewed by some in this body as the solution to unwanted pregnancies. The Global Gag Rule will cost women's lives!

Let's remember that it has been against U.S. law to use USAID funds for abortion or to promote abortion since 1973. The Global Gag Rule is a means of denying to women in other, poorer countries services that are legal in the United States even when these services are paid for with private funds.

The Mexico City restrictions even go so far as to prohibit NGOs from using their own funds to lobby their own governments to change laws regarding abortion. The restrictions force foreign NGOs to choose between desperately needed family planning funding and their right to speak out on an important social issue.

Under the Global Gag Rule, an NGO that dared to protest a lack of post-abortion care and the jailing of women and girls who have had abortion would lose U.S. family planning funds. If this NGO were the only family planning provider in a remote rural area—there are seldom multiple providers—then access to these services would be eliminated.

I find it incredible that the United States would use its enormous influence and power to curb free speech in the developing world. This is contrary to everything our country stands for. If the Congress attempted to pass such a provision affecting nonprofit agencies in the United States, it would be struck down as un-Constitutional.

In her Washington Post column of September 29, 2000, Judy Mann quotes Katherine Bourne, director of public affairs for Pathfinder, and international reproductive health organization, about the dangers of the Global Gag Rule.

[The gag rule] allows these organizations to provide care when a woman is dying from a botched abortion, but "they are not parsing out the legislative language," Bourne says. "What they are hearing is: 'The U.S. doesn't like abortions. It endangers our funding. We'll stay away from it entirely.'" . . . "In Peru, we work with eight different NGOs," she says. "They tend to be [in remote areas] where there are no services. They are so nervous about it, they won't stock equipment to do post-abortion life-saving care. They refer women to the public-sector hospital. That can make the difference between a woman going to a local clinic that is a half-hour away or going to a public hospital that is an eight-hour walk away. If you are hemorrhaging from an abortion, you could die within hours."

All Americans want to see the number of abortions decline. The best and most proven method of reducing abortions is to provide family planning services. The Global Gag Rule will not reduce abortions, but it will reduce access to family planning and lifesaving reproductive health services to the detriment of the world's poorest women and children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HINCHEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

NOMINATION OF SENATOR ASHCROFT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Speaker's kindness. I rise to join my colleagues who have spoken of their concern about the recent executive order that eliminates the opportunity of international family planning. My fellow colleagues have been extremely eloquent, and I would for a moment just like to expand that opposition to that decision by the administration to carry forth my opposition to the nomination of former Senator John Ashcroft to the position of Attorney General of the United States of America.

I would hope that this representation and opposition clearly will not be characterized as personal. I testified in the Committee on the Judiciary on my position, and it is a passionate position on the importance of the fundamental rights, civil rights, the right to vote, freedom of choice, all the law of the land. I might suggest to my colleagues that I believe that this USA Today, People for the American Way advertisement, captures my concern. Should a man who misrepresents the facts under oath be our Attorney General? And the facts are there. Again, it is not to personally suggest that Mr. Ashcroft may not believe in what he has said, but his actions speak louder than words.

When asked repeatedly whether he would be able to support *Roe v. Wade*, he indicated it was the settled law of the land but yet consistently throughout his Senatorial career, gubernatorial career and his other career, this individual showed that he was not in support of the law of the land, the Constitution of the United States, which gives a woman the right to choose.

In a decision dealing with voluntary desegregation in St. Louis, it was noted that in the first representation of his testimony he said the State was not liable and was not involved and, in fact, the State was involved and it was attributed to his position that caused this delay in a resolution of this desegregation order where the parties at hand voluntarily decided to resolve this.

His position as Attorney General or governor caused it to continue to be at odds, because he fought against the voluntary agreement.

Do we believe in integration in this country? Do the laws provide us the opportunity for civil rights? Yes. And I believe the actions of this nominee do not speak well for him being able to enforce the law of the land.

Might I suggest that several other items come to mind and that, of

course, is one that many of us have heard over and over again, that is the nomination of Judge Ronnie White and the comments being made by Senator Ashcroft that he was pro-criminal or had a criminal bent when over 60 percent of the time Judge White agreed with the nominees of then-Governor Ashcroft in confirming the death penalty.

Might I read this insert by Congressman WILLIAM CLAY as he introduced Judge Ronnie White before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary upon which Senator Ashcroft said, I might cite one incident that attests to the kind of relationship that Judge White has with many and that is with a member of this committee Senator Ashcroft. When I recommended Judge White to the President for nomination and the President nominated him, one of the first people that I conferred with was Senator John Ashcroft. At a later date, he told me that he had appointed 6 of the 7 members to the Missouri Supreme Court. Ronnie White was the only one he had not appointed. He said, meaning Senator Ashcroft, he had canvassed the other six, the ones that he appointed. They all spoke very highly of Ronnie White and suggested that he would make an outstanding Federal judge. So I think that this is the kind of person we need on the Federal bench. These were the confirmation hearings on Federal appointments, hearings before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary 105th Congress.

Yet on the floor of the Senate, Senator Ashcroft vigorously opposed Judge Ronnie White, for what reason we do not know; and this nominee came out of the Committee on the Judiciary twice victoriously. One wonders whether or not in his explanation that the reason he opposed him was his record, when his record was clear, Judge White's record was clear. He was an independent justice who reviewed the facts and supported the facts and was well respected in his State.

Then we have the situation of Ambassador Hormel, who we have heard recently who has a different life-style, and because of a different life-style he opposed him.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for this unique opportunity to offer a few observations on the nomination of Mr. John Ashcroft for attorney general of the United States. As Martin Luther King once stated, "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." That is why I am here today to speak out not only as a member of Congress, but as a citizen of our diverse and vulnerable nation.

The Senate is moving closer to taking final action on Mr. Ashcroft's nomination. This causes me great anxiety that a growing number of Americans are demonstrating in every state of the Union.

Based on Mr. John Ashcroft's voting record of aggressive opposition to women's rights, civil rights, and the unfortunate handling of the nomination of Judge Ronnie White, the Senate Judiciary Committee and its colleagues should vote down his nomination for the sake of unifying America. The attorney general for the

United States should support laws that protect all of America's people. It is unfortunate that ratings by the Christian Coalition, the National Right to Life Committee, and the American Conservative Union show that throughout his six years in the United States Senate, John Ashcroft has been a consistent and reliable vote in opposing the certified law of the land.

Let me be absolutely clear. I am not questioning Mr. Ashcroft's personal probity; I am vigorously questioning his suitability for the job for which he has been selected.

Mr. Ashcroft's record on matters of race has been simply disappointing. According to the Washington Times, Ashcroft received a grade of 'F' on each of the last three NAACP report cards because of his anti-progressive voting record, having voted to approve only three of 15 legislative issues supported by the NAACP and other civil rights groups. This explains why such a broad number of groups are so strongly united against his confirmation as the next attorney general of the United States.

Mr. Ashcroft opposed the approval of Judge Ronnie White to the Federal Bench. In 1997, President Clinton nominated Judge White of the Missouri Supreme Court to be a United States District Court Judge. At the hearings on his nomination in May 1998, Judge White was introduced to the Senate Judiciary Committee by Republican Senator CHRISTOPHER BOND, who told the committee that Judge White "has the necessary qualifications and character traits which are required for this most important job." See Confirmation Hearings on Federal Appointments: Hearings Before the Senn. Comm. On the Judiciary, 15th Cong., 2d Sess. 7-8 (1998).

In 1962, Dr. King once said that "[it] may be true that the law cannot make a man love me, but it can keep him from lynching me, and I think that's pretty important." But have we learned from his admonition? We all know that John Ashcroft led a campaign to defeat the nomination of Missouri's first African-American Supreme Court Justice, Judge Ronnie White, to the federal bench. Mr. Ashcroft seriously distorted White's record, portraying it as pro criminal, and anti-death penalty, and even suggested, according to the London Guardian, that "the judge had shown a tremendous bent toward criminal activity." Ironically, Judge White had voted to uphold the death sentence in 41 of the 59 cases that came before him, roughly the same proportion as Ashcroft's court appointees when he was Governor.

In fact, of these 59 death penalty cases, Judge White was the sole dissenter in only three of them. As a matter of fact, three of the other Missouri Supreme Court judges, all of whom were appointed by Mr. Ashcroft as Governor, voted to reverse death penalty case sentences in greater percentage of cases than did Judge White. Ashcroft also failed to consider or mention that in at least fifteen death penalty cases Missouri Supreme Court Justice, Ronnie White, wrote the majority opinion for the court to uphold the death sentence. America owes an apology to Judge White and I admire his ability to move forward with his life. This is a judicial nominee for which Mr. Ashcroft had no substantial reason to oppose—and it is time that America knows the facts.

I took my responsibility in helping shed light on Judge White's confirmation hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee on the 17th of January of this month with great seriousness.

I felt compelled to have my voice heard on behalf of Judge White who had never been given the chance to defend himself from vicious attacks on his impeccable judicial record. More importantly, each Senator and Representative now knows that when Judge White's nomination was brought to the Senate floor in October 1999, Senator Ashcroft spearheaded a successful party-line fight to defeat White's confirmation, the first time in twelve years (since the vote on Robert Bork) that the full Senate had voted to reject a nominee to the federal bench.

In contrast to that effort, as former Congressman William L. Clay introduced Judge Ronnie White before the Senate Judiciary Committee he said the following: "I might cite one incident that attests to the kind of relationship that Judge White has with many, and that is with a member of this committee—Senator Ashcroft. When I recommended Judge White to the President for nomination and the President nominated him, one of the first people that I conferred with was Senator Ashcroft. At a later date, he told me that he had appointed six of the seven members to the Missouri Supreme Court. Ronnie White was the only one he had not appointed. He said he had canvassed the other six, the ones that he appointed, and they all spoke very highly of Ronnie White and suggested that he would make an outstanding Federal Judge. So I think that this is the kind of person we need on the Federal bench." Confirmation Hearings on Federal Appointments: Hearings before the Sen. Comm. On the Judiciary, 105th Cong., 2d Sess. 7-8 (1998).

I am further saddened to learn that Mr. Ashcroft accepted an Honorary Degree from Bob Jones University. In 1999, Ashcroft accepted an honorary degree Bob Jones University, which critics have rightly called racist and anti-catholic. Bob Jones University lost its tax-exempt status in 1970 for refusing to admit African-Americans. The school then changed its policy but still prohibited any interracial dating or marriage. In 1983, the U.S. Supreme Court supported an IRS decision to remove tax-exempt status from the school for its dating policy, which included rules such as "students who date outside their own race will be expelled."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ashcroft even opposed gathering statistics for racial profiling studies. After learning of the importance of law enforcement efforts to stem these unlawful activities in a number of states, Mr. Ashcroft's views appear not only out of touch with mainstream America but with existing consent decrees by law enforcement to rid the nation of this practice. As a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, this troubles me immensely. In 1999, Ashcroft opposed legislation for gathering racial statistics on traffic violations after chairing the Subcommittee hearing on it, favoring ignorance over information. Mr. Speaker, how can Mr. Ashcroft be attorney general if he fundamentally disagrees with this fundamental human rights issue? That is sad and further evidence of his insensitivity for basic matters concerning equal protection and justice for all.

The President-Elect's selection for Attorney General has certainly been no friend of reproductive rights for women in America. Ashcroft would not be a guardian of women's right to reproductive choice as provided by the Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade*. On

the contrary, Mr. Ashcroft supports a constitutional amendment that would outlaw abortion even in cases of incest and rape and that would criminalize several commonly used forms of contraception.

As Missouri attorney general and governor, and more recently in the Senate, he repeatedly used his office as a United States Senator to push through severe new restrictions on women's reproductive freedom as part of an effort to get the Supreme Court to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. It is fair to say that many women in America have a right to be concerned because as attorney general, Ashcroft could use the power the Federal government behind new strategies to defeat the right to an abortion in the Supreme Court. It is also reasonable to express doubts about whether he would fully enforce laws that insure access to abortion clinics by limiting violent or obstructive demonstrations by abortion opponents.

We all look to the attorney general to ensure even-handed law enforcement and protection of our basic constitutional rights: freedom of speech, the right to privacy, a woman's right to choose, freedom from governmental oppression and other vital functions. We cannot deny the attorney general plays a critical role in bringing the country together, bridging racial divides, and inspiring people's confidence in their government.

Accordingly, as I review the series of questionable acts that can be found in Mr. Ashcroft's record as a public servant, I find such action by Mr. Ashcroft to be inconsistent with the kind of vision and tolerance that the next top law enforcement officer will need to exhibit. Mr. Ashcroft's record on desegregation in the State of Missouri is one of those examples that makes me truly sad as an African American and I have an obligation to emphasize this very grave matter.

John Ashcroft, as Attorney General and as Governor of the State of Missouri consistently opposed efforts to desegregate schools in Missouri, which for more than 150 years, had legally sanctioned separate and inferior education for blacks.

Missouri has a long and marked history of systematically discriminating against African Americans in the provision of public education. During forty-five years of slavery, the State forbid the education of blacks. After the Civil War, Missouri was the most northern state to have a constitutional mandate requiring separate schools for blacks and whites. This Constitutional provision remained in place until 1976. For much of its history, Missouri provided vastly inferior services to black students.

After the Supreme Court's ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education*, the Missouri Attorney General's office, rather than ordering the dismantling of segregation, simply issued an opinion stating that local districts "may permit" white and colored children to attend the same schools, and could decide for themselves whether they must integrate." Local schools districts in St. Louis and Kansas City perpetuated segregation by manipulating attendance boundaries, drawing discriminatory busing plans and building new schools in places to keep races apart.

The now well-known St. Louis case, which is under such debate in these proceedings before the Senate Judiciary Committee, was filed in 1972. St. Louis had adhered to an explicit system of racial segregation throughout the 1960s. White students were assigned to

schools in their neighborhood; black students attended black schools in the core of the city. Black students who resided outside the city were bused into the black schools in the city. The city had launched no effort to integrate; it simply adopted neighborhood school assignment plans that maintained racial segregation.

Senator Ashcroft then, the Attorney General, challenged the desegregation plan. He argued that there was no basis for holding the State liable and that the State had taken the "necessary and appropriate steps to remove the legal underpinnings of segregated schooling as well as affirmatively prohibiting such discrimination." The courts rejected his attempts; even the U.S. Supreme Court denied certiorari.

In 1983, the city school Board and the 22 suburban districts all agreed to a "unique and compressive" settlement, implementing a voluntary five-year school desegregation plan for both the city and the county. Importantly, the plan was voluntary—it relied on voluntary transfers by students rather than so-called "forced busing." The district court approved this plan.

Attorney General Ashcroft, representing the State, was the only one that did not join the settlement. He opposed all aspects of the settlement. In fact, he sought to have it overturned by the Eighth Circuit. The Eighth Circuit upheld most of the provisions of the plan, and emphasized that three times over the prior three years, specifically held that the State was the primary constitutional violator.

We need a nominee that enforces the civil rights laws of the Nation, that brings strength and confidence to the top law enforcement post of our great country, and to affirm equal protection and fundamental fairness in the United States of America. We owe at least that much to the working people of America and all those who believe the United States remains an example of basic fairness and justice for all.

I strongly believe that the philosophy and beliefs of Senator John Ashcroft are archaic and obsolete. This country has come so far in improving civil rights and fundamental fairness. The confirmation of John Ashcroft will set us years back after all the improvements that have been made. This would be a travesty.

TRIBUTE TO THE LEGENDARY DR. JOHN BIGGERS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me also say in closing that I pay tribute to Dr. John Biggers and would insert my comments concerning the loss of this great artist into the record. I am sorry I had to put it in conjunction with my opposition to Senator Ashcroft.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of Houston's best known and most beloved artists and teachers, and one of my constituents—Dr. John Biggers. Dr. Biggers passed away this month in his Houston home. He was one of the most renowned and beloved residents in our city, and there is no doubt that his death will leave a hole in our community and in the art world—a hole that will never be filled.

According to an article written in our local newspaper the Houston Chronicle, John Biggers's life began in racially divided Gastonia, N.C., a rural community near Charlotte, where he was a teacher, traveler, author and artist. Dr. Biggers was born in 1924, the youngest son of Paul and Cora Biggers' seven children.

His father was the son of a white plantation owner who at age 18 had the opportunity to attend a school for freed slaves and their children. There he met his future wife, Cora, and began preaching the gospel, accepting eggs and never money, for his ministries.

John Biggers arrived in Houston in 1949 to establish the art department at the Texas State College for Negroes, known today as Texas Southern University. At 25 years old, he had a bachelor's and master's degree from Penn State and had received an honorable discharge from the U.S. Army.

John Biggers would go on to change his world and ours through painting. He has used his gift as a tool to paint the mosaics of life. He turned canvasses into stories of life and was able to share with young and old people a continuing and colorful history of America. His art has received international and national acclaim. He traveled to Africa and brought back the dreams and aspirations of those who lived there in the form of unbelievably life like and moving art. He has shared them with those of us who live around the United States giving us a peek into the lives of others through art. More importantly, he has opened the eyes of children, including inner city children, who no longer wonder if they too can paint with a brush and turn a blank canvass into life in pictures.

I hope that Dr. Biggers' life and his work will serve as an inspiration not only to Texans who have treasured his work for many years, but also for all Americans, throughout the United States.

For his dedication and success to teaching art in our community, Dr. Biggers received many awards and grants during his lifetime. Among the most prestigious was a 1957 UNESCO Fellowship that allowed him to study in West Africa. In March, he was to receive the first Texas Medal of Arts Award from the Austin-based Texas Cultural Trust. But these awards simply mark points in a larger than life existence—the life of Dr. John Biggers.

I extend my deepest sympathies to his wife Hazel Hales Biggers, his sister Ferrie Arnold of Florida, his nieces and nephews, and his entire family, including the families of strangers he touched during his remarkable journey.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of Dr. John Biggers is a great loss to the State of Texas and the United States. His contributions to national and local culture will be sorely missed for generations.

I hope that many others learn from and follow his example of creating beauty for all to enjoy.

I thank my colleagues for this opportunity to pay tribute to this admirable man in the permanent history of this body. I also encourage my colleagues to take a few minutes to read the following article about Dr. Biggers, which appeared in the Houston Chronicle on February 16, 1997. The article does a fine job of capturing Dr. Biggers life in words as his art has captured life in pictures.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 16, 1997]

FAME IS FINE, BUT ARTIST JOHN BIGGERS HAS MORE ON HIS MIND

(By Patricia C. Johnson)

John Biggers smiles warmly as he opens the door to his studio. It is the private world where he has conceived and executed monumental murals, drawings and easel paintings for 50 years of his life. The radio is tuned to a jazz station, and the music fills the air,

bouncing off walls lined with partitions covered with paintings. African masks and figures he's collected through the decades cram shelves at one end of the room, and the large table in the center disappears beneath a load of books and catalogs, opened and unopened mail, sketches and pens, even an occasional African carving that's strayed.

It's been two years since the retrospective of his work premiered at the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, an event the artist described then as "miraculous."

Forty-five years earlier, he was not allowed inside the museum to receive the prize awarded his drawing in the museum's annual juried exhibition, for in the segregated city, blacks were allowed inside only on specified times and days. The special arrangements that were made for Biggers and a colleague to view the show in advance became moot when the museum changed its admission policy a few months later to open its doors to everyone at all times.

Now "John Biggers: View From the Upper Room," has been traveling cross-country from Los Angeles to Boston's MFA, gathering marvelous reviews along the way. It opens at Hampton University (Virginia) later this year, completing one cycle in the artist's rich career.

And when the University of Texas Press reissued his landmark book, "Ananse: The Web of Life," last month, another cycle began to inspire a whole new generation.

"You make art one piece at a time," Biggers says today. "Fifty years is a lifetime, it is a long time. And 50 years is very short. You have to reckon with all of that. You may be impressed with the great quantity of work. But, what about the dream?"

Giving form to that dream has been the consuming passion of a lifetime dedicated to making art that is meaningful.

The artist's oft-told story begins in racially divided Gastonia, N.C., a rural community near Charlotte, where this teacher, traveler, author and artist was born in 1924, the youngest of Paul and Cora Biggers' seven children. His father was the son of a white plantation owner who at age 18 had the opportunity to attend a school for freed slaves and their children. There he met his future wife, Cora, and began preaching the gospel, accepting only good things, such as eggs, never money, for his ministries. When he died in 1937, Cora took in laundry to help support her family.

John Biggers was drawing and shaping things from the mud beneath his house from the time he was a child. When he set out for Hampton Institute (now Hampton University) in 1941, however, it was with the intention of becoming a plumber. Fortunately for everyone, a forward-looking professor, Viktor Lowenfeld, redirected the young man's goals. Lowenfeld, a Jewish refugee from Hitler's Austria, an artist and psychologist, had left Harvard for Hampton, an all-black school, and organized its first art classes. He taught his students that art could be the road to self-realization. When he transferred to Pennsylvania State University, Biggers followed him.

"I began to see art not primarily as an individual expression of talent," Biggers stated in "Black Art in Houston" (Texas A&M Press, 1978) "But as a responsibility to reflect the spirit and style of the Negro people."

That realization would become his credo and the foundation for his art.

John Biggers arrived in Houston in 1949 to establish the art department at the Texas State College for Negroes, known today as Texas Southern University. He was 25 years old, had bachelor's and master's degrees from Penn State and an honorable discharge from the U.S. Army. His wife, Hazel, was with him.

They had met at Hampton University, where both were undergraduates. He courted her for years, sometimes long-distance, before she finally agreed to marry him in December 1948. Within a few years of their arrival, they settled into the ranch-style brick house in the tree-lined Riverside neighborhood east of the Museum District that is still their home.

The city was segregated, as was the rest of the country. But, Biggers has said, "the conditions (for blacks) in Philadelphia and New York in the 1940s repelled me. Houston was segregated, but we had recognition from the community at large."

Besides, he says, Texas was close to Mexico where the great muralists—Diego Rivera, Jose Clemente Orozco and David Alfaro Siqueiros—had made a case for art as a political and pedagogic tool as well as an aesthetic pursuit. And Texas was in the South, where the idealistic artist felt he could find—and define—himself, too.

"I wanted to get involved with and attempt to express the lifestyle and spiritual aspirations of the black people," Biggers once said in an interview. "The richness of it was here."

Complicating the issue of racism, the problem—and bitter disappointment—was that at the time, the black community didn't realize or understand who they were and the cultural wealth it possessed. Most blacks viewed acculturation as the goal. But Biggers, who had first learned about African art and life from his teacher, Viktor Lowenfeld, wanted "to change old images of poverty into new perceptions of honest, simple dignity," he states in "Black Art in Houston."

"We had to rip through veils . . . (and) understand new truths," he said. Africa was the route to reconnecting with "our ancestors (who) were hewers of wood and drawers of water, husbands of the land." His desire to visit Africa was derided by everyone, especially his TSU colleagues, who urged him to go to Paris and London instead.

Still, the determined young artist persisted, and in 1957, a grant from UNESCO enabled Biggers and his wife to visit the ancestral land for six months. It was an epiphany, and it changed his life and his art forever.

"I found a dignity (in the African people) I had rarely encountered before, for I had been accustomed to living with warped personalities all my life," he wrote in "Ananse," published in 1962. "I admired the African's straightforwardness, a characteristic that contrasted sharply—and much in his favor—with the slippery maneuverings of our culture."

"And when I heard the great drums call the people, when I saw the people respond with an enthusiasm unequalled by any other call of man or God, I rejoiced, I knew that many of these intrinsic African values would never be lost in the dehumanizing scientific age—just as they were not lost during the dark centuries of slavery."

In the United States, the civil rights movement was changing blacks' perception of themselves. Though art seemed peripheral to it all and Biggers' emphasis on Africa "was not resting well with the more conservative faculty members (at TSU)," as Alvia Wardlaw noted in her catalog on Biggers' retrospective, the artist "continued to teach the fundamentals of drawing, printmaking and paintings . . . and the murals created by his students increasingly reflected the movement's struggles."

Anything else would have been dishonest to an individual of conscience and the artist of vision.

In his own work, Biggers struggled for a unified image that would reflect the ancestral legacy of Africa and the realities of con-

temporary urban America. His figures became increasingly abstract, and he incorporated personal symbols—the quilt, remembered from his grandmother's house, and the kettle, in which his mother boiled the laundry—as he searched for archetypes. His palette of earth tones became lighter and almost transparent. He described complex spaces with patterns combining elements of the urban landscape, notably the shotgun houses symbolic of freed slaves, and pure geometry based on the symmetry of the classic quilt. He populated these spaces with families, mothers and children especially, who shared it with magical things like the rabbits and tortoises of West African creation myths and celestial bodies.

Biggers retired from TSU in 1983 and has since been dividing his time between Houston and Gastonia, preferring the rural simplicity and quiet of his hometown, where his family also lives, to the urban cacophony. In a way, it's returning to the dreams of his youth, discovering the connectedness to the Earth and its rhythms that he had discovered on that first visit to Africa.

"I like the little frogs and the birds and the trees," he says with a laugh.

He's delighted by the attention his retrospective is receiving, and graciously attends the events that surround it, most recently at the Boston museum. But he's tired, he says.

"When you're young and have goals, you're interested in reaching out and proving yourself. I'm not interested in that anymore," he says.

"I'm a person who needs to work rather than celebrate. For me, the payoff is the work itself. It think this work I'm doing now is showing I've grown. It has greater simplicity, and I like that."

Biggers has a mural commission, the 16th in his career, in progress. He titled it "Salt Marsh," and enlisted friend and former student James McNeil to assist. Its final version will be 10 feet by 27 feet, painted with acrylic on canvas. On this cool winter morning, work is in the early stages, with McNeil painstakingly translating Biggers' first small but detailed pencil drawing into a larger, color-coded version pinned to the studio wall.

In a corner, a half-finished painting sits on the easel waiting for the artist's return. This, too, is a commission, and similarly loaded with symbols and meanings distilled from decades of research and hundreds of artworks.

He's titled it "The Morning Star." There, in Biggers' unmistakable crystalline colors and geometric forms, are the father and mother, the son who's being born and the daughter who is yet to be conceived, in a mystical space with the symbolic rabbit and turtle. Ever the teacher and storyteller, he explains:

"You see, the boy here is being born from the blue sky. Those are his parents, sitting on a bench, which is on a barge, their feet on the floor, which is a xylophone." The soft voice goes on to describe the other components, their shapes and their origins in ancient African myths, and their timeless meaning.

"Individual life is very short," he says, "All things rise and fall, live and die."

"But if we agree the spirit does not die, that it inhabits the world, time takes a different dimension."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from urging action by the Senate or characterizing action of the Senate.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES 107TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at its organizational meeting on January 3, 2001, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1)(A) of rule XI of the rules of the House, the Rules Committee adopted in an open meeting, with a quorum present, its committee rules for the 107th Congress. Pursuant to clause 2(a)(1)(D) of rule XI of the rules of the House and clause (d) of rule I of the rules of the Committee on Rules, the rules of the Committee on Rules are hereby submitted for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES—U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 107TH CONGRESS

RULE 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The rules of the House are the rules of the Committee and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are non-debatable privileged motions in the Committee. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day).

(b) Each subcommittee is a part of the Committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(c) The provisions of clause 2 of rule XI of the rules of the House are incorporated by reference as the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable.

(d) The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

RULE 2—REGULAR, ADDITIONAL, AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

Regular Meetings

(a)(1) The Committee shall regularly meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday of each week when the House is in session.

(2) A regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chairman of the Committee (hereafter in these rules referred to as the "Chair"), there is no need for the meeting.

(3) Additional regular meetings and hearings of the Committee may be called by the Chair.

Notice for Regular Meetings

(b) The Chair shall notify each member of the Committee of the agenda of each regular meeting of the Committee at least 48 hours before the time of the meeting and shall provide to each member of the Committee, at least 24 hours before the time of each regular meeting.

(1) for each bill or resolution scheduled on the agenda for consideration of a rule, a copy of

(A) the bill or resolution,
(B) any committee reports thereon, and
(C) any letter requesting a rule for the bill or resolution; and

(2) for each other bill, resolution, report, or other matter on the agenda a copy of—

(A) the bill, resolution, report, or materials relating to the other matter in question; and

(B) any report on the bill, resolution, report, or any other matter made by any subcommittee of the Committee.