

was but 18 years old. He went on to get his law degree, and he was inspired by the death of Martin Luther King to enter politics, and enter politics he did.

He first ran against Mr. Talmadge, Herman Talmadge, and he lost that race. But he proved that there was a need for a new direction. He won the votes in Atlanta. He did that when outside of Atlanta, as a matter of fact, he lost by 3 to 1. But that really did launch his political career. Maynard Jackson went on to serve as Mayor for 3 terms in Atlanta.

I loved Maynard Jackson because he was a man of impeccable integrity. Not only did he provide a new kind of leadership for Atlanta, he opened up opportunities for African Americans and people of color. When Maynard Jackson, the first African American mayor to be elected in Atlanta, took office, African Americans were not really a part of the business community, and he actually alienated some of the white business community, because he insisted on opening up these opportunities. When I look at the airport there, I know the stories about how Maynard Jackson helped to implement affirmative action, and when we see some of the concessions that are there, they are there because Maynard Jackson led the way for much of that to take place.

Maynard Jackson loved the Democratic Party, and he served on the Democratic National Committee for many years. And as many folks know and understand, I encouraged him to run at our last winter meeting to be head of the DNC. Even though he started late, we created a conversation and discussion about what kind of leadership we needed for the DNC. Maynard Jackson certainly did not win that election. As a matter of fact, he bowed out and he supported Terry McAulliffe.

The debate that we created had to do with the direction of the party. Where are we going? Where is this party going? Maynard had a plan: the southern strategy plan. Maynard knew and understood that unless we increased the turnout and understand the importance of the South to the Democratic Party, then we could not win, and we will not win.

When we were in our struggle for Maynard to lead the Democratic National Committee, we finally agreed that Maynard would take over a new position that we created in the Democratic Party called the National Development Commission, of which he would be chairman. Under that, he would have the Voting Rights Institute. And Maynard set about with that designation to increase the awareness about what was wrong with the voting systems in this country.

We had just come out of Florida where votes had been stolen, where people had been turned away from the polls, where folks were identified as felons and put on lists who had never been to jail, and Maynard was convinced that we had to clean that up. And he begged the DNC to take this as

their number one issue and their number one priority. Maynard identified people who were to serve with him as he tried to carry out his vision of this Voting Rights Institute. But, for whatever reasons, it did not happen. Maynard called me and he said, I am going to resign the position. I do not think that it is going to happen in the way that we thought it would happen. And I consider that one of the greatest losses for the Democratic Party. Maynard went on back to Atlanta, to Jackson Securities, a company that he had founded where he did tremendously well.

He was a fine businessman, and he worked well with so many elected officials around this country in order to achieve the kind of success that he was able to achieve in the bond business.

I am going to miss Maynard. He was a dear and close friend, and the Democratic Party and all of us who wish to see this party go in a new direction, understanding the significance of the South, are going to miss him, and unless his thoughts and his ideas are accepted by this party we are going to continue to lose.

REMEMBERING MAYNARD JACKSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice again to those who are lamenting the life well-lived, and the life just going into transition. It was Maynard Jackson, as my colleagues just heard, who had a vision of inclusion.

□ 2000

Maynard was able to unite various groups and interests in building one of the most complex airport terminals in the world ahead of schedule and within budget. And as I said before, it is particularly amazing that today was the day that Maynard Jackson transitioned and also the day the Supreme Court issued its landmark ruling.

In two successive votes, the Justices recognize that the most effective way to cure society of its exclusionary practices is to make special efforts to see that Americans are included, which is exactly what Maynard Jackson stood for when he mentioned the phrase "affirmative action." It was first used in President Lyndon Johnson's 1965 executive order. In 1967 Johnson expanded the executive order to include affirmative action requirements to benefit women. The policy was significantly expanded in 1969 by President Richard Nixon and then-Secretary of Labor George Schultz.

In 1973 Maynard Jackson began his leadership in implementing these policies, which enabled Atlanta to become a true world class city. There has always been affirmative action in public policy; but for many years it fought to

exclude, rather than include, people of color. Affirmative action was put in place to not only encourage diversity but to be a minor step in the direction of justice after hundreds of years of institutional and social discrimination against women and people of color in the United States of America. Much of the opposition to affirmative action is framed on the grounds of so-called reverse discrimination and unwarranted preferences. In fact, less than 2 percent of the 91,000 employment discrimination cases pending before the Equal Opportunity Commission are reverse discrimination cases.

Under the law as written, in executive orders and interpreted by the courts, anyone benefiting from affirmative action must have relevant and valid job or educational qualifications. Opponents of affirmative action also claim it is discriminatory. The problem with this myth is that it uses the same word, discrimination, to describe two very different things. Job discrimination is grounded in prejudice and exclusion; whereas, affirmative action is an effort to overcome prejudicial treatment through exclusion and to provide inclusion. The most effective way to cure society of exclusionary practices is to make special efforts at inclusion, which is exactly what affirmative action does.

When thinking about affirmative action policy, it is important to keep this principle in mind. In fact, despite the progress that has been made, the playing field today is still far from level. Women continue to earn 76 cents for every dollar earned by a male. Black people continue to have twice the unemployment rate of white people and graduate from college at half the rate of white people. In fact, without affirmative action, the percentage of black students at many selective schools would drop to only 2 percent of the total student body.

While I applaud the Court's decision today, our society still suffers from racial discrimination. And in the name of Maynard Jackson, we must carry on his legacy and his commitment to never waiver from equality for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my shock and sadness at the untimely passing of my dear friend Maynard Jackson—former Mayor of Atlanta and one of our country's most charismatic political leaders. I also want to take this opportunity to remember Maynard's contribution to affirmative action on the day when the Supreme Court declared its support for the program.

Maynard was a giant of his time, a trailblazer and a dedicated public servant who became the inspiration for generations of African American politicians. His election in 1974 as the Mayor of Atlanta helped usher in a new movement of racial equality and a new process of interracial understanding and co-existence where the spirit of the civil rights movement was carried forward by victories at the ballot boxes.

Maynard will be remembered as the South's first big-city African-American mayor, but his

legacy was much more than that. During his three terms as Mayor, Maynard oversaw construction of the midfield terminal at Hartsfield Atlanta International Airport, established a cultural affairs department, brought the Olympics to Atlanta, and all the while gave a voice to the city's in town neighborhoods.

Perhaps one of the most significant accomplishments of Maynard Jackson's tenure was his early support and leadership on affirmative action. During his first term, Maynard instituted a groundbreaking affirmative action program that elevated the percentage of city contracts awarded to minorities in Atlanta from less than 1 percent in 1973 to 38.6 percent five years later.

One of the great success stories of Maynard's affirmative action program was the creation of a "joint venture" between white and minority-owned businesses during the construction of the Atlanta airport. Working from a vision of inclusion, Maynard was able to unite various groups and interests in building one of the most complex airport terminals in the world ahead of schedule and within budget.

It is particularly ironic then that Maynard passed away on the day before the Supreme Court issued its landmark ruling. In two successive votes, the Justices recognized that the most effective way to cure society of exclusionary practices is to make special efforts at inclusion, which is exactly what affirmative action does.

The actual phrase "affirmative action" was first used in President Lyndon Johnson's 1965 Executive Order. In 1967, Johnson expanded the Executive Order to include affirmative action requirements to benefit women. The policy was significantly expanded in 1969 by President Richard Nixon and then Secretary of Labor George Schultz. In 1973, Maynard Jackson began his leadership in implementing these policies, which enabled Atlanta to become a world-class city.

There has always been affirmative action in public policy—but for many years it operated to exclude, rather than include, people of color. Affirmative action was put in place to not only encourage diversity, but to be a minor step in the direction of justice after hundreds of years of institutional and social discrimination against women and people of color in the United States.

Much of the opposition to affirmative action is framed on the grounds of so-called "reverse discrimination and unwarranted preferences." In fact, less than 2 percent of the 91,000 employment discrimination cases pending before the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission are reverse discrimination cases. Under the law as written in Executive Orders and interpreted by the courts, anyone benefitting from affirmative action must have relevant and valid job or educational qualifications.

Opponents of affirmative action also claim it is discriminatory. The problem with this myth is that it uses the same word—discrimination—to describe two very different things. Job discrimination is grounded in prejudice and exclusion, whereas affirmative action is an effort to overcome prejudicial treatment through inclusion. The most effective way to cure society of exclusionary practices is to make special efforts at inclusion, which is exactly what affirmative action does. When thinking about affirmative action policy, it is important to keep this principle in mind.

In fact, despite the progress that has been made, the playing field today is still far from level. Women continue to earn 76 cents for every dollar earned by a male. Black people continue to have twice the unemployment rate of white people, and graduate from college at half the rate of white people. In fact, without affirmative action the percentage of Black students at many selective schools would drop to only 2 percent of the total student body.

While I applaud the Court's decision today, our society still suffers from racial discrimination. It is unfortunate that after all these years we are still fighting an uphill battle for full inclusion into our Nation's society.

However, we are fortunate to have had the civil rights movement and leaders like Maynard Jackson. In remembering Maynard, we must carry on his legacy and his commitment to never waver from equality for all.

MAKING MEDICARE BETTER FOR ALL SENIORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here tonight to talk about a very important issue that is resonating across the country, and just recently on my return back from my district, more importantly, the issue of Medicare and prescription drug reform which is impacting largely low-income working families and especially many of the families that I represent in my district in California, Latino working families.

The facts are clear, 87 percent of uninsured Latinos come from working taxpaying families. However, nearly 60 percent of Latinos live in families with incomes below 200 percent of the poverty level. Many of these families, 37 percent, in fact, lack basic access to quality care. Low-income elderly Latinos face incomparable barriers to health care at just about every corner of their lives. Linguistic, cultural, financial burdens continually impede their health access that would otherwise be available to every American.

When President Johnson signed the Medicare bill back in 1965 he said, and I quote: "No longer will older Americans be denied the healing miracle of modern medicine."

Medicare was not created to exclude the elderly in exchange to enrich private insurance companies. The Republican proposal as I see it undermines the universal character of Medicare that ensures quality for all seniors. Instead, it provides different benefits to different seniors depending on your income. Figures estimate that the Medicare beneficiaries who spend \$4,000 or more out of pocket on drugs are not individuals making less than 100 percent of poverty, not those between 100 and 200 percent of poverty, but those individuals who live with incomes greater than 200 percent of poverty. These are the people we are asking to pay the most for their prescription drugs.

The House Republican bill increases costs for seniors by \$8 billion and does not offer meaningful benefits, nor does it make drugs affordable for our seniors. How can we even realistically say we are attempting to improve the lives of all Americans when the Latinos and low-income elderly population are the most susceptible for falling between the privatized cracks?

There are more than 214,000 Latino Medicare beneficiaries currently residing in the State where I come from, in California, and over 55 percent of those seniors report having little or no information. They do not even know about the bilingual toll-free Medicare phone number. Some do not even have telephones in their homes. Who will care for those beneficiaries when the Republicans impose unaffordable premiums, requiring spending up to \$250 before they can receive any help at all? This even prohibits the HHS Secretary from negotiating better prices. I thought he was supposed to be working on our side on behalf of our consumers and our seniors.

With private and for-profit managed care plans competing to entice healthy seniors to enroll, traditional Medicare will be forced to raise out-of-pocket costs astronomically for the sickest and most disabled beneficiaries. The holes in the cracks are visible. We are just seeing what has occurred in the State of California where many beneficiaries were dumped and they were left without care.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to think of the future of these populations, the low-income, taxpaying. Whether they are Latino or not, let us help all the elderly who deserve accessible and meaningful Medicare plans. Let us protect our Nation by caring for all American seniors, and let us begin by working with the program that we know works, that will make a difference for all of us.

HONORING MAYNARD JACKSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am sad to join my colleagues, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT), as well as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) who was on the floor earlier, and I know the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MAJETTE), I do not know if she has been here yet, and many other Members, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) who was a very close friend of Maynard Jackson. I am saddened to add my personal thoughts and prayers to their wonderful comments about Maynard Jackson.

America has lost a great statesman today, and our hearts are saddened for his family and thousands of his colleagues and friends who loved him and worked with him on so many issues.

For his many friends at the United States Conference of Mayors where he