

2ND STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1999 Bulletin Broadfacing Network, Inc.  
The Bulletin's Frontrunner

October 20, 1999

LENGTH: 195 words

HEADLINE: Clintons Asked To Honor NAACP Boycott Of South Carolina.

BODY:

The State/AP (10/20) reported, "A Columbia attorney is urging Bill and Hillary Rodham Clinton to forgo their annual New Year's trip to Hilton Head Island to honor the NAACP boycott of the state. This weekend, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People formally called for a tourism boycott of South Carolina until the Confederate flag is removed from the State House dome." The Clintons, who "are friends with Renaissance Weekend co-founders and part-time Hilton Head residents Phil and Linda Lader, have attended "the private New Year's Eve event for 14 consecutive years. The event draws high-profile guests from around the world to its off-the-record discussions." The State continued, "In letters to the White House this month, Columbia lawyer Tom Turnipseed asked the Clintons to stay away in a show of solidarity and to boost Hillary Clinton's New York senatorial campaign." White House press secretary Joe Lockhart "said Tuesday that no decision had been made on the Clintons' New Year's plans and he did not know if they would take the boycott into account. The boycott is set to begin on Jan. 1, when Renaissance Weekend ends."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: October 20, 1999

4TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

The Associated Press State & Local Wire

The materials in the AP file were compiled by The Associated Press. These materials may not be republished without the express written consent of The Associated Press.

October 19, 1999, Tuesday, BC cycle

SECTION: State and Regional

LENGTH: 383 words

HEADLINE: Clintons urged to honor NAACP boycott, avoid Renaissance Weekend

DATELINE: CHARLESTON, S.C.

BODY:

A Columbia attorney is urging Bill and Hillary Rodham Clinton to forgo their annual New Year's trip to Hilton Head Island to honor the NAACP boycott of the state.

This weekend, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People formally called for a tourism boycott of South Carolina until the Confederate battle flag is removed from the Statehouse dome.

The Clintons, who are friends with Renaissance Weekend co-founders and part-time Hilton Head residents Phil and Linda Lader, have attended the private New Year's Eve event for 14 consecutive years. The event draws high-profile guests from around the world to its off-the-record discussions.

In letters to the White House this month, Columbia lawyer Tom Turnipseed asked the Clintons to stay away in a show of solidarity and to boost Mrs. Clinton's New York senatorial campaign.

"I strongly support your candidacy," Turnipseed wrote the first lady. "I ask you to exercise leadership and stand up against this continuing symbol of economic and social oppression of African-Americans by supporting our struggle."

Turnipseed also asked Renaissance Weekend founder Phil Lader to move the annual gathering out of South Carolina. Lader, Clinton's appointee as U.S. ambassador to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, was traveling Monday and could not be reached for comment.

White House press secretary Joe Lockhart said Tuesday that no decision had been made on the Clintons' New Year's plans and he did not know if they would take the boycott into account.

The boycott is set to begin on Jan. 1, when Renaissance Weekend ends.

South Carolina NAACP Executive Director Dwight James would not discuss Turnipseed's letter Monday, but group spokesman Jim Wiggins said James will

The Associated Press State & Local Wire, October 19, 1999

address it formally during a news conference Thursday at the start of the South Carolina NAACP convention. That convention has been moved to Charlotte, N.C., because of the boycott.

The local chapter also is considering stepping up its campaign to include goods made in South Carolina, especially by high-profile manufacturers, such as BMW, Michelin, General Electric and Hitachi.

"We're considering cars and tires," said Nelson Rivers III, NAACP national field operations director. "The pain has to be spread around."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: October 19, 1999

15TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1999 The National Journal Group, Inc.  
The Hotline

October 18, 1999

SECTION: IN THE STATES

LENGTH: 82 words

HEADLINE: SOUTH CAROLINA: NAACP SAYS NO TO SC

BODY:

The NAACP's national board on 10/16 unanimously approved a tourism boycott of SC until the state stops flying the Confederate flag from its Capitol. The NAACP also asked the Justice Dept. to investigate whether flying the flag "infringed on the civil rights of black people." The tourism boycott will begin 1/00, but NAACP officials said that 42 "state and national organizations" have already cancelled meetings in SC (AP/Spartanburg Herald-Journal, 10/17).

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: October 18, 1999

12TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

The Associated Press State & Local Wire

The materials in the AP file were compiled by The Associated Press. These materials may not be republished without the express written consent of The Associated Press.

October 18, 1999, Monday, BC cycle

SECTION: State and Regional

LENGTH: 105 words

DATELINE: COLUMBIA, S.C.

BODY:

An Oct. 15 Associated Press story that said Seventh-day Adventists would move a youth conference to North Carolina because the Confederate flag flies above South Carolina's Statehouse failed to specify which branch of the church was involved.

The mostly black South Atlantic Conference of the church joins more than 40 groups that have dropped plans for South Carolina events in response to a boycott called by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The mostly white Carolinas Conference of Seventh-day Adventists has made no plans to support the boycott, its president, Kenneth Coonley, said Monday.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: October 18, 1999

9TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1999 The Post and Courier (Charleston, SC)  
The Post and Courier (Charleston, SC)

October 19, 1999, Tuesday, POST AND COURIER EDITION

SECTION: A, Pg. 1

LENGTH: 494 words

HEADLINE: Clintons urged to honor boycott

BODY:

AH:Skip Renaissance Weekend, leading Democrat advises PH:Color mug of Turnipseed BY: SCHUYLER KROPP Of The Post and Courier

A leading Democrat says Bill and Hillary Clinton will have to skip the New Year's Eve Renaissance Weekend on Hilton Head Island to honor the NAACP's Confederate flag boycott.

In letters to the White House this month, Columbia lawyer Tom Turnipseed asked the Clintons to stay away in a show of solidarity and to boost her New York senatorial campaign.

"I strongly support your candidacy," Turnipseed wrote the first lady. "I ask you to exercise leadership and stand up against this continuing symbol of economic and social oppression of African-Americans by supporting our struggle."

In a separate telephone interview Monday, Turnipseed added that the stakes are too great in the New York race for Mrs. Clinton to make an appearance in South Carolina this year.

"I don't think Hillary can possibly show up given the political situation of running for Senate in New York," he said.

Turnipseed also asked Renaissance Weekend founder Phil Lader to move the annual gathering out of South Carolina.

Lader, Clinton's appointee as U.S. ambassador to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, was traveling in the U.S. on Monday and could not be reached.

A White House spokesperson said the first couple's New Year's schedule had not been set and couldn't comment about their sympathies to the NAACP boycott.

The boycott is set to officially begin on Jan. 1, when Renaissance Weekend ends.

S.C. NAACP Executive Director Dwight James declined to comment Monday about Turnipseed's letter, but group spokesman Jim Wiggins said James will address it formally during a press conference Thursday at the start of the S.C. NAACP convention.

The Post and Courier (Charleston, SC), October 19, 1999

That convention has already been moved to Charlotte because of the boycott.

Boycott organizers have never hidden their push to make Renaissance Weekend a target because of its high profile draw in the days between Christmas and Jan. 1 every year. The Clintons have attended Renaissance Weekend every year since the mid-1980s.

An organization pamphlet describes the Renaissance getaway as a forum for people "to broaden their perspectives, stretch their minds, share their views and their experiences."

It draws politicians, artists, writers, business leaders, judges, military leaders and others to Hilton Head each year for off-the-record discussions.

Lader, former head of the U.S. Small Business Administration who held other high posts as well in the Clinton White House, is perhaps best known as the founder and co-host, with his wife Linda.

He is also a former president of Winthrop University and was an unsuccessful gubernatorial candidate in 1986.

Turnipseed, who is white, has been a NAACP member for 25 years. He lost in a bid for the attorney general's post last year.

Mrs. Clinton is expected to formally declare her Senate bid in January.

LOAD-DATE: October 20, 1999

28TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1999 The Post and Courier (Charleston, SC)  
The Post and Courier (Charleston, SC)

October 17, 1999, Sunday, SUNDAY EDITION

SECTION: I, Pg. 1

LENGTH: 1262 words

HEADLINE: A CIVIL ACTION

Will a tourism boycott by black groups coming to South Carolina help bring down the Confederate flag over the Statehouse?

BYLINE: STEPHANIE HARVIN; Of The Post and Courier

BODY:

Boycott.

The term was coined after Capt. Charles C. Boycott, a land agent in Ireland, was ostracized by his tenants for charging high rents in 1880.

The definition, according to Webster's New World College Dictionary, is: 1. to join together in refusing to deal with, so as to punish, coerce, etc. or 2. to refuse to buy, sell, or use.

This summer, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People started using that definition when it called for a tourism boycott by black groups coming to South Carolina in protest of the continued flying of the Confederate flag over the Statehouse.

At stake is the more than \$ 280 million that black travelers are believed to spend each year in the state. In response to the boycott, some organizations, such as the National Urban League, the S.C. Legislative Black Caucus, the N.C. Academy of Trial Lawyers, the Association of State Democratic Party Chairs and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference have already canceled events in South Carolina.

What boycotts do

But do boycotts really accomplish what they set out to do? And how do you measure the impact?

"Impact of a boycott is not just linked to the dollars involved," says William Moore, a political science professor at the College of Charleston.

"There is also an image factor that is more intangible and harder to measure."

Moore sees the current NAACP boycott as having "an insignificant impact" since it mainly targets black businesses and conventions coming to South Carolina.

The Post and Courier (Charleston, SC), October 17, 1999

"It is probably a more minimal impact than if they were targeting all the tourism industry."

Moore says boycotts used during the civil rights era were successful when they began to hurt businessmen who were losing money, and not just the political structure of the times.

"Those (boycotts) went beyond sit-ins at the lunch counters. The civil rights movement targeted Woolworth's, and not just those in the South, but in the North, too."

Boycotts were only one factor in several that came into play during desegregation, says Moore. And there are always those who fight on the other side.

"There was what is called the Citizens' Council that was pro-segregation. It formed after the Brown vs. Brown decision, and it was the same type of fighting in reverse."

The only way to measure the actual impact of a NAACP boycott would be to compile tourism figures from year to year, says Moore.

"If there were a drop over several years, you might be able to say there was an impact."

But the fighting does have an impact on the public consciousness. Moore says the impact that can't be measured is a symbolic one - how the image of South Carolina is perceived by areas outside the state.

"These are the ones where individuals might decide not to vacation at Myrtle Beach, or a business decides not to locate here because of the boycott. These are individual decisions that happen and you have no way of knowing it," says Moore.

In Arizona, the economic impact was measurable when, in 1990, voters failed to pass a Martin Luther King Jr. paid state holiday.

In response, the National Football League withdrew Super Bowl XXVII, which was to be played there in 1993. The Super Bowl was moved to the Rose Bowl in Pasadena, Calif., after a great deal of national publicity.

According to The Houston Chronicle, at the same meeting where the owners decided to move the game, they held out the possibility of the Super Bowl in 1996 in Tempe, Ariz. While no conditions were stated, committee members interested in having the Super Bowl in Arizona realized they needed to have the holiday passed in the 1992 election.

The second time the vote passed, and the Super Bowl was held in Arizona in 1996.

The impact to the state was measured by the Greater Phoenix Convention and Visitors Bureau. From the defeat of the MLK holiday in November of 1990 until its approval in 1992, 108 conventions canceled, causing a direct loss of \$ 69.4 million which affected 2,200 jobs. The indirect impact was an additional \$ 62.5 million plus a tax loss of \$ 14.4 million. The total impact was \$ 141.9 million

dollars in lost revenue.

As of January 1996, resolicited and new businesses in that area were pouring \$ 103 million (with a tax gain of \$ 7.8 million) back into the local economy.

Blacks have a long history of using boycotts successfully, says Dr. Marvin Dulaney, executive director of the Avery Research Center and chairman of the department of history at the College of Charleston. He cites transportation boycotts by blacks going back to the days of street trolleys in Charleston, as well as numerous other boycotts in both Southern and Northern states prior to the famous boycott of the Montgomery, Ala., city bus system in 1955.

In the Montgomery boycott, the city had a municipal law which required its black citizens to ride in the back of the city's buses. On Dec. 1, 1955, Rosa Parks, a 42-year-old seamstress, boarded a city bus and sat in the first row of seats in the black section of the bus. When some white men got on the bus, the driver, James F. Blake, asked her to move to the back of the bus. When she refused, he called the police to have her arrested.

Over the weekend that followed, preachers and civil rights leaders, including Martin Luther King Jr., called for a boycott of the buses. It was an immediate success. According to bus company receipts, about 90 percent of the blacks who usually rode the buses joined the boycott and found other means of transportation on that Monday.

"The reason that boycott was so successful was that there was already a ground swell of support for it. The churches and the professors at the college had already been educating people," says Dulaney.

Diversity may hurt

The success of a boycott depends on the decisions of the people.

"I teach history and I'm always telling my students that it is the people who make these decisions, and then the leaders emerge to implement them. I use the example of George Washington. If the people hadn't wanted to separate from Great Britain, Washington would never have emerged as a leader. He would have been hanged by British supporters.

"The same thing happened with Martin Luther King Jr. He emerged as a leader because he was needed."

But Dulaney sees a lack of cohesion in this boycott.

"There is tremendous diversity in the black community now. There are plenty of people who live outside of the community, who work in corporate America, who don't go to the traditional Baptist churches. Some don't see their interests as being part of the black community.

"The big difference here is that the movement is coming from the leadership down, instead of from the grass-roots level where it belongs."

State leaders at the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce are taking the boycott seriously, says Paula Harper Bethea, chairman of the board and a Hilton Head businesswoman.

The Post and Courier (Charleston, SC), October 17, 1999

The Chamber takes the position that the flag should be removed, and they are working behind the scenes to see that it happens.

"Our position is that a boycott is a lose-lose situation," says Bethea.

"Nobody wins and those who can least afford it are the most affected."

Canceled events and conventions are most likely to affect those who live along the coast, and she includes those people who work in the hotel and hospitality industries.

"If the conventions don't come, then there is no work. Everybody loses in an economic boycott."

"My hope is that as we further open the lines of communication, we will see movement on this issue."

GRAPHIC: Three Color and One B&W AP Photos: President and CEO of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Kweisi Mfume (right), listens as NAACP Chairman Julian Bond responds to questions during a news conference at the NAACP's 90th Annual Convention in New York Saturday. As an expected 14,000 members trickled into New York for Saturday's start of the six-day conference, NAACP officials mourned Friday's death of James Farmer, founder of the Congress of Racial Equality and the last survivor of the "Big Four," who guided the civil rights battles of the 1950s and 1960s, One of The National Football League withdrew Super Bowl XXVII, which was to be played in Sun Devil Stadium in Tempe, Ariz., in 1993 after the state's voters failed to pass a Martin Luther King Jr. state paid holiday in a 1990 election. However, Super Bowl XXX was played there in 1996 after the holiday was approved in a 1992 election, One of Rosa Parks, whose refusal to move to the back of a bus touched off the Montgomery, Ala., bus boycott and the beginning of the civil rights movement in America, is fingerprinted by Deputy Sheriff D.H. Lackey in Montgomery on Feb. 22, 1956. She was among some 100 people charged with violating segregation laws and One of The Confederate flag flies above South Carolina's copper-domed Statehouse on the south side of downtown Columbia. For some, the flag is a symbol of pride; for others, a reminder of oppression.

LOAD-DATE: October 20, 1999

29TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1999 Bergen Record Corp.  
The Record (Bergen County, NJ)

October 17, 1999, SUNDAY; ALL EDITIONS

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. A15

LENGTH: 393 words

HEADLINE: NAACP BOARD OKS TOURISM BOYCOTT OF S. CAROLINA

SOURCE: Wire services

BYLINE: SETH HETTENA, The Associated Press

DATELINE: LINTHICUM, Md.

BODY:

The NAACP's national board on Saturday approved a tourism boycott of South Carolina until the state removes the Confederate flag from the Statehouse dome.

"The ratification officially mobilizes all of our chapters and members to not visit or spend dollars in South Carolina until the flag is removed," said NAACP spokeswoman Sheila Douglas.

A spokeswoman for Gov. Jim Hodges said the boycott decision will make it harder to get a compromise to resolve the issue.

Nina Brook also criticized the House, and Republican Speaker David Wilkins, for the failure to reach a compromise.

"A very real obstacle remains, a majority in the House who say they will not vote for a compromise, and the speaker of the House who says he will not vote for a compromise," Brook said.

The House rejected a compromise to move the flag to a Confederate monument on the Statehouse grounds several years ago.

"I have not seen a significant change or shift in the House's position on that," Wilkins said.

Supporters say the flag represents Southern heritage and honors South Carolinians who died in the Civil War. The NAACP says it is a symbol of racism.

The South Carolina branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People proposed the tourism boycott of the state in July. It would begin Jan. 1.. The NAACP's national leaders say they are working to make sure South Carolina will feel economic pain from the national boycott.

More than \$ 280 million a year that African-American travelers spend in South Carolina could be at stake.

"We know that economic sanctions work," said Lonnie Randolph Jr., chairman of the NAACP's programs and research committee.

Several groups from across the nation have already canceled plans to hold meetings and conventions in South Carolina since the NAACP called for the boycott.

Last week, the Seventh-day Adventist Church canceled a meeting that would have brought 7,000 people to Columbia for four days in March.

Officials said the event would have brought \$ 500,000 worth of tourism business.

The flag controversy has embroiled South Carolina for years. The state is the only one in the nation to fly the Confederate flag over its Statehouse, although Georgia and Mississippi incorporate part of the design into their state flags.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: October 18, 1999

32ND STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1999 Sun-Sentinel Company  
Sun-Sentinel (Fort Lauderdale, FL)

October 17, 1999, Sunday, Broward Metro EDITION

SECTION: NATIONAL, Pg. 3A

LENGTH: 483 words

HEADLINE: CLINTON, CLASS OF '64 GATHER FOR REUNION

BYLINE: SUN-SENTINEL WIRE SERVICES

BODY:

WASHINGTON

President Clinton and classmates of the 1964 class of Hot Springs High School in Arkansas celebrated the 35th anniversary of their graduation Saturday at the White House.

About 300 people, classmates and their families, attended a reception in the White House with the president. Clinton had missed the 35th reunion party that the class held earlier because of a scheduling conflict -- the first time he had missed a high school reunion. So he invited the class to a White House celebration. NORTHEAST Woodstock to aid a rape hotline

ROME, N.Y. -- Some proceeds from a compact disc and a video of the Woodstock '99 concert -- which ended with reports of rapes and other sexual assaults -- will go toward a national rape hotline.

Besides the donation, every copy of the Woodstock '99 CD and home video will include information about the hotline. Rape Abuse and Incest National Network spokesman Scott Berkowitz said the money also will be used to expand the group's outreach and educational programs. SOUTH NAACP board OKs tourism boycott

LINTHICUM, Md. -- The NAACP's national board on Saturday approved a tourism boycott of South Carolina until the state removes the Confederate battle flag from the Statehouse dome.

The NAACP has 2,200 branches with about 500,000 members nationwide.

The NAACP's national leaders say they're working to make sure South Carolina will feel economic pain from the national boycott, which would begin Jan. 1. More than \$ 280 million a year that black travelers spend in the state could be at stake. MIDWEST Crash in stolen car kills four students

GRAND HAVEN, Mich. -- Four high school freshmen riding in a stolen car were killed early Saturday when the vehicle struck a tree, authorities said.

The teen-agers were not wearing seat belts and died at the scene of the crash

Sun-Sentinel (Fort Lauderdale), October 17, 1999

about 12:50 a.m. near this western Michigan community, authorities said. Michigan State Police identified the victims as driver John Mogielski, and passengers Ryan Lyles, Adam Bennett and David Morgan. Morgan was 15, the others 14. WEST JonBenet case is not over yet

BOULDER, Colo. -- Gov. Bill Owens will meet with Boulder District Attorney Alex Hunter on Monday to discuss the possibility of appointing a special prosecutor for the JonBenet Ramsey murder case, one of Hunter's advisers said.

The grand jury investigation of the Ramsey case, launched by Hunter Sept. 15, 1998, ended Wednesday without any indictments. Adams County District Attorney Bob Grant, who is part of Hunter's team of advisers on the Ramsey case, said of the meeting: "The only person I'm sure will be there is me, since I haven't talked to anyone else."

Grant said he expects Hunter's grand jury team of Michael Kane, Bruce Levin, Mitch Morrissey and Denver-area prosecutors Bill Ritter, Dave Thomas and Jim Peters to be present at the meeting as well.

LOAD-DATE: October 20, 1999

48TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

The Associated Press State & Local Wire

The materials in the AP file were compiled by The Associated Press. These materials may not be republished without the express written consent of The Associated Press.

October 16, 1999, Saturday, AM cycle

SECTION: Domestic News

LENGTH: 513 words

HEADLINE: NAACP board votes to boycott South Carolina

BYLINE: By SETH HETTENA, Associated Press Writer

DATELINE: LINTHICUM, Md.

BODY:

The NAACP's national board on Saturday unanimously approved a tourism boycott of South Carolina until the state stops flying the Confederate flag from its Capitol.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People also asked the U.S. Justice Department to investigate whether official display of the symbol infringed on the civil rights of blacks.

The aim of the boycott is to use the full force of the nation's oldest civil rights organization, with 500,000 members in 2,200 branches, to pressure the South Carolina Legislature to lower the flag or risk losing the estimated \$ 280 million that black travelers spend in the state each year.

The NAACP's tourism boycott will officially begin Jan. 1, 2000. The South Carolina branch of the organization first sought the boycott in July, and the controversy has already prompted 42 state and national organizations to cancel meetings or conventions in the state, NAACP officials said.

The text of the NAACP resolution calls the flag "an unspoken symbol of resistance to the battle for civil rights and equality," the main symbol for numerous groups advocating white supremacy and an "affront to the sensibilities and dignity" of the state's blacks. Blacks account for more than a third of South Carolina's population.

"For people of African ancestry in this country, the flying of the Confederate flag and the symbolism of it represents one of the most reprehensible aspects of our country's history," said NAACP President Kweisi Mfume.

Supporters say the flag represents Southern heritage and honors South Carolinians who died in the Civil War.

The Associated Press State & Local Wire, October 16, 1999

The resolution also called on the U.S. Justice Department's Division of Civil Rights to investigate whether flying what many blacks view as a symbol of oppression from the Statehouse dome violated federal civil rights law.

The NAACP board voted 53-0 to approve the recommendation, with 11 members not present.

"We know that economic sanctions work," said Lonnie Randolph Jr., President of the Columbia, S.C., NAACP chapter.

South Carolina, the only state to fly the Confederate battle flag over its Statehouse, first raised the flag in 1962 to commemorate the Civil War's centennial. Legislators, who have the sole power to remove it, have quashed past attempts to remove the flag, including a lawsuit by business leaders.

Nina Brook, a spokeswoman for South Carolina Gov. Jim Hodges, said the boycott decision will make it harder to resolve the issue. Hodges is talking to legislators, ministers, business leaders and others in an attempt to find a compromise, she said.

But she also criticized the House, and Republican Speaker David Wilkins.

"A very real obstacle remains, a majority in the House who say they will not vote for a compromise, and the speaker of the House who says he will not vote for a compromise," Ms. Brook said.

The House rejected a proposal to move the flag to a Confederate monument on the Statehouse grounds several years ago.

"I have not seen a significant change or shift in the House's position on that," Wilkins said.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: October 16, 1999

52ND STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1999 McClatchy Newspapers Inc.  
The Herald (Rock Hill, S.C.)

October 16, 1999 Saturday 1ST EDITION

SECTION: OPINION; Pg. 7A

LENGTH: 421 words

HEADLINE: To the contrary: Flag rally was a success

BYLINE: John Hill Special to The Herald

BODY:

Our recent Confederate flag rally on Saturday, Oct. 9, at the State Capitol was a monumental event. With a colorful motorcycle escort, the flag waving and chanting marchers, we paraded down Main Street to the Capitol steps.

Contrary to some newspaper reports, the turnout of 300 to 450 supporters was excellent, as we had sent few invitations, relying instead on the Internet and radio. Both Patrick Buchanan and David Duke had been discussed as possible speakers. In his presidential campaign, Pat Buchanan had said the flag was a South Carolina issue for the residents. We discounted the idea of Duke, as we could not pay his expenses.

I contacted Duke Headquarters in Louisiana two days prior to the rally and was told that, although David Duke was in Washington being interviewed by the British Broadcasting Corporation, he would be glad to donate his time to fly to our rally at his own expense, round trip out of D.C.

His speech on the steps of the Statehouse was electrifying. The essence of his speech was that if the Confederate flag is forced down by a minority, if the civil rights of the majority of the voters are denied, then the internationalists of the culture war will go after our historical monuments of leaders such as Washington and Jefferson, and eventually our constitutional freedoms that represent our society.

David Duke, like Sen. Robert Byrd, had a Klan affiliation in his youth but the media never lets up on his youthful association. Conversely, Ben Chaves, former head of the NAACP, served time for involvement with the 1970s riots in Wilmington, N.C. that left several people dead. It is obvious that the international Ssocialists who are destroying our national sovereignty, who seek to flood the United States with destitute Third World immigrants, and who export our industries to cheap, foreign labor markets, are petrified of an "America First" leader.

The majority of the board of the S.C. Council of Conservative Citizens, on last minute notice, agreed to let David Duke have their speaking time. As a former Louisiana legislator, presidential candidate and current president of the largest Republican parish in Louisiana, Mr. Duke is an international figure and the most articulate defender of American sovereignty and the Constitution. As he stated, "the real battle over the Confederate flag is to preserve our American

way of life."

The real issue is majority rule. A referendum on this issue is the only solution. Minority rule is tyranny.

John Hill

Ladson

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: October 19, 1999



**Eugenia Chough**

10/21/99 10:33:57 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Irene Bueno/OPD/EOP

cc:

Subject: flag

Just spoke with Ron Jones at OMB -- on 7/20/93, we issued a SAP in support of the National Community Support Act of 1993, and then Helms introduced his Amendment on 7/22. It was voted down shortly thereafter, so we never had to make a statement then. For our records, Ron is faxing us the SAP on the larger bill.

Any other trees to bark up?

**EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT**  
**Office of Management and Budget**  
**Legislative Reference Division**  
**722 New Executive Office Building**  
**725 17th Street, NW**  
**Washington, DC 20503-0001**

October 21, 1999

TO:	AGENCY:	FAX Phone	Recipient's Phone
Eugenie Chough <i>cc:   Rene Bueno</i>		67431	65566

\*\*\*\*\*

**FROM: Ronald Jones**

**PHONE: (202) 395-3386**

**FAX:(202) 395-3109**

**EMAIL: Ronald\_E.\_Jones@omb.eop.gov**

**SUBJECT: Helms United Daughters of the Confederacy. Amendment and SAP for S919**

**COMMENTS:**

Per our phone conversation

**HELMS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 610 (Senate - July 22, 1993)**

[Page: S9300]

Mr. HELMS (for himself, Mr. Lott, Mr. Coverdell, Mr. Faircloth, Mr. Cochran, and Mr. Thurmond) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 919), supra, as follows:

At the appropriate place add the following new section:

**SEC. . EXTENSION OF PATENT FOR INSIGNIA.**

A certain design patent issued by the United States Patent Office on November 8, 1898, being patent numbered 29,611, which is the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, which was renewed and extended for a period of fourteen years by the Act entitled 'An Act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy', approved November 11, 1977 (Public Law 95-168, 91 Stat. 1349), is renewed and extended for an additional period of fourteen years from and after the date of enactment of this Act, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to the same, being generally known as the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

---

*END*



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

July 20, 1993 (SENT)  
(Senate)

# STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(THIS STATEMENT HAS BEEN COORDINATED BY OMB WITH THE CONCERNED AGENCIES.)

## S. 919 - National Service Trust Act of 1993 (Kennedy (D) MA and 19 others)

The Administration strongly supports S. 919. The bill establishes an innovative Corporation for National Service to offer Americans educational awards in return for service to their country. In addition, the bill provides for a variety of other programs to develop citizenship among Americans of all ages, ranging from elementary school "service learning" projects to the National Senior Volunteer Corps. Enactment of this legislation will encourage service by all citizens and reaffirm an American community that transcends race, region, or religion.

The Administration has concerns with a number of amendments to be considered on the floor. The Administration opposes amendments to S. 919 that would: (1) require means-testing, (2) impose a "trigger" to limit availability of funds, (3) reduce educational awards, (4) weaken provisions regarding labor unions, or (5) otherwise weaken the bill.

### Pay-As-You-Go Scoring

S. 919 would affect direct spending and receipts; therefore, it is subject to the pay-as-you-go requirement of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (OBRA). The bill does not contain provisions to offset the increased direct spending. Therefore, if this bill were enacted, its deficit effects could contribute to a sequester of mandatory programs.

OMB's preliminary scoring estimates for this bill are presented in the table below. Final scoring of this legislation may deviate from these estimates. If S. 919 were enacted, final OMB scoring estimates would be published within five days of enactment, as required by OBRA. The cumulative effects of all enacted legislation on direct spending and receipts will be reported to Congress at the end of the congressional session, as required by OBRA.

### Pay-As-You-Go Estimates (\$ in thousands)

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1994-1998</u>
Outlays	*	*	*	*	*	*

\* - less than \$500,000

\* \* \* \* \*

**(Do Not Distribute Outside the Executive Office of the President)**

The position to strongly support the bill was developed by LRD (Mustain) in consultation with HR (Van Wie), BASD (Stigile), GM (Johnson), OFFM (Green), IA (Sandy), and OIRA (Semenuk). The Departments of Education (Heindel), Labor (Morin), Health and Human Services (White), Justice (Taylor), the Interior (Harris), and the Treasury (Dorsey), and the Office of Personnel Management (Woodruff), the Office of National Service (Lew, Gordon), ACTION (Fleming), and the Peace Corps (Martin) agree with this position.

The discussion of objectionable amendments was provided by the Office of National Service (Lew). HR (Van Wie) and White House Legislative Affairs (Brophy) concur.

S. 919 is substantially the same as the draft bill transmitted by the President on May 6, 1993. The Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee reported the bill on June 29, 1993.

**Major Provisions of S. 919**

**Structure.** S. 919 would establish a Corporation for National Service. The Corporation would provide: (1) grants to organizations to carry out national service programs and (2) educational awards to participants in the programs. Eligible organizations would include nonprofit organizations, institutions of higher education, school districts, local governments, States, and Federal agencies. The Federal share of assistance to operate a national service program would be 75 percent, exclusive of living allowances, health insurance, or child care assistance. The Corporation may waive the 75 percent limit under certain conditions. The Corporation also has authority to make a variety of grants to encourage the establishment of State Commissions for National Service and for other purposes.

Organizations wishing to administer a national service program must apply either through their State Commission or directly to the Corporation. Proposed programs must meet unmet human, educational, environmental, or public safety needs. The Corporation would distribute available funds for programs and educational awards in three equal parts: (1) by formula to States, (2) competitively to States, and (3) competitively to organizations (including States) applying directly to the Corporation.

**Educational Benefits.** The Corporation would pay educational awards of \$5,000 to participants in national service programs. Participants, generally age 17 and up, would be allowed to earn up to two awards, one for each term of service (1,700 hours). Individuals may use educational awards to repay student loans, to pay for attendance at an institution of higher education, or to pay for expenses in an approved school-to-work program.

Funds available for educational awards would be held in an National Service Trust account. The Trust would consist of: amounts appropriated by Congress, gifts and bequests, and interest and proceeds generated from the sale or redemption of obligations held by the Trust.

Other Benefits. Participants would also receive a living allowance that may be no less than the Volunteers In Service To America (VISTA) average annual subsistence allowance. The Corporation would pay 85 percent of the allowances; organizations administering the national service program would pay the remaining 15 percent.

Participants would also receive basic health insurance if they are not otherwise covered by a health insurance policy. The Corporation would pay for 85 percent of the insurance; organizations administering the program would pay the remainder. Finally, the Corporation would provide a child care allowance to full-time participants who require such services. The Corporation would establish guidelines for the availability of child care.

Miscellaneous. S. 919 would also amend the National and Community Service Act to improve school and community-based service learning programs.

The programs administered by ACTION would be transferred to the Corporation and the Chairperson of the Corporation would assume the duties of the Director of ACTION. In addition, the functions of the Commission on National and Community Service would be transferred to the Corporation.

S. 919 would also reauthorize the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 and the National and Community Service Act of 1990.

Authorization of Appropriations. S. 919 would authorize total appropriations of \$687 million in FY 1994 and such sums as may be necessary in FYs 1995 and 1996. The largest authorization of appropriations is a combined amount for the National Service Trust programs and Service learning programs, totalling \$434 million in FY 1994 and such sums as may be necessary in FYs 1995 and 1996. Approximately 89 percent of the \$434 million would be designated for the National Service Trust programs.

Differences between the Administration's Draft Bill and S. 919

The majority of the differences between the Administration's bill and S. 919 are technical in nature. The most significant differences relate to (1) the civil service status of ACTION employees transferred to the Corporation for National Service and (2) the retirement credit provided to certain former ACTION volunteers.

**Pay-As-You-Go Scoring**

Per GM (Johnson), S. 919 is subject to the pay-as-you-go requirement of OBRA because it affects direct spending and receipts. The bill contains several provisions that would increase receipts by authorizing Federal entities to receive gifts and bequests. OMB assumes that such receipts would be spent, and therefore estimates the pay-as-you-go effect to be zero. In addition, the retirement provisions regarding ACTION volunteers would affect direct spending and receipts, with a net increase in direct spending estimated at less than \$500,000 in each fiscal year.

In its final estimate, CBO is unable to estimate the deficit effect of gift and bequest authority and concurs with OMB regarding the pension provisions.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE DIVISION

July 20, 1993 - 1:00 p.m.

<u>THIS SEARCH</u>	<u>THIS DOCUMENT</u>	<u>THIS CR ISSUE</u>	<u>GO TO</u>
<a href="#">Next Hit</a>	<a href="#">Forward</a>	<a href="#">Next Document</a>	<a href="#">New CR Search</a>
<a href="#">Prev Hit</a>	<a href="#">Back</a>	<a href="#">Prev Document</a>	<a href="#">HomePage</a>
<a href="#">Hit List</a>	<a href="#">Best Sections</a>	<a href="#">Daily Digest</a>	<a href="#">Help</a>
	<a href="#">Doc Contents</a>		

*16- found this in CR → incredible stuff. But OMB SAP not online for pre-97 who should I call at OMB? -GC*

**NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)**

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Wofford). Without objection, it is so ordered.

**AMENDMENT NO. 610**

**(PURPOSE: TO GRANT AN EXTENSION OF PATENT TO THE UNITED DAUGHTERS OF THE CONFEDERACY)**

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Helms], for himself, Mr. Lott, Mr. Coverdell, Mr. Faircloth, and Mr. Cochran, proposes an amendment numbered 610.

At the appropriate place add the following new section:

**SEC. . EXTENSION OF PATENT FOR INSIGNIA.**

A certain design patent issued by the United States Patent Office on November 8, 1998, being patent numbered 29,611, which is the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, which was renewed and extended for a period of fourteen years by the Act entitled 'An Act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy' approved November 11, 1977 (Public Law 95-1468; 91 Stat 1349), is renewed and extended for an additional period of fourteen years from and after the date of enactment of this Act, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to the same, being generally known as the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the pending amendment, cosponsored by Senators Lott, Faircloth, Coverdell, and Cochran, has to do with an action taken by the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 6, which I am inclined to believe--and I certainly hope I am correct--that the distinguished Senators on that committee did not intend.

The action was, I am sure, an unintended rebuke unfairly aimed at about 24,000 ladies who belong to the United Daughters of the Confederacy, most of them elderly, all of them gentle souls who meet together and work together as unpaid volunteers at veterans hospitals and many, many other places.

These ladies, for example, present awards each year at West Point, the Naval Academy, and other military institutions, to honor young people whose academic achievements merit special attention. These ladies raise and/or contribute hundreds of thousands of dollars each year in scholarships. They perform charitable work at homeless shelters, at food banks, at homes for battered women. They are the only private organization authorized by the Defense Department to award crosses of military service and

national defense medals. When the military calls, the Daughters of the Confederacy always answer.

Most of these ladies, as I say, are elderly, and are not the kind of gentle souls when the Senate Judiciary Committee should want to offend deliberately, let alone rebuke. I am sure that the committee's action on May 6 was not intended to have that effect.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have offered the pending amendment to set matters straight with these 24,000 delightful ladies, many of whom live in the few remaining rest homes established decades ago to care for the widows and daughters of **Confederate** soldiers.

Let me say again that I believe that the May 6 action by the Judiciary Committee was the result of a good faith misunderstanding. I sincerely hope that we can remedy that error now.

I have to be honest, Mr. President. I was not aware that many organizations--for example, the American Legion, the Sons of Union Veterans, the Daughters of Union Veterans, the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republics, and the United Daughters of the Confederacy, among others--have been given patent protection by Congress for many, many decades. All of these organizations, and others, have their own insignias and badges, and so forth. Since 1898, Congress has granted patent protection for the identifying insignia and badges of various patriotic organizations. That patent protection runs for 14 years for each organization, and has been renewed automatically for these organizations in various years.

---

<i><u>THIS SEARCH</u></i>	<i><u>THIS DOCUMENT</u></i>	<i><u>THIS CR ISSUE</u></i>	<i><u>GO TO</u></i>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	Next Document	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	Prev Document	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	Daily Digest	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

---

<u><a href="#">THIS SEARCH</a></u>	<u><a href="#">THIS DOCUMENT</a></u>	<u><a href="#">THIS CR ISSUE</a></u>	<u><a href="#">GO TO</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Next Hit</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Forward</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Next Document</a></u>	<u><a href="#">New CR Search</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Prev Hit</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Back</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Prev Document</a></u>	<u><a href="#">HomePage</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Hit List</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Best Sections</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Daily Digest</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Help</a></u>
	<u><a href="#">Doc Contents</a></u>		

---

**NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)**

---

[Page: S9253]

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I would like to respond to this amendment and to suggest that it is absolutely ill-founded and to oppose the amendment.

Mr. President, I understand that we do not have a germaneness rule here in the Senate. But I would submit that, in the first instance, this amendment is not germane, either to this bill or, frankly, to anything else.

The real bottom line with regard to this amendment and to the request for a design patent extension by the United Daughters of the Confederacy is that it is not needed. This was recognized by the Judiciary Committee when, on the 12th of May of this year, it considered the extension of design patents and, by a vote of 13 to 2, I believe, rejected the appeal of the United Daughters of the Confederacy for renewal and extension of this particular design patent.

I think it is important to note what a design patent is. It is not just a matter of simple recognition. It is a rare honor given to an organization. There are very few of them given. In fact, design patents have only been conferred on fewer than 10 organizations in this century. They are given for a period of some 14 years. And it just is rarely done, in any event, for any organization.

There are a number of fine organizations throughout this country that are well known that do not enjoy or do not have design patents. But this organization, by a matter of oversight or whatever, has--this last year, as was brought to the attention of the Judiciary Committee, and the design patent was refused or withheld. Now the Senator from South Carolina has come to the floor attempting to undo the work of the Judiciary Committee, attempting to undo the decision of that committee that a design patent was not necessary in this case.

I submit further that the design patent is not needed in terms of the work of the organization. The Senator from South Carolina has gone on at great length to talk about the charitable work of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. The fact of the matter is the refusal to extend this extraordinary honor by this body does not stop them from doing whatever it is they do, from continuing their work in the community and the like.

The Senator has not explained, however, why the Daughters need this extraordinary congressional action to continue the work of their organization or protect against the unauthorized use of their insignia. He has not addressed at all the conclusions that have been set forth from the Treasury, which were addressed in the committee, that say it is not only extraordinary but probably inappropriate to have a design patent issued in this regard.

When members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy came to my office to discuss this issue

when we were involved with consideration of the issue before the Judiciary Committee, they could not even then answer the question why it was necessary to have a design patent. They can continue to fundraise. They can continue to exist. They can continue to use the insignia. Nothing changes in terms of what it is they do. The only issue is whether or not this body is prepared to put its imprimatur on the **Confederate** insignia used by the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

I submit to you, Mr. President, and the Members who are listening to this debate, as I did in the Judiciary Committee, that the United Daughters of the Confederacy have every right to honor their ancestors and to choose the **Confederate flag** as their symbol if they like. However, those of us whose ancestors fought on a different side in the Civil War, or who were held, frankly, as human chattel under the **Confederate flag**, are duty bound to honor our ancestors as well by asking whether such recognition by the U.S. Senate is appropriate.

The United Daughters of the Confederacy did not require this action to either conduct the affairs of their organization or to protect their insignia against unauthorized use. As the Patent Commissioner, Mr. Kirk, wrote in a letter issued April 30:

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<a href="#"><u>Next Hit</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Forward</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Next Document</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>New CR Search</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Prev Hit</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Back</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Prev Document</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>HomePage</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Hit List</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Best Sections</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Daily Digest</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Help</u></a>
	<a href="#"><u>Doc Contents</u></a>		

---

---

<u>THIS SEARCH</u>	<u>THIS DOCUMENT</u>	<u>THIS CR ISSUE</u>	<u>GO TO</u>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	<u>Next Document</u>	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	<u>Prev Document</u>	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	<u>Daily Digest</u>	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

**NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)**

---

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, he answered this question: Is it common practice for nonprofit groups to obtain design patents for their insignia and logos?

The answer is this:

First, logos are generally words or word combinations and are not articles of manufacture. As a consequence, they cannot be protected by design patents, but may be appropriate subject matter for trademark protection.

I point out that this is a design patent involved in this situation.

Obtaining design patent protection for a nonprofit group's insignia and emblems used to be more frequent in past years than today. However, obtaining renewal and extension of design patents for the insignia of such groups is the exception rather than the rule. This may well be due to the fact that numerous organizations have acquired exclusive rights to their seals, emblems and badges under title 36, U.S. Code, which pertains to patriotic societies and observances. It should be noted, however, that under this statute some organizations are granted exclusive rights to their names, emblems, seals and badges, while others have exclusive rights to their names only.

In other words, what he is saying is that most organizations have other kinds of protections and do not have this design patent, which is sought today by the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

He goes on:

For example, 36 U.S.C., section 48 confers to the American Legion only the exclusive right to its name.

The Boy Scouts have exclusive right to their name. But neither of these organizations enjoy a design patent.

He goes on:

'In that regard, the Boy Scouts'--with regard to their fleur-de-lis emblem--`\* \* \* did not obtain an extension' of the design patent that they had at the turn of the century when it expired.

So this organization has now had a design patent, from what I understand, for two renewals and they are extraordinary in their request to have it renewed.

The next question asked in the letter is: Are design patents typically renewed? The answer to this question I think is significant to this body:

You are correct in understanding that design patents normally terminate after 14 years and, as a rule, are not renewed.

So while I will not finish reading the rest of the letter, because I have no intent right now to stand here

and filibuster this issue, I think it is important to note that these patents are rarely renewed.

This is more than a second renewal for this organization. It is not necessary to begin with. They can continue to use their insignia. It does not interfere with their fundraising. It does not interfere with their charitable activities. It interferes in no way with their real activities, but rather is a symbolism of what is sought here with this amendment, which is so troublesome.

I submit to the body that the Judiciary Committee, in voting 13 to 2, recognized how singularly inappropriate it would be to renew the patent for the United Daughters of the Confederacy and it is singularly inappropriate for this amendment to be accepted.

## Exhibit 1

U.S. Department of Commerce,  
*Washington, DC, April 30, 1993.*

Hon. Carol Moseley-Braun,  
*U.S. Senate,*  
*Washington, DC.*

**Dear Senator Moseley-Braun:** Thank you for your letter requesting information about design patents. I am pleased to furnish the following answers to your questions:

What are the criteria for granting a design patent?

In accordance with section 171 of title 35, United States Code, anyone who invents a new, original and ornamental design for an article of manufacture may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of title 35, United States Code. In that respect, the requirement that a design be 'new' is equivalent to the novelty requirements applied to utility inventions under 35 U.S.C. 102. Similarly, the requirement of nonobviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 is also applied to design inventions. On the other hand, the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101, which is a patentability criterion for inventions protected by utility patents, is not applicable to design inventions. Instead, designs must meet the requirement of being ornamental. There are also a few differences in formality requirements between an application for a design patent and a utility patent application. Further, unlike utility patent applications that are entitled to a right of priority of twelve months under 35 U.S.C. 119, design patent applications are limited to a right of priority of six months under 35 U.S.C. 172.

---

---

***THIS SEARCH***

[Next Hit](#)  
[Prev Hit](#)  
[Hit List](#)

***THIS DOCUMENT***

[Forward](#)  
[Back](#)  
[Best Sections](#)  
[Doc Contents](#)

***THIS CR ISSUE***

[Next Document](#)  
[Prev Document](#)  
[Daily Digest](#)

***GO TO***

[New CR Search](#)  
[HomePage](#)  
[Help](#)

---

---

---

<u><a href="#">THIS SEARCH</a></u>	<u><a href="#">THIS DOCUMENT</a></u>	<u><a href="#">THIS CR ISSUE</a></u>	<u><a href="#">GO TO</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Next Hit</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Forward</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Next Document</a></u>	<u><a href="#">New CR Search</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Prev Hit</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Back</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Prev Document</a></u>	<u><a href="#">HomePage</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Hit List</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Best Sections</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Daily Digest</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Help</a></u>
	<u><a href="#">Doc Contents</a></u>		

---

## NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)

---

### Exhibit 1

U.S. Department of Commerce,  
*Washington, DC, April 30, 1993.*

Hon. Carol Moseley-Braun,  
*U.S. Senate,*  
*Washington, DC.*

**Dear Senator Moseley-Braun:** Thank you for your letter requesting information about design patents. I am pleased to furnish the following answers to your questions:

What are the criteria for granting a design patent?

In accordance with section 171 of title 35, United States Code, anyone who invents a new, original and ornamental design for an article of manufacture may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of title 35, United States Code. In that respect, the requirement that a design be 'new' is equivalent to the novelty requirements applied to utility inventions under 35 U.S.C. 102. Similarly, the requirement of nonobviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 is also applied to design inventions. On the other hand, the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101, which is a patentability criterion for inventions protected by utility patents, is not applicable to design inventions. Instead, designs must meet the requirement of being ornamental. There are also a few differences in formality requirements between an application for a design patent and a utility patent application. Further, unlike utility patent applications that are entitled to a right of priority of twelve months under 35 U.S.C. 119, design patent applications are limited to a right of priority of six months under 35 U.S.C. 172.

What are the rights and privileges of the owner of a design patent?

Like a utility patent, a design patent grants its owner the right to exclude others from making, using, or selling the invention under 35 U.S.C. 154. In that regard, all remedies under chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, for infringement of a patent are available to the owner of a design patent. Unlike utility patents, however, whose term is seventeen years, design patents are limited to a term of fourteen years under 35 U.S.C. 173.

Is it common practice for nonprofit groups to obtain design patents for their insignia and logos?

First, logos are generally words or word combinations and are not articles of manufacture. As a consequence, they cannot be protected by design patents, but may be appropriate subject matter for trademark protection. Obtaining design patent protection for a nonprofit group's insignia and emblems used to be more frequent in past years than today. However, obtaining renewal and extension of design patents for the insignia of such groups is the exception rather than the rule. This may well be due to the fact that numerous organizations have acquired exclusive rights to their seals, emblems and badges under title 36, United States Code, which pertains to patriotic societies and observances. It should be noted, however, that under this statute some

organizations are granted exclusive rights to their names, emblems, seals and badges, while others have exclusive rights to their names only.

For example, 36 U.S.C. 48 confers to the American Legion only the exclusive right to its name. By contrast, 36 U.S.C. 27 conveys to the Boy Scouts of America the exclusive right to use all emblems, badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases used by the Boy Scouts organization in carrying out its program. In that regard, the Boy Scouts also obtained a design patent on their fleur-de-lis emblem on May 30, 1911, but did not obtain an extension when the patent expired. We have no record that any design patent was ever issued to the Campfire Girls.

Are design patents typically renewed?

You are correct in understanding that design patents normally terminate after 14 years and, as a rule, are not renewed.

Do the insignia, badges and logos of nonprofit organizations enjoy any legal protection in the absence of a design patent?

As already mentioned, numerous organizations are granted the exclusive rights to their names and insignias under various provisions of title 36, United States Code. Other statutes offer additional protection, such as 18 U.S.C. 705, which provides criminal sanctions against the unauthorized use on merchandise of any insignia or colorable imitation thereof any veterans' organization incorporated by enactment of Congress. As a matter of interest, the signs of the American National Red Cross and the 4-H club are also protected under sections 706 and 707, respectively, of title 18, United States Code.

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	Next Document	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	Prev Document	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	Daily Digest	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

---

<u>THIS SEARCH</u>	<u>THIS DOCUMENT</u>	<u>THIS CR ISSUE</u>	<u>GO TO</u>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	<u>Next Document</u>	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	<u>Prev Document</u>	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	<u>Daily Digest</u>	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

**NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)**

---

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I, therefore, move that amendment 610--this amendment--be tabled.

Mr. METZENBAUM addressed the Chair.

Mr. HELMS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will kindly withdraw and give me about 4 minutes to make a further statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would take unanimous consent----

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Carolina be given 4 minutes to respond, that the Senator from Ohio be given an equal amount, 4 minutes, in order to support the tabling motion, and if the Senator from North Carolina wants 4 minutes, I have no objection to that either.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a parliamentary inquiry? Did you declare there to be a sufficient second?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I did declare there was a sufficient second.

Mr. HELMS. Well, fine. Just in case I might want to use it, I would appreciate 4 minutes more, too, but I do not want to delay the proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the opponents of the design patent extension for the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy [UDC] assert that the Congress should not act because there is absolutely no need for the protection of a design patent when other options may be available. In fact, however, a design patent provides protection which differs from that available under trademark and copyright law. Each type of legal protection has been created for specific usages which overlap but are not identical. The courts of the United States have emphasized the distinctions under the law between design patents and either trademarks or copyrights. The decision in Application of Mogen David Wine Corp. illustrates this point and holds that a design patent is not the same as other forms of protection.

The extension of the design patent will permit the UDC to prevent others from improperly using its insignia in circumstances which the UDC might not be able to prevent with a mere trademark or copyright action. Such circumstances might exist, for example, if a slightly modified version of UDC's emblem were used without permission. Design patent protection, which the UDC cannot obtain apart from this extension, does not require the different and more onerous showings that are required under the trademark or copyright laws to stop an infringer. Acting Commissioner Kirk agrees that a design patent offers separate and distinct protection from that available under trademark and copyright law.

Mr. President, the insignia of the UDC does not receive any protection under the provisions of titles 18 or 36 of the United States Code, which were mentioned by Acting Commissioner Kirk. Title 36 provides a Federal charter and perpetual protection to the Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War and other similar organizations, but not the United Daughters of the Confederacy. In contrast, this amendment simply provides a 14-year patent extension for the insignia of the UDC. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by Senator Helms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I rise to commend the Senator from Illinois for her eloquent presentation in connection with this particular issue. She has pointed out that there is no real reason nor need for an extension of the design patent for the United Daughters of the Confederacy. There are only less than 10 groups in the country that have it. Nobody is going to be in the position to steal their insignia. That is protected by reason of other laws.

I commend my friend from South Carolina for stating the fine work that this organization allegedly does. But that does not provide any reason why we have to provide this kind of an affront to so many Americans who are offended by that for which the Confederacy stood over a period of so many years. It is time for us to unite. It is not time for us to be divisive, and there is a kind of divisiveness that is implicit in the offering of this amendment.

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<a href="#"><u>Next Hit</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Forward</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Next Document</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>New CR Search</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Prev Hit</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Back</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Prev Document</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>HomePage</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Hit List</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Best Sections</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Daily Digest</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Help</u></a>
	<a href="#"><u>Doc Contents</u></a>		

---

---

<u>THIS SEARCH</u>	<u>THIS DOCUMENT</u>	<u>THIS CR ISSUE</u>	<u>GO TO</u>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	<u>Next Document</u>	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	<u>Prev Document</u>	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	<u>Daily Digest</u>	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

---

**NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)**

---

Mr. METZENBAUM addressed the Chair.

Mr. HELMS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will kindly withdraw and give me about 4 minutes to make a further statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would take unanimous consent----

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Carolina be given 4 minutes to respond, that the Senator from Ohio be given an equal amount, 4 minutes, in order to support the tabling motion, and if the Senator from North Carolina wants 4 minutes, I have no objection to that either.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a parliamentary inquiry? Did you declare there to be a sufficient second?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I did declare there was a sufficient second.

Mr. HELMS. Well, fine. Just in case I might want to use it, I would appreciate 4 minutes more, too, but I do not want to delay the proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the opponents of the design patent extension for the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy [UDC] assert that the Congress should not act because there is absolutely no need for the protection of a design patent when other options may be available. In fact, however, a design patent provides protection which differs from that available under trademark and copyright law. Each type of legal protection has been created for specific usages which overlap but are not identical. The courts of the United States have emphasized the distinctions under the law between design patents and either trademarks or copyrights. The decision in Application of Mogen David Wine Corp. illustrates this point and holds that a design patent is not the same as other forms of protection.

The extension of the design patent will permit the UDC to prevent others from improperly using its insignia in circumstances which the UDC might not be able to prevent with a mere trademark or

copyright action. Such circumstances might exist, for example, if a slightly modified version of UDC's emblem were used without permission. Design patent protection, which the UDC cannot obtain apart from this extension, does not require the different and more onerous showings that are required under the trademark or copyright laws to stop an infringer. Acting Commissioner Kirk agrees that a design patent offers separate and distinct protection from that available under trademark and copyright law.

Mr. President, the insignia of the UDC does not receive any protection under the provisions of titles 18 or 36 of the United States Code, which were mentioned by Acting Commissioner Kirk. Title 36 provides a Federal charter and perpetual protection to the Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War and other similar organizations, but not the United Daughters of the Confederacy. In contrast, this amendment simply provides a 14-year patent extension for the insignia of the UDC. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by Senator Helms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I rise to commend the Senator from Illinois for her eloquent presentation in connection with this particular issue. She has pointed out that there is no real reason nor need for an extension of the design patent for the United Daughters of the Confederacy. There are only less than 10 groups in the country that have it. Nobody is going to be in the position to steal their insignia. That is protected by reason of other laws.

I commend my friend from South Carolina for stating the fine work that this organization allegedly does. But that does not provide any reason why we have to provide this kind of an affront to so many Americans who are offended by that for which the Confederacy stood over a period of so many years. It is time for us to unite. It is not time for us to be divisive, and there is a kind of divisiveness that is implicit in the offering of this amendment.

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<a href="#"><u>Next Hit</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Forward</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Next Document</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>New CR Search</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Prev Hit</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Back</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Prev Document</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>HomePage</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Hit List</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Best Sections</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Daily Digest</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Help</u></a>
	<a href="#"><u>Doc Contents</u></a>		

---

---

<u>THIS SEARCH</u>	<u>THIS DOCUMENT</u>	<u>THIS CR ISSUE</u>	<u>GO TO</u>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	<u>Next Document</u>	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	<u>Prev Document</u>	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	<u>Daily Digest</u>	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

## NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)

---

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I would like to remind the Senator, Senator **DeConcini**, as well as myself, supported the amendment.

Mr. METZENBAUM. It is a fact the Senator did receive one Democratic vote.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 4 minutes

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not have a dyspeptic confrontation on this matter. The situation is perfectly clear. The United Daughters of the Confederacy was singled out for punitive action and the pending amendment will remedy that.

And, by the way, it's worthy of note that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. **Metzenbaum**] on three occasions has voted to renew the patent protection for UDC. The fact that he reverses himself today is instructive from a political standpoint.

The last thing the Senate should do is to engage in clearly an inflammatory action. As far as I know, race relations in North Carolina are excellent--they may not be good in Illinois, or Ohio--I do not know about that, but in North Carolina they are fine.

The point is this: Why was the UDC singled out for such a punitive rebuke? These fine, gentle ladies do not deserve to be singled out for such abuse, made the target under an implied pretense that the UDC is some sort of evil organization--which it absolutely is not. I have never heard the UDC mentioned as having created any dissension whatsoever, racial or otherwise.

I hope the Senator from Illinois has not embarked upon an inflammatory political gambit. We should avoid theatrics. There should be no ad hominem attacks either way, either side. But I must say that the Senate may be making a very, very bad mistake in reverse of the very thing that the distinguished Senator from Illinois has talked about; there are going to be hard feelings about the action of the Senator from Illinois. There should be no hard feelings.

And there certainly should be none in States where thousands upon thousands of people from other sections of the country have moved in to and enjoyed the good living in North Carolina, people who love our State and they love the South.

As far as I know, there is no bitterness between the races. But this motion to table the pending amendment, let me guarantee you, is bound to create bitterness. If a Senator is going to use tactics of this sort, it would be better if she would pick on somebody her size. Leave the United Daughters of the Confederacy alone. These good ladies have a fine history and they do not deserve to have been singled out for an undeserved rebuke.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise in support of my dear friend and colleague, Senator **Carol Moseley-Braun**, and against racism and its symbols.

I know her sense of frustration. I recognize her outrage. As a woman, I share some understanding of her situation. But I cannot know her sense of isolation being the only African-American in this body.

I thank her for standing up today and telling the truth about the racism embodied in the amendment we are debating. The issue here is not one of insensitivity or tradition. It is racism, pure and simple.

Without Senator **Moseley-Braun's** courageous stand against this amendment, the American people would think it's business as usual in this body--that they had not, in fact, voted for change last November. What we've seen today is clear evidence of change. We will not allow deference to notions of tradition to hide racism or any other form of discrimination or intolerance.

I am proud to stand with the Senator from Illinois and to serve with her in the U.S. Senate.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator from Illinois proceeding?

Mr. HELMS. What is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has no time.

A motion to table is not debatable. There were three 4-minutes pieces allocated.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I yielded to Senator **Metzenbaum**. Senator **Metzenbaum** assented to the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from----

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	Next Document	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	Prev Document	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	Daily Digest	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

---

<u>THIS SEARCH</u>	<u>THIS DOCUMENT</u>	<u>THIS CR ISSUE</u>	<u>GO TO</u>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	Next Document	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	Prev Document	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	Daily Digest	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

## NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)

---

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. That is what this vote really means.

I started off--maybe--I do not know--it is just my day to get to talk about race. Maybe I am just lucky about that today.

I have to tell you this vote is about race. It is about racial symbolism. It is about racial symbols, the racial past, and the single most painful episode in American history.

I have just gone through--in fact in committee yesterday I leaned over to my colleague **Dianne Feinstein** and I said, 'You know, **Dianne**, I am stunned about how often and how much race comes up in conversation and debate in this general assembly.' Did not I say that?

I have the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. The Senate is not in order. The Senator from Illinois is making an important statement, and the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, please ask that conversations leave this floor while the Senator from Illinois is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York makes the point. All conversations will cease. Anyone wishing to conduct conversations, please continue in the Cloakroom.

The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. So I turned to my colleague, **Dianne Feinstein**. You know, I am really stunned by how often and how much the issue of race, the subject of racism, comes up in this U.S. Senate, comes up in this body and how I have to, on many occasions, as the only African-American here, constrain myself to be calm, to be laid back, to talk about these issues in very intellectual, nonemotional terms, and that is what I do on a regular basis, Madam President. That is part and parcel of my daily existence.

But at the same time, when the issue of the design patent extension for the United Daughters of the Confederacy first came up, I looked at it. I did not make a big deal of it. It came as part of the work of the Judiciary Committee. I looked at it, and I said, well, I am not going to vote for that.

When I announced I was not going to vote for it, the chairman, as is his due, began to poll the members. We talked about it, and I found myself getting drawn into a debate that I frankly never expected.

Who would have expected a design patent for the **Confederate flag** ? And there are those in this body who say this really is not the **Confederate flag** . The other thing we did know was a **Confederate flag** .

I did my research, and I looked it up as I am wont to do, and guess what? That is the real **Confederate flag** . The thing we see all the time and are accustomed to is the battle **flag** . In fact, there is some history on this issue. I would like to read the following quote from the '**Flag** Book of the United States.'

The real flower in the southern **flag** began in November 1860, when the election of Lincoln to the President caused widespread fear the Federal Government will try to make changes in the institution of slavery. The winter of 1860 to 1861, rallies and speeches were held throughout the South and, frankly, the United States **flag** was replaced by a local banner.

This **flag** is the real **flag** of the Confederacy. If there is anybody in this Chamber anybody, indeed anybody in this world, that has a doubt that the **Confederate** effort was around preserving the institution of slavery, I am prepared and I believe history is prepared to dispute them to the nth. There is no question but that battle was fought to try to preserve our Nation, to keep the States from separating themselves over the issue of whether or not my ancestors could be held as property, as chattel, as objects of commerce and trade in this country.

And people died. More Americans died in the Civil War than any war they have ever gone through since. People died over the

proposition that indeed these United States stood for the proposition that every person was created equal without regard to race, that we are all American citizens.

I am sorry, Madam President. I will lower my voice. I am getting excited, because, quite frankly, that is the very issue. The issue is whether or not Americans, such as myself, who believe in the promise of this country, who feel strongly and who are patriots in this country, will have to suffer the indignity of being reminded time and time again, that at one point in this country's history we were human chattel. We were property. We could be traded, bought, and sold.

---

*THIS SEARCH*

[Next Hit](#)

[Prev Hit](#)

[Hit List](#)

*THIS DOCUMENT*

[Forward](#)

[Back](#)

[Best Sections](#)

[Doc Contents](#)

*THIS CR ISSUE*

[Next Document](#)

[Prev Document](#)

[Daily Digest](#)

*GO TO*

[New CR Search](#)

[HomePage](#)

[Help](#)

---

---

<u>THIS SEARCH</u>	<u>THIS DOCUMENT</u>	<u>THIS CR ISSUE</u>	<u>GO TO</u>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	<u>Next Document</u>	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	<u>Prev Document</u>	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	<u>Daily Digest</u>	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

## NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)

---

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. If I have to stand here until this room freezes over, Madam President, I am going to do so. Because I will tell you, this is something that has no place in our modern times. It has no place in this body. It has no place in the Senate. It has no place in our society.

And the fact is, Madam President, that I would encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle--Republican and Democrat; those who thought, 'Well, we are just going to do this, you know, because it is no big deal'--to understand what a very big deal indeed it is--that the imprimatur that is being sought here today sends a sign out to the rest of this country that that peculiar institution has not been put to bed for once and for all; that, indeed, like Dracula, it has come back to haunt us time and time and time again; and that, in spite of the fact that we have made strides forward, the fact of the matter is that there are those who would keep us slipping back into the darkness of division, into the snake pit of racial hatred, of racial antagonism and of support for symbols--symbols of the struggle to keep African-Americans, Americans of African descent, in bondage.

Madam President, may I yield, without losing my right to the floor, to the Senator from California?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Hearing none, the Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much, Madam President.

Madam President, I am afraid the issue has been joined and I find myself in agreement with my colleague from Illinois.

This great party has to stand up and take a position on this issue.

Madam President, I am a new member of the Judiciary Committee, along with Senator **Moseley-Braun** from Illinois. I watched her make this presentation in committee. It was thoughtful, it was considered, and she received an overwhelming majority of the votes in the committee.

Madam President, I would like to make this appeal to the members of my party from the Southern States to listen to what Senator **Moseley-Braun** said about the impact of the **Confederate flag** has on a major portion of the American constituency; those who are African-American; those who carry with them the heritage of a nation which at one time and to a great extent still has a certain racism and bias in much of what we do.

Madam President, it is my hope that members of the Southern delegation, and members of the Republican party, after hearing the eloquent words of the Senator from Illinois, would be willing to recognize the importance of this issue and the statement that it sends to all Americans. We should not grant a patent for a **flag** which to many people represents the condoning of slavery in the United States. It is not the way to heal the wounds of this Nation. It is not the way to bring people together.

So I would like to submit to you Madam President, that Senator **Carol Moseley-Braun** is correct.

**Carol**, I think you said it the way it had to be said. You said it eloquently. You said it beautifully.

I am hopeful that members of the Republican Party and of our very own party, will come forward with good will and provide the necessary votes to change this previous vote.

Mr. BRADLEY. Will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I yield to Senator **Bradley** for a question.

Mr. BRADLEY. Madam President, in a very profound way, this is a sad moment. This is very sad for the U.S. Senate.

Decisions are made in this body from time to time that are viewed as procedural, processed as legal, and the symbolic is often lost that there is power in symbols--power in symbols.

This is a powerful symbol that sits on the other side of this Chamber. It is the symbol that signifies a large part of this Nation's past that we have strived to put behind us and to move on.

This amendment is an easy amendment that elicits old divisions and opens up older wounds. I wish it were not so. I wish it were not so, but it is.

I appeal to people who voted for this amendment to understand not just the wisdom, but the passion and the depth of feeling from which Senator **Moseley-Braun** spoke.

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	Next Document	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	Prev Document	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	Best Sections	Daily Digest	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

---

<u>THIS SEARCH</u>	<u>THIS DOCUMENT</u>	<u>THIS CR ISSUE</u>	<u>GO TO</u>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	<u>Next Document</u>	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	<u>Prev Document</u>	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	<u>Daily Digest</u>	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

## NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)

---

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I thank the Senator very much. I would like to respond to the Senator from New Jersey, first to say in response to a series of questions that this amendment took many by surprise. In fact, I was over in the Judiciary Committee in the midst of confirmation hearings for the next Supreme Court Justice when I got a note on my desk that this Dracula had come back. I had believed that it had been killed dispositively by the Judiciary Committee previously when it voted 13 to 2 not to adopt this amendment. Lo and behold, it was being talked about on the floor as I sat on the Judiciary Committee. So I came dashing over here. I had not had occasion or time to alert my staff even. They had to bring over the book later. But I started to respond. I would catch people as they came on the floor. At the time the amendment was first put there were only three people on the floor.

So, as people came in I tried to tell them what this was about, but it was difficult because the vote was occurring. And I think the Senator's point is well taken. A lot of people thought, 'Well, this is not a big thing. This will never be noticed.' And did not understand the implications of what this means, not only to me personally, but what it means to every descendant of that peculiar institution, what it means to the people who fought on both sides of that war, what it means to America now, and what it will mean to America in the future: Whether or not we can put this behind us and move forward.

I know there are a number of Senators who have questions and I would like to yield for questions only.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam President. I have a parliamentary inquiry which I think is privileged.

With respect to this, the motion to table having been defeated, what is the business before the floor? Is it the original amendment or is it some other business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is the pending question, and the Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. BENNETT. So there is the possibility for an up-or-down vote on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Will the Senator yield for a question without yielding her right to the floor?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Yes, for a question.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Senator from Illinois. I will ask a question in just a moment. The Senator from Utah asked a question a moment ago. It may not be fully understood what the parliamentary situation is.

As I understand the parliamentary situation, the amendment that is opposed--and justifiably so, by a colleague from Illinois--was not tabled but the usual procedure then did not take place, wherein a motion is made to reconsider and that is laid on the table. So, someone who is on the prevailing side of the failure of the tabling motion--I think we can find some people to do that--would be in order if they chose to get up and say: I want a reconsideration of the vote. And if the Senator who made that motion was on the prevailing side of the failure of the tabling motion, then we could reconsider? I ask if that is not the correct interpretation, from a parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator--a Senator who voted on the prevailing side, or who did not vote at all, is eligible to move to reconsider.

Mr. EXON. That is another way of saying yes without the Chair having said the question was stated correctly by the Senator from Nebraska. Is that correct, I ask the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding, yes.

Mr. EXON. Thank you. Sometimes I like to have a nonlegal answer to a legitimate, straightforward question.

I thank the Chair.

Let me speak on this matter as one who has indicated earlier, because of the cost consideration, I am going to vote against this motion when it does get to a final vote, up or down, on whether we want to institute this policy. Although I happen to feel that those who would advance this education measure, this measure that has to do with voluntarism, are well-intentioned, I think this is not the time to be going to this program.

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	Next Document	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	Prev Document	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	Daily Digest	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

---

<u>THIS SEARCH</u>	<u>THIS DOCUMENT</u>	<u>THIS CR ISSUE</u>	<u>GO TO</u>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	<u>Next Document</u>	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	<u>Prev Document</u>	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	<u>Daily Digest</u>	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

**NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)**

---

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I thank the Senator for his question. The fact is, I did not look for a filibuster. I was not looking for a fight. I would very much like to have this resolved. I would like to put a stake through the heart of this particular Dracula and hope it never comes up again. It came up in Judiciary and was defeated soundly, with only three members of that entire committee--it is a large committee--two voting for it and one abstaining. The bulk of the Judiciary Committee, both Republican and Democrat alike, voted against this amendment. I would like to see that same result obtained today.

I yield to the Senator from New York for a question.

Mr. FORD. Parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FORD. As we stand now, the motion to table has been defeated. We are on the amendment itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FORD. Would it be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to table was defeated, provided a Senator who voted on the prevailing side made that motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be in order.

Mr. FORD. Then, Madam President, the tabling motion is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FORD. And on the tabling motion, the yeas and nays had been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Correct.

Mr. FORD. If in this request to reconsider, and that is agreed to, could the motion to vitiate the yeas and nays then be in order and a voice vote on the motion to table be agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would require a unanimous consent vote.

Mr. FORD. I understand, but the motion to vitiate could be offered and it would be unanimous consent and then it would take only one Senator to object to that and we would be, again then, on the tabling motion with the yeas and nays and we would vote then to either yea or nay the tabling motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FORD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that in my 17 years in this body, I have been not so moved as by her statement. She spoke of what in Christian faith would be called an epiphany, a sudden shining through of an internal reality that had not been there. I do not think the Senate knew it could do what it has just done. I do not think we had any idea how it would be undone. But I say this to the Senator:

When each of us comes to this body, and marches to the podium and we take an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, I say to the body that when I first took that oath, I thought it read 'foreign or domestic,' the idea that there would be a presumption of domestic enemies of the Constitution being odd.

Then I learned originally it did, but after the Civil War it was changed: 'Foreign and domestic.' And that Constitution which was forged in the Civil War is so clearly in spirit at odds with the proposal we have just voted on.

She could not have been more clear about the rights of free speech. Anybody who wants to wear that **flag**, anybody who wants to wave it, who wants to wrap himself or herself in it are free to do so, but for the Senate to endorse it is something I do not think we had any idea we were capable of.

I will ask the Senator one question: Will she not yield the floor until this matter is resolved to her satisfaction and to the honor of the U.S. Senate?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I thank the Senator very much. That is correct. The Senator is absolutely correct. I am prepared to do whatever is necessary. I will defend this **flag** against all enemies, foreign and domestic. I will do everything I can to see to it that this body does not disgrace itself by giving its imprimatur to a symbol of a **flag** that was defeated in the Civil War.

Mr. BIDEN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SIMON. Will my colleague yield for a question?

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<a href="#"><u>Next Hit</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Forward</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Next Document</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>New CR Search</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Prev Hit</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Back</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Prev Document</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>HomePage</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Hit List</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Best Sections</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Daily Digest</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Help</u></a>
	<a href="#"><u>Doc Contents</u></a>		

---

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<a href="#">Next Hit</a>	<a href="#">Forward</a>	<a href="#">Next Document</a>	<a href="#">New CR Search</a>
<a href="#">Prev Hit</a>	<a href="#">Back</a>	<a href="#">Prev Document</a>	<a href="#">HomePage</a>
<a href="#">Hit List</a>	<a href="#">Best Sections</a>	<a href="#">Daily Digest</a>	<a href="#">Help</a>
	<a href="#">Doc Contents</a>		

---

## NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)

---

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I thank the Senator from Delaware very much.

Mr. BIDEN. It is the only question I could think of.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Redemption is always possible, and I would look very much forward to getting beyond this problem.

The Senator from Colorado came over and asked me about a question a few minutes ago, and I would like to respond to him without giving up the floor.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank my colleague.

As has already been put into practice by several of my colleagues, I will get around to my question in a short time. Let me say that I came over to the floor and voted a while ago with **Carol Moseley-Braun**, went back to my office, as many of us did, and was answering some mail and watching television and it sort of exploded in my office on television.

I just wanted to tell her in front of this body that I was so proud that she stood up and kind of took on this issue. She is an outstanding legislator, and I am very proud to be able to serve with her. And I guess as the only other so-called person of color in this body, perhaps I have some insight that some of my colleagues may not except Carol.

If I can ask her forgiveness, I would also say that I now there are some places in this country yet where American Indians are called prairie niggers, which is about the most vulgar term I can think of, or calling any African-American a name and certainly American Indians, too.

I know that some of my colleagues who did not support her in this last issue feel they were upholding tradition. I would point out to them that slavery was once a tradition, like killing Indians like animals was once a tradition. That did not make them right, and we sought, as a body, as a Nation, to correct that. There are still remnants.

Unfortunately, too many of our children are taught anger and insensitivity, not love, patience, and tolerance, and we have a long way to go. I think probably some of the people who did not support Senator **Braun** did not do it out of malice. They did it out of some kind of a misguided idea that they were preserving some kind of tradition.

I had a couple of experiences when I ran for this body just last fall that reminded me you never get to a point in America where we are going to totally erase some of the roots of prejudices. In one place, in fact--I am a veteran of the Korean conflict and very proud of our country, proud of the fact I was in the Air Force and proud of the fact that I carried the **flag** of the 1964 Olympic games when **Bill Bradley** and I were teammates in 1964 in Tokyo. And yet when I was endorsed by a veterans group and they asked the VFW, of which I am a member in one town in my State, if I could be endorsed in that VFW, they said we are not letting any Indians be endorsed in this body.

The VFW certainly apologized for that and whoever said that as a specific person did not speak for the VFW, which is by and large a good, patriotic, wonderful group of Americans, and I am very supportive of them. But it does tell from firsthand experience that you never get away from that stuff. And maybe because of that kind of constant reminder, even when you are a Senator, we develop maybe some raw nerves that other people do not have.

I wanted to point that out. That was only one of several things that happened to me just in the last year or so. But one thing is clear. Symbols are important in this country; otherwise what is that **flag** about that I said I once carried and what is the Statue of Liberty about? They are meant to do several things. One is to uphold and uplift the spirits of people and to draw them together. But, clearly, other symbols, such as the swastika, was meant to symbolize a division and draw people apart.

That is what we are talking about. Do we want to validate and ratify symbols in this country through this body? And I

think historically we have tried to say we want to validate and ratify those symbols which are positive and which point out to all of us that we are all Americans and have a common goal, perhaps a common background, and we need to work together and not validate those symbols that are going to divide us and made us enemies of each other.

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	Next Document	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	Prev Document	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	Best Sections	Daily Digest	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

---

<u><a href="#">THIS SEARCH</a></u>	<u><a href="#">THIS DOCUMENT</a></u>	<u><a href="#">THIS CR ISSUE</a></u>	<u><a href="#">GO TO</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Next Hit</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Forward</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Next Document</a></u>	<u><a href="#">New CR Search</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Prev Hit</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Back</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Prev Document</a></u>	<u><a href="#">HomePage</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Hit List</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Best Sections</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Daily Digest</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Help</a></u>
	<u><a href="#">Doc Contents</a></u>		

---

## **NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)**

---

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I would just respond by saying that they did not notice. I mean, that was said in debate earlier. It just happened. It just happened because there was nobody around to bring attention to what was clearly and obviously a mistake, what was clearly and obviously something that this body did not need to do. I mean, that is the issue.

Senator **Heflin** has a question for me, and I would like to yield to him only for a question and without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Illinois very much. It is a very difficult issue. She handled it magnificently. I thank her.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois to allow me to make a statement or to try to bring this to a grinding halt, if I may?

I would like to know how many more would like to make statements so----

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky----

Mr. FORD. There are at least four on the Democratic side, and two on the Republican side.

Would it be in order that after Senator **Heflin**, Senator **Kerry** of Massachusetts, Senator **Riegle** of Michigan, Senator **Simon** of California, Senator **Boxer** of California, Senator **Wofford** from Pennsylvania--and I see we are going to have too many. I think the Senator is going to have to yield the floor, or perhaps we can get a unanimous-consent agreement that after these statements are made, Senator **Bennett** and I will make a motion to reconsider the vote.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I only yielded for a question. I am not yielding the floor.

Mr. FORD. I ask unanimous consent that I might make this statement, without you losing the right to the floor. I would never allow the Senator to lose her right to the floor. I would like to put it in some perspective here, because at the rate we are going, it will be a long afternoon.

Would the distinguished assistant Republican leader on the floor help me with trying to work out procedure here so that we can get a number and make a unanimous consent shortly?

Mr. SIMPSON. I certainly will, Mr. President.

Mr. FORD. I will yield the floor, and I will try to work it out so we can get to a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion was not tabled.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I thank the Senator.

The Senator from Alabama has a question he would like to put.

I yield for that purpose, without losing my right to the floor.

(Mr. WELLSTONE assumed the chair.)

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I rise with a conflict that is deeply rooted in many aspects of controversy. First, the conflict arises for the love of my southland. I feel today, however, that we also have a conflict in modern America.

I come from a family background that is deeply rooted in the Confederacy. My great-grandfather on my mother's side was one of the signers of the Ordinance of Secession by which the State of Alabama seceded from the Union. My grandfather on my father's side was a surgeon in the **Confederate** Army.

I have many connections through my family with the Daughters of the Confederacy organization and the Children of the Confederacy, and I have a deep feeling, relative to my family's background, that what they did at the time they thought was right.

History, as we look back, always can give perspectives on what existed at the particular time. But I revere my family, and I respect those who thought whatever they were doing was right at that particular time in our Nation's history.

But we live today in a different world. We live in a Nation that every day is trying to heal the scars of racism that have occurred in the past. We are trying to heal problems of racism in the world in which we live today. Perhaps racism is one of the great scars and one of the most serious illnesses that we still suffer today.

The United Daughters of the Confederacy has done a lot of good work. Its support for soldiers in arms in times of war and national conflicts, and its support for the sale of war bonds, and its charitable donations to orphans, and the countless hours donated to veterans in our national veterans hospitals, are certainly admirable.

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	Next Document	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	Prev Document	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	Daily Digest	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

---

<u><a href="#">THIS SEARCH</a></u>	<u><a href="#">THIS DOCUMENT</a></u>	<u><a href="#">THIS CR ISSUE</a></u>	<u><a href="#">GO TO</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Next Hit</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Forward</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Next Document</a></u>	<u><a href="#">New CR Search</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Prev Hit</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Back</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Prev Document</a></u>	<u><a href="#">HomePage</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Hit List</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Best Sections</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Daily Digest</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Help</a></u>
	<u><a href="#">Doc Contents</a></u>		

---

## NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)

---

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I say to Senator **Heflin**, my senior Senator, Senator **Simon**, has been so nice in standing by me throughout this debate today.

The Senator has a question without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to make a unanimous consent--without losing her right to the floor--to make a unanimous-consent agreement at this time?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. So long as I do not lose the floor.

Mr. FORD. I so ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be recognized for statements and that the time announced for each be recognized, and that it will alternate from one side of the aisle to the other. They are 10 Senators; and at the end of the last speech that Senator **Bennett** of Utah and myself be recognized for a bipartisan motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was not tabled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I think the Chair interrupted the Senator from Kentucky. He needs to continue first with his request and then I will ask if there is any objection.

Mr. FORD. Senator **Riegle**, 7 minutes; Senator **Kerry** of Massachusetts, 5 minutes; Senator **Boxer**, 5 minutes; Senator **Conrad**, 3 minutes; Senator **Metzenbaum**, 3 minutes; Senator **Simon** 2 minutes; Senator **Wofford**, 2 minutes; Senator **Specter**, 3 minutes; Senator **McConnell**, 3 minutes; Senator **Bennett**, 3 minutes; Senator **Kennedy**, 3 minutes; and Senator **Carol Moseley-Braun**, 5 minutes; and at the end of that time Senator **Bennett** and I be recognized to make the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina has the floor.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina just was responding. The Senator from Illinois still has the floor.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Just checking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina reserves the right to object.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object pending a response to a question. I do not care how many Senators speak on the motion to reconsider. That is irrelevant, and the time ought not to be taken for that anyhow. But that is not for me to judge. What I want to be sure of is that no action is going to be taken to limit the debate on the amendment when it becomes the pending business. The Senator from Kentucky has no idea of limiting debate on that, does he?

Mr. FORD. If the amendment gets to the floor, the Senator can have it.

Mr. HELMS. You bet. I do not object.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. If I may have the attention of Senator **Ford**.

Mr. FORD. I want to be sure.

Mr. SPECTER. I want to be sure this is alternated here.

Mr. FORD. That is part of my unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. SPECTER. Do the Republicans get the first speech, with the last one the Democrats?

Mr. FORD. I had not decided that yet, but since the Senator is here and I would not want to keep him on the floor longer than necessary I will be more than glad to ask him to speak first.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Now, Mr. President, we have a unanimous consent agreement, and I would like to amend my unanimous-consent agreement, that Senator **Lautenberg** be recognized for 3 minutes, Senator **Kohl** be recognized for 3 minutes, and also Senator **Feinstein** from California be recognized for 2 minutes.

---

*THIS SEARCH*

Next Hit

Prev Hit

Hit List

*THIS DOCUMENT*

Forward

Back

Best Sections

Doc Contents

*THIS CR ISSUE*

Next Document

Prev Document

Daily Digest

*GO TO*

New CR Search

HomePage

Help

---

---

<u>THIS SEARCH</u>	<u>THIS DOCUMENT</u>	<u>THIS CR ISSUE</u>	<u>GO TO</u>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	<u>Next Document</u>	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	<u>Prev Document</u>	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	<u>Daily Digest</u>	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

## NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)

---

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I simply want to tell my colleague from Illinois how proud I am of her at this moment.

This discussion, frankly, has been good for the Senate and good for the Nation. I also want to tell you that I am very, very proud today to be your colleague. It took courage to do what you have done. The reality is symbols are important.

The Senator from Colorado, Senator **Nighthorse Campbell**, has talked about the offense that the use of the name Washington Redskins gives to native Americans. We have to face these problems and we have to be sensitive.

When I see a pickup truck driving down the highways of Illinois with a **Confederate battle flag** on the back of that pickup truck, I know that is not a symbol for understanding. It is a symbol that is not good. And what my colleague from Illinois has done today is to say let us use symbols that bring us together when we grant special opportunities to groups.

This group can continue to do that, I do not question that they do good things. But if they want to have this Federal charter renewed, come back with a different kind of a symbol. I am proud of my colleague, proud of the U.S. Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. **McCONNELL**. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from Illinois for her effective presentation. I understand the passion that she feels for this.

I would like to bring a slightly different perspective to it. My roots, like the senior Senator from Alabama, run deep in the South. Ironically just over the last 10 days I have been doing some work on my family genealogy.

My great grandmother's first husband was killed in the Civil War. I have learned that he was not a slaveholder, but he, like others in Alabama, viewed that conflict through the lenses of those days. And his view was that it was a fight for his region.

My grandmother belonged to the United Daughters of the Confederacy. I know she did not support slavery.

So it has been my view in growing up that the UDC largely was a group not about the purpose of glorifying slavery, but a group that very much revered the lives of those who were lost during that great conflict which was the most costly conflict this country has ever endured. More Americans were killed in the Civil War than any other war in our history.

So I voted in opposition to the Senator from Illinois, certainly not because I, in any way, advocate slavery nor do I believe that UDC advocates slavery, but out of respect for my forefathers who did what they thought was appropriate for their region of the country during this most difficult time.

I would hate to have this vote to be construed as somehow a refighting, if you will, of the Civil War or an endorsement of racism in any way. The Civil War happened. It is part of our history. Many of us, as we reach our fifties, get interested in our family histories, as I have been in the last months.

I revere those forefathers of mine, not because I approve of slavery, but they did what they thought was appropriate in their time. And so I do not feel we should deny this patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

It never occurred to me in casting my vote a while ago that it would be interpreted as somehow an endorsement of racism or slavery, but rather I did it out of respect for my ancestors and their roots which ran deep in the South.

That same family that supplied a **Confederate** soldier also supplied a drummer boy in the American Revolution. So my descendants have fought to establish the country, some of us thought to divide us into two countries. I am glad that position did not prevail.

But I do not think the UDC has done anything to be punished for or to have this particular patent withdrawn.

So, Mr. President, I am going to, when we vote on this again, vote the same way I did the first time, simply out of reverence for my ancestors whose roots run deep in the Southern part of our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 7 minutes.

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	Next Document	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	Prev Document	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	Best Sections	Daily Digest	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

---

<u>THIS SEARCH</u>	<u>THIS DOCUMENT</u>	<u>THIS CR ISSUE</u>	<u>GO TO</u>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	<u>Next Document</u>	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	<u>Prev Document</u>	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	<u>Daily Digest</u>	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

## NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)

---

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I probably will not use that time. I join my colleague from Michigan and other colleagues who have, first of all, applauded the courage of the Senator from Alabama. Standing right behind him, one could feel as well as see the emotion that consumed him as he expressed a reversal which for him, where he comes from, is very, very hard to explain to some people and very hard to summon up on quick notice, if you will. I think it was great courage. Most importantly, it was leadership.

What is remarkable to me, as I stand here, is that there is a real discomfort as I think about the fact that we are 96 white men and women debating whether or not we ought to be sensitive to the expression of one African-American and one native American. If that does not tell us what the problem is, then nothing will.

I heard my very good friend from Wyoming, who I know does not have a racist streak in him, who is a good soul and friend of all of ours, cite the fact that four times in the past the U.S. Senate has just let this go by. But that is also the problem. Because you cannot look to the Senate of the twenties and the thirties and the forties and the fifties as an example of either what was right or how you ought to respond on an issue regarding the perception of people to something about race and about past history that we know was wrong. This institution did not begin to have much of a record on this subject until the 1960's.

You can turn to my colleague, Senator **Kennedy**, and others, and ask what a struggle that was in the days of real filibusters, or long weeks, of all-night sessions, when they struggled to do what was right.

So the fact we are here now, reminded by one African-American, the first elected in her own right on this side of the aisle in the history of this institution, ought to give us pause to think about the message that she carries on behalf of millions of other people in this country.

This is not an issue of punishing an institution for what it believes. This is not an issue of denying people the right to fly the **Confederate flag**. This is not an issue of denying people the right to be proud of where they come from in this country, or of the history of their families.

This is an issue of sensitivity, about whether or not we, this mostly white institution, are going to express an understanding of a symbol that carries with it the capacity to make people literally fear for themselves. I have learned something about that in the last years as I have talked to African-Americans who tell me about the fear they can feel just crossing Harvard Square, or walking in Washington, DC, when they get into the wrong part of town and people look at them differently.

When you see the Confederacy symbolized--maybe not for a lot of people in this institution, but for an awful lot of Americans--it summons up and conjures up images that are painful and difficult. This is a question of whether or not we are going to ratify, as a Federal institution, a symbol that carries that fear. Or whether we will do what the Senator from Alabama has done so courageously: Summon up the will to acknowledge that this is a different time in this country; it demands a different response. And today is a great learning moment for the U.S. Senate, a moment where we, all of us in America, can gain a new sensitivity to the realities of this great Nation of ours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California [Mrs. **Boxer**] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am so honored to be in this Chamber, standing so close to leadership and courage as I was, as I sat in the Chair and watched the Senator from Illinois speak from the deepest recesses of her soul, and at the same time from a very strong intellectual part; and to stand near the Senator from Alabama as he spoke to us and showed the most extraordinary courage I have seen in very many, many years.

When I was a little girl, my father used to say it is in the Senate where you see the courage. I thank the Senator from Alabama for making me feel so good that I am in this institution. For what he has done today, and the way he did it, speaks to the best in every American. If ever there was proof that diversity in this institution is important, we got that proof today.

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	Next Document	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	Prev Document	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	Best Sections	Daily Digest	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

---

<u>THIS SEARCH</u>	<u>THIS DOCUMENT</u>	<u>THIS CR ISSUE</u>	<u>GO TO</u>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	<u>Next Document</u>	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	<u>Prev Document</u>	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	<u>Daily Digest</u>	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

---

## NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)

---

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Illinois, **Carol Moseley-Braun**, I think, was perhaps the most powerful, moving statement I have heard on the floor of the Senate since I came here 7 years ago. I was proud to vote with her, and prouder still of my colleagues who stood up, one after another, to say what is true: Senator **Bradley**, Senator **Campbell**, especially Senator **Heflin**, Senator **Riegle**, Senator **Boxer**, Senator **Feinstein**, and many more.

The fact is, something very important happened this afternoon on the floor of the U.S. Senate because we have confronted something ugly in this country, something very ugly in our past, something that haunts us still.

My relatives fought in the Civil War. They fought on the side of the North. They fought because they deeply believed in preserving the Union and they were deeply and morally opposed to slavery.

Mr. President, the **Confederate flag** is a symbol. It is an important symbol. It is a symbol of a system that allowed slavery. The Vice President of the Confederacy, in the letter the Senator from Illinois read from, said:

The cornerstone of the Confederacy rests upon the great truth that the Negro is not equal to the white man.

Mr. President, African-American soldiers were equal to white soldiers when they died to preserve that **flag** --the American **flag** --in the Civil War. African-American soldiers were equal to white soldiers when they died to preserve that **flag** --the American **flag** --in World War I and in World War II. They were equal to white soldiers when they died to preserve this country in the Korean war and the Vietnam war and in every other conflict.

The Vice President of the Confederacy said that the other side, led by Jefferson, saw that enslavement was wrong in principle, wrong socially, morally, and politically. They were right.

The Senate should not, in my judgment, indeed cannot, put its stamp of approval on a symbol of something that was so wrong.

So, Mr. President, I hope and urge my colleagues that we will overturn a mistake that was made earlier. This is a great opportunity to confront something that is ugly in our present and in our past. I thank the Chair.

Mr. METZENBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. **Dorgan**). The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I rise because I have seen something here today that I have not seen since I have been in the Senate. I saw one person, who was able to make a difference, stand up and fight for what she believes in, and she gave a message to this body that electrified the body. I want to take my hat off to her because I think that she has not only won her point, but she has elevated this body.

By her eloquence, she has shown that this body can be electrified. She had a losing hand. I stood there and tried to help her get votes. She had lost 52 to 48. I saw Members of this body vote the wrong way, and it was a difficult situation. She went back to her chair and she said, 'I'm going to stand here as long as I have to. This amendment is not going to pass.' There is no question about it, she will prevail.

But what is so important to me is that this body--not always, but in this instance--has proven that it can be prodded to do what is right. What a magnificent moment for this Senate when the Senator from Alabama, who voted against the Senator from Illinois, stands up and makes that most beautiful speech. It took a lot of courage to make that speech. I think each of us in this body recognize the difficulties of a Senator from Alabama speaking to this particular issue.

I just want to say that I personally am grateful to her. I am grateful to her for getting elected. I am grateful to the people of Illinois for sending her here. It was long past due that we have a woman of color in the U.S. Senate, and I am so pleased she is a Member of the body that I belong to.

But more important than that even is the fact that she showed us today how one person can change the position of this body, and she did it in a most eloquent way. We all owe her a great debt of gratitude.

---

*THIS SEARCH*

Next Hit  
Prev Hit  
Hit List

*THIS DOCUMENT*

Forward  
Back  
Best Sections  
Doc Contents

*THIS CR ISSUE*

Next Document  
Prev Document  
Daily Digest

*GO TO*

New CR Search  
HomePage  
Help

---

---

<u>THIS SEARCH</u>	<u>THIS DOCUMENT</u>	<u>THIS CR ISSUE</u>	<u>GO TO</u>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	<u>Next Document</u>	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	<u>Prev Document</u>	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	<u>Daily Digest</u>	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

## NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)

---

Mr. WOFFORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator **Wofford**, for 2 minutes.

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has shown not only that one person can make a difference, but that even a Senator can make a difference. I think this time has been very worthwhile today, even though I cannot think of an amendment more extraneous, irrelevant, and impertinent to a bill on national service than a bill for extending the patent of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

It has been worthwhile if only for having seen once again the profile in courage of Senator **Heflin** from Alabama and to stir some of us into thinking about our own families and background and my two grandmothers who were members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy and who survived by going to Howard Law School and joining the civil rights movement, and to think back on the past, but also as the Senator from Alabama said the America of today.

I ask the Senator from Illinois and our friends here, is there anything that is more the opposite of the bill for national service that we are returning to soon than the divisive issue we have just taken up? And is not the national service bill itself designed for just the opposite, to bring our country together, rich and poor, North and South, young and old, black and white, cities, suburbs, and farms?

I hope, as we get moving on to the business at hand of the bill for national service, the better angels of our nature, as Lincoln would wish, do prevail in this Chamber tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Who seeks recognition?

Mr. MITCHELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, Senator **Mitchell**.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in commending the Senator from Illinois as well as the Senators from Alabama and Utah and all of those who have spoken on this subject this afternoon.

The eloquence, the conviction, the power of the remarks made by the Senator from Illinois, the persuasiveness as seen in the subsequent remarks, is something rarely seen in the Senate or anyplace else in our society, and I commend her for the conviction and the principle and the courage she has brought to this matter.

Race has been the most divisive issue in American history. It continues to be. Let us hope that in a way that no one could have foreseen, and perhaps unintended, this issue, this debate, what we hope will be the result, will serve to help us get past this issue in our country.

I would like also to ask all Senators to reflect on another important issue presented by what has occurred here this afternoon. The Senate is a unique institution, and among the rules which make it unique are that any Senator can offer any amendment, anytime he or she wants, even though it has no relationship to the bill being considered, and without giving any notice.

Indeed, the sad reality is that many of the amendments we vote on we do not even know about until after they have been offered and they are read for the first time. Every Member of this Senate knows we are repeatedly confronted with amendments of this type that deal with seemingly less than nationally significant issues, that are unrelated to the bill being considered, on which there has been no notice, no debate, no discussion, and consideration. The first instinct of almost every Member of this Senate is to be cautious and to cast a vote that will not cause any problems later. And so time and time and time again we are confronted with amendments of this type and we have gone ahead and voted for them as a body because it is the easy way out.

I hope Senators will reflect upon this, and that, first, we will see a reduction in these kinds of amendments, amendments that are unrelated to the bill, amendments on which there has not been any time to reflect and consider and make a reasoned judgment before voting, and Senators in the future, thanks to the courage of the Senator from Illinois, will think long and hard before they take the easy way out and vote for an amendment of this type. It is the kind of thing we regularly confront. This is an important issue in its own right, but it is also important to cause every Member of the Senate to pause and reflect on the way we do business in this institution.

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	Next Document	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	Prev Document	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	Best Sections	Daily Digest	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

---

<u><a href="#">THIS SEARCH</a></u>	<u><a href="#">THIS DOCUMENT</a></u>	<u><a href="#">THIS CR ISSUE</a></u>	<u><a href="#">GO TO</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Next Hit</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Forward</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Next Document</a></u>	<u><a href="#">New CR Search</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Prev Hit</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Back</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Prev Document</a></u>	<u><a href="#">HomePage</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Hit List</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Best Sections</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Daily Digest</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Help</a></u>
	<u><a href="#">Doc Contents</a></u>		

---

## NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)

---

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, to paraphrase Charles Dickens, the past few hours in the Senate were the worst of times and the best of times.

I was distressed to see the Senate vote against tabling the amendment by Senator **Helms** when it was first offered. The amendment would have continued what amounts to a Federal seal of approval on a symbol that is offensive to millions of Americans. The vote represented an insensitive display of business as usual--its OK to do something again because we have done it before. I voted in favor of tabling the Helms amendment.

However, it appears that we are about to reverse that decision. In doing so, the Senate has demonstrated its ability to listen to the courageous voice of a new member and to correct its mistake. Instead of putting its stamp of approval on a symbol that has divided this Nation, the Senate has shown the benefit of debate and diversity. Instead of dredging up the horrors and prejudices of the past, it has shown its ability to look to the future with sensitivity and the hope of renewal. For these reasons, I will be pleased to vote for the motion to reconsider the motion to table the Helms amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Utah for the purpose of making a motion.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which we moved to table the amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, joining with the Senator from Utah, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah to reconsider the previous motion to table. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced--yeas 76, nays 24, as follows:

### Rollcall Vote No. 207 Leg.

[Rollcall Vote No. 207 Leg.]

YEAS--76

- Akaka
- Baucus

- Bennett
- Biden
- Bingaman
- Boren
- Boxer
- Bradley
- Breaux
- Brown
- Bryan
- Bumpers
- Campbell
- Chafee
- Coats
- Cohen
- Conrad
- D'Amato
- Danforth
- Daschle
- DeConcini
- Dodd
- Domenici
- Dorgan
- Durenberger
- Exon
- Feingold
- Feinstein
- Ford
- Glenn
- Gorton
- Graham
- Gregg
- Harkin
- Heflin
- Hollings
- Hutchison
- Inouye
- Jeffords
- Johnston
- Kassebaum
- Kennedy
- Kerrey
- Kerry
- Kohl
- Lautenberg
- Leahy
- Levin
- Lieberman
- Lugar
- Mathews
- Metzenbaum
- Mikulski
- Mitchell
- Moseley-Braun
- Moynihan
- Murkowski
- Murray
- Nunn

- Pell
- Pressler
- Pryor
- Reid
- Riegle
- Robb
- Rockefeller
- Roth
- Sarbanes
- Sasser
- Shelby
- Simon
- Simpson
- Specter
- Warner
- Wellstone
- Wofford

**NAYS--24**

- Bond
- Burns
- Byrd
- Cochran
- Coverdell
- Craig
- Dole
- Faircloth
- Gramm
- Grassley
- Hatch
- Hatfield
- Helms
- Kempthorne
- Lott
- Mack
- McCain
- McConnell
- Nickles
- Packwood
- Smith
- Stevens
- Thurmond
- Wallop

**NOT VOTING--0**

So, the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, would it be in order to vitiate the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator that will require unanimous consent.

Mr. HELMS. I object.

Mr. FORD. Objection is heard, and I respect that.

We go to the motion to table without intervening business and the vote is 'yea' to table or 'nay' to not table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question on reconsideration is the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina. Under the precedents, the yeas and nays carry over.

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	Next Document	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	Prev Document	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	Daily Digest	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

---

<u>THIS SEARCH</u>	<u>THIS DOCUMENT</u>	<u>THIS CR ISSUE</u>	<u>GO TO</u>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	<u>Next Document</u>	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	<u>Prev Document</u>	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	<u>Daily Digest</u>	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

**NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)**

---

Mr. DANFORTH. Certainly.

Mr. DODD. That will be evenly divided; 30 minutes evenly divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HELMS. Yes, there is, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Several Senators addressed Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam President, I believe there are other Senators who wish to do the same thing and I wonder if we could arrange it so all would have a chance.

Does the Senator from North Carolina wish to address the Senate on the same subject?

Mr. HELMS. I think it would be appropriate, Mr. Leader, yes. I had intended to use a few minutes, but not many. I decided to object to the unanimous-consent request. If I can have a few minutes? I do not want to be limited. I will only use a few minutes but I do not want the Chair saying my time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. What I propose then is we now have, I believe, four Senators who wish to address the Senate on a previous subject. I would like to simply inquire of each what time they want and then encompass that in an agreement, and then we could proceed with that.

Three minutes to the Senator from Missouri. How much time would the Senator from North Carolina like?

Mr. HELMS. I do not think I will use more than 5 minutes. I do not think I will use that much, but I do not want to be restrained because I have a few things I want to say. I will promise the leader I am not going to waste time.

Mr. MITCHELL. I accept that.

The Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. Leader, I would like 3 minutes and I will not waste time either.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Senator from Illinois? How much time does the Senator require?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Two minutes will be fine.

Mr. DODD. I will take a minute.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the Senator from North Carolina will remain, I am going to put a request to accommodate everyone and I will not put a time limitation on his remarks.

Mr. HELMS. That will be fine, Mr. Leader. And I promise you I will not be too long.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask unanimous consent the Senator from North Carolina be recognized to address the Senate; that upon completion of his remarks the Senator from Missouri be recognized to address the Senate for up to 3 minutes; that upon the completion of his remarks the Senator from New Jersey be recognized to address the Senate for up to 3 minutes; that upon the completion of his remarks the Senator from Connecticut be recognized to address the Senate for up to 3 minutes; and that upon completion of his remarks the Senator from Illinois be

recognized to address the Senate for up to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, if the majority leader would withhold, I will probably not object, but I reserve that right. I thought the Senator from North Carolina had declared that he was interested in 5 minutes worth of time and I think we ought to honor that request and thereby limit it and be able to move this along.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina indicated that he did not wish a time limitation to be imposed, but he assured us that he would not use more than 5 minutes and I am prepared to accept his word on that.

I would like to ask the Senator from North Carolina if we would permit the Senator from Illinois to proceed first for 3 minutes, to change the order so he would then go second?

Mr. HELMS. To the contrary, let me appear last. Let everybody have their say and then I will wind up. I thank the leader.

Mr. MITCHELL. I renew my request with the modification the Senator from Illinois proceed first and the Senator from North Carolina proceed last, in the order stated, all other terms of the request being the same.

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, just one moment. I think someone, either the distinguished Senator from New Jersey or maybe the majority leader, misstated what I said. I said I did not want any time limitation but I did not plan to use more than 5 minutes. Is that what the Chair understood me to say?

---

*THIS SEARCH*

[Next Hit](#)

[Prev Hit](#)

[Hit List](#)

*THIS DOCUMENT*

[Forward](#)

[Back](#)

[Best Sections](#)

[Doc Contents](#)

*THIS CR ISSUE*

[Next Document](#)

[Prev Document](#)

[Daily Digest](#)

*GO TO*

[New CR Search](#)

[HomePage](#)

[Help](#)

---

---

<u><a href="#">THIS SEARCH</a></u>	<u><a href="#">THIS DOCUMENT</a></u>	<u><a href="#">THIS CR ISSUE</a></u>	<u><a href="#">GO TO</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Next Hit</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Forward</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Next Document</a></u>	<u><a href="#">New CR Search</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Prev Hit</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Back</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Prev Document</a></u>	<u><a href="#">HomePage</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Hit List</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Best Sections</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Daily Digest</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Help</a></u>
	<u><a href="#">Doc Contents</a></u>		

---

## NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)

---

Mr. DANFORTH. Madam President, I simply want to take a few minutes to share with the Senate the profound distress that I experienced during this last series of votes. It became clear after the first vote that this was a highly symbolic question and that the symbolism that we were supposed to vote on was how we felt about racism in America.

If there is going to be a symbolic vote on that question, I have to vote that racism in America is something that has to be absolutely condemned and there cannot be any question in anybody's mind as to how I feel about it. That is why I voted.

But I was almost sick to my stomach when I cast that vote, and the reason was that in order to prove in a symbolic way my feelings about how disgusting racism is, I had to tar with the brush of racism innocent people who are members of an organization, for whatever reason, that they feel strongly about and they feel dearly about and their motives have nothing to do with racism and nothing to do with approval of slavery.

There are plenty of people in this country who are proud of their heritage and who are members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, or whatever the comparable organization is for the survivors of the Union, who are not racists. They are just proud of their ancestors.

I was reminded during this series of votes that on April 10, 1865, after Robert E. Lee surrendered at Appomattox, President Lincoln asked that night on the lawn of the White House that two songs be played by the band to the crowd that had gathered. One song was 'Yankee Doodle' and the other song was 'Dixie.' I take it that if April 10, 1865, occurred today, we would be having symbolic votes on the floor of the U.S. Senate to the effect that the band should not have played 'Dixie' on that occasion.

I hope the Civil War is behind us, and I hope that we do not have to prove our dedication to the cause of racial justice any more by rubbing it in the faces of those who, for perfectly innocent reasons, are members of either the United Daughters of the Confederacy or any other organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I have been here 10 years now, and there have been few, if any, occasions in which the remarks of a U.S. Senator left the kind of impression that the comments made by Senator **Moseley-Braun**, of Illinois, have made because she touched the nerve of everybody who had the opportunity to hear what she was saying. She was reminding us that to salute that symbol was, indeed, a salute to racism. She articulated it so clearly, and if one wants to see what the effects were, one need only look at the vote count on votes two and three when repudiation and redemption took place as people examined their consciences.

What she did was very clearly and very loudly sound the alarm. She was the Paul Revere of this day to say, 'Beware of what we are looking at, beware of racism, beware of the ugly sight of bigotry.'

I do not attribute a sinister intention to everyone who voted differently, but there is no doubt in my mind that couched somewhere in this support to preserve that symbol was an intended reminder that there is

an old tradition, a history that is revered and beloved.

Senator **Moseley-Braun** was so clear as she reminded us that people who bore her color were slaves, chattel, property to be sold and dealt with as they saw fit.

And so today I think the Senate has had an opportunity to rethink a decision that it earlier made. Once again, I say that I do not attribute a sinister meaning to every vote that was against the position that Senator **Moseley-Braun** took, but this symbol is a salute to a period that was a dark one in American history.

So I just want to say, Madam President, that I am proud of all of my colleagues this day, but particularly the Senator from Illinois, who has established herself as a voice to be heard on matters of fairness and equity in our society forever.

I thank the Chair.

---

*THIS SEARCH*

Next Hit

Prev Hit

Hit List

*THIS DOCUMENT*

Forward

Back

Best Sections

Doc Contents

*THIS CR ISSUE*

Next Document

Prev Document

Daily Digest

*GO TO*

New CR Search

HomePage

Help

---

---

<u><a href="#">THIS SEARCH</a></u>	<u><a href="#">THIS DOCUMENT</a></u>	<u><a href="#">THIS CR ISSUE</a></u>	<u><a href="#">GO TO</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Next Hit</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Forward</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Next Document</a></u>	<u><a href="#">New CR Search</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Prev Hit</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Back</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Prev Document</a></u>	<u><a href="#">HomePage</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Hit List</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Best Sections</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Daily Digest</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Help</a></u>
	<u><a href="#">Doc Contents</a></u>		

---

## NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)

---

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, I find myself highly regretful that the media have left the galleries and did not hear the distinguished and able President pro tempore of the Senate. He has stated the case precisely, and if he could have done that a bit earlier, some of the things that happened this afternoon would not have happened.

Be that as it may, I am proud of **Bob Byrd** and I refer to him that why because he is a fellow North Carolinian by birth, and he is the most exemplary authority on the United States Senate that I have ever known--and I have known a lot of Senators, having been here in the early 1950's before I came here as a Senator in January 1973.

I felt at times this afternoon, not very seriously, when I heard all of the condemnations of the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy--I felt a little bit like Mrs. O'Leary's cow, when all I was trying to do was to restore a sense of fairness by the Senate to the United Daughters of the Confederacy. But the Senate rose above principle this afternoon when the specter of race was introduced by contrivance into the debate. Race should never have been introduced and would not have been except for the political rhetoric and partisan oratory that happened this afternoon.

I knew a remarkable Senator in the early 1950's when I was here administrative assistant to two North Carolina Senators--the Senator with whom I came to Washington died in office and Governor Umstead asked me to stay on awhile with the successor to Senator Smith. I shall never forget Richard Brevard Russell, whom everybody called Dick Russell, the Senator from Georgia. What a great statesman he was.

Senator Russell and I were talking about the Senate one day, and I said, 'Senator, it must be a matter of great pride to be a Member of the Senate.' He said, 'Most of the time. Most of the time.' But, he said, 'There are times when some Senators practice the world's second oldest profession.'

I think some of that happened here this afternoon. Piety I guess is the word that describes some of the oratory this afternoon. My friend Chub Seawell, son of a Chief Justice of North Carolina, used to call it 'piousness' in speeches he made.

I do wish--and I know it is not going to happen--that the media, for once, would make it clear it was not those of us on this side who introduced race into the debate this afternoon. It was a political ploy to escape responsibility for false pretense that should not have happened in the first place.

Let me given you an example of an inaccuracy. Some Senators would have you believe that this **Confederate** battle **flag** is on the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. Not so. I said over and over and over again that it was not so, but the other side pretended that the battle **flag** of the **Confederate** Army was on the insignia.

Here is the total insignia. No **Confederate** battle **flag** there at all. It's the first national **flag** of the Confederacy. Senator **Robert C. Byrd** is exactly right. What happened today, Madam President, was a major revision of history.

In response to the argument, heard over and over and over again this afternoon--to the point that I felt that I was going to throw up--let me quote a distinguished journalist, a Pulitzer Prize-winning editor, Paul Greenberg, who is editor of the Arkansas Democrat. Mr. Greenberg wrote about this issue not long ago. He was asking this question of the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

What of the thousands of black soldiers who served under the **confederate flag** ? Are they to be read out of the race? And it was not the Supreme Court of the **Confederate** States of America that declared Negro slaves chattel in 1887, but that of the United States, Roger B. Taney, presiding.

Shall that Star-Spangled Banner, too, be denied congressional recognition?

Then Mr. Greenberg wrote:

Beyond contentions over fact, the whole enterprise of using the dead and the cause they died for, Union or **Confederate** , in order to justify some petty meanness today wrecks.

Then he added:

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	Next Document	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	Prev Document	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	Daily Digest	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

---

<u>THIS SEARCH</u>	<u>THIS DOCUMENT</u>	<u>THIS CR ISSUE</u>	<u>GO TO</u>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	<u>Next Document</u>	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	<u>Prev Document</u>	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	<u>Daily Digest</u>	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

## NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)

---

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I have been informed that my unanimous-consent request of some time ago actually was not entered into when got off on a tangent. I will not ask for 30 minutes, unless my colleague from Idaho wants to. I ask unanimous consent for 15 minutes, whatever time is left, and that no second-degree amendments intervene. I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. I apologize. I thought it had been entered into.

Madam President, first of all, let me say, like Yogi Berra, this is like 'deja vu all over again.' I thought I had heard the last of family and medical leave some months ago, and after 7 years and three different votes on the floor of the Senate, an override of a Presidential veto, we finally adopted family and medical leave legislation by the vote of 71-27, with strong bipartisan support.

I am not going to go into the entire arguments of family and medical leave legislation, obviously, with the time allocated here. Suffice it to say that I made the point over the years that family and medical leave was not a benefit but a right, a fundamental right, as distinguished between a dental plan or a few days of vacation, but the fundamental principle of human decency. People confronted with family crises ought not to be put in the position of jeopardizing their health care benefits or their employment. They ought to be able to deal with those crises and come back to their positions of responsibility.

We did not necessarily get into a lengthy division over here between being a volunteer or a full-time employee. In this case here we are talking about full-time volunteers, not somebody who is showing up a few hours a week to be a good citizen, to contribute to a church or charity, but rather, full-time volunteers and all that that entails. All of the provisions of the family and medical leave apply.

If you are not working at least 25 hours a week, 1,250 hours a year, full time, you do not get any of these benefits.

So as the Senator pointed out, it would not even begin to apply until the second year. If you are in your second year as a full-time volunteer and a family crisis hits, all we say is you can go deal with that, assuming you meet the criteria and the employer does, employing so many people, whether it is a voluntary agency or a paid agency or not, without losing your health care benefits. If you go, you run the risk of losing your health care benefits and, of course, you have to come back and complete the full 2 years or you do not get the educational benefits, which is also something.

So you have to come back and complete the 24 months that the bill requires. So to suggest that we are making some huge distinction--incidentally, VISTA volunteers will be included, and Peace Corps will not, because we do not cover them in this bill. I think they ought to. I called the Peace Corps and asked, 'What have you dealt with over the years, prior to dealing with the family and medical leave legislation, when volunteers'--and I was one and, thank God, I was not confronted with a family crisis, but I knew people who were, and they went home and dealt with the family crisis, and the Peace Corps allowed them to come back and maintain their benefits. That was before we adopted the legislation.

So, historically that has applied, and I think a strong case can be made when we talk about the reauthorization of the Peace Corps we do not apply it. This will cover VISTA and full-time volunteers involved in the program.

Some people are totally opposed to family and medical leave. I understand that. We had a long debate about whether or not there ought to be family and medical leave policies. One of the arguments--in fact, it was the Senator from Iowa [Mr. **Grassley**] who strenuously made this point, and he was right. He said, you know, you guys in Congress want to go around and apply these programs to everybody in the private sector but do not want to apply them to people in the public

sector, in Government. You want to exempt them.

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<u>Next Hit</u>	<u>Forward</u>	Next Document	<u>New CR Search</u>
<u>Prev Hit</u>	<u>Back</u>	Prev Document	<u>HomePage</u>
<u>Hit List</u>	<u>Best Sections</u>	Daily Digest	<u>Help</u>
	<u>Doc Contents</u>		

---

---

<u><a href="#">THIS SEARCH</a></u>	<u><a href="#">THIS DOCUMENT</a></u>	<u><a href="#">THIS CR ISSUE</a></u>	<u><a href="#">GO TO</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Next Hit</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Forward</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Next Document</a></u>	<u><a href="#">New CR Search</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Prev Hit</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Back</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Prev Document</a></u>	<u><a href="#">HomePage</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Hit List</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Best Sections</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Daily Digest</a></u>	<u><a href="#">Help</a></u>
	<u><a href="#">Doc Contents</a></u>		

---

## NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE TRUST ACT OF 1993 (Senate - July 22, 1993)

---

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I ask the Chair how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has 2 minutes; the Senator from Connecticut 6 minutes.

Mr. CRAIG. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Madam President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

I really believe national service is a different situation. Certainly, the Senator from Connecticut was persuasive, as he has always been on the family and medical leave issues. However, I did not support family and medical leave when it was debated earlier this year, and I do not believe it is an appropriate benefit for participants in a volunteer service corps.

The Senator talked about the Peace Corps. As you know, those volunteers perform their service overseas.

However, I think when you are serving here in the United States, in a volunteer organization which offers all the benefits that S. 919 offers; that, the health benefits, the child-care benefits, et cetera then adding family and medical leave on top of these benefits, goes far beyond the scope of a community service corps.

Mr. President, I add again my strong support to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Kansas for that statement.

Let me say in closing, I do not think the intent of this legislation is to rewrite Webster's definition of voluntarism, but that is exactly what is going on.

My colleague, who is expressing opposition, constantly referred to the employee. These are volunteers. These are not full-time employees. If they were I would be speaking differently today.

Yes, I am in opposition to this legislation. I do not plan to hide behind this amendment at all. I do not believe we ought to be spending \$10 billion in a \$300 billion deficit environment. But that is neither here nor there.

What I am saying is, there has been a substantial change in what we are doing here. If a person is a volunteer, then let them step back from their voluntarism to go home and take care of their needs. That is understandable. That is the way it ought to be. Why should we put a burden on nonprofit organizations in a voluntary setting to try to deal with this?

So, I would suggest that although we do provide benefits and they do have necessary consequences in this area, we ought to say no, these are volunteers making a choice to do this. These not private-sector

employees. These are not organizations for profits. These are nonprofits.

With that I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I want to point out we are not talking about vacation time here, not someone who says it is a nice day, I am going fishing tomorrow; mind if I take a day off?

The family and medical leave covers crises, serious illness. This is not something you wish happens at all. For all full-time volunteer out there working in a situation and a crisis hits, we do have health care benefits here for the people covered under this program. There is a danger of losing those benefits, as would be the case under other situations. The fact that you are a volunteer or employee, it is unpaid leave.

The issue of being paid is not in question here because there is not any pay involved in either case. We are talking about if you are out there as a volunteer and working hard in North Carolina, or Kansas, or Idaho, or Connecticut, and all of a sudden the parent is taking care of the child or the spouse gets

really ill and you have to be with them.

The question is should you be with them or not? And can you be with them without losing your benefits?

That was the essence of the debate that occurred several months ago. That is the essence of the debate. That has not changed. We are not talking about the part-time people.

So, the essence here has not changed by this fact, by being against the whole concept of family and medical leave. That I accept. And I understand people do not like that idea. But to say that this fact situation presented by this bill is fundamentally different covered on a right, not a benefit as we described in a earlier legislation, I think would be an incorrect characterization of it.

---

*THIS SEARCH*

Next Hit

Prev Hit

Hit List

*THIS DOCUMENT*

Forward

Back

Best Sections

Doc Contents

*THIS CR ISSUE*

Next Document

Prev Document

Daily Digest

*GO TO*

New CR Search

HomePage

Help

---

---

<i>THIS SEARCH</i>	<i>THIS DOCUMENT</i>	<i>THIS CR ISSUE</i>	<i>GO TO</i>
<a href="#">Next Hit</a>	<a href="#">Forward</a>	<a href="#">Next Document</a>	<a href="#">New CR Search</a>
<a href="#">Prev Hit</a>	<a href="#">Back</a>	<a href="#">Prev Document</a>	<a href="#">HomePage</a>
<a href="#">Hit List</a>	<a href="#">Best Sections</a>	<a href="#">Daily Digest</a>	<a href="#">Help</a>
	<a href="#">Doc Contents</a>		

---

Congressional Record article 1 of 50      [Full Display](#) - 6,448 bytes. [[Help](#)]

---

**FRESHMAN TURNS SENATE SCARLET -- HON. LOUIS STOKES (Extension of Remarks - July 28, 1993)**

[Page: E1907]

---

**HON. LOUIS STOKES**

**in the House of Representatives**

*WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 1993*

- Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the American people witnessed a historic moment as the Nation's first black female Senator, **Carol Moseley-Braun**, during debate on the Senate floor, taught her colleagues a valuable lesson about racism. The controversy centered around the granting of a patent which featured the **Confederate flag** for the United Daughters of the Confederacy.
- During the intense debate, the distinguished Senator from Illinois remained staunch in her opposition to the approval of the patent design. She used the opportunity to deliver a powerful message about symbolism, slavery, and the danger of simply going along with the status quo. Senator **Braun** was not only successful in her effort to defeat the amendment, but she won the respect and admiration of her colleagues who, in the end, stood proudly with her to defeat the measure.
- Mr. Speaker, it took courage for **Carol Moseley-Braun** to take this strong stand. I rise today to applaud her for this courageous effort. In recent days, many others have come forward to offer their congratulations. I read with great interest a commentary concerning the Senate debate which appeared in the July 27, 1993, edition of the Washington Post. It is certainly worthwhile reading and I am pleased to share it with my colleagues.

The calls, the letters, the flowers, the faxes, are pouring into Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun's office, and no wonder. The first black female senator is a heroine to her people and to liberals of all shades. She took the Senate by the lapels and made it do right. She KO'd the body's self-designated ogre, Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.).

The issue was trifle, critics keep saying. Oh, yeah? It was just a little matter of being nice to some 'gentle ladies' of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, said Helms, pushing for an extension of patent for the Daughters' Confederacy **flag** insignia. The idea had been defeated in committee, but Helms tried to slip it in as an amendment to the national service bill. Mosely-Braun hurried to the floor and furiously demanded the tabling of the amendment.

The Senate, for a number of reasons too dreary to tell, voted 52 to 48 against her. Her seatmate, Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.), who was also elected because of the way the Senate treated another black

woman, reached over and took her hand. 'It's terrible,' she said, 'but hang on. I think we can fix it.' The two women stood there with their hands clasped. It was a tableau to remind the Senate how much things had changed since the all-male Judiciary Committee manhandled Anita Hill.

Even the most obtuse realized that in 1993, the Senate could not vote for the Confederacy, even in a symbolic way. Only stupidity or racism could explain it. Moseley-Braun, a veteran of the Illinois legislature, understood what she had to do. And she had a clear idea, uncommon in a freshman, of the power she possessed. She had to hold the floor, so she could continue the fight and carry out her furious threat to 'talk until this chamber freezes over' if necessary.

The following several hours were not just dramatic, they were history-making. People actually listened to the debate. The Senate for once argued not about itself but about the country, about the right of one group to offend another. For once senators changed their minds. Things that are usually decided in the cloakroom, were settled on the floor in plain sight. Stricken senators volunteered for emergency duty. Robert F. Bennett (Utah) offered to line up fellow Republicans. Howard M. Metzenbaum (D-Ohio) organized Democrats. Bill Bradley (D-N.J.) warned his colleagues that 'this was not a free vote.' He meant that those who meant merely to throw a bone to the Old South or to Jesse Helms would have no place to hide when the country saw what they had wrought.

Sen. Wendell H. Ford (D-Ky.), who had earlier voted with Helms, introduced the resolution to reconsider the motion--under the rules, loser Moseley-Braun could not. Senators lined up to speak. Howell T. Heflin (D-Ala.), newly returned from heart surgery, heaved himself to his feet and said heavily, 'Mr. President, I rise with a conflict that is deeply rooted in many aspects of controversy.'

An ancestor, he told the rapt chamber, had signed the order of secession. The women in his family had been members of the Daughters. 'But we live in a different world,' he sighed. Others were reminded about black constituencies who felt about the issue exactly as Moseley-Braun. Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.) called it an 'epiphany--a sudden shining through of an eternal reality that had not been there.'

The motion to reconsider passed by a 75 to 25 vote, and Helms huffed that 'race should never have been introduced'--as though the **Confederate** flat was in no way a provocative reminder of what Moseley-Braun called the 'the single most painful episode in American history.'

Its first black female senator had shamed the club into realizing that it is not an old boy's club and maybe not a club at all, but a body with responsibilities for protecting minorities in the country as well as in its membership. The immediate effect may be the confirmation of Joycelyn Elders as surgeon general, the futility of opposing strong-minded black women having been shown anew. Moseley-Braun is aglow, knowing she has redeemed herself with Illinois voters who were disillusioned by her post-election extravagances.

The day after the operatic afternoon, she went to the Senate dining room and got an opera star's welcome. Senators, grateful that she had rescued them from opprobrium, waved at her, blew kisses and introduced their constituents.

What probably meant as much to her was being surrounded by the black waiters and waitresses. Their usual diffidence overcome, they shook hands with her, they murmured, 'We appreciate what you did. Thank you.'

They knew absolutely what it all meant.

•

*THIS SEARCH*

Next Hit

Prev Hit

Hit List

*THIS DOCUMENT*

Forward

Back

Best Sections

Doc Contents

*THIS CR ISSUE*

Next Document

Prev Document

Daily Digest

*GO TO*

New CR Search

HomePage

Help

---