

Someone who, like Coretta Scott King and Myrlie Evers, could be called upon to tender an opinion on what Malcolm's views on various issues of the day might be. But something happened along the way. Dr. Shabazz herself became the authority, and the questions initially directed toward the widow of Malcolm X became inquiries of Dr. Betty Shabazz. Only a woman of this intellectual and academic magnitude could overshadow the mystique of such a historical figure as Malcolm X.

Mr. Speaker, a college bearing the name of Malcolm X is located in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois. I came to know Dr. Shabazz very well during her many visits to Chicago. She was truly one of the most dynamic and engaging people that I have ever met. Her command of the issues affecting the many different people of the world was, in a word, extraordinary. Her passing at this time and in this way is terribly unfortunate. It speaks to the human condition in a way that only an event this tragic and unwarranted can. It begs for another figure like Dr. Shabazz to stand and say something to put right this egregious wrong. Yet she is still gone, and it seems that we are without recourse.

When her husband was murdered, he was eulogized by Ossie Davis, the great African-American actor. Mr. Davis referred to Malcolm X as our shining black manhood. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that Dr. Betty Shabazz, through her countless achievements, has transcended Mr. Davis's description of her husband. She belongs to all of us and stands as a tribute to what we all must strive to become. While she may have left this Earth on the 23d of June, her legacy lives on and will undoubtedly influence many more generations to come.

I ask all of us to join today in paying tribute to Dr. Betty Shabazz. Having known her is an honor which words cannot convey, and her earthly presence will be sorely missed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE FARMLAND PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the introduction of a bill that is crucial to my district. It is very important. It is the Point Reyes National Seashore Farmland Protection Act, H.R. 1995.

Just 45 miles north of San Francisco lies the Point Reyes National Sea-

shore, a peninsula containing 71,000 acres of the most beautiful vistas and pristine wilderness in America. Across Tomales Bay from the seashore lie 38,000 acres of privately held land that is used for agriculture, primarily for dairy ranching.

In Marin and Sonoma Counties, we like it that way, since we know that farmland makes our community economically strong and economically diverse. The national seashore likes it that way because the careful stewardship of these lands by ranchers has helped to safeguard the seashore and the bay, keeping it one of the most pristine areas in our Nation.

The ranchers like it that way because ranching is their livelihood, and they like what they do.

And the community likes it that way, because local residents know that agriculture plays an important role in the mix that gives the north bay a strong economy and makes it a wonderful place to live.

No one, Mr. Speaker, absolutely no one in the community wants to see the land turned into housing developments or casinos, except possibly developers who are putting pressure on the area to change.

So that is what I have set out to do in the Point Reyes National Seashore Farmlands Protection Act, keep everything the way it is now. That means keeping those 38,000 acres in private ownership and productive agriculture, safeguarding the livelihood of the farmers who live there along with protecting the park and the bay that are nearby.

The way we would do this is through a public-private partnership, a partnership to purchase conservation easements, instead of outright purchase of the land, an innovative and cost-effective, cost-saving method that can serve as a model for farmland protection around this Nation.

My bill establishes a boundary, a boundary that allows Federal matching funds to be available to willing local farmers who volunteer to sell their conservation easements.

Participation in the program is 100 percent voluntary. The easements would be managed by a local nonprofit land trust or open space districts. These are groups that already have experienced managing 11,000 of the 38,000 acres in question, meaning that the Federal role will be limited and administrative costs will be kept low.

Now, I knew that the local landowners would have some concerns about a proposal that involved the Federal Government. So I sat down with them, not the Federal Government, but with the local farmers. I sat down one on one at their ranches, around the kitchen tables, and we talked the program through. I listened carefully, and the results of those talks is the bill that I am confident will fully protect the private property rights.

In fact, the way this bill is crafted, ranchers who do not choose to partici-

pate in the program will go on living their lives exactly as they do now, and those who do choose to participate will also see little change, except that their land, once they have negotiated their easements, will be protected as farmland in perpetuity.

This idea, Mr. Speaker, is so powerful that it has already attracted some very influential bipartisan supporters, and it has also attracted some serious interest at the committee level. I am proud to announce that the original cosponsors of my bill are the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY], and the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1995 is a way to preserve farmland and protect neighboring park land at the same time, in a private-public partnership with a very limited Federal role. It is a win/win solution for my district, and it is a win/win solution for the Nation. H.R. 1995 makes a difference. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

DISNEY VERSUS THE BAPTISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I was recently asked who is right, the Southern Baptists or Disney, in their argument regarding homosexuality. The question was pointedly directed to me because it is known that my political positions do not exactly conform to Washington's conventional wisdom.

As a Congressman, the answer for me was easy: both. Neither party is incorrect in stating their position. Both are permitted their viewpoint and neither has violated the other's rights.

Disney has chosen to use its own property to express a view. Although not endorsed by everyone, Disney has every right to do so. The Government did not tell them they must nor did Disney ask for any Government pressure to be applied to those disinterested in Disney's message. Moreover, no Government money was involved. Disney's right of free expression is achieved in this case through its constitutional right to own and use its own property. This is an easy call when private property is involved and property rights are acknowledged.

If this incident occurred using governmental funds or on Government property, as in a Government school, and only the concept of free speech was taken into consideration, it would have been virtually impossible to satisfy everyone's demands.

□ 1900

One set of taxpayers claiming free speech on public property only opens the floodgates of controversy in an attempt to permit everyone to express

any viewed desire. But it is this very fuzziness injected by government control of property that today is the source of so many hard feelings and difficult problems.

Some argue that the freedom to express the views of secular humanism and even communism are perfectly acceptable in government schools, while at the same time, it is necessary to exclude voluntary prayer and all religious programs. Recognizing that atheistic humanism is a substitute for religious beliefs, this argument falls far short of satisfying any group desiring to use government property for religious reasons.

Such conflicts do not occur on private property. No one argues the right of Protestants to invade Catholic-owned premises to preach the Protestant doctrine as a right under the first amendment. The access to a newspaper, television station, or radio station should only come with the permission of the owner. Who owns the property becomes the overriding issue and the right of free expression is incidental to that ownership.

Essentially, all conflicts as to who could say what could easily be resolved with a greater respect for private property ownership. This is this principle that protects us in our homes from those that would lecture us in the name of free speech in public places.

Thus, it is easy to argue for the Baptists' right to boycott. They are expressing their disgust by withholding their support and their property, that is, their money. And that is perfectly appropriate. As far as I am concerned, the more voluntary nonviolent boycotts, the better. The boycott is the free society's great weapon and was well understood by Martin Luther King. The evil comes when a boycott or any objection is made illegal by the State and the participants are jailed. When laws such as these exist, only jury nullification or even civil disobedience can erase them if the legislatures and the courts refuse to do so.

Quite clearly, both sides of the Disney flap are correct in asserting their rights. The proper view on homosexuality and tolerance is a moral and theological question, not a political one.

Problems like this can be voluntarily sorted out by the marketplace, but only when property rights are held in high esteem and there is an acknowledgment that government and individual force have no role to play. Imposing one's view upon another, through any type of force, should always be forbidden in a free society.

Actually, the Disney-Baptist skirmish is a wonderful example of how freedom can work without Congress sticking its nose into each and every matter. Both sides have a right to stand up for their respective beliefs.

By using the rules of private property ownership to guide our right of free expression and religion, it is not difficult to find an answer, for instance, to the conflict between

unwelcomed speeches in privately-owned malls and mall owners. Because most of the difficult and emotional problems occur on Government-owned and Government-regulated property, we should, here in the Congress, do whatever we can to reinstate the original intent of the Constitution and honor and protect property ownership as an inalienable human right.

LA MUJER OBRERA: THE WORKING WOMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. JONES]. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, first a few remarks in Spanish.

(The following paragraph was delivered in Spanish.)

Mr. Speaker, a lot of people have come to this floor in recent weeks to talk about NAFTA. And several of those Members have talked about what is going on in my district, El Paso, TX. Tonight, I want to talk about my district.

The reason I have opened my remarks in Spanish, Mr. Speaker, is because it is important to the story that I want to tell my colleagues this evening. The district that I represent, El Paso, TX, has experienced more NAFTA-related job losses than any other community in the country, more than 5,600 jobs.

This week, a delegation of dislocated workers from my district, who call themselves the La Mujer Obrera, or The Working Woman, are here in Washington, DC to tell their story and share it with Members of Congress and administration officials. They are here this evening in this House to listen to my remarks.

La Mujer Obrera is a community-based, nonprofit organization dedicated to working to improve the social and economic conditions of low-income Hispanic workers and their families in the El Paso area. Many of these workers had jobs in El Paso in the garment industry. And as most of my colleagues know, a lot of those jobs have now gone to Mexico, leaving these workers and others like them without jobs and without the skills needed to get new ones.

When Congress passed NAFTA, it provided training assistance for workers dislocated by NAFTA. The workers of the La Mujer Obrera in El Paso were eligible for training assistance. What they got instead was remedial English lessons. It is important to understand that many of the people I am talking about have been working and paying taxes for 20 and 30 years.

While you and I probably agree that the ability to speak English will help, it will not by itself secure jobs for these workers. Since I became a Member of Congress 6 months ago, I have been working with La Mujer Obrera and the Texas Workforce Commission to provide the kind of assistance that will make a difference.

As a result, a pilot project was launched in El Paso that we hope should effectively address the needs of dislocated workers. This pilot project will provide bilingual job training and prepare dislocated workers for new jobs. Approximately 1,200 dislocated workers will benefit from this project. Some Members of this body will listen to the story of La Mujer Obrera and conclude that NAFTA is bad. Others will point to the fact that the new jobs have been created by NAFTA and conclude that NAFTA is good.

I think the truth lies somewhere in between. NAFTA was and is a bold initiative. But as with all great experiments, we should not be surprised when we hit some problem spots. We must be willing to make corrections along the way. This is especially true when it affects people like Armida Arriaga, a 56-year-old woman in El Paso who worked in the garment industry for 18 years before losing her job. Ms. Ariaga has used the NAFTA benefits, but she would rather have a job.

In a recent report, the Forum for International Policy, whose members include Brent Scowcroft, Carla Hills, Colin Powell and Robert Strauss, said it best:

"Increased international trade may well lead to U.S. job losses for certain companies in certain sectors. The response should not be to impede greater trade, but rather to develop effective programs to provide American workers with training to acquire new skills and develop new business. Of course, meeting this challenge cannot be underestimated. Some workers may find developing new skills difficult, if not impossible. But dealing creatively with job transitions is preferable, for the people concerned and society as a whole, to denying ourselves increased trade opportunities."

I think it is appropriate that on this date in 1647 Margaret Brent proclaimed herself as America's first feminist by demanding a voice and vote for herself in the Maryland Colonial Assembly. Brent came to America in 1638 and was the first woman to own property in Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, the workers of the La Mujer Obrera are here today to demand a voice in the decisions that we make that affect their lives. As this body ponders serious policy questions, I encourage all of my colleagues to listen carefully to the voices of these people, the dislocated workers, and remember that what we are here to do is the people's business. They expect and deserve this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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