

had more investment and we had more jobs.

There are not a lot of things that Congress really can do to grow the economy. We have the Federal Reserve and monetary policy, we have the Congress and fiscal policy. There is one thing that we can get wrong and there is one thing that we can get right.

The thing that we can get wrong is that we can spend, spend, spend and raise that baseline of spending, and dig ourselves deeper into debt for the future, so that we send our children and their grandchildren an even larger bill in the form of greater debt.

But the one thing that we can get right in fiscal policy here in Congress is that we can look at who creates jobs in this country, how jobs are created, and what can we do to make it easier to create jobs. When we look at that, we see that there are a lot of taxes that are levied on capital, a lot of taxes that are levied on investment.

When we look at this recession, like other recessions it started with a big drop in investment, a 72 percent decline in venture capital. Venture capital a year ago was about \$35 billion. Today it is \$8 billion. That is the seed corn that starts every small business.

When we see the small businesses dying on the vine all over the place, small businesses closing their doors, huge layoffs at our largest employers across the country, we see a huge decline in investment in those companies, in those businesses.

The one thing that we can control is we can make investment cheaper, we can make risk-taking less risky, by reducing the price on those investments, the price on risk. That means reducing the tax on those things by making it easier through the Tax Code, by lowering the bias against saving, the bias against investment, by making it easier for businesses to reinvest in their corporations, by making it easier for the market to take risks, to take capital risks, to invest in new ideas.

That way we can create jobs. Every time we have cut the capital gains tax, every time we have accelerated depreciation, every time we have cut marginal income tax rates across-the-board in this last century, every time we have done that we have created more jobs. We have improved the growth of the economy.

□ 1615

And we duly increased revenue coming into the Federal Government in those sources. So we see that there is a big difference here. On the one side we are focused on one thing and one thing only, jobs; getting people back to work, making sure that they are working.

On the other body's side, they want to spend more money here in Washington, and that is the difference. And the problem with that kind of thinking is, the problem with the idea that we need to have more rebates and more spending is that we are going to get consumers to all of the sudden spend

more money. Consumers are not going to spend more money if they do not have jobs, if they are losing more jobs.

So I think what we have to be in the House is really admirable. We need to build on this; and we have to learn the lessons of the past, and, that is, simply spending more money in Washington is not going to get people back to work. But making it easier for Americans, for small, medium and large businesses to invest in their people, in their companies, making it easier to create jobs, that is what we can do. And we can help here in Congress to make it easier to create jobs. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if I could make a couple of concluding observations. First of all, I want to thank everybody participating.

Mr. Speaker, the difference between the two propositions that are advanced in the House, already passed the House and that which they are working in the Senate, in the other body they are saying, let us show you what we can do for our friends with your money. What the House said was, let us see what you can do for yourselves if you keep your money.

I think we have addressed America in the appropriate way. And finally it is said, Mr. Speaker, that a recession is when your neighbor is out of a job. A depression is when you are out of a job. Well, everyone in this legislative body on both sides of the building have neighbors out of jobs. We are the only ones of their neighbors that they can say, if you do your job right, I am get my job back. They have a right to expect that of us. And we have an obligation to understand, if we do our job wrong and they do not get their job back, we will have a depression.

HATE CRIMES IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORBES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues today to address hate crimes, an important issue that is being ignored by this Congress.

First, I would like to thank my Democratic colleagues for joining me today to talk about the importance of tolerance and why we must disavow hateful acts, acts that are being committed across this Nation in the wake of September 11. Their participation shows the commitment we as a Congress must make to protect our children and our families and all Americans from hate.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to tell you that hate crimes are not new. The problem today is they are not just isolated incidents. Instead, they represent an alarming nationwide trend. This trend is shown on the chart to my right.

As the chart clearly shows compared to the number of incidents reported in the first 8 months of 2001, hate crimes against Muslim and Arab Americans have increased dramatically since September 11. Nationwide reports indicate a 162 percent increase in the number of new hate crimes. As of August, 2001, there were 366 incidents reported across our country.

But in the wake of September 11, this number has risen to 959 reported accounts of assault, intimidation, racial profiling, deaths, and public harassment. This dramatic increase is found in several States in particular, including New York, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Massachusetts.

Sadly, in the case of my home State of California, hate crimes have risen by 225 percent. This underlines the seriousness of a new wave of hate crimes, especially when California is the most diverse State in our Union and certainly a State that thrives because of our diverse population.

Many of my colleagues know the popular saying, "As goes California, goes the Nation." Well, we want that to be true in most cases; but in the case of hate crimes, we must face the fact and realize that California's 225 percent increase could become common place across the Nation if we do not act now to stem the tide.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the communities that I represent and the communities across the Nation, including Marin and Sonoma Counties, just north of the Golden Gate Bridge, the counties that I work for, are actually horrified by these acts of hate, these acts of fear, ignorance, and bigotry. In particular, our constituents are outraged that countless stories of harassment and shootings and bias are being directed at our children.

We have read about the hate crimes being committed, the threat to a turban-wearing Sikh in Connecticut, the attack of a woman on a Maryland college campus, rocks thrown through the open bedroom window in Roanoke, Virginia. But then we learn that the victim in Connecticut was a second grader, the woman was a teenager attacked by fellow young adults, and the child who was barely missed from being hit by a rock was only 2 years old. The tragedy, the unacceptable nature of hate crimes becomes all the more clear when we learn of these stories.

It is unacceptable that throughout our country Muslim or Muslim-appearing children are fearful of attacks on their own streets, in their homes, and at their schools in the wake of September 11. As a result, some Muslim private schools have canceled classes; parents are being asked to help patrol school yards; and according to the American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, parents are keeping their children home from both public and private schools.

In fact, law enforcement officials and leaders in Arab American and Muslim communities are preparing for more

trouble because children are still being attacked by fellow classmates and schools are being vandalized.

Last week, two Malaysian students at Indiana University were assaulted, and an Afghan student in New York was attacked by a fellow student; and only last month a threatening note found at a Palmdale, California, high school forced five Muslim American students home for their own safety.

I ask my colleagues, is this what we want to teach our children? I know the answer is a resounding no; but the fact remains that children and their families are suffering as a result of ignorance, fear, and hate.

Mr. Speaker, it is unacceptable; and it is exactly why this Congress must send a very strong message that hate crimes will not be tolerated. That is why we must strengthen our existing laws to protect families and children against all hate crimes.

Fortunately, we have a bipartisan bill. It is legislation in this House that has 199 cosponsors, and this legislation will help combat these hateful crimes.

The gentleman from Michigan's (Mr. CONYERS) bill, H.R. 1343, Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act, will add teeth to the existing laws by making it easier for Federal law enforcement to investigate and prosecute crimes motivated by race, color, religion and national origin, as well as adding gender, sexual orientation and disability.

Yet even with an overwhelming number of bipartisan cosponsors, I told my colleagues this bill has 199 bipartisan cosponsors, this legislation has been cast aside by the Republican leadership, and that is just plain wrong. If there is ever a time that we needed to be passing hate crime legislation, that time is now.

That is why I am here today, Mr. Speaker, to encourage the Republican leadership to address this important issue, to urge them to bring the Conyers bill to the floor; and I have with me my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER), who is going to talk to us about an incident in Ohio. I thank him for joining me.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my always thoughtful colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), for her work on this important issue. I join her in thanks to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for his effort, his always civil, thoughtful, and insightful approach to issues of this kind.

I am not here to make a speech so much as I am to tell a story, but I hope that it is one of those stories that will illustrate what brings both of us and others later on this afternoon to the floor on this subject.

I do not believe, I certainly do not want to believe, that it is a story of hatred, but it is a story I believe of ignorance; and it is the kind of ignorance which, unchecked, leads to hatred. It is the kind of ignorance which, unchecked, gives license to hateful behav-

ior; and it is the kind of ignorance which needs to be addressed at its core.

I am going to try to make sure that I do not mention the name of the institution because I tell you that the place where this occurred is well known to most Americans. It is a wonderful institution. When I get done, I hope you will agree with me, that they have made a serious mistake or may well have made a serious mistake; and I think it is important that they have the room and the latitude in which to reconsider that mistake.

The story is basically this: it begins shortly before nine o'clock on the morning of September 11. Dr. Taranjit Sangari, a physician, was coming off of his work in the ICU, and was talking with a colleague of his in their native Punjabi. His English is perfectly usable, but they were sharing a joke; and as they walked past a group of people who were unknown to them and who did not know either physician, were speaking animatedly and laughing.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Would the gentleman yield just a minute?

Mr. SAWYER. Surely.

Ms. WOOLSEY. That was before September 11?

Mr. SAWYER. This was on the morning of September 11, just before 9 o'clock. As we all know, the events were unfolding at this very moment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Right.

Mr. SAWYER. In as much as the doctor had been in the intensive care unit, he had had no access to a television. He saw people gathered around a television, had no idea what was going on; and the truth of the matter is that later on in the day, he was accused of inappropriate behavior in an area occupied by patients.

He was accused of celebrating what was being revealed on the television at that point, laughing about it, gesturing, when, in fact, in all probability, since they were both speaking in Punjabi, no one could have told what they were saying, and he had no idea and no opportunity to know what had happened in the world. I quote from his account as he spoke, in writing, to the appeals committee of the institution at which he works.

He says: "I am a Sikh from India. I have never been to the Middle East nor have I been to Pakistan. To accuse a Sikh of sympathizing with any terrorist reflects a complete misunderstanding and ignorance of the history of the Sikhs. If anything, anyone who knows anything about Sikhs and their history should have expected that a Sikh would have had a deeply rooted antipathy for the culture that produced the terrorists. I do not. I practice tolerance and acceptance of all cultures and religions, including Muslims. It is unfortunate that my accusers do not subscribe to the same values.

"On September 11 I made the mistake of wearing a turban and a beard to work and joking with a colleague while speaking Punjabi. I wear the tradi-

tional ceremonial turban and beard of Sikh men. At the time I spoke with my colleague I had no understanding whatsoever that terrorists had attacked the World Trade Center. When I laughed with my friend, I was teasing him and sharing a joke I had heard earlier that morning. Obviously, as a dark-skinned, bearded man in a turban speaking in a strange tongue and laughing on the very morning of the terrorist attacks I was prejudged by my accusers.

□ 1630

I did not know at the time that terrorists had attacked the targets in New York and Washington and my accusers did not know me."

The tragic fact is that over the course of the next month, in an attempt to relay the experience that he had been through, he found himself a month later in front of a panel where he was afforded very little opportunity to defend himself. The meeting was held without third party observers or disinterested coworkers. Dr. Sangari was unable to identify or confront his accusers or to bring witnesses. He was not permitted to read witness statements. He was not permitted to have counsel. And, in fact, he has lost his residency at this extraordinary institution without anything that most of us here, regardless of our views of any of this, would regard as due process.

I tell this story because on the one hand I very much hope that this institution will reconsider the way in which it reached its conclusion, but even more importantly, I think it is critically important for those of us who gather here and those who listen to these words to understand that this is as fundamental a violation of the principles for which we struggle and which were attacked on that day. It is every bit as much a travesty, although on a far smaller scale, as the tragedy that has taken place throughout this country and throughout the world.

My hope is that we will learn from this kind of experience; that we will recognize the obligation we all have to one another; that we will understand the enormously important role that Diaspora communities from all over the world can play in assuring the security that we all enjoy in this country; and in recognizing that truly we are all in this together and that a miscarriage of justice through total failure of process is as much an attack on all of the rest of us as it is on Dr. Sangari.

I thank the gentlewoman for the opportunity to tell that story and hope it speaks for itself.

Ms. WOOLSEY. If the gentleman will yield a minute, I want to ask him a question about this.

Mr. SAWYER. Certainly.

Ms. WOOLSEY. So the turban was something the young resident wore daily?

Mr. SAWYER. He wears it daily. He wears a beard daily.

Ms. WOOLSEY. The beard, yes. The language. Had he, in the past, been speaking Punjabi?

Mr. SAWYER. He has, from time to time. His English, I have to tell say, is as usable as yours or mine. But he was sharing a social moment, as I am told. He was sharing a social moment with his friend. It was no more, no less than that.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the gentleman very much for sharing that story. That is just an example of what we are up against, and that was pretty far-reaching as far as dealing with something like that.

Mr. SAWYER. This is a serious issue the gentleman brings before us today and I am grateful to her.

Ms. WOOLSEY. That was a rock or a bullet in a different form against that young man. I thank the gentleman.

Now I would like to introduce another colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), and I thank her for joining us this afternoon.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for this opportunity. When I heard that she had dedicated an hour to making a special call for tolerance and to disavow hate crimes, I did not want to pass up the opportunity. And based on my district, I felt a special obligation and desire to come down here and speak.

I represent certainly the most diverse district in Illinois, and probably one of the most diverse districts in the country. People view my district on the north side of Chicago, and some of the near northern suburbs, as a kind of gateway to the United States. Immigrants from all over the globe make their home in Chicago, in my district, seeking to become citizens, to send their children to school, to create their livelihood, to fulfill the American Dream that they brought with them from all parts of the world to live out in our country and to seek the promise of freedom and tolerance and the ability to practice their religions.

Generally, that has been true in the district. We all get along, we celebrate together and work together. There is every religion being practiced there and lots of good solid community feelings. But I knew, as soon as we identified those attacks on the Twin Towers as a terrorist attack, and as soon as it was identified as being wrought by terrorists that were using the name of Islam in their attacks, that there was going to be fear in my district among the Muslim and Arab American community in particular. Then I started hearing about comments that were being made to Sikhs.

Again, I think it is important to just note that that reflects a misunderstanding of Sikhs to begin with. But nonetheless, I think anybody who was dark skinned, darker skinned or different, was feeling a sense of fear. So what I decided to do, just to address that a little bit, was the Sunday after the terrorist attack I invited people in the district to take a walk down Devon Avenue.

Now, people who know Chicago know that it is a commercial street that has

many, many shops of people of Pakistani origin, from India, and in a certain section there is a lot of immigrants from the former Soviet Union, an orthodox Jewish community, and so everybody works and lives in that neighborhood. About a thousand people joined for a peaceful walk down the street. There were no speeches. We just joined arms and walked together, some chanting "Long Live USA," with different accents, different faces, and there was certainly a solemnity about it because of the terrible incident, but there was a comfort and a joy about that, too.

But when I talked to people on the walk and subsequently, and every week that I have gone back, I know that there is a lot of fear and that it is grounded. And when I look at the chart that is here, I am sorry to see that, under hate crimes against Muslim and Arab Americans by State, Illinois was not doing so well before September 11, but in the 2 months since that we certainly have had way too many.

So I was hearing from women who were reluctant to go out of the house with their heads covered, who were talking about keeping their children home from school, who were fearful about security around the mosque, who were changing their behavior as a result of threats that were made to them. Not all the comments were hate crimes in the sense of violence or attacks, but hurtful comments that were being made to them on the street or things that were said to taxicab drivers, some of them who decided actually not to drive for a while. I do not know if they are back to driving.

So I guess the thing that should be of concern to all of us is that what the September 11 attack has done is made us reflect on what are the things that are most precious about the United States, about the lives that we live as individuals and the values that we share. And I think none is more precious than the value of tolerance, of individual freedom to be who you are in this country. The recognition that we are a Nation of immigrants, a people coming from all over the world who want to live here, and that we open our arms to those who want to share our values and live them out in their lives, and that when we turn on one another, then in a devastating way the terrorists have struck a blow and that we have to guard against that with as much fervor as we fight the terrorist threat externally. As we search for Osama bin Laden, we also have to search for tolerance. We cannot turn one against another.

I think as leaders of this country, we want to create that sense in our districts, to make sure that we help infuse, to create the culture of tolerance back home in our districts. So that when we check those numbers next month and next year, we see that they have fallen. And, hopefully, with the passage of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act as well that we not just talk about

it but we put in to the words of our laws that we stand firmly against intolerance.

I again want to express my appreciation for the opportunity to come down here and just support the words of the gentlewoman from California and to speak on behalf of my district and my community.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for coming and for being such an outspoken colleague for human rights and civil liberties and humanity in general. I think what the gentlewoman has done, and I compliment her on taking ahold of the issue immediately after September 11, she has prevented some hate crimes, I am certain of that.

And one of the ways we can know that, if my colleagues will look at Virginia and Maryland on this chart, both those States were addressing the issues before September 11. Hence, they do not have an increase in hate crimes in their communities. They were already dealing with something they knew was sensitive and must be addressed and they needed their communities working together.

So the gentlewoman made that difference, too, and I thank her.

I am now honored to introduce my colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON). I thank her for joining us.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her continuous and tireless work on this legislation and so many other pieces of legislation. This legislation to pass hate crime legislation was a valuable piece of legislation prior to September 11 and certainly it has been made more essential now since we have had the incident of September 11.

The gentlewoman from Illinois, I think, said it correctly and very eloquently; that what we have come to as a Nation is to begin to value ourselves as Americans, but in that process we have come to value what it is to be an American and what we stand for. And what are those principles? Certainly the principle of diversity, tolerance, freedom to worship, freedom to speak, and that we do not associate misdeeds or crimes with certain people who look a certain way. We call that profiling. We must not profile people because we know they are related to a certain religion that may not be our own faith as Christians and because we think someone in that religion might have done something that is evil and that is unacceptable and so then we brand everyone.

Certainly hate crime legislation was to allow us to treat incidents of crime, assault, speech or violence against someone because they were different for just what it was, that it was only because they were different and, therefore, it was labeled appropriately as hate crime. Now, since this incident has come about, we cannot imagine that we would not want to pass this legislation.

Really, when I think about it, I am astonished that we have not embraced this. Just as we embraced giving the police more authority for tools to arrest people because they had violated the Criminal Code in terms of physical assault or for murder or for destruction of property, we should also be aiding law enforcement with tools to arrest and for prosecution and administering of the law and prevention in this realm of crime, because they are a combination. That is what terrorism has the effect of doing, is creating an environment where we hate each other, and so it brings terror to us and it alters our thinking and our reasoning.

I would think that we would want to enable and empower our law enforcement with this very tool to say that, as we are getting those who indeed perpetrated this heinous, unthinkable, horrific crime against us, we also want tools that would constrain and prosecute and convict individuals who are perpetrating these crimes.

□ 1645

One would think there would be some balance in this. More importantly, it reinforces who we are as Americans, what it is we are all about, is the freedom and liberty of being separate and different and being able to worship as we want to and being able to speak freely about issues that may not be a popular issue or be able to have an independent thought that goes against the norm. That is what it means to be free, and those are our civil liberties that we are so envied for throughout the world. That is what our young men and women go into the military and fight and die for.

It is a precious right to be an American, and anything that violates that would be the taking away of those liberties. I commend the gentlewoman and would just review what are we afraid of in this law. It is really very straightforward. It gives local authorities, meaning State and local government, the empowerment and authorizes the Attorney General to provide technical, forensic, prosecutorial and other assistance in the criminal investigation or prosecution of any crime that, one, constitutes a crime of violence under the Federal law; two, is motivated by prejudice; and also it authorizes the Attorney General to award assistance and grants to give them information and technical assistance through resources that we can provide.

It further directs the U.S. Sentencing Commission to study and provide sentencing for juveniles who commit hate crimes. It is a range of services and tools both for enforcement, both for prevention and intervention, and gives some guidance on how to deal with young people who are guilty of that.

Even more important, what are we teaching our young people when we are not speaking out for them? Our young people learn a lot from us, and we should set the example. Young people many times have an opportunity to be

very cruel to each other, but young people are also quick learners. They know when it is unacceptable, and we ought to set the mark because they want to achieve the high mark. I thank the gentlewoman for challenging us and our colleagues. We just need a few more. There is an extraordinary, large list of bipartisan support; and I urge the leadership to bring this up for a vote.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. She has confirmed that the time is now. It is time to vote for expanding the intelligence community's privileges and giving law enforcement more tools as far as going after terrorists. I think the time is now to show our young people that we do not tolerate hate crimes, that we do not paint everybody with the same brush. If one person has shown that they are evil, that does not mean everybody that looks like that person is evil, and that there is no excuse for the United States Congress not to pass a hate crimes bill before we recess for the year.

Mrs. CLAYTON. We can almost pass this on suspension.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, it has 199 cosponsors. It is bipartisan. Let us make it happen. I thank the gentlewoman.

Now I am delighted to be joined by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 1343, the hate crimes bill sponsored by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), and I am a cosponsor of the legislation. I am glad that we are beginning that discussion here on the floor tonight.

As Members know, this Nation has seen a sharp rise in hate crimes against individuals perceived to be Muslims or of Arab descent. There have been over 1,140 complaints since September 11. That is more than triple the number of all last year. I am not proud of the fact that California has seen one of the largest increases in hate crimes of all of the States this year. Since September 11 in Los Angeles County, the county that I represent, there have been 156 reported incidents of hate crimes against Arabs or Muslims. That includes two homicides. This is a huge increase over last year when there were 12 reported incidents in Los Angeles County.

I am alarmed at the senseless acts of cowardice which have included physical assaults, hate mail, public harassment and even death. We hear reports of hate groups throughout the country, particularly in the Midwest, that are calling out for people to become recruits and to join in to harass people who look different from them. I think this is wrong, and I think the gentlewoman's legislation will help move us in a direction that will help inform young people to prevent these heinous crimes.

In my own congressional district, I would like to share that, in fact, short-

ly after the September 11 incident, there was an Egyptian shopkeeper who owned a store in the city of San Gabriel for the last 20 years. People would come and have coffee at his shop. At 3:00 in the afternoon on a Saturday, two young men shot him point-blank. They did not take one dime from the cash register. They thought he was a radical Muslim or something of that nature. Unfortunately, his family is now grieving.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I think we can assume that it was a hate crime.

Ms. SOLIS. Yes. Indeed, the FBI is looking at it. They have not declared that it is a hate crime, and I am urging them to continue that investigation.

Along with that, there were other incidents reported where young women attending a local community college in my district were assaulted because they were wearing scarves over their heads. They literally had to have gentlemen of their own descent walk them to classrooms. They were doing nothing wrong. They were students going to class.

The other things that have come up as well, hate crimes against people who look Muslim and Arab who look like me. I have been asked if I am of Middle Eastern descent in Washington, D.C. In my own district, one Latino gentleman was chased on the freeway and beaten by two individuals who thought he was from the Middle East. I would like our laws to go after individuals who abuse our rights and freedoms.

Ms. WOOLSEY. And if the gentlewoman were from the Middle East, she would be proud of it; and it does not mean that she is an evil-doer or was going to do something wrong because she came from some part of the world.

Ms. SOLIS. We need to educate and teach our young people that diversity is our strength, particularly in places like Southern California where we exchange different languages, different cultures; and we enjoy that strength. We have unifying symbolisms there that people can join. We need to talk about that more forcefully here on the floor as the gentlewoman is doing tonight. I commend the gentlewoman, and on behalf of the people in the 31st Congressional District, I know that they want to see some improvement with respect to hate crimes legislation.

One of my cities has had numerous hate crimes against African Americans because there are very few there. That has created a big problem in that city. We need to provide support, financial support, whether it be through our law enforcement efforts to do more sensitivity training and outreach, community policing, but also in the schools and even in our churches and mosques and other centers of religious teaching where people can begin to break down those barriers and really begin to have a thoughtful discussion on what it is to be an American, what that really means.

Ms. WOOLSEY. If the gentlewoman would yield, on this chart are Virginia

and Maryland, the difference between the increase since September 8 was hardly even experienced because those two communities have been working with their Muslim American and their Arab American communities, and understood the sensitivities and what needed to be done. So when September 11 happened, their communities were already sensitive and caring about each other. So it works if we put the energy into it.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time because we are putting energy into these areas. We voted for an airline bailout bill for \$15 billion. We can put energy into that. We can put energy into a stimulus package that gives huge tax breaks to the large corporations in the country. So certainly we have time to bring the legislation of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) to the House floor and it could pass on a suspension in a minute. We have started the drum beat, and we are not going to stop.

Another reason we are not going to stop is another reality that hate groups are using, they are using the events of September 11 to gain new recruits, and they are specifically targeting the youth. It was reported in last Saturday's Washington Post that white supremacy groups have recently used images of the burning World Trade Center towers on fliers as a way to argue that the United States needs to close its borders to new residents. Some are using the images on their magazine covers and Web sites to increase support and numbers at their rallies. In the last year, 33 percent of white nationalist groups engaged in efforts to recruit and organize young people. This is a 10 percent increase over the year before. For example, the National Alliance members in Columbus, Ohio, blanketed the University of Ohio with fliers warning against interracial relationships. Fliers featuring a skull and crossbones with the slogan "Race mixers beware" were slipped under the doors of African American professors at the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana.

Unfortunately, such incidents are not confined to one university. Such efforts to simultaneously terrorize and recruit are becoming disturbingly commonplace on campuses, and we must pass legislation that makes a statement to our youth and to Americans in general that we do not tolerate hate crimes in the United States of America.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I also read that article. It appeared in one of my local papers, in the San Gabriel Valley Tribune. I hope our law enforcement will do the utmost that they can to find out who the individuals are that are spreading this hateful type of literature on the Internet, and other means that they are using to provoke people in the community. It is horrible that goes on.

Mr. Speaker, I see young people in my district putting flags on their cars and trunks, but at the same time some

of those youths think that taking their frustrations out on a group of people is just senseless, and we have to stop it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. There is a lot of anger and we need to find ways for people to deal with anger and their differences, and the entire situation in the Mideast tells us that we have to do that.

□ 1700

We can start at home. It is very important that we start at home. I thank the gentlewoman so much for joining me.

Ms. SOLIS. I thank the gentlewoman from California for this special order.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of introducing the Democratic leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), and I thank him very much for joining us.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentlewoman from California for taking this time, this special order, and bringing up this matter that is so important to all Americans. I admire the work that she has done consistently over a long period of time to try to get hate crimes legislation passed here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, last year we came very close to making this bill the law of the land. Bipartisan majorities supported it in both Houses of Congress. We argued that the country needed to take a strong stand against brutal crimes committed against people because of who they are. We said attacks on Americans because of race, color, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, gender or disability were attacks not just on individuals but assaults against all Americans. We argued that law enforcement agents at all levels should have better tools and resources to find those responsible for these crimes and to see that they were brought to justice. We had heard too many stories of people beaten and brutalized and murdered because of who they were.

Matthew Shepherd was tied to a post and left to die by two men because he was gay. James Byrd, Jr. was tied to a truck and dragged through the streets and killed because he was black. Ricky Brydson was shot dead on the streets of Chicago because he was an African American. Children at a Jewish community center in Los Angeles were fired upon and then the perpetrator went and killed a Filipino American.

There are countless other stories of people who have been victimized or assaulted that did not make headlines and went unreported. But in the end, the Republican leadership thwarted the will of the majority and blocked the bill from being enacted.

Today, in light of the events of September 11, I believe with all my heart that this law is needed more than ever before. We need to bring this bill up and pass it in order to increase the power of law enforcement officials and send a message to the entire country and to the world that hate crimes in

the United States will not be tolerated. We need to demonstrate today that we will not let terrorists with hate in their hearts divide the greatest country in the history of the world. We will not let them turn Americans against one another in the most diverse society on the face of the Earth. We will not let them instill fear of our fellow citizens because of appearances or perceptions or heritage or backgrounds. We must, and I repeat must, pay close attention to divisions breaking out among our citizens in the wake of September 11.

We need to avoid the mistakes of our past in targeting certain citizens. We need to remember what happened in World War II to Japanese Americans and to my colleagues and friends, the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) and Norm Mineta, who were put in camps because of who they were.

We need to send a clear message to all that we will never accept or condone violence or hatred against any of our citizens. We need to put a stop to recent attacks on American Muslims and Arab Americans.

A Pakistani store owner was shot and killed a few days after September 11 because of who he was. Two girls were beaten at a college in Illinois because they were of Middle Eastern descent. A gas station owner in Arizona was shot and killed in his store because he was a Sikh who was wearing a turban.

The attacks must stop. These attacks are un-American. They violate not just the rights of individuals but they are an affront to us all. They are crimes against all of us, and we must strengthen our law enforcement and our society to better deal with these acts.

I recall what Abraham Lincoln said during the wrenching challenge of the Civil War: "Think anew and act anew. Rise with the occasion and then we will save our country."

I urge my colleagues opposed to this legislation to think anew, to act anew, to bring this bill up and work with us to renew the spirit of tolerance that makes America great.

I thank the gentlewoman for holding this special order.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the gentleman for joining us and being willing to work with us, because it is time. It is time to pass hate crimes legislation, Mr. Leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentlewoman. I obviously agree.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to thank my colleagues for participating in this special order. This Congress can no longer ignore the need for hate crimes legislation. As I stated earlier, my colleagues' participation this evening sets an example of the commitment we as a Congress share in protecting our children and families from hate. Hate crimes legislation must be a priority. The Conyers bill, H.R. 1343, must be brought to the floor and passed and passed immediately. I have tried to do

my part by sending out letters to my colleagues with information about hate crimes, the record of what is happening across the country, what is happening against Arab and Muslim Americans.

Mr. Speaker, organizing these speeches today is not the end of what we are going to do. We are going to work with all of our colleagues to ensure that this issue is addressed by the Republican leadership and it is one of my top priorities. We heard from our leader, Leader GEPHARDT, it is very important to him. We are going to continue this drumbeat until the Republican leadership allows this Congress to debate hate crimes and to vote on hate crimes and protect our children now and in the future from hate.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, under the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, Congress has defined a hate crime as "any act of violence against a person or property based on the victims' race, color, gender, national origin, religion, sexual orientation or disability."

We have all seen the many forms that crimes of hate can take. We have witnessed crimes perpetrated against persons based on their ethnicity or race; due to a person's sexual orientation; or based on a person's religion. Recently, we have witnessed numerous, heinous crimes against Muslims and Shiks based on their identity and religion. These are crimes of hate perpetrated against Americans and should be prosecuted with a heightened sense of responsibility.

FBI statistics reveal that in 1999, a total of 7,876 bias-motivated criminal incidents were reported. Of these incidents: 4,295 were motivated by racial bias; 1,411 by religious bias; 1,317 by sexual-orientation bias; 829 by ethnicity/national origin bias; 19 by disability bias; and 5 by multiple bias.

As we discuss this issue, I believe that there are two questions our nation must answer.

First, why should we care?

I submit to you today that we should care because our nation was built on a foundation of democracy and independence for all. Our Declaration of Independence states: "We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness."

We all take pride in these words, but we all have a duty, as American people, to recognize that this principle applies to all of our nation's citizens regardless of their race or national origin, gender, sexual orientation, religion, or disability status.

I believe that in this time of national emergency it is critical that we remain a "unified America" and reach out across our differences in ethnicity, race, and religion to respect each other and to celebrate the differences. We must all remember that although we are a melting pot of various cultures, ideals, and physical makeups, we are all one human race.

As one 16-year-old recently wrote:

He prayed—it wasn't my religion.
He ate—it wasn't what I ate.
He spoke—it wasn't my language.
He dressed—it wasn't what I wore.
He took my hand—it wasn't the color of mine.

But when he laughed—it was how I laughed, and when he cried—it was how I cried.

The second question our nation must answer is "How can we put an end to hate violence?"

The American people must take action. We must have a united and determined partnership of elected officials, law enforcement entities, businesses, community organizations, churches and religious organizations, and schools.

Congress must also take action. Yes, statistics have shed light on the prevalence of hate crimes in our society. However, hate crimes are often under reported. Although we gather significant information as a result of the Hate Crimes Statistics Act, this act makes the reporting of hate crimes by state and local jurisdictions voluntary, leaving gaps in information from key jurisdictions. (For example, of the 100 most populous cities in the U.S., 10 did not participate in the reporting of hate crime data in 1997.) We should encourage all jurisdictions to collect, record, and report hate crime data so that we may have a true understanding of the depth and nature of this issue.

It is also our duty to ensure that our nation's laws fully protect all of its citizens. Our existing civil rights laws protect citizens against crimes involving acts of violence because of race, color, religion, or national origin. The Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2001 (H.R. 1343) would for the first time broaden federal jurisdiction under civil rights law by adding gender, disability, and sexual orientation to the categories protected by these laws. In addition, it would remove limits on the prosecution of hate crimes that are not committed under "federally protected" activities under existing civil rights laws, such as voting, attending school, serving on a jury, or traveling for purposes of interstate commerce.

As such, I call for immediate consideration and passage of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act which would allow prosecution of serious, violent hate crimes, regardless of whether a federally protected right was being exercised.

Nonaction translates into not caring.

Nonaction translates into condoning the hatred that continues to permeate this nation.

But most significant, nonaction translates into silence.

And as Martin Luther King stated: "We will remember not the words of our enemies, but the silence of our friends."

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, since the April 3, 2001 introduction of H.R. 1343, the Hate Crimes Prevention Act, 199 members from both sides of the aisle have added their voices to the call for comprehensive legislation that will provide assistance to state and local law enforcement and amend federal law to streamline the investigation and prosecution of hate crimes.

The events of September 11th have demonstrated the destructive power of hate to rend the fabric of a community and a nation. Domestically, hate crimes statistics are a disturbing barometer of the state of the nation. In spite of national success in lowering overall crime rates, hate crimes have proven resistant to that trend. Data collected for 2000, pursuant to the 1990 Hate Crimes Statistics Act, documented 8152 hates crimes, an increase of 3.5 percent from 1999 figures.

Overall, racial bias accounted for 54.3 percent of incidents, with religious bias

accounting for 16.5 percent, sexual orientation 16 percent and ethnicity 12.4 percent of incidents. Notably, anti-black bias accounted for 35.6 percent of all racial bias and anti-Semitism accounted for 75.5 percent of all religious bias incidents.

In the wake of the terrorist attacks, the Arab-American Anti-Discrimination Committee has investigated, documented and referred to federal authorities over 450 incidents. These incidents include the murders of an a Muslim Pakistani store owner in Dallas, TX, and an Indian-American gas station owner in Mesa, AZ, where a suspect was arrested shouting, "I stand for America all the way."

The Department of Justice, however, has initiated only approximately 40 investigations of hate crimes directed against institutions or people of Arab or Middle-Eastern decent. As the James Byrd and Matthew Shepard tragedies suggest, the investigation and prosecution of this flood of hate crimes will strain the resources of state and local law enforcement agencies.

Current law limits federal jurisdiction to federally protected activities, such as voting for even covered classes of persons, so all these incidents will not be subject to federal jurisdiction. Moreover, current law does not permit federal involvement in a range of cases involving crimes motivated by bias against the victim's sexual orientation, gender or disability. This loophole is particularly significant given the fact that ten states have no hate crime laws on the books, and another 21 states have extremely weak hate crimes laws.

Our bill will remove these hurdles, so the federal government will no longer be handicapped in its efforts to assist in the investigation and prosecution of hate crimes. Through an Intergovernmental Assistance Program, federal authorities will be able to provide technical, forensic or prosecutorial assistance to state and local law enforcement officials. In addition, the legislation authorizes the Attorney General to make grants to state and local law enforcement agencies that have incurred extraordinary expenses associated with the investigation and prosecution of hate crimes.

The Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2001 is a constructive and measured response to a problem that continues to plague or nation—violence motivated by prejudice. It is vital that both government and individuals distinguish the beliefs of the Arab-American and Muslim communities from the perpetrators of September 11th's violence, and recognize that these Americans share our values and contribute significantly to our communities.

All Americans should stand to condemn any acts of bigotry, violence or discrimination against Arab-Americans, South Asians and American Muslims and call upon Americans of every faith and heritage to stand together in this time of national crisis. Our sense

of community with fellow Americans of Arab and South Asian decent and those of the Islamic faith should not be counted as another casualty of September 11th's senseless violence.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MEEKS of New York (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. ANDREWS, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. WATSON of California, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. SCOTT, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)
 Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. GANSKE, for 5 minutes, November 21.
 Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today and November 15.
 Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, November 15.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution providing for a National Day of Reconciliation; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on November 13, 2001 he pre-

sented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 768. To amend the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 to extend the favorable treatment of need-based educational aid under the antitrust laws, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 15, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4570. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Selected Acquisition Reports (SARS) for the quarter ending September 30, 2001, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4571. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision; Interim Final Determination that State has Corrected the Deficiencies [CA 249-0307; FRL-7102-4] received November 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4572. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Standards of Performance for Large Municipal Waste Combustors for Which Construction Is Commenced After September 20, 1994 or for Which Modification or Reconstruction Is Commenced After June 19, 1996 and Emission Guidelines and Compliance Times for Large Municipal Waste Combustors That are Constructed On or Before September 20, 1994 [AD-FRL-7100-8] (RIN: 2060-AJ52) received November 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4573. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, California State Implementation Plan Revision; San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, and South Coast Air Quality Management District [CA 169-0272a; FRL-7100-6] received November 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4574. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 02-10), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4575. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of waived missile sanctions against the Government of Pakistan essential to the national security of the United States, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

4576. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Blocked Persons, Specially Designated Nationals, Specially Designated Terrorists, Foreign Terrorist Organizations, and Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers: Additional Designations of Terrorism-Related Blocked Persons—received November 7, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

4577. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pennsylvania Regulatory Program [PA-132-FOR] received November 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4578. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indiana Regulatory Program [SPATS No. IN-152-FOR; State Program Amendment No. 2001-1] received November 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4579. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—North Dakota Regulatory Program [SPATS No. ND-042-FOR; Amendment No. XXXI] received November 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4580. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Justice Programs for Fiscal Year 2000, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3712(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4581. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System for Hospital Outpatient Services: Criteria for Establishing Additional Pass-Through Categories for Medical Devices [CMS-1179-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AK59) received November 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. H.R. 981. A bill to provide a biennial budget for the United States Government; with an amendment (Rept. 107-200 Pt. 2).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 288. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2269) to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to promote the provision of retirement investment advice to workers managing their retirement income assets (Rept. 107-289). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3009. A bill to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107-290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the committee on Government Reform discharged from further consideration.