

studying trauma; and, third, the development of new approaches and products for trauma prevention, a national issue, that will provide scientific, intellectual and financial benefits to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the effort of Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh, in collaboration with Carnegie Mellon University, to pursue in the near future a partnership with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to address the critically important issue of preventing bicycle accidents—especially those involving children. I am pleased that the committee favorably responded to the efforts of Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Mellon University in urging the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to collaborate with institutes that are conducting human factors research relating to bicycle safety. I believe that the pioneering research to be undertaken by Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Mellon responds to the committee's recommendation and will provide significant benefits to the administration's ongoing work in bicycle safety.

ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH OF FLORIDA, NY, CELEBRATES 101ST ANNIVERSARY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1996

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to recognize St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church in Florida, NY, for its 101st anniversary. St. Joseph's was established in 1895, and immediately became a landmark of the small village of Florida, where it has remained a hub of the community throughout the 20th century. St. Joseph's was conceived in the Polish tradition of Catholicism, and has continued in this tradition to the present day. Father William Torowski is currently the administrator of the congregation, and has served as an inspirational leader to his congregation and community throughout his tenure.

St. Joseph's has a long history of dedicated service to its community, including an elementary school, which has consisted of lay as well as nun instructors through the years. The Felician Sisters of Connecticut and the Sisters of Charity of the Bronx, NY, are among the convents who have contributed to the excellence of this educational institution throughout its history.

St. Joseph's has also been active in missionary work since its inception over a century ago. A mission in nearby Pine Island, NY, which has since become a separate entity, and St. Andrew Bobola in nearly Pelletts Island, NY have been a crucial part of St. Joseph's admirable efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to honor St. Joseph's for all that it has done for its community. St. Joseph's has distinguished itself as a provider of education and charity, as well as provider of its holy message. Its presence throughout the 20th century has been an inspiration to the residents of the area and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, we should remember that our houses of worship are vital to the identities of our Nation's communities, and we must not

forget our constitutional guarantee of freedom of religion, which allows congregations such as St. Joseph's to exist as the stabilizing force which draws the local communities of Nation together. St. Joseph's of Florida, NY, exemplifies this vital force in an admirable fashion, and I am proud to honor its 101st anniversary.

CHURCH ARSON PREVENTION ACT OF 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1996

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 1996, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 3525 by a rollcall vote of 422 to 0. Shortly thereafter, on June 26, 1996, the Senate approved an amended version of H.R. 3525, the provisions of which were arrived at through bipartisan negotiations between the House and Senate sponsors. The House later approved H.R. 3525, as amended by the Senate, and the President signed the bill into law on July 3, 1996.

Due to the celerity with which this legislation was adopted, and the fact that no House-Senate conference was required, there is no legislative history explaining the provisions of H.R. 3525 which were added after consideration of the measure by the House Judiciary Committee. The provisions of the bill as reported by the committee are explained in House Report 104-621. For this reason, I am inserting in the RECORD the following "Statement of Floor Managers Regarding H.R. 3525," which shall serve as additional legislative history for the bill. Senators FAIRCLOTH and KENNEDY will be inserting identical language in the Senate portion of the RECORD.

JOINT STATEMENT OF FLOOR MANAGERS REGARDING H.R. 3525, THE CHURCH ARSON PREVENTION ACT OF 1996

(By Congressmen Hyde and Conyers, and Senators Faircloth and Kennedy)

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, the entire nation has watched in horror and disbelief as an epidemic of church arsons has gripped the nation. The wave of arsons, many in the South, and a large number directed at African American churches, is simply intolerable, and has provoked a strong outcry from Americans of all races and religious backgrounds.

Congress has responded swiftly and in a bipartisan fashion to this troubling spate of arsons. On May 21, 1996, the House Judiciary Committee held an oversight hearing focusing on the problem of church fires in the Southeast. Two days later, on May 23, Chairman Hyde and Ranking Member Conyers introduced H.R. 3525, the Church Arson Prevention Act of 1996. H.R. 3525 was passed by the House of Representatives on June 18, 1996, by a vote of 422-0. On June 19, 1996, the Senate introduced a companion bill, S. 1890.

In the interests of responding swiftly to this pressing national problem, the Congressman Henry Hyde and Congressman John Conyers, the original authors of the bill in the House of Representatives, and Senator Lauch Faircloth and Senator Edward Kennedy, the original authors of the bill in the Senate, with the cooperation and assistance of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, have crafted a bipartisan bill that combines portions of

H.R. 3525, as passed on June 18, 1996 by the House of Representatives, and S. 1890, as introduced in the Senate on June 19, 1996. On June 26, 1996, an amendment in the form of substitute to H.R. 3525 was introduced in the Senate, and passed by a 98-0 vote. This substitute embodies the agreement that was reached between House and the Senate, on a bipartisan basis. The House of Representatives, by unanimous consent, took up and passed H.R. 3525 as amended on June 27, 1996.

This Joint Statement of Floor Managers is in lieu of a Conference report and outlines the legislative history of H.R. 3525.

II. SUMMARY OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the legislation is to address the growing national problem of destruction and desecration of places of religious worship. The legislation contains five different components.

1. Amendment of Criminal Statute Relating to Church Arson

Section three of the bill amends section 247 of Title 18, United States Code, to eliminate unnecessary and onerous jurisdictional obstacles, and conform the penalties and statute of limitation with those under the general federal arson statute, Title 18, United States Code, Section 844(i). Section two contains the Congressional findings that establish Congress' authority to amend section 247.

2. Authorization for Loan Guarantees

Section four gives authority to the Department of Housing and Urban Development to use up to \$5,000,000 from an existing fund to extend loan guarantees to financial institutions who make loans to organizations defined in Title 26, Section 501(c)(3), United States Code, that have been damaged as a result of acts of arson or terrorism, as certified by procedures to be established by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

3. Assistance for Victims Who Sustain Injury

Section five amends Section 1403(d)(3) of the Victim of Crime Act to provide that individuals who suffer death or personal injury in connection with a violation described in Title 18, United States Code, Section 247, are eligible to apply for financial assistance under the Victims of Crime Act.

4. Authorization of Funds for the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Justice

Section six authorizes funds to the Department of Justice, including the Community Relations Service, and the Department of the Treasury to hire additional personnel to investigate, prevent and respond to possible violations of title 18, United States Code, Sections 247 and 844(i). This provision is not intended to alter, expand or restrict the respective jurisdictions or authority of the Department of the Treasury and the Federal Bureau of Investigation relating to the investigation of suspicious fires at places of religious worship.

5. Reauthorization of the Hate Crimes Statistics Act

Section seven reauthorizes the Hate Crimes Statistics Act through 2002.

6. Sense of the Congress

Section eight embodies the sense of the Congress commending those individuals and entities that have responded to the church arson crisis with enormous generosity. The Congress encourages the private sector to continue these efforts, so that the rebuilding process will occur with maximum possible participation from the private sector.

III. AMENDMENT TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 247

Section 3 of H.R. 3525, as passed by the Senate and the House, amends section 247 in a number of ways.

I. Expansion of Federal Jurisdiction to Prosecute Acts of Destruction or Desecration of Places of Religious Worship

The bill replaces subsection (b) with a new interstate commerce requirement, which broadens the scope of the statute by applying criminal penalties if the "offense is in or affects interstate or foreign commerce." H.R. 3525 also adds a new subsection (c), which provides that: "whoever intentionally defaces, damages or destroys any religious real property because of the race, color, or ethnic characteristics of any individual associated with that religious property, or attempts to do so," is guilty of a crime. Section two of H.R. 3525 contains the Congressional findings which establish Congress' authority to amend section 247.

The new interstate commerce language in subsection (b) is similar to that in the general federal arson statute, Title 18, United States Code, Section 844(i), which affords the Attorney General broad jurisdiction to prosecute conduct which falls within the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution.

Under this new formulation of the interstate commerce requirement, the Committee intends that the interstate commerce requirement is satisfied, for example, where in committing, planning, or preparing to commit the offense, the defendant either travels in interstate or foreign commerce, or uses the mail or any facility or instrumentality of interstate commerce. The interstate commerce requirement would also be satisfied if the real property that is damaged or destroyed is used in activity that is in or affects interstate commerce. Many of the places of worship that have been destroyed serve multiple purposes in addition to their sectarian purpose. For example, a number of places of worship provide day care services, or a variety of other social services.

These are but a few of the many factual circumstances that would come within the scope of H.R. 3525's interstate commerce requirement, and it is the intent of the Congress to exercise the fullest reach of the federal commerce power.

The floor managers are aware of the Supreme Court's ruling in *United States v. Lopez*, 115 S.Ct. 1624 (1995), in which the Court struck down as unconstitutional legislation which would have regulated the possession of firearms in a school zone. In *Lopez*, the Court found that the conduct to be regulated did not have a substantial effect upon interstate commerce, and therefore was not within the federal government's reach under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution.

Subsection (b), unlike the provision at issue in *Lopez*, requires the prosecution to prove an interstate commerce nexus in order to establish a criminal violation. Moreover, H.R. 3525 as a whole, unlike the Act at issue in *Lopez*, does not involve Congressional intrusion upon "an area of traditional state concern." 115 S.Ct. at 1640 (Kennedy, J. concurring). The federal government has a longstanding interest in ensuring that all Americans can worship freely without fear of violent reprisal. This federal interest is particularly compelling in light of the fact that a large percentage of the arsons have been directed at African-American places of worship.

Congress also has the authority to add new subsection (c) to section 247 under the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution, an authority that did not exist in the context of the Gun Free School Zones Act. Section 1 of the Thirteenth Amendment prohibits slavery or involuntary servitude. Section 2 of the Amendment states that "Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." In interpreting the

Amendment, the Supreme Court has held that Congress may reach private conduct, because it has the "power to pass all laws necessary and proper for abolishing all badges and incidents of slavery in the United States." *Jones v. Alfred H. Mayer Co.*, 392 U.S. 409, 439 (1968). See also *Griffin v. Breckinridge*, 403 U.S. 88 (1971). The racially motivated destruction of a house of worship is a "badge or incident of slavery" that Congress has the authority to punish in this amendment to section 247.

Section two of H.R. 3525 sets out the Congressional findings that establish Congressional authority under the commerce clause and the Thirteenth Amendment to amend section 247.

In replacing subsection (b) of section 247, H.R. 3525 also eliminates the current requirement of subsection (b)(2) that, in the case of an offense under subsection (a)(1), the loss resulting from the defacement, damage, or destruction be more than \$10,000. This will allow for the prosecution of cases involving less affluent congregations where the church building itself is not of great monetary value. It will also enhance federal prosecution of cases of desecration, defacement or partial destruction of a place of religious worship. Incidents such as spray painting swastikas on synagogues, or firing gunshots through church windows, are serious hate crimes that are intended to intimidate a community and interfere with the freedom of religious expression. For this reason, the fact that the monetary damage caused by these heinous acts may be de minimis should not prevent their prosecution as assaults on religious freedom under this section.

H.R. 3525 also amends section 247 by adding a new subsection (c), which criminalizes the intentional destruction or desecration of religious real property "because of the race, color or ethnic characteristics of any individual associated with that property." This provision will extend coverage of the statute to conduct which is motivated by racial or ethnic animus. Thus, for example, in the event that the religious real property of a church is damaged or destroyed by someone because of his or her hatred of its African American congregation, section 247 as amended by H.R. 3525 would permit prosecution of the perpetrator.

H.R. 3525 also amends the definition of "religious real property" to include "fixtures or religious objects contained within a place of religious worship." There have been cases involving desecration of torahs inside a synagogue, or desecration of portions of a tabernacle within a place of religious worship. These despicable acts strike at the heart of congregation, and this amendment will ensure that such acts can be prosecuted under section 247.

2. Amendment of Penalty Provisions

H.R. 3525 amends the penalty provisions of section 247 in cases involving the destruction or attempted destruction of a place of worship through the use of fire or an explosive. The purpose of this amendment is to conform the penalty provisions of section 247 with the penalty provisions of the general federal arson statute, Title 18, United States Code, Section 844(i). Under current law, if a person burns down a place of religious worship (with no injury resulting), and is prosecuted under section 247, the maximum possible penalty is ten years. However, if a person burns down an apartment building, and is prosecuted under the federal arson statute, the maximum possible penalty is 20 years. H.R. 3525 amends section 247 to conform the penalty provisions with the penalty provisions of section 844(i). H.R. 3525 also contains a provision expanding the statute of limitations for prosecutions under section

247 from five to seven years. Under current law, the statute of limitations under section 844(i) is seven years, while the statute of limitations under section 247 is five years. This amendment corrects this anomaly.

IV. SEVERABILITY

It is not necessary for Congress to include a specific severability clause in order to express Congressional intent that if any provision of the Act is held invalid, the remaining provisions are unaffected. S. 1890, as introduced on June 16, 1996 contained a severability clause, while the original version of H.R. 3525 which was introduced in the House did not. While the final version of H.R. 3525, as passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives, does not contain a severability clause, it is the intent of Congress that if any provision of the Act is held invalid, the remaining provisions are unaffected.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION IN SUPPORT OF STATES' RIGHTS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1996

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, my home State of Illinois has been embroiled in litigation, *Pennington versus Doherty*, regarding the base period used to determine eligibility for unemployment compensation. The plaintiffs in *Pennington* have argued that the Federal Government, and not the individual States, should have the right to set those base periods. Their position is diametrically opposed to the common practice recognized as lawful and legitimate for decades. I believe that States should retain this right and that Federal action in this area should not preempt State law. Unfortunately, an appellate court did not agree.

While the outcome of this suit will unquestionably have a significant impact on Illinois, it may also lead to changes across the country, since more than 40 States utilize similar methods for determining eligibility for unemployment compensation. The final ruling could lead to greatly increased costs, both for individual States and the Federal Government. In fact, some have estimated that an unfavorable outcome in this case could increase costs by as much as \$750 million over the next 8 years in Illinois alone, and the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that costs to the Federal Government could reach the \$3 billion range over that same period. There can be little doubt that if the *Pennington* suit is successful, other plaintiffs in other States will be lining up to file their suits.

But perhaps even more troubling than the financial impact of this decision is the circumvention and misinterpretation of congressional intent through judicial action. Earlier today, the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources held a hearing regarding the *Pennington* case. While a variety of witnesses, including representatives of the administration, expressed various opinions regarding this case, there was unanimity on the fact that Congress intended States to control their own base periods. Despite widespread agreement on that issue, the courts may now redefine the law through judicial fiat.

In order to protect congressional intent and avoid these unnecessary expenditures, I am