

United States Constitution, which vests the responsibility in this body, in the House of Representatives, to regulate trade with foreign nations. It also vests the power in the Congress to make any necessary laws for the exercise of that authority.

Secondly, I oppose Fast Track because it requires that these negotiations, very detailed, complicated negotiations, with great impact for not only our generation but those to come, it requires that these negotiations occur in secret; not in open debate on the floor of the House, but in secret.

I also oppose Fast Track because of our own past experience. We have seen what Fast Track has brought us, and we have been shown that it is a poor way to conduct, establish, and implement trade policy.

We have seen what it has done for workers, both in the United States and Mexico, through the example of NAFTA. We see now multinational corporations, General Motors, closing down plants in the U.S. and moving them over the border into Mexico, where our own auto workers are now forced to compete with auto workers in Mexico making 67 cents an hour. That is what Fast Track has brought us.

We have seen what it has brought to our environment, where corporations are continuing to seek to escape, avoid and evade responsible environmental standards in this country in order to go to other countries and to make a profit, make a profit by avoiding responsible environmental behavior.

We have seen what it has done to our food safety standards, where right now in this country under Fast Track legislation we can no longer keep out foods that do not meet our own food safety standards.

But last of all and most importantly, I oppose Fast Track because I think it is the single greatest threat to our representative form of democracy. It takes the power that has been vested in this body as representatives of the voters and gives it to the United States Trade Representative, who then, through agreements again in secret, delegates the authority to the World Trade Organization in Geneva, Switzerland. I think every Member in this body knows the chances of their own constituents exercising any right to petition to the WTO representatives in Geneva, Switzerland.

I think this is a bad policy for America. I think that we have a responsibility here to our constituents. I know they did not send me down here to give away the rights of the constituents in the Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts, and I assure you that no Representative in this Congress has been so directed by their people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEKAS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage the Republican leadership to bring the bill offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), H.R. 1343, The Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act, to the House floor. It is time to take action against crimes that are motivated by hate.

I appreciate all of my colleagues that are coming here this evening that are going to take their time and to speak in support of H.R. 1343.

In the past 3 months, crimes against Muslims, Arabs, Sikhs, Southeast Asians and anyone resembling these nationalities have increased significantly. The Council on Arab and Islamic Relations has compiled more than 1,400 reports of hate crimes since September 11. This represents a 51 percent increase in reported crimes against those of Middle Eastern descent since the attacks.

Our children are watching in horror as they and their moms and their dads, their brothers, their sisters and close friends, are being harassed, spit on, beaten and, even worse, killed. These hate crimes are happening in their neighborhoods, at their schools, and their places of worship. This Congress does not want to stand by and let our children be subjected to this kind of hate. We cannot. We should not. The 107th Congress must recognize the problem at hand and must take effective measures to reverse this trend, and we can do that by bringing H.R. 1343 forward.

The stories of these hate crime victims are disheartening. In Poughkeepsie, New York, a high school student was harassed and attacked while another student yelled "I hate you, dirty Afghani," as he pelted him with rocks and plants.

In Dumfries, Virginia, a mother and her son attacked two Afghani American brothers, age 16 and 17. During school the son and a group of his friends approached the two Afghani teenagers and began taunting and hitting them. The mother entered the fight and hit the 17-year-old youth in the head. Luckily, both boys escaped into a neighbor's home and luckily neither was seriously injured.

In San Mateo, California, a gasoline bomb was thrown through the window of a Sikh family's home hitting a 3-year-old. Fortunately, the bomb failed to explode.

These stories are both unbelievable and intolerable. But, sadly, these acts of hate are rampant, and people of Middle Eastern descent are not the only victims affected by ignorance and hate.

Just a week ago, a hate crime occurred in my district. Three sophomores at a high school in my district assaulted a 17-year-old student because

he was openly gay. The apparent leader of the assault paid two other boys \$10 each to beat up the victim. Our children cannot be subjected to such violence and such hate.

No one in America should live in fear because of his or her ethnic background, because of religious affiliation, because of gender, disability or sexual preference. This is especially true of our children.

That is why it is important to pass meaningful hate crime legislation, and to pass it now. We need to strengthen our existing laws, and we must protect people against all hate crimes. We must send a message, especially to our children, that hateful behavior is wrong and it will not be tolerated.

Our law enforcement officials need vigorous tools to fight and prosecute hate crimes. Yet existing Federal law is inadequate. That is why I am a strong supporter of the bill offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

For the first time under Federal law, this measure would add sexual orientation, gender and disability. In addition, it would expand Federal civil rights law to allow prosecution of hate crimes even if no federally protected activities were involved, such as voting or attending school. Also the bill would expand the circumstances under which the Federal Government could offer assistance to State and local governments to help prosecute these crimes.

Even though the bill is cosponsored by over 200 bipartisan Members, it has been cast aside. We must bring it to the floor, and we must pass it now.

HONOR THE FALLEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to again take up the effort to pay tribute and honor the fallen who perished as a result of the attacks on September 11, 2001.

This growing list of over 3,000 names is comprised of many of the victims of the recent horrific attacks on our Nation, including the firefighters and policemen who willingly gave their lives in an attempt to rescue others. I intend to read these names for as many days as it takes to bring honor and recognition to those individuals who lost their lives or are still missing:

Alok Mehta; Raymond Meisenheimer; Manuel Emilio Mejia; Antonio Melendez; Mary Melendez; Manny Melina; Christopher D. Mello; Yelena Melnichenko; Stuart Todd Meltzer; Diarelia J. Mena; Dora M. Menchaca; Charles Mendez; Lizette Mendoza; Shevonne Mantis; Wolfgang Menzel; Steve Mercado; Wesley Mercer; Ralph Mercurio; Alan H. Merdinger; Yamel Merino; George Merino; Michael Dermott Mullan; Dennis Michael Mullan; Peter Mullan; Michael Joseph

Mullin; James Donald Munhall; Nancy Muniz; Carlos Mario Munoz; Theresa "Terry" Munson; Robert M. Murach; Cesar Augusto Murillo; Marc A. Murolo; Raymond E. Murphy; Patrick Jude Murphy; Christopher William White Murphy; James Francis Murphy, IV; Brian Joseph Murphy; James Thomas Murphy; Edward C. Murphy; Kevin James Murphy; Charles Murphy; Robert Murphy; Susan D. Murray; John Murray; Susan D. Murray; John "Jack" Murray; Fall Mustafa; Richard Todd Myhre; Louis J. Nacke; Robert Nagel; Mildred Naiman; Takuya Nakamura; Alexander J.R. Napier, Jr.; Frank Naples; John Napolitano; Catharine Nardella; Mario Nardone; Manika Narula; Shawn Nassaney; Narendra Nath; Karen S. Navarro; Joseph Michael Navas.

Mr. Speaker, today I heard as others were honored who were on United Flight 93, and it did my heart good to know we have them all in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join me in remembering these brave heroes, so that their names will go down in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and they will not be just remembered as numbers, but will be remembered as people.

□ 1630

PASS H.R. 1343. THE HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENCE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 1343, the Hate Crimes Prevention Act, I am committed to seeing this legislation enacted into law. It is really important. I also want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), my friend and colleague, for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, last year hate crimes legislation passed the Senate in a bipartisan 57 to 42 vote on June 20. We had over 190 bipartisan cosponsors in the House, regrettably not enough to gain House passage. Many fear that this legislation would create a new area of law, and this is simply not true.

H.R. 1343, which currently has 199 bipartisan cosponsors, will enhance the ability of Federal law enforcement to provide assistance to State and local prosecution of hate crimes and, in certain limited cases, ease the ability of Federal law enforcement to prosecute racial, religious, ethnic and gender-based violence.

The FBI has reported approximately 50,000 hate crimes have been committed in the past 5 years, with nearly 8,000 reported last year alone. And although these statistics are alarming, even more disturbing is the fact that groups monitoring such crimes report that the FBI's data collection method has rou-

inely missed tens of thousands of cases, and the number of hate crimes is probably closer to 50,000 a year.

Why the discrepancy? Because participation in the FBI's annual hate crimes statistics report is voluntary, and several States do not fully participate. The FBI collects the data from local jurisdictions under the 1990 Hate Crime Statistics Act; and, unfortunately, little money has been allocated to train police officers to determine whether a crime was fueled by hate.

Mr. Speaker, now more than ever we need to provide law enforcement the tools and the resources they need to both report and fight against these senseless acts of hate and violence. These crimes are uniquely destructive and divisive. Their perpetrators seek not only to harm the immediate victim but to make a statement to an entire community.

Hate crimes are a disturbing barometer of the state of a nation. Notably, antiblack hate crimes accounted for 35.6 percent of all racial bias; anti-semitism accounted for 75 percent of all religious incidents; and people with substantial disabilities, approximately 15 percent of the population, suffer from violent and other major crimes at rates many times higher than that for the general population. Research shows that this population is over four times as likely to be victims of crime than are people without disabilities.

Hate crimes based on sexual orientation also continue to rise and currently make up the third highest category after race and religion. Additionally, in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks, the Arab-American Anti-discrimination Committee has investigated, documented and referred to Federal authorities over 450 incidents of hate-related crime. Moreover, the Council on American-Islamic Relations has compiled over 1,200 complaints of hate attacks directed against American Muslims.

State and local authorities currently prosecute the overwhelming majority of hate crimes, and they will continue to do so with enhanced support of the Federal Government under the Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

Mr. Speaker, hate crimes represent an attack on the American ideal that we can forge one Nation out of many different people and requires a determined response from law enforcement. The Hate Crimes Prevention Act is a constructive and measured response to a problem that continues to plague our Nation: violence motivated by prejudice. Let us pass H.R. 1343. It is long overdue.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10. An Act to provide for pension reform, and for other purposes.

PREVENTION OF TERRORISM ORDINANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about recent statements made by one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), with regard to India. We will soon be voting on the Foreign Operations appropriations bill which will be providing very limited aid to India, the world's largest democracy and our strong friend in the politically unstable Southeast Asia region.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) recently made critical statements to the press about India in an effort to persuade Members to not provide aid to India or to resume sanctions against India. He specifically referenced the Prevention of Terrorism Ordinance, or POTO, and stated that it was the most repressive law that India has ever considered.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 50 years, India has been forced to deal with severe cross-border terrorism in Kashmir and an upsurge of terrorist attacks throughout their nation. Since the September 11 attacks here in the U.S., India has experienced heightened terrorism in Kashmir; and, quite frankly, I have been reading about murders of innocent Kashmiris by Islamic militants on nearly a daily basis.

Just this morning I read about two new incidents that occurred yesterday. Suspected terrorists shot and killed a judge in Kashmir, along with his friend and two guards. This is the first attack on the judiciary of Jammu and Kashmir State.

The other incident was a suicide squad of a Pakistani-based guerilla group that killed at least five people at an Indian Army camp in Kashmir. This latest suicide attack is to be added to a long series of suicide attacks that have killed many innocent Kashmiris.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of violent terrorist attacks against India, the Indian President has issued the Prevention of Terrorism Ordinance, POTO. POTO would make provisions for Indian law enforcement officials to prevent and deal with terrorist activities. The current criminal justice system in India is not sufficient in prosecuting terrorists and, with passage of POTO, India will be provided the necessary law enforcement tools to prevent and effectively deal with terrorism.

I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) or anyone else should not be able to speak out against POTO if they desire. We know that India is a vibrant democracy with an open political system. Its free press and democratic nature allows all voices and opinions to be heard. But I think the criticism is undeserved at this time.

I would like to draw an analogy between what is happening with POTO in India and what is happening with the