

It is our hope that we could perhaps build on this little beginning from the other body and achieve some substantive legislative results in this very important area of public policy.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to respond to the gentleman about the actions in the Senate, but it is my understanding that the House rules forbid us from addressing any individual in the Senate or in the manner it was brought up here. Is that not correct, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is the gentlewoman making a parliamentary inquiry?

Ms. PELOSI. Yes, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rules of the House prevent Members from characterizing either action or inaction by a Senator or by the other body.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the Speaker for that clarification.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the majority leader, I think that if the package he was talking about that was this job creation package is the one that gave \$250 million back to Enron retroactively, then I think the public will understand why that is something that was unacceptable in a bipartisan way in this body.

I hope that we will be able to find bipartisan relief for those who have been caught in this recession, and the very least that we can do before we go off on a 13-day break is to complete action on 13 weeks of extended benefits for the workers, as the other body has done. I urge the majority to consider doing that next week before we leave.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. My final response would be that if indeed it was the violation of this body to do only the very least we could do, we would, in fact, take up the very least that was done by the other body. But it is our hope we can improve on that and actually do something that would be of real value in the real lives of really unemployed American citizens. We do not believe that we should content ourselves with doing only the very least we can do.

So we will try, in fact, to do something more, put together a bill that could be beneficial in people's lives, and hope that the other body could find some way to deal with it in a manner that would look something like legislative effectiveness.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it may seem the least that we can do, but if you are out of work, these 13 weeks extended benefits make all the difference in the world. I agree, we should be doing much more.

In a matter of hours, maybe 72, of the tragedy in New York, we bailed out the airlines. That was important, it was necessary, and we had to do that. We did it with a promise, though, that relief for the workers in those industries would be on the way soon. Now we are months later, indeed into a new year, a new session of Congress, and we still do

not see action on behalf of the workers who lost their jobs, while we put billions in relief for the industry.

I further urge what may seem like the least, I am not talking about this as the total package, but as an absolute emergency measure for these families caught in this recession, I continue to urge the majority to take up the Senate bill ASAP, certainly before we go out on a 13-day break.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his information on the schedule.

□ 1215

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY,
FEBRUARY 12, 2002

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, February 8, 2002, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 12, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CON-
SIDERATION OF H.R. 1542, INTER-
NET FREEDOM AND BROADBAND
DEPLOYMENT ACT OF 2001

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, today, a "Dear Colleague" letter was sent to all Members notifying them of an amendment filing deadline of 4:00 p.m., Monday, February 25, for Members wishing to offer amendments to H.R. 1542, the Internet Freedom and Broadband Deployment Act of 2001, which the distinguished majority leader just mentioned.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment by 4 p.m. on Monday, February 25, to the Committee on Rules upstairs in room H-312 in the Capitol.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, which is available on the Web sites of both the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Rules.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that

their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with Rules of the House.

SUPPORT HATE CRIMES
LEGISLATION

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, because of Enron hearings regarding the situation dealing with the Enron collapse, I will not be able to join my colleagues in advocating for a very important legislative initiative. I am here to enthusiastically support the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) as we look to pass the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2002, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Just this week we had an individual in my community who may have been viewed as being different and was murdered, and we are still looking to determine who killed Hugo Cesar Barajas and how he was killed, because he was different and because he had a different lifestyle. We must believe in everyone and support human dignity. I have asked for this to be investigated as a hate crime.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is imperative. We must pass this legislation now to provide dignity to all in this Nation.

HONORING DALE THOMPSON FOR
TEN YEARS OF SERVING THE
COMMUNITY OF FORT BAPTIST
CHURCH IN FORT SMITH, ARKAN-
SAS

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished Member of the Northwest Arkansas community, Pastor Dale Thompson.

Dale Thompson is in the beginning of his 10th year of service at the First Baptist Church in Fort Smith, Arkansas. At the age of 15, Dale began preaching and was ordained to the gospel ministry in 1971 after graduating from Oklahoma Baptist University. While serving his first pastorate, Dale continued his studies and received his masters of Biblical Arts from Luther Rice University.

Dale has been helping people for the past 25 years as a pastor in Arkansas and Oklahoma; and since 1974, he has ministered at churches in the third district of Arkansas. He has served as a member of the executive board of the Arkansas State Convention and is the

past president of the Pastors Conference of the Arkansas Board of Trustees of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Wake Forest, North Carolina.

Dale is currently serving the community as the pastor of the 6,000-member First Baptist Church in Fort Smith. Since his tenure at the church began 10 years ago, the church has grown by 2,451 members. This number is sure to continue to grow as long as Pastor Thompson remains actively involved in his community.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for allowing me the opportunity to honor Dale Thompson. He is a committed servant and deserves our praise.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

H.R. 1343, THE LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage the Republican leadership to bring the Conyers bill, H.R. 1343, the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act, to the House floor. Congress must take action against crimes that are motivated by hate. That is why I organized these speeches today to promote H.R. 1343. I appreciate all of my colleagues who have taken their precious time to come down to the House floor to join in on this discussion.

Hate crime offenses are more serious than comparable crimes that do not involve prejudice, because they are intended to intimidate an entire group. These crimes have a particularly damaging effect on victims, their families, and the communities they are part of. Victims oftentimes feel powerless, isolated, depressed and suspicious. Fear is another pervasive victim response, fear for their personal safety and for the safety of their families.

Family members share some of the long-term effects of hate crime victims. They may feel guilty for not protecting their family member who has been victimized. Like those actually targeted by the hate crimes, families may feel isolated or helpless. Their effectiveness on the job or at home or in school is also affected. When the perpetrator is arrested and convicted, but not given a full consideration and a harsh penalty, families actually lose faith in the justice system. Light sentencing may also cause further disillusionment.

In addition to the psychological effects hate crimes have on families, Mr. Speaker, there are particular concerns

as well depending on the crime and there may be repair bills or medical bills or funeral expenses. Trials and court appearances can prolong the grieving process, as can parole hearings. If there is media coverage of a hate crime, a family may find itself dealing publicly with intensely personal issues.

Currently, the Justice Department's civil rights division lists nine killings across the country as possible hate crimes in revenge for the terrorist attacks on September 11. Many families of post-September 11 murder victims believe that police are reluctant to recognize and pursue hate crimes, which is a complaint that African American victims have made for years. These outcries from victims and their families signal that hate crimes need to be taken more seriously.

It is unbelievable that Congress has yet to pass significant legislation that will strengthen and expand hate crimes law. And it is unbelievable that when there is a bill already crafted that would elevate hate crimes law that Congress has the opportunity to debate, it has not been brought to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Conyers Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Protection Act because it would offer real solutions by strengthening existing Federal hate crimes law. This legislation allows the United States Department of Justice to assist in local prosecutions, as well as investigate and prosecute cases in which violence occurs because of the victim's sexual orientation, disability, or gender. H.R. 1343 would also eliminate obstacles to Federal involvement in many cases of assault or murder based on race or religion.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is too important to ignore as families across our country continue to fall victim to hate crimes. We have over 200 bipartisan Members of the House of Representatives who have signed on to H.R. 1343, and we ask the leadership to bring this issue before the House to show American families that hate crimes are taken seriously.

This Congress has a responsibility to fight against hate and this bill will provide that commitment. I look forward to hearing the rest of my colleagues on this issue.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BRINGING TO HOUSE FLOOR H.R. 1343, THE LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I will not take my 5 minutes, but I will yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

Mr. Speaker, the Conyers-Woolsey hate crimes bill is approaching that critical mass where we will soon have the 218 votes. This Special Order is generated to pick up the last dozen or so cosponsors that we would like to have to have the bill brought forward as quickly as possible.

The Members will recall that there has been hate crimes legislation since 1968, and what we do is take away some of the restrictions which would prevent us from bringing in Federal jurisdiction to aid local law enforcement. This bill does not supplant the law enforcement at the local level. We assist them and work in a cooperative spirit with them.

Particularly, we take away the existing Federal jurisdictional requirements that a Federal act is impeded upon as a result of the incident. For example, voting, interstate commerce, or some other Federal nexus is required to trigger the bill under its current legal status. What we do is to say for crimes of gender, sex, sexual orientation, we remove a Federal requirement because a hate crime is a hate crime whether there is a Federal nexus or not.

Many States have hate crimes legislation, except for the fact that 21 of them are admittedly very weak. Five States have none at all. What we are doing is in the wake of September 11, what we are doing is saying that there has been a dramatic increase of hate crimes activity. The lawyers on the Committee on the Judiciary have discovered with the Council for Islamic Relations that there are nearly 1,500 reported cases, frequently of people who were mistaken to be of Arab descent and were not, but they were clearly crimes that would fall into this category that we find so offensive.