

Mr. Lerone Bennett, Jr., Clarksdale, Mississippi,

Ms. Claudine K. Brown, Brooklyn, New York.

As nonvoting members:

Mr. J.C. WATTS, Jr., Norman, Oklahoma,

Mr. JOHN LEWIS, Atlanta, Georgia.

There was no objection.

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.

WE MUST PASS HATES CRIMES BILL

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, tomorrow is the United Nations International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. What better way to honor this day than to act upon legislation that will help law enforcement investigate and prevent crimes based on discrimination?

That is why I ask my colleagues to join me to encourage the Republican leadership to bring the gentleman from Michigan's (Mr. CONYERS) bill, H.R. 1343, the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act, to the House floor.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), and others that will be here this evening for their commitment to this issue and their time to speak about it.

Hate crimes have been a persistent problem in the United States. The FBI recently released its hate crimes statistics of 2000. Sadly the report indicated that bias-motivated crimes continue to increase. During the year 2000, law enforcement reported 8,063 bias-motivated criminal incidents, indicating a 3.5 percent increase since 1999. In this report, crimes based on race ranked number one, while crimes based on religion and sexual orientation ranked second and third.

The most disturbing part of this report is what it does not show. The official numbers barely scratch the surface of the hate crime problem across the country. The true number of hate crimes actually committed last year could top 50,000 according to the Southern Poverty Law Center. Yet hate crimes continue to go unreported because of victims' fear and lack of law enforcement resources.

Mr. Speaker, hate crimes continue to occur every day in our cities and small town. What is extremely disturbing is that some of these crimes are committed by children who have learned a pattern to hate. Such an incident occurred in my home State of California

on March 11 in Huntington Beach, California. Three teenagers confronted a Filipino-American in the rear parking lot of his place of employment.

The teens began shouting racial slurs and "white power" before beating him with metal pipes. After the attack, the victim was even more frightened when he received a call from a person identifying himself as a parent of one of the attackers. This parent proceeded to threaten the victim using racial slurs.

This pattern of violence, Mr. Speaker, cannot continue. Our children are learning to hate from their parents and from their peers. We must set an example in Congress by passing legislation that will help to prevent hate. That is why I am a proud co-sponsor of the gentleman from Michigan's (Mr. CONYERS) bipartisan bill, H.R. 1343, the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act. And Mr. Speaker, I am joined as a co-sponsor by 203 of my colleagues and a growing chorus that wants the Republican leadership to bring H.R. 1343 to the House floor. This bill would offer a real solution by strengthening existing Federal hate crimes laws. H.R. 1343 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. It would also eliminate obstacles to Federal involvement in many cases of assaults or murder based on race or religion.

This legislation is too important to ignore, especially during a week the United Nations is reminding the world to end racial discrimination.

The Republican leadership must bring this bill before the House to show our Nation and the world that hate will not be tolerated in the United States. This Congress has a responsibility to fight against hate. And the Conyers bill will prove that commitment.

DO NOT INITIATE WAR ON IRAQ

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

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I was recently asked why I thought it was a bad idea for the President to initiate a war against Iraq. I responded by saying that I could easily give a half a dozen reasons why; and if I took a minute, I could give a full dozen. For starters, here is a half a dozen.

Number one, Congress has not given the President the legal authority to wage war against Iraq as directed by the Constitution, nor does he have U.N. authority to do so. Even if he did, it would not satisfy the rule of law laid down by the Framers of the Constitution.

Number two, Iraq has not initiated aggression against the United States. Invading Iraq and deposing Saddam Hussein, no matter how evil a dictator

he may be, has nothing to do with our national security. Iraq does not have a single airplane in its air force and is a poverty-ridden Third World nation, hardly a threat to U.S. security. Stirring up a major conflict in this region will actually jeopardize our security.

Number three, a war against Iraq initiated by the United States cannot be morally justified. Arguing that someday in the future Saddam Hussein might pose a threat to us means that any nation any place in the world is subject to an American invasion without cause. This would be comparable to the impossibility of proving a negative.

Number four, initiating a war against Iraq will surely antagonize all neighboring Arab and Muslim nations as well as the Russians, the Chinese and the European Union, if not the whole world. Even the English people are reluctant to support Tony Blair's prodding of our President to invade Iraq. There is no practical benefit for such action. Iraq could end up in even more dangerous hands like Iran.

Number five, an attack on Iraq will not likely be confined to Iraq alone. Spreading the war to Israel and rallying all Arab nations against her may well end up jeopardizing the very existence of Israel. The President has already likened the current international crisis more to that of World War II than the more localized Viet Nam war. The law of unintended consequences applies to international affairs every bit as much as to domestic interventions, yet the consequences of such are much more dangerous.

Number six, the cost of a war against Iraq would be prohibited. We paid a heavy economic price for the Vietnam war in direct cost, debt and inflation. This coming war could be a lot more expensive. Our national debt is growing at a rate greater than \$250 billion per year. This will certainly accelerate. The dollar cost will be the least of our concerns compared to the potential loss of innocent lives, both theirs and ours. The systematic attack on civil liberties that accompanies all wars cannot be ignored. Already we hear cries for resurrecting the authoritarian program of constricting in the name of patriotism, of course.

Could any benefit come from all this war mongering? Possibly. Let us hope and pray so. It should be evident that big government is anathema to individual liberty. In a free society, the role of government is to protect the individual's right to life and liberty. The biggest government of all, the U.N. consistently threatens personal liberties and U.S. sovereignty. But our recent move toward unilateralism hopefully will inadvertently weaken the United Nations. Our participation more often than not lately is conditioned on following the international rules and courts and trade agreements only when they please us, flaunting the consensus without rejecting internationalism on principle, as we should.

The way these international events will eventually play out is unknown,

and in the process we expose ourselves to great danger. Instead of replacing today's international government, the United Nations, the IMF, the World Bank, the WTO, the international criminal court, with free and independent republics, it is more likely that we will see a rise of militant nationalism with a penchant for solving problems with arms and protectionism rather than free trade and peaceful negotiations.

The last thing this world needs is the development of more nuclear weapons, as is now being planned in a pretense for ensuring the peace. We would need more than an office of strategic information to convince the world of that.

What do we need? We need a clear understanding and belief in a free society, a true republic that protects individual liberty, private property, free markets, voluntary exchange and private solutions to social problems, placing strict restraints on government meddling in the internal affairs of others.

□ 2015

Indeed, we live in challenging and dangerous times.

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

(Mr. HINOJOSA 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 Indiana (Mr. KERNS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KERNS 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 Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

RECOGNIZING MS. DIANE S. ROARK

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

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, in the past, usually during consideration of the Intelligence budget, I have risen before this body and mentioned the superb and thoroughly knowledgeable staff that resides in the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, of which we are very proud. These individuals are specially selected because of their knowledge and their understanding of the intelligence world, a world that is actually very arcane and confusing to people who do not spend time in it.

We do not talk a lot about these folks and they do not seek recognition. They are not that kind. They understand that much of the work must be done in secret so as not to betray the sensitive information they handle, but let me assure my colleagues and the American people that this group of dedicated people works very hard, and they dig very deeply into the operations of the Intelligence Community in order to ensure that there is oversight of intelligence activity and that our Nation is secure and the Intelligence Community is playing by the rules.

I want to specifically recognize one of these dedicated people who has served the committee and our country diligently for almost 2 decades. Her name is Diane Roark, and I am sorry to say that when this body reconvenes in April Diane will no longer be on our staff. She is retiring from the House and from government service.

Madam Speaker, Diane first joined the committee in April 1985, having previously served in the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense, and just prior to joining us, on the National Security Council, where she was Deputy Director of Intelligence Programs. Since joining the committee, Diane has excelled in the very difficult, technical areas of our oversight. She was the program monitor for the National Reconnaissance Office where she not only challenged the embedded bureaucracy and made it become more innovative in approaches to future election, but she also forced the office to restructure and reform their fiscal accountability system so that oversight was assured.

Most recently, Diane has been our program manager for the National Security Agency, a vital agency for us. This agency has many, severe challenges, Madam Speaker, and if it were not for the efforts of Ms. Roark, I do believe that our committee's efforts to oversee and advocate for NAS would have been much less effective, and for that she has my personal thanks.

Diane is known as a very dedicated, tough-minded program monitor who digs into the issues and forces agencies to see and understand what they sometimes miss themselves. She is also known as a very knowledgeable task master, and her arrival at an agency is often anticipated with apprehension.

Those managing the community know that she is usually on the mark with her assessments and that she takes the public's trust very well to heart. Recently, one of the senior managers within the community commented on her performance by saying that our staff "is very aggressive in their oversight and has a very serious and in-depth knowledge of our programs, sometimes a better understanding than some of the senior managers do."

I think that this is the type of oversight capability that the American people are entitled to and should de-

mand. I cannot think of any greater tribute for Diane than knowing that agency leaders throughout the community recognize that her instincts and assessments are sound.

So, Madam Speaker, it is with some sadness that I rise today to say farewell to a public servant who has dedicated a career to ensuring our security, each and every one of us. Diane's departure is truly our loss, although I know that her younger son, Bryce, will enjoy having Mom around home more. We are going to miss her.

On behalf of the committee I thank Diane for her professionalism, her dedication, her unflinching commitment to our Nation and its security. We wish her well in her future endeavors, whatever they be. Know that she has served her country well and she will be missed. Job well done.

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

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

COMMENDING LOCAL UNITED WAY CHAPTERS FOR CONTINUING SUPPORT OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the 97 percent of all local United Way chapters which continue to support the Boy Scouts of America despite the national campaign to demonize this wonderful organization.

The pressure to abandon the Boy Scouts has been just as intense as the pressure on the scouts themselves to abandon their moral standards and to take God out of the scout oath. Powerful business interests and Hollywood moguls like Steven Spielberg have severed their links with the scouts, and the taxpayer-funded public broadcasting system have attacked them as well. However, an overwhelming majority of the United Way chapters and the American people themselves have not cowered and have stood tall against this disgraceful campaign of intimidation.

In my own constituency, for instance, the Orange County United Way Chapter has given local scout troops and organizations \$1.3 million over the last 3 years and has no sign of letting up. Just recently, the City of Huntington Beach, for example, has named itself the Tree City USA for its greenery. Many of those trees in Huntington Beach were planted by local boy scout troops doing their good deeds and community service.

The United Way chapters that did cave into the pressure were mostly