

crisis and to gauge their need for additional counterterrorism and security improvements.

In the 6 weeks following the terrorist attacks, my State spent \$18 million on homeland security and needs \$56 million more to upgrade emergency response in public health systems. State and local governments have done an exceptional job at pinpointing and prioritizing areas in need of improvement to ensure the safety of their citizens, and Congress must act now to provide them with the resources that they require.

Rhode Island's leaders recognize that law enforcement and emergency responders represent the first line of defense in the domestic fight against terrorism. As a result, they hope to invest \$5.8 million for improvements in coordinated emergency response efforts. Through new equipment and training for hazmat teams, the State will be better prepared to deal with the threat of weapons of mass destruction.

Also, the anthrax attacks highlight the need for a strong public health infrastructure. Rhode Island has proposed a \$48 million plan to enhance medical surveillance, research, and investigation. Our health officials must be prepared to identify a biological attack in its early stages, respond swiftly to the threat, and prevent further contamination.

As an original cosponsor of the Bioterrorism Prevention Act of 2001, which would provide \$7 billion to improve our national public health infrastructure, I applaud the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for proposing funding to address the threat of bioterrorism in our communities.

One particularly important provision included in the Obey amendment was a budget increase for the Coast Guard, which has now taken on new responsibilities since September 11. Daily life of Rhode Island is intricately tied to the ocean and Narragansett Bay. Commercial fishing netted \$79 million for the State's economy in 1999, and recreational boating is a popular pastime among our residents.

The Coast Guard's dependable presence and its work to keep our seaways safe have made them well respected among our boaters and our residents. However, the Coast Guard has been plagued by dwindling budgets in recent years, preventing personnel increases and equipment improvements. As a result, of the 41 nations with coastal patrols, the U.S. Coast Guard now has the 39th oldest fleet.

Nonetheless, the Federal Government expects the Coast Guard to patrol the Nation's 361 ports and increase inspections of foreign vessels, and 121 Rhode Island reservists have been called to this mission. Commandant Admiral James Loy has pleaded with Congress for years to raise funding levels for the Coast Guard, but we have again taken the wind out of their sails.

Moreover, the Obey amendment would have provided critical funding to

strengthen our border patrol. Each day, 1.25 million people, 500,000 vehicles, and 50,000 containers cross our borders; yet far too few vehicles, containers, packages, and other possessions are properly checked. We must provide the Border Patrol with the resources needed to detect and prevent terrorism at our borders.

Although the House was not able to address these and many other concerns by voting on the Obey amendment, I strongly encourage my colleagues to continue pushing for increased homeland security funding so that we may provide Americans the protection and peace of mind that they demand and that they deserve.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for raising these issues, especially his statement about the Coast Guard. I represent San Diego, California; and we only inspect less than 10 percent of the ships coming in. We need more positions for the Coast Guard. I thank the gentleman for his efforts here.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I could not agree more.

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

(Mr. FOLEY 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 Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HATE CRIMES

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, since the April 3, 2001 introduction of H.R. 1343, the Hate Crimes Prevention Act, more than 200 members (202) 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.

This legislation is a constructive and measured response to a problem that continues to plague our nation—violence motivated by prejudice. The legislation is designed to address two significant deficiencies in the existing bias crime law enforcement framework. First, the legislation loosens the overly restrictive federally protected activity requirement under existing hate crimes law. Second, the legislation expands the jurisdiction of the federal government to reach violent conduct aimed at victims on the basis of their gender, sexual orientation or disability status.

Title 18, United States Code, Section 245, is one of the primary statutes used to combat racial and religious violence. At the time of its passage in 1968, a number of members of Congress wanted to limit the reach of the statute. They accomplished their goal by including a dual intent requirement. To establish a violation under Section 245, a federal prosecutor must prove that a defendant acted, for example, because of the victim's race and because the victim was exercising one of a limited category of federally protected rights (e.g., serving on a jury, voting or attending public school).

The original version of the statute contained a less restrictive, but still substantial, intent requirement that the government prove the defendant acted while the victim engaged in a federally protected activity.

This dual intent requirement has substantially hampered the hate crimes enforcement by the Department of Justice. There are numerous examples of heinous acts of violence that DOJ has either been unable to prosecute, or has been unsuccessful in prosecuting, due to the limitations of Section 245.

One of the most egregious examples of the problems under current federal law occurred in a 1994 Texas hate crimes prosecution. A federal jury acquitted three white supremacists of civil rights violations arising out of an incident where they stalked the street of Fort Worth hunting for African-American victims. Although the jury agreed that the defendants' actions were racially motivated, they acquitted the assailants because they could not conclude that they intended to deprive the victims of a federally protected right.

The Hate Crimes Prevention Act would correct this deficiency by expanding the reach of federal jurisdiction to cover serious, violent bias crimes. Under the bill, hate crimes that cause death or bodily injury because of prejudice can be investigated federally, regardless of whether the victim was exercising a federally protected right.

This legislation will also address inconsistencies in the coverage of current federal, state and local bias crime provisions. 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 five states have no hate crime laws on the books, and another 21 states have extremely weak hate crimes laws.

Our bill will expand the jurisdiction of federal law to cover sexual orientation, gender or disability, so the federal government will no longer be handicapped in its efforts to assist in the investigation and prosecution of hate crimes.

In addition, 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 is endorsed by notable individuals and over 175 law enforcement, civil rights, civic and religious organizations, including: President Bush's Attorney General Dick Thornburgh; 22 State Attorney Generals; National Sheriffs' Association; International Association of Chiefs of