

FUTURE ROLE OF WOMEN IN
AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to continue to speak out on the critical issue of women in Afghanistan and their plight during these perilous times. As Democratic Chair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, I have made it a priority to address the House each week to provide a voice to the women who have been silent far too long. It is also my intention to continue to raise awareness about the current state and the future state of women and children in Afghanistan.

Today marks the conclusion of the Bonn negotiations for a post-Taliban government in Afghanistan. A new interim administrator will be in place by December 22. While few women were involved in the current negotiations, I am happy to learn that women will take part in the rebuilding of their country. The new administration will include five deputy prime ministers and 23 other members for negotiation. Of the five deputy prime ministers, one is a woman. Women are also expected to occupy up to five other ministerial portfolios. One minister is to be established solely for women and children. I am happy to report that there is progress being made.

Under the proposed agreement, a special commission will be appointed within a month to organize the calling of an emergency legislature or traditional constituent assembly of provisional leaders and notables. It should be called within 6 months and would have the right to revise the new interim executive and create other bodies that would serve for up to 2 years.

The commission is also to ensure that due attention is paid to the presence in the governing body of a significant number of women. The proposed agreement foresees the drafting of a new constitution to be ratified by another legislature, with elections to take place at the end of that 2-year period.

As women strive both inside the country and outside to contribute towards shaping a meaningful future, we must demonstrate our resolve to help those Afghanistan leaders be involved in all political and economic negotiations from the outset. It is extremely important that there are not just a few women used as tokens but as real partners and equal partners. Women need to be involved in every aspect of that country's fabric.

As I have said before, Afghan women must be ensured of their basic human rights once more such as access to safe drinking water and sufficient food; to receive decent health and maternal care; and, foremost, to again move freely in their society without being subject to harassment and abuse.

Above all, they must be allowed to practice their religious beliefs as Islamic women without retribution.

It will be important to see that women are involved in the emergency *laya jerga* since it appears that this is a real place where power and authority will be exercised.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present this report this evening.

□ 1745

HATE CRIMES

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to offer my thoughts on the importance of passing in this body hate crimes legislation, but also to ask this House to prioritize its work. Inasmuch as we can spend an enormous amount of time on some very valid initiatives, I do believe that hate crimes legislation, the passage of hate crimes legislation that has been offered in two previous congressional sessions, is long overdue and it is not being passed.

I heard a colleague of mine just earlier today talk about the climate in which we live. All of us have stood up against terrorism and have given to the President the authority to ferret out terrorism and to bring to justice those who perpetrated the unspeakable crime on September 11, 2001. But, likewise, we have spoken against the indictment of the Islamic faith and all Muslims. We realize that Muslims are not the crux of our problem inasmuch as the virtues of their faith talk about peace and justice.

I would say that we experienced over the past weekend some terrible tragedies, terrible loss of life in the Mideast. It does us no good as well to speak hate against either the Israelis or the PLO. In fact, it is most important that we look to speak to the issues of peace and reconciliation and bringing people together.

Our first step to acknowledge to the world that we will not harbor hate is to pass our own hate crimes legislation so that we can say to the world we argue and fight against hate in this Nation, and we will stand against hate in the world. We cannot cry in a one-sided manner. We must cry for all of those who lose their life.

So, as we talk about the passage of hate crimes legislation, let us be reminded that we have those brothers and sisters within our boundaries who feel that they have been discriminated against because of their faith. We may have brothers and sisters around the world who feel that these tragedies that have occurred, that we have somewhat not understood their crisis and that we do not look to seek peace. I would argue that we can find peace here in this Nation and a recognition and reconciliation of our opposition to

hate by passing the hate crimes legislation, and we can do so by speaking to all parties who would come to the table of peace to design peace in the Mideast and to design peace in Afghanistan.

The hate crimes legislation that is so needed in this country would address the question of Leonard Clark, a 13-year-old African American teenager who was riding his bicycle one day in Chicago when he was accosted and brutally beaten by three white teenagers. The perpetrators have been charged with attempted murder, aggravated battery and hate crimes under the Illinois State law. However, the irony in this case is that one of the key witnesses to the beating remains missing. A Federal hate crimes law would have allowed for the full involvement of the FBI in this case, thereby increasing the chances of capture and justice.

In my own congressional district in Houston in 1995, Fred Mangione, a homosexual, was stabbed to death, and his companion was brutally assaulted. The two men who were charged with Mangione's murder claimed to be members of the German Peace Corps, which has been characterized in media reports as a neo-Nazi organization based in California. At the time, this crime did not meet the State of Texas threshold for trial as a capital offense because the murder did not occur during the commission of a rape or robbery. Justice failed us during that time frame.

I am very gratified to say that since that time and since the brutal beating and killing and dismemberment of James Byrd, Jr., we have passed the James Byrd, Jr., Hate Crimes Act in Texas. It was passed by Republicans and Democrats and signed by a Republican Governor.

So I speak tonight not in one voice. I speak to all of my colleagues, and I am gratified that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has offered legislation and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) continues to bring us together so that we can speak in one voice.

But even as we speak, we are still facing attacks on our own American citizens and those within our boundaries, such as the statistics of 1995, 2,212 attacks on lesbians and gay men were documented, an 8 percent increase over the previous year. There have also been numerous attacks on people of various backgrounds, whether they have been Jews or Asians, Hispanics, Native Americans or anyone that has been different in our community. The hate crimes prevention act will protect these groups from targeted attacks because they are members of these groups. They likewise would protect women and others on the grounds of difference.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in simply saying we can fight hatred with our own changed hearts, but as well we can provide changed laws for America and pass the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2001 or 2002.

Mr. Speaker, the tragic events of September 11 have compelled this great country of ours to join efforts and resources in healing the wounds and rebuilding lives. Our love for America was never more evident than in the days and months subsequent to September 11. Flags are flown daily even embroidered on clothing. We cannot stop showing our love for our country.

Yet expressing our deep affections for our country and what we have had to endure, must include ALL Americans. It must not be exclusionary, but rather include all races, creeds, gender, and sexual orientation.

When Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence he stated that, "We hold these truths to be self evident that all Men Are created Equal." Women, African Americans, Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, and Jewish Americans have been too often historically, culturally, and prospectively excluded from inclusion in that declaration.

President Abraham Lincoln stated so eloquently in his Gettysburg Address, "Our Nation must struggle . . . in order to create a more perfect union". The problem with our struggle today is our judiciary system's inability to effectively address violent acts of hate crime in our society. It is particularly difficult because there is no current law that makes a hate crime a federal offense. We need Hate Crimes legislation to "create a more perfect union."

Early in 1987, a public controversy developed between William Bradford Reynolds, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, and prominent civil rights advocates. Reynolds stated that racial violence was not increasing, basing his assertion on informal surveys of Federal prosecutors and the number of civil rights complaints being filed with the Justice Department. Civil rights advocates asserted the contrary, that racial violence was in fact increasing, basing their assertions on data supplied by the Justice Department's own Community Relations Service, which reportedly indicated a rise from 99 racial incidents in 1980 to 276 in 1986.

This controversy ultimately led to the passage of the Hate Crime Statistics Act, enacted April 23, 1990. This law required the FBI to collect, compile, and publish statistics on hate motivated crime. Since then, Federal legislation has moved beyond data collection on the incidence of hate crime activity, to include new provisions requiring stiffer penalties for bias-motivated criminal activity. Also, it has designated a new category of individuals, to include those with disabilities.

According to the Hate Crimes Statistics Act, a hate crime is defined as acts which individuals are victimized because of their "race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity." In this statute, hate crimes are those in which "the defendant intentionally selects a victim, or in the case of a property crime, the property that is the object of the crime, because of the actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, ethnicity, gender, disability, or sexual orientation of any person.

But despite our historical progress and despite our laws, how far have we really come? Just when we thought that our Nation had built a foundation for peace and harmony, three attackers in a small town in Texas, shattered the illusion with an atrocity beyond imagination. The so-called "dragging" murder DEFIES

the very fabric of the moral code that all Americans innately support. The moment that Mr. Byrd's tormentors chained his body against the cold, lifeless metal of their truck, they became something savage, something inhuman, and the very embodiment of hate criminals.

African-Americans have historically been the most frequent targets of hate violence in the United States, and they are among its principal victims today in many states. From lynching to cross-burning, and church-burnings, antiblack violence has been, and still remains, the prototypical hate crime—an action intended not simply to injure individuals but to intimidate an entire group of people. Hate crimes against African-Americans impact upon the entire society not only for the hurt they cause, but for the tragic history they recall and perpetuate.

In March of 1997, Leonard Clark, a 13-year-old African-American teenager was riding his bicycle home one day in Chicago, when he was accosted and brutally beaten by three white teenagers. The perpetrators have been charged with attempted murder, aggravated battery and Hate Crimes under Illinois state law. However, the irony in this case is that one of the key witnesses to the beating remains missing. A federal hate crimes law would allow for the F.B.I.'s full involvement in this case, thereby increasing the chances of capture, and thus, justice.

In my Congressional District in Houston in 1995, Fred Mangione, a homosexual, was stabbed to death, and his companion was brutally assaulted. The two men who were charged with Mangione's murder, claimed to be members of the "German Peace Corps," which has been characterized in media reports as a neo-Nazi organization based in California. This crime did not meet the State of Texas' threshold for trial as a capital offense, because the murder did not occur during the commission of a rape or robbery.

In recent years, attacks upon gays and lesbians are increasing in number and in severity. During 1995, 2,212 attacks on lesbians and gay men were documented—an 8% increase of the previous year.

There have also been numerous attacks against Jews, Asians, Hispanics, and Native Americans. Fortunately, the Hate Crimes Prevention Act would protect these groups from targeted attacks because they are members of these groups.

Examination of hate crimes statistics sadly reveals that Mr. Byrd's murder was not an isolated incident. The FBI releases the totals each year for hate crimes reported by state and local law enforcement agencies around the country based on race, religion, sexual orientation or ethnicity. These national totals have fluctuated—6,918 in 1992, 7,587 in 1993, 5,852 in 1994, 7,947 in 1995, and 8,759 bias-motivated criminal incidents reported in 1996. Of the 8,759 incidents, 5,396 were motivated by racial bias; 1,401 by religious bias; 1,016 by sexual-orientation bias; and 940 by ethnicity/national origin bias.

A Hate Crimes Prevention Act would send a message that perpetrators of serious, violent hate crimes will be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. Hate crimes that cause death or bodily injury because of prejudice should be investigated federally, regardless of whether the victim was exercising a federally protected right.

It is time for the Congress to act. Violence based on prejudice is a matter of national con-

cern. Federal prosecutors should be empowered to punish if the states are unable or unwilling to do so.

OPPOSING FAST TRACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I joined a number of my colleagues from the House and leaders of the most influential environmental groups in the United States to express opposition to so-called Fast Track, granting the President Trade Promotion Authority. The presence of this coalition highlighted quite impressively the solidarity of the environmental community on this critical vote.

Another thing that underscores the solidarity of the environmental community against the Thomas bill is the stern warning issued by the League of Conservation Voters that it will likely score this vote. The LCV takes its scoring seriously and to ensure balance in its ratings only scores environmental votes for which there is absolute unanimity in the environmental community. The League of Conservation Voters has never before scored a trade vote. That means the environmental community has never been so focused on and so unanimously supportive of and so involved in a trade vote in this country's history.

Why is there such urgency in the environmental community in opposition to the Thomas Fast Track proposal? Because this bill would do nothing, would do nothing to prevent countries from lowering their environmental standards to gain unfair trade advantages. It would do nothing to require that the environmental provisions be included in the core text of our trade agreements, because it would do nothing to ensure that the environmental provisions in future trade agreements are enforceable by sanctions.

Instead, it would transfer the burden to consumers and to regulators to prove that the science underlying domestic regulation is beyond dispute, resulting in a downwards harmonization of our environmental laws, a rollback of environmental laws, a weakening of environmental regulation. It would encourage Western companies to build manufacturing plants in countries with the least stringent environmental laws, and, as a result, cost skilled American workers good-paying jobs.

It would allow future trade agreements to include provisions like NAFTA's chapter 11, encouraging so-called regulatory tax claims by foreign companies and threatening hard-won democratically enacted laws and regulations that protect our natural resources.

This investor-state relationship cast by chapter 11 of the North American