the ranchers have pocketed some cash and will reap tax benefits from the conservation easements. There is a satisfying financial trade-off, they said.

But more satisfying for these ranchers is knowing their land will remain undeveloped for the enjoyment of heirs or other future owners, they said.

"I'm sure we could make much more money if we sold the land for development, but we didn't want to do that," said Kathy DeSmith, 60, who raises hay and cattle. She and her ranching partner put 179 acres in an easement as part of the conservation project. Miller said she had to zig-zag past his 8-year-old granddaughter ride horses, climb apple trees, fish and wade in the creek on his ranch. He hopes others will someday find the same carefree joys on his land.

The rancher said he's been offered more than $1 million for his property. But the money did not entice him or his three children, especially because they knew development would almost certainly follow, Miller said.

"...What would I do with a big pile of money, living in town with nothing to do? That doesn't suit me at all," he said. "I don't make a great deal of money—cash—but look at what I've got."

Edie Yates, 53, who with her husband owns the 530-acre Park Creek Ranch, agreed that the idea of houses built all over it," and said, "Your conscience falls in somewhere."

As she led a tour of her ranch, Yates stood on a ridgeline and gazed at the striking landscape of canyons, meadows and towering rock formations.

"To me, to stand out here right now, it's good for your soul," she said.

EQUAL PAY DAY
HON. DANNY K. DAVIS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Equal Pay Day. A woman would have to work until today, April 3, 2001 in order to earn the same salary of her male counterparts through December 31, 2000. Regrettably, the gap is even wider for Black and Hispanic women.

Perhaps even more troubling than the actual disparities are the poor explanations used to justify the situation.

Some blame pay inequity on women because they enter less lucrative professions. This assertion ignores the fact that traditionally female professions are purposely very underpaid. Professions such as teaching and nursing are devalued or devaluing because they are traditionally female. Furthermore, the inequity exists within traditionally female fields. For example, female elementary school teachers still make 70 dollars a week less than men in the same position. Clearly, this reason is not a sound one.

Another popular justification assumes that equal pay for women translates into financial disaster and instability for the American family. This persistent myth states that equality will rob men of their jobs, lure women from their children, and is unnecessary for married women who benefit form their husband's salary.

Despite the calamity theories, equal pay is essential for working families. When we end pay discrimination against women, family incomes will rise. Working parents will have more to spend on household needs and more to save for their children's education and their own retirement security. Working parents may be able to spend less time at work and more time with their families, a very positive change for parents and children.

Many excuses and theories abound, but the truth overpowers every last excuse. There is no justification for pay discrimination against women. Let's rectify pay inequity this year, and render Equal Pay Day 2002 obsolete.

REINTRODUCTION OF HATE CRIMES BILL
HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 2001

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2001, along with Representatives GEPHARDT, SKELO, FRANK, BALDWIN, MORELLA, KOLBE, FOLEY, SHAYS and KELLY. As of today there are 180 orginal co-sponsors.

In the year 2001, there are still too many messages to African-Americans and other minorities that we are not full participants in American democracy. Decrepit voting machinery in African-American communities disenfranchises our voters. Racial profiling continues unabated. Discrimination continues.

There have been over 50,000 hate crimes reported in the last five years, and nearly 8,000 reported last year alone. The gruesome, hateful murders of James Byrd and Matthew Shepard stand as symbols of the incidence of hate violence that has worsened since their deaths. Hate crimes don't only visit unspeakable violence on the immediate victims, but also send a message of a desired apartheid that its sponsors want to violently enforce. Today, organized hate and supremacist groups operate with greater sophistication, and across state lines.

While many of these crimes do and should get prosecuted at the state and local levels, many do not. Some local governments lack the resources to track interstate hate groups that perpetrate them. In other places, there may even be a lack of will. Ten states, for example, have no hate crime laws on the books, and another 21 have anemic hate crime laws.

If enacted, this legislation would give the federal government the jurisdictional tools necessary to assist local law enforcement in fighting the scourge of hate violence.

In instances where state and local governments do not have the capacity to prosecute such crimes, the legislation creates a federal backstop—the ability for the local U.S. attorney to ensure that justice will be done, deterring hate violence regardless of whether the victim happens to be engaged in a "federally