

(6) To facilitate the replacement of a defective firearm by the same regulated firearms dealer with 30 days of purchase.

(7) Lastly the one gun in 30 days provision does not apply to estate sales.

As a result of this legislation, the number of firearms acquired through multiple purchases have reduced significantly.

In addition, and perhaps most telling effect, is the drastic decrease in the number of guns initially purchased in Maryland that have been recovered as a result of crimes in other States.

By comparing the one year period prior to the enactment of Maryland's multiple purchase legislation, which became effective on October 1, 1996, with the year following its enactment, you can clearly see the dramatic results (two charts; multiple sales bar chart comparison, and multiple sales graph)

From October 1, 1995, to September 30, 1996, 7,569 handguns were sold in Maryland, as a result of multiple purchases.

From October 1, 1996, to September 30, 1997, that number was reduced to 1,618 handguns which were sold as a result of multiple purchases, a seventy eight percent (78%) (59% difference) reduction in firearms acquired through multiple purchases.

In 1991 Maryland was nationally ranked second in terms of suppliers of crime guns to the city of New York. By 1997, one year after the passage of Maryland's one gun a month law, Maryland moved out of the top ten suppliers of crime guns to New York City.

Maryland is proud of its proactive firearms legislation. Our efforts to limit the supply of guns to the illegal market without adversely impacting upon law abiding citizens are strong and sincere. The multiple purchase allows for the quick acquisition of large numbers of regulated firearms by proscribed individuals. The one gun a month law in Maryland has shown that it is an effective means of disrupting the illegal diversion of firearms which are acquired through multiple purchases and will ultimately reduce the supply of firearms readily available to criminals.

Thank you again for the opportunity to appear before you today.●

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL S. DALEY

●Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Michael S. Daley who is retiring from over 30 years as an orderly at Fletcher Allen Hospital in Burlington, Vermont. Michael joined the hospital in the late 1960's and began his career as a health care worker. After a few years, he thought he would try his luck in California. He soon realized that Vermont was where he wanted to be. He rejoined the workers at the hospital in October 1970 and continued to be a care giver in every sense of the word. Michael is my wife, Liz's, bother. I can not count the number of times Vermonters' have come up to me to tell me how kind Michael had been to them when they were ill or injured.

Being an orderly was more than a job to Michael. It was a vocation. He was ever mindful of the importance of medical care, however, he never neglected the soul. Every one of his co-workers would tell you that Michael brought a sense of humor to everything he did. He would often bring his lunch to a patient's room and visit during this lunch break. Doctors, new to the O.R. or

leaving for other assignments, were regularly treated to lunches prepared by Michael in their honor. "Michael knows everyone", a co-worker stated. I think that Michael made it his business to get to know everyone. He would note when someone from our hometown of Shrewsbury, Vermont was hospitalized and he would pay them a visit. If a person wanted to talk, Michael would be there.

Michael is a religious man who lives his faith. His work in the Episcopal church in Milton, Vermont kept that small community alive for years. Along with his wife, Alice, and their three children, Michael is and has been very active in Saint Andrews Church in Colchester, Vermont. His faith has helped Michael go the extra mile in the care and comfort of his fellow Vermonters. His sense of humor has added sunshine to the lives of those he meets. Michael represents the millions of unsung heroes who care for and comfort our neighbors, family and friends. I wish to honor him and his life's work.●

COMMENDING THE WORK OF THE NATIONAL COMMEMORATIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE CENTENNIAL OF THE SUBMARINE FORCE

●Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the U.S. Navy Submarine Force as it approaches its 100 year anniversary and to commend to the work of the National Commemorative Committee for the Centennial of the Submarine Force.

The submarine force traces its beginnings to the spring morning of April 11, 1900. Following demonstration trials off Mount Vernon on the Potomac River, the Navy agreed to purchase the submarine boat USS *Holland* (SS-1). The USS *Holland* was named for its inventor John Holland. Inventors such as John Holland and Simon Lake had been experimenting in submarine design during the last decades of the nineteenth century. However, Mr. Holland was the first to give the submarine true mobility by using a gasoline engine on the surface and a battery supplying electric motors when submerged. It was due to the success of the USS *Holland* that the Navy pursued the submarine program. For this reason, the Submarine Force traditionally recognized April 11th as the anniversary of its establishment.

Dramatic improvements to the submarine have been made since the USS *Holland*. The diesel engine replaced the gasoline engine in 1912. All welded hulls, allowing submarines to submerge to much greater depths, were introduced in the 1930s. Radar and sonar were incorporated during World War II. It is with the introduction of nuclear power, however, that the submarine became a true submersible—limited in endurance only by the needs of its human crew.

Earlier this year the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program celebrated its 50th anniversary. It was in 1948 that the leg-

endary Admiral Hyman Rickover, then a Captain, assigned himself the task of building a nuclear submarine. At that time, the technology that enabled the release of nuclear power was in its infancy. Just seven years later, the USS *Nautilus* put to sea under nuclear power. Today the Navy's nuclear submarine force is a crown jewel of our Nation's Defense arsenal.

In the year 2000, the Navy's Submarine Force will celebrate its 100th anniversary. The Secretary of the Navy has designated the period from January 2000 through December 2000 for the commemoration of the Centennial of the U.S. Submarine Force. The Director of Submarine Warfare, Rear Admiral Malcolm Fages, and the Submarine Warfare Division have the responsibility for overall coordination of commemorative activities with assistance of the National Commemorative Committee for the Centennial of the Submarine Force.

Mr. President, it is the work of the National Commemorative Committee and its chairman, Admiral Hank Chiles, that I wish to recognize today. Plans are already underway to observe the anniversary at appropriate occasions throughout the calendar year 2000. The National Commemorative Committee is planning events and ceremonies that will provide the opportunity for people to observe and experience the special world of the U.S. Navy Submarine Force and to become more acquainted with its rich and colorful history. Proposed events for 2000 include the opening of a Smithsonian exhibit, a birthday ball and the unveiling of a submarine stamp in Washington, DC, and participation in fleet week celebrations throughout the year.

I commend the dedicated effort of the National Commemorative Committee for the Centennial of the Submarine Force and urge my colleagues to support the Committee as they continue their work planning the centennial events.●

CELEBRATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA'S 87TH ANNIVERSARY NATIONAL DAY

●Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate the Republic of China's 87th Anniversary National Day on October 10, 1998. Taiwan has prospered beyond most people's wildest dreams despite its limited resources and vast population. The people of the United States have a special bond with the people of Taiwan, who have unfalteringly demonstrated to the world their commitment to democracy and democratic ideals. Taiwan is a vibrant, thriving country for the present and a model for the future—a model characterized by strong economic growth and respect for basic human rights and democratic freedoms.

Taiwan has been and will continue to be an important partner of the United States, economically, culturally, strategically, and politically. May God

bless our friends in Taiwan, including President Lee Teng-hui, Vice President Lien Chan and Taipei's Foreign Minister, Dr. Jason Hu, who have done an excellent job in leading Taiwan down the road of democracy and prosperity. Mr. President, I ask that you join me and our colleagues in congratulating the Republic of China's freedom on its 87th Anniversary National Day. I look forward to celebrating this historic event annually for many, many years to come.●

NATIONAL SALVAGE MOTOR VEHICLE PROTECTION ACT

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the substitute amendment to S. 852, the National Salvage Motor Vehicle Protection Act of 1998.

The substitute makes a number of changes to the Committee-passed bill. While not as far reaching as some would like, I believe that the changes improve a measure that has always had a very laudable intent, but which was criticized nevertheless by attorneys general and consumer groups for preempting, in some instances, more favorable state law and not providing consumers with enough information about a vehicles' history.

As a former Attorney General, I was particularly sensitive to these criticisms, and last Fall I placed a hold on the measure with the expectation of facilitating a consensus between the bill's supporters, the attorneys general, and various consumer advocate groups. Regrettably, a consensus of legislation was not to be had. While the changes in the amendment are generally intended to address concerns raised by the attorneys general and, to some extent, consumer advocates, neither of these groups has endorsed this measure. I removed my hold on the amendment despite this, however, because there is a consensus, of which I am a part, on the need for federal legislation regarding salvage and rebuilt vehicles. The bill, as amended, is not perfect. But as my months of trying to broker an agreement revealed, "perfect," even if defined to mean the best interest of consumers, is a subjective term. S. 852, as amended, is, in my view, and in that of over 50 co-sponsors, better than the status quo.

I remain troubled that the attorneys general and some consumer advocate groups do not agree. I am also somewhat baffled by the seemingly studied misconstruction of the bill, and my amendment to it by some who continue to oppose it.

Let me explain the changes in the amendment to S. 852. In response to complaints that S. 852 set too high a damage threshold for designating a vehicle as "salvage," the amendment lowers the threshold from 80% to the lower of 75% or the percentage threshold in a state as of the date of enactment. Seventy-five percent is the threshold recommended by the task

force created by the Anti-Car Theft Act of 1992, on whose work this legislation is based. Industry defenders of the higher threshold argued that lowering it would hurt, not help, consumers because it would devalue vehicles even when there is no legitimate safety-related reason for mandating the disclosure of prior damage. I understand their point, but don't agree. Yes, there is some threshold at which mandatory labeling, and the bureaucratic burden that attends it, is more costly than beneficial for both buyers and sellers, but I do not believe we have come close to that turning point.

The attorneys general's concern that S. 852 did not provide for sufficient disclosure applied not only to the percent of damage threshold, but also to limited scope of the vehicles covered by the bill. S. 852 proposed to permit the "salvage vehicle" label to attach only to vehicles less than seven years old or with more than \$7500. While states were free to use any other label they chose for all vehicles, including older vehicles, state attorneys general wanted to be able to use the term "salvage" to describe older vehicles because it is the term most commonly used today to advise of prior damage. The amendment to S. 852 permits states to do this, and explicitly provides that states can use the term "older model salvage vehicle" to label older vehicles.

Complaints about the mandatory nature of S. 852 ran the gamut. Some critics of S. 852, including the Department of Transportation, objected to the fact that states were not obligated to comply with the Act, arguing that states could opt out and become regional title washing capitals. Others complained that the bill was too prescriptive, and did not allow states (the majority of which, until now, do not appear to have adopted very consumer-friendly laws) to set the standards for labeling and disclosure. Rather than refight the battle that led the House to conclude that a mandate would be unconstitutional, and because I was unable to persuade anyone to agree that we should use a big stick as opposed to a carrot approach, the amendment to S. 852 does not make the labeling system mandatory, but incorporates a provision to address concerns that opt-out states will become title-washing capitals. The amendment to S. 852 makes it a violation of the Act to move vehicles, or vehicle titles, across state lines for the purpose of avoiding the requirements in the Act.

Another minor modification to S. 852 corrects what I believe was an oversight in S. 852, and makes it a violation of the Act not to comply with the labeling and disclosure requirements for "flood vehicles."

Another modification made to S. 852 clarifies that states that choose to abide by the provisions of the Act must carry over not only the "salvage vehicle," "nonrepairable vehicle," and "flood vehicle" labels on titles, but also any other disclosure that states

prescribe. This concept was contained in S. 852, but the language was unclear. The legislation does not restrict states from labeling a car with any term, and prescribing treatment of a car so labeled with any term, other than the very limited list of terms used in the bill. In other words, a state that accepts federal funds for the national motor vehicle identification number database, and that does not specifically state on its titles that it is not complying with the federal titling standards, must use the definition of "salvage vehicle" and "nonrepairable vehicle" prescribed in the bill. However, S. 852 permits that state to label the same vehicle with any other term it chooses and imposes any restrictions attendant to the other label. The amendment clarifies that states that chose to use the national labels, including those for "salvage vehicle" and "nonrepairable vehicle," must not only carry over these labels from other states, but must also carry over any other labels another state chooses to affix, and specify the state that so labeled the vehicle.

Other modifications specifically permit state attorneys general to bring actions on behalf of individuals for violations of the Act, and clarify that the Act in no way affects individuals' ability to bring private rights of action. In response to concerns that S. 852 preempted state causes of action and created a sole remedy for violations relating to title labeling and disclosure, the amendment specifically provides that the Act does not preclude any private right of action available under state law. This provision was intended to provide assurances that nothing in the Act restricts individuals, or attorneys general, from pursuing any claims under state law, such as claims based on violations of consumer protection laws, unfair trade practices, or failures to disclose the material terms of a contract. Curiously, the inclusion of this provision, designed to allay concerns about preemption, appears to have unreasonable stirred them. Some appear to have drawn the illogical and legally unsupported conclusion that any claim not specifically preserved is implicitly barred. Let me again try to clarify. There is absolutely nothing in the bill that suggests that the remedies it provides (action by attorneys general) are exclusive. Simply because the legislation states that private actions are specifically preserved does not mean that all other actions are barred or restricted in any way.

The modification that has drawn criticism even from those consumer groups whose interests I was attempting to advance in my amendment, is the striking of the criminal penalty provisions. This modification was not requested by anyone seeking to avoid accountability. Rather, I sought to strike the criminal penalties because I believe that the criminal sanctions in S. 852 were inappropriate in most instances, and unnecessary in others. As