

simple: federally prosecute all handgun violations, and mete out tough federal prison sentences for all convictions. It has shown dramatic results in Richmond, Va., and I have no doubt that it will reduce gun violence and the carnage that accompanies it on the streets of Philadelphia. People on both sides of the age-old gun debate have criticized this partnership, but again, this is not about the Second Amendment. This is not about the right to bear arms. We're talking about stemming the flow of guns into the inner city, where they are used by criminals and children to commit crimes and destroy families. Thanks to the support of Sen. Lautenberg and Sen. Specter, Congressional support for this initiative will help us obtain the federal resources needed to make the program a success. I have already been to the White House to discuss Administration support for the initiative, and I believe that it will be successful in that regard.

We are engaged in a war to reduce the carnage caused by gun violence. And we must fight this fight on many fronts, and sometimes with unusual allies. We have worked with the gun industry, the NRA and its representatives, for one simple reason: We need their help to reduce gun violence. And we are still considering litigation to force gun manufacturers to join the fight against gun violence if they do not do so willingly.

V. THE NEED FOR FEDERAL ONE GUN A MONTH LEGISLATION

If these initiatives are critical to our fight, then the enactment of legislation is no less essential in the effort to reduce gun violence. And that is why today's forum is critically important: Whatever other initiatives are implemented, we must develop Congressional support for S. 466, the federal Anti-Gun Trafficking Act sponsored by Sen. Lautenberg. Because gun trafficking knows no state lines, federal legislation—a uniform national standard limiting handgun purchases—is the only effective way to combat this problem.

I have long advocated support for One Gun a Month, because it is a matter of basic common sense. One Gun a Month deals only with handguns, and does not interfere at all with a citizen's right to maintain a firearm for home or personal protection. Instead, One Gun a Month focuses on stopping multiple purchases of handguns, because these are the guns that ultimately wind up being resold on the streets of our cities to criminals and children.

Look at the statistics on gun sales in Pennsylvania. In 1996, there were 150,000 handgun sales statewide. During roughly the same period, there were 38,338 guns sold in the Philadelphia region alone. Of that number, roughly nine percent of the purchasers bought nearly 30 percent of the guns.

What that means is that small numbers of people are buying lots of guns, and our experience shows that is for only one reason: to resell them on the street to people who use them in the commission of crimes.

One Gun a Month would limit purchasers to buying 12 guns a year. I also support the so-called "Collector's Exception," which would permit bona fide gun collectors from the legislation. As a result, for the overwhelming majority of gun purchasers, only the 13th gun would be prohibited. Ladies and gentlemen, legislation that proposes to ban handgun sales only at the purchase of 13 guns a year does not affect the average citizen—or the average gun purchaser. As the New York Times pointed out in a recent editorial supporting a federal limit, those who argue that One Gun a Month would limit a citizen's right to bear arms should be forced to "explain to crime-fearing Americans why a 12-gun-per-year limit would impose any offensive burden on law-abiding users who may

want a weapons for target shooting or for personal protection."

Instead, the federal standard proposed in S. 466 simply limits the ability of those who resell guns on our streets. Again, look at just the Pennsylvania numbers. Of the 25,510 purchasers of guns in 1996, One Gun a Month would affect only 103 Pennsylvania purchasers (those who bought more than 12 guns in a 12-month period.) That's .4 percent of all purchasers of guns in Philadelphia, and only a total of 5,000 guns out of the 38,000 sold in 1996 in the Philadelphia region.

And while One Gun a Month does little to limit purchases by law-abiding citizens in Pennsylvania, it has the potential to crack down on the sales to those who sell to criminals and children. In other words, it has the ability to go after the gun sales that none of us want: not the City of Philadelphia, not any member of Congress, and not even the gun manufacturers or the NRA.

The grim reality of these types of sales is inescapable. FACT: At least 20 percent of all multiple gun purchasers can be linked to guns used in the commission of crime, particularly violent crime, in Philadelphia. FACT: A total of 608 handguns that were purchased in multiple purchase transactions have been directly linked to a homicide or other violent crime in Philadelphia. And as the tracing of these guns continues, these numbers undoubtedly will continue to rise. FACT: Under One Gun a Month, the sale of guns to "suspect purchasers" (those whose purchases suggest involvement in street resale of guns) could be reduced by as much as 54 percent.

States have taken the lead in the effort to limit purchases to one gun a month. And as Sen. Lautenberg has made clear, the good news is that One Gun a Month is working in Virginia, South Carolina and Maryland, where it was most recently enacted. In Virginia, the odds of a handgun seized in a crime anywhere along the East Coast has dropped 66 percent since One Gun a Month was enacted in 1993. In Maryland, handgun sales dropped more than 25 percent last year, and as the Washington Post noted sarcastically, that in turn "is threatening Maryland's position as a leading supplier of handguns seized by police at crime scenes up and down the East Coast."

I urge members of Congress to follow the lead of Sen. Lautenberg and support S. 466, the "Anti-Gun Trafficking Act." I have also urged the gun industry and the NRA to support this important legislation, together with my fellow mayors from cities all over the nation. Again, this is not about whether people have the right to bear arms or purchase weapons. This legislation does not affect them. This is about keeping guns out of the hands of criminals, and out of the hands of children. Gun violence is out of control in Philadelphia, and this legislation can help to stop it. I urge your support.

Several years ago, a Florida-based manufacturer of assault pistols which at that time were with a 32-round magazine, said: "I know some of the guns going out of here will end up killing people, but I'm not responsible for that." He was wrong then, and that attitude is wrong now. It is my responsibility, and it is everyone's responsibility, including mayors, state legislators, members of Congress, and indeed, especially the gun industry itself.

Back in April, I came to Washington to speak directly to gun manufacturers, thanks to the invitation of the American Shooting Sports Council. It was, I might add, not the greatest reception I've ever gotten. But they were at least willing to listen, and I told them that we very much wanted to be their allies in fighting the growing plague of gun violence. That remains true, but understand,

one way or another we will try anything and everything—whether it is partnering with the gun industry or the NRA, or suing gun manufacturers—to end the terrible consequences of gun violence on the streets of Philadelphia.●

THE CALENDAR

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, for the leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the following bills, en bloc:

Calendar Nos. 494, S. 890; 525, S. 1398; 527, S. 2171; 528, H.R. 449; 529, H.R. 2886; 530, H.R. 3796; 541, S. 1016; 542, S. 1408; 543, S. 1990; 546, S. 2232; 550, S. 1333; 551, S. 1665; 552, S. 2129; 561, S. 469; 565, S. 2272; 571, S. 1718; 573, S. 2106; 579, H.R. 3903; 598, H.R. 3381.

Further, I ask unanimous consent that any committee amendments be agreed to, the bills be read the third time and passed, as amended, if amended, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bills appear at the appropriate point in the RECORD, with the above occurring en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DUTCH JOHN FEDERAL PROPERTY DISPOSITION AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1998

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 890) to dispose of certain Federal properties located in Dutch John, Utah, to assist the local government in the interim delivery of basic services to the Dutch John community, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Dutch John Federal Property Disposition and Assistance Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1)(A) Dutch John, Utah, was founded by the Secretary of the Interior in 1958 on Bureau of Reclamation land as a community to house personnel, administrative offices, and equipment for project construction and operation of the Flaming Gorge Dam and Reservoir as authorized by the Act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105, chapter 203; 43 U.S.C. 620 et seq.); and

(B) permanent structures (including houses, administrative offices, equipment storage and maintenance buildings, and other public buildings and facilities) were constructed and continue to be owned and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior;

(2)(A) Bureau of Reclamation land surrounding the Flaming Gorge Reservoir (including the Dutch John community) was included within the boundaries of the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area in 1968 under Public Law 90-540 (16 U.S.C. 460v et seq.);

(B) Public Law 90-540 assigned responsibility for administration, protection, and development of the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area to the Secretary of Agriculture and provided that lands and waters needed or used for the Colorado River Storage Project would continue to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior; and