Mr. CRAPO thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, this morning the Senate will resume debate on the juvenile justice bill. Under a previous order, amendments that qualify under the list may be offered until 12:00 p.m. today. At 12:00 p.m., the Senate will begin debate on amendments numbered 357, 358, 360, and 361 which were previously offered to the bill. Each of the four amendments will have 10 minutes of debate equally divided with stacked votes to begin at 1 p.m. Senators are encouraged to offer their amendments this morning so we can finish this important legislation in a timely manner.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

VIOLENT AND REPEAT JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1999

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will now resume consideration of S. 254, which the clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A bill (S. 254) to reduce violent juvenile crime, promote accountability by and rehabilitation of juvenile criminals, punish and deter violent gang crime, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Frist amendment No. 355, to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994 to authorize schools to apply appropriate discipline measures in cases where students have firearms.

Wellstone amendment No. 356, to improve the juvenile delinquency prevention challenge grant program.

Sessions/Inhofe amendment No. 357, relating to the placement of a disclaimer on materials produced, procured or disseminated as a result of funds made available under the Act.

Wellstone amendment No. 358, to provide for additional mental health and student service providers.

Hatch (for Santorum) amendment No. 360, to encourage States to incarcerate individuals convicted of murder, rape, or child molestation.

Ashcroft amendment No. 361, to provide for school safety and violence prevention and teacher liability protection measures.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to continue for 1 minute, the time not taken from either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, also for the advice of our colleagues, the distinguished Senator from Utah and I continued work on the managers’ package, which we worked on over the weekend, last night, and we will be prepared to present that fairly soon.

If I could have the attention of the Senator from Utah for just a moment, I suspect what we would probably do at that time, when it is prepared, is to move to set aside other things so we could do that and go forward with it.

I mention this because several Senators had asked about where it was—it is a complex thing—to help make sure we get the drafting all right.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I think we are just about done with the drafting of it. I know staff on both the minority and the majority side are finishing that up as we speak, so I agree...
with the Senator. When we get that finally done, we will interrupt every-thing and set matters aside so we can pass the managers’ amendment.

I notice the distinguished Senator from New Jersey is prepared to offer his amendment again. Could I ask the other sponsors, many further gun amendments are we going to have? I would at least like to know.

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator asks a legiti-mate question. That is why I asked about the managers’ package. Some are holding back where the managers’ package goes, and it will probably de-pend upon what happens with the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey.

Let me try to get a more specific an-swer. That does not answer the ques-tion of the Senator from Utah. As this debate starts—we are running some trampolines now—I will try to get that answer for the Senator as quickly as I can.

Mr. HATCH. The reason I bring that up is we have had enough time on gun amendments, it seems to me. There has been a lot of getting together, and I have helped to lead that. I think it is about time we get on to the rest of this bill. We have had much more important than the gun aspect of this bill. There is a huge number of things we do in this bill to try to stop juvenile crime in this country, and especially violent ju-venile crime. This bill will help to al-low, to al-leviate that. So I want to finish the bill, and I think we ought to do the very best we can to do that.

Mr. LEAHY. If the Senator will yield, I would note that we had a list of over 90 amendments entered under a con-sent agreement last Friday. We have pared that back to about a dozen or less. So we are making significant progress. I think what we want to do is make sure as amendments are coming up, the few that are left, Senators are not forced to take a position, as the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER, was yesterday, or Senator LAUTENBERG last Friday.

Now we can move on. We have gone from 90 down to about a dozen. The managers’ package is making a lot of that possible. Again, I commend the Senator from Utah for his work on this, and we should continue.

But while the Senator from New Jer-sey is debating his amendment, I will try to get a clearer answer for the Sen-ator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, let me say one other thing. This is an amend-ment that has already been debated, and it was defeated. So it is coming back again substantially in the same form.

Now, I was told yesterday that the minority believes they have narrowed their amendments down to about eight. As I understood it, they figured they would have three more gun amend-ments, including this, and possibly a fourth.

All we want to know is how many are we going to have and what are they so

we are sure of what is going to come up. But in all honesty, I do not want to just keep debating the same subject over and over when we have made real honest and decent efforts to try to re-solve these problems.

Be that as it may, I would like to know, otherwise and I can, just exactly how many gun amendments we are going to have to put up with or are we going to do the rest of the bill. Are we going to get something seriously done about juvenile crime or are we going to make political points in the Chamber, to the extent Senators think they are making them?

That is what I am concerned about. I would like to pass this bill which will make a real difference on account-ability, making kids who commit vio-lent acts responsible for their actions. For the first time, we actually have prevention moneys, more than account-ability moneys. We are doing something about the cultural problems in this country. We are doing a lot about the cultural problems—that really will work if we can just get this bill passed. Of course, we are going to get tougher on violent juveniles in the sentencing phase and a number of other things from a law enforcement stand-pointh.

We have spent most of our time in the last 6 days—now 7 days—on gun amendments. We have made a real ef-fort to try to accommodate people on the other side and some on our own side—to resolve these matters. I think we have largely resolved them. Be that as it may, we will go on from here.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, again, I ask consent not to have my time come from anybody else.

We are making progress. As I said, we had 90 possible amendments entered as a consent agreement last Friday. We pared that back to a dozen or less. The distinguished Senator from Utah said over the weekend that it appeared they would need about seven from their side. They offered four. That leaves about three more.

I point out that sometimes this de-bate is wise. When the Craig amend-ment first came up, the Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, and I came on the floor and said there were some very se-rious problems with it, that part of the drafting was left out, that it did things that were different from what the Senator from Idaho, Mr. CRAIG, had said it did. We were told by the Senator from Idaho that we were flatout wrong, that there was no such thing. It was a good amendment. It was adopted, then, on virtually a party line vote.

The next day, as soon as the press had analyzed it, they found exactly what the Senator from New York and I had said was accurate, that what the Senator from Idaho said was not accu-rate. There was a great flapdoodle over—outside from the early unpublished Jefferson’s “Manual on Parliamentary Procedure.” I tell Mr. Dove, the Parlia-mentarian.

It comes back again now, redrafted. And then, after that, it was pointed out that there were other errors, and we were told again we were wrong. A third part of the draft is coming back. Frankly, Mr. President, sometimes the Senate is a little bit longer if amendments do not do what the spon-sors say they do.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-pore. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 362

(Purpose: To regulate the sale of firearms at gun shows)

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Chair, and I thank my colleague from Vermont.

I particularly pay a note of respect to our colleague from Utah, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the manager on the Republican side, for this juvenile justice bill. I know how anxious he is to effect a compromise that permits us to move ahead with legislation which is constructive. I have never known him to obstruct for the sake of obstruction. I appreciate his interest in moving this bill, as we all would like to do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-sent to set aside the pending amend-ments and send a compromise gun show amendment to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-pore. Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. Reserving the right to object, I did not hear.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-pore. Will the Senator restate his unanimous consent request.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Surely. I first paid extensive compliments to the Sen-ator from Utah.

Mr. LEAHY. There was no objection to that part.

Mr. HATCH. I am happy to hear that.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Did I hear an ob-jection from the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. HATCH. Could I understand what the unanimous consent request is?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, what I want to do is to see if we can present a compromise position that takes care of some of the problems which still exist after we passed the Craig-Hatch amendment, which differs from my original language in an extent that I think makes it more palatable to our friends on the other side. I will go through my presentation on the amendment. It is obvious that we want to do what we can.

While the Senator from Utah was oc-cupied, I did say that I have never known him to obstruct for the purpose of obstruction but, rather, to effect change. I think it is fair to say there is a significant amount of interest on the Republican side in the changes we have made to try to limit the definition of gun shows, to try to make certain we have not increased the bureaucratic or the regulatory requirements such that substantially more paperwork is in-volved. We are not attempting to keep
files open on people for whom there is no discredited information, changes of that nature.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Utah and other Members of the Senate will look at what we have and give it a positive review of it.

Mr. HATCH. Could I ask—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair notes that under the previous order, the Senator has the right to send his amendment to the desk, and the Chair does not interpret the unanimous consent request to be anything other than that. Does that clarify the situation?

Mr. HATCH. His amendment will go in order after the amendments that were—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct. The Chair does not interpret the unanimous consent request to change the order of the presentation of the amendments. It does interpret the request simply to be to present the Senator's amendment at this time.

Mr. HATCH. The reason I was concerned is that we set these in order by unanimous consent. I had to go to great lengths to get that done. That is fine with me, if that is the understanding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], for himself and Mr. KERRY, proposes an amendment numbered 362.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment (No. 362) is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. MCG. I thank, again, the Senators from Utah and Vermont.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator from New Jersey yield? Could we have a copy of the amendment. It is certainly nice to know what is going on. That is what I am concerned about. If we are going to have amendments, I at least want to know what they are, because I have gone to great lengths to try to bring both sides together. I don't want to be blind-sided by amendments at the last minute here. I would like to at least know what is in this amendment. I think I have a pretty good idea, but I would like to know.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, in response to the Senator from Utah, there is no intent to offer anything that hasn't been discussed or anything that is a radical change that further limits the activities of legitimate transactions at a gun show.

This amendment which I send up now has been effectively challenged by Senator Bob KERREY from Nebraska. He has signed on as a cosponsor. His input has been truly valuable in crafting a workable proposal. He comes from a largely rural State where guns are a significant part of the State's culture. I really appreciate his strong support of my amendment.

This amendment is offered in a bipartisan fashion to finally close the gun show loophole. The question is, would you support or oppose a law requiring background checks on people buying guns at gun shows? The support level was 89 percent. So it does not leave a lot of room for doubt.

Last week the Senate did cast two votes on different gun show proposals. My amendment was defeated by a slim majority of 51 votes. Obviously, we had Republican support. There were several absences, primarily from the Democratic side, people were called away, some for emergencies and illness. And after a couple of days later, the Hatch-Craig amendment was offered, and it passed by only one vote, with five Senators not voting; there were a total of 95 votes cast. The result was 48–47. So we are only one more Senator away. When it comes to thinking about what ought to happen. People are very wary and upset by the fact that guns can be purchased without any identification of the buyer. I call it "buyers anonymous." The public is obvious distress about the way things have been done in the past.

We are not going to interrupt the process whereby people who are not felons and are of sound mind can buy a gun. We are not looking to interrupt the process of the interested purchaser in buying a gun. But we know that, just as with other transactions—vehicles, for instance—there is a recognition of who is buying a vehicle. The same thing ought to be true when we talk about guns.

So that is what brings us to the position we are in. I asked several Senators who were leaning to my position to come to an agreement on the gun show debate. It is very much in the minds of the public. There was a poll just done, an ABC-Washington Post poll, which said, in response to the question, would you support or oppose a law requiring background checks on people buying guns at gun shows? The support level was 89 percent. So it does not leave a lot of room for doubt.

Additionally, during the course of the debate, some of my opponents have suggested that a national registry would lead to a national registry of gun owners. My amendment had nothing remotely resembling a national registry. It simply required gun sales to go through an existing national instant criminal background check system.

The problem is that some who oppose any kind of gun owner identification as a new purchaser have always opposed the criminal background check system. They argue that it is the first step toward a national registry of firearm owners. They raise the specter of a national registry because they want to scare people away from reasonable, commonsense gun proposals.

I think it is time for us to come to an agreement on the gun show loophole. I think it is time for us to finally close the gun show loophole. I think it is time for us to come to an agreement on the gun show loophole.
of our colleagues on the other side interpret it. Well, I want to make sure that the record is clear and, thus, we were truly circumspect in the way we asked for this data to be presented and for this amendment to be offered.

If we colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have helped me work on these issues. This is a compromise from my original position, but my mission is to accomplish the goal, and the goal very simply is to satisfy the American people. It is not just curiosity; it is fear; it is their belief that anybody who buys a gun ought not to be anonymous in that purchase, especially when we know that so many of those transactions have occurred at gun shows. So that is the purpose of this change. We need this amendment to close the gun show loopholes once and for all.

Now, although the Hatch-Craig amendment may have generated a well-intentioned effort to address the gun show loophole, it did create additional problems. If we leave the language in this bill as it presently is with the Hatch-Craig amendment, our gun laws are actually going to be weaker. I know that is not the intention of the authors of this bill, but I believe—and I know Senator KERREY, in particular, for joining with the Senator from Nebraska. I think this combination is a very good one. It is a Senator from the East and a Senator from Nebraska working together. I think they pull us all together and put this amendment over the top.

I wanted to ask my friend if he saw the op-ed piece in the Los Angeles Times today written by Janet Reno?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I did see it. I was pleased to see it, as a matter of fact. Mrs. BOXER. I wanted to say to my friend, thank you very much for giving the Senate a chance to undo the damage that it did by not voting for the Lautenberg amendment in the first place and then adopting some amendments that have problems. I thank Senator KERREY, in particular, for joining with the Senator from New Jersey. I think this combination is a very good one. It is a Senator from the East and a Senator from Nebraska working together. I think they pull us all together and put this amendment over the top.

I wanted to ask my friend if he saw the op-ed piece in the Los Angeles Times today written by Janet Reno?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I did see it. I was pleased to see it, as a matter of fact. Mrs. BOXER. I wanted to say to my friend, quoting very briefly—then I will put this in the RECORD, and I will yield back—that Janet Reno, our law enforcement officer, says, "The Senate properly enough didn't do enough to keep firearms out of the wrong hands." She said that the "U.S. Senate has . . . the opportunity to make our streets and communities safer by closing the loophole that lets felons, fugitives and other prohibited people buy dangerous weapons at gun shows." She laments the action that the Senate took. She points out that even though some on the other side said this amendment would close the gun show loophole, they do not, and she basically then says that what Senator LAUTENBERG and Senator KERREY does the job, and it follows the recommendations of the Attorney General. She says there is still time for the Senate to revisit this important issue and adopt legislation that closes the gun show loophole once and for all.

I guess my final question to my friend is this: It is unusual to see a Senator get up and offer once again an amendment that essentially he offered before. Does my friend have hope that we will get enough votes on the other side to have a better outcome and to plug this loophole?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I have a strong feeling that we can pass this. It would take many minds to change to make that happen. My colleagues on the Republican side—I want to say I have had lots of private conversations with them—also want to see the loophole closed. While the Hatch-Craig amendment passed, it was the intent of those who supported it, and I am sure it closed the loophole. However, it is technically still open to loopholes through which lots of problems could emerge.

As a consequence, I am hopeful that we will get strong support on this amendment. The American public is strongly supportive of gun control. I point out. That is an enormous number.

What I am hoping is that finally the voices of the parents, those who are concerned who have seen violence in their schools, who have seen violence in their streets, are heard. If we can, without harm to those who want to observe a legitimate request, continue to do that, I am hopeful that we are going to be able to alert some of those who oppose it to the fact that we with very great pains to satisfy their needs in the revised Lautenberg-Kerrey amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment. Let's close the gun show loophole once and for all.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS addressed the Chair. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is a point from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank Senator LAUTENBERG for his work on this. He is committed to it very strongly. We just have different views on a number of issues about guns. I wish it weren't so. But we do have some differences.

With regard to the gun shows, I think a lot of progress has been made since the Lautenberg bill has made some movement toward a more centrist position. But I would say that this amendment is unacceptable for a number of different reasons. One of them is an additional tax and fee that can be imposed by the ATF on a transaction that previously was not taxed. It does not provide the kind of qualified immunity that would induce people to do the background checks and could, in fact, cause more black market sales of guns.

But let me say this. I have been a prosecutor for 17 years, 15 as a Federal prosecutor, and I prosecuted gun cases.
aggressively; it was a high priority. Under this Project Triggerlock proposal, I sent out a newsletter on guns called "Triggerlock News," to the local sheriffs and chiefs of police explaining to them what the Federal laws were.

Federal laws against guns are very strong. If you fire a gun during a drug offense or a burglary, it is 5 years without parole consecutive to any punishment you get on the underlying offense. In Federal court you have the Speedy Trial Act. People have to be tried promptly in Federal court when you have a speedy trial and the individual is already out on bail or parole, the judge usually will deny them bail. So you could have a case where, offentimes, these violent criminals are denied bail, then they are tried within 60 days, and removed from the community for 5 years and more. That was a high priority with me.

This administration under Attorney General Reno has allowed those prosecuteable offenses to be prosecuted under Federal law. She appointed by President Bush. And President Clinton has now appointed all 93 U.S. attorneys around the country. His U.S. attorneys have allowed gun prosecutions to decline 40 percent, from 7,000 in 1997 to 4,000 in 1999. And, I am told that they have gone forward with this idea that the way to fight violent crime and keep people from using guns illegally is to pass more laws. But they are not enforcing the laws they pass.

For example, there were 6,000 incidents of firearms carried on school grounds last year, according to the President. And within the last several years this Congress, at the request of the President, passed a law to make it a Federal crime to carry a firearm on school grounds. Yet out of 6,000 incidents, fewer than 10 cases were prosecuted each of those 2 years. It is a Federal crime in America to deliver a firearm to a teenager under most circumstances.

That federal crime, that Federal law, was passed several years ago at the request of the President. Yet his Department of Justice, Attorney General Janet Reno, prosecuted less than 1 prosecution for 5 years and more. That was a proven record of dangerous use of guns. And the President's own U.S. attorneys have allowed fewer than 10 prosecutions of that kind are in that bill, and they shouldn't possess. We added in the two people at Littleton, Klebold and Harris, had not violated the law before—or were not detected.

It is of little consolation, it seems to me, to their parents and their families that in the end that was the result that had that two teenagers not really killed themselves they would have been prosecuted. They should be prosecuted. I am for laws as tough as my friend from Alabama is, but why shouldn't we both do things to prevent violence. If people lawfully get guns before they commit crimes, as well as prosecute them after they commit crimes? The two are not contradictory.

I always hear "let's do more prosecution" as a substitute for also preventing criminals and young people from getting guns in the first place so we won't have to prosecute them.

I ask my friend from Alabama, why is one in place of the other, as opposed to doing both alongside one another?

Mr. SESSIONS. We are not against laws that rationally and effectively prevent people from having weapons they shouldn't possess. We added in this bill a prohibition on what I think was a loophole on assault weapons, dealing with teenagers. Other violations of that kind are in that bill, and that bill can provide more restrictions.

To me, it is a bizarre event that we are talking about a 3,000-prosecution decline and about passing this arcane law dealing with gun shows which may have some positive effect in reducing illegal gun sales.

So we are working with Members on that. We have probably five or more gun restriction provisions in this legislation. That is not going to solve the fundamental problem if we are not going to have those laws in force nor if we don't have a commitment from the Attorney General to do that.

We heard from her own U.S. attorney in Richmond. She had adopted a program very similar to Project Triggerlock under President Bush. She called it Project Triggerlock with Steroids. They were aggressively prosecuting individuals who utilized guns illegally, and the President's own U.S. attorney attributed their aggressive prosecution of current gun laws for a 40-percent reduction in murder and a 21-percent reduction in violent crime.

The clear impression was that not only was she not in accord with what I believe the law of the United States required, but that she was not even in accord in the wishes of the President of the United States.

Mr. KERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes.

Mr. SESSIONS. There is one difference we have. Yes, prosecute those who violate the law, no question. But very simply, that doesn't say you shouldn't prevent young people from lawfully obtaining guns before they violate the law. The two people at Littleton, Klebold and Harris, had not violated the law before—or were not detected.

I notice that the co-sponsor of the amendment is on the floor. I wonder if he might be able to speak since he is the principal co-sponsor. Traditionally, we have let principal sponsors be allowed to speak. The Senator is always courteous in all these occasions. Would the Senator be willing to let him proceed?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Senator. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY. The Senator didn't take too much time at all. It is within your right to do it. I do have a markup with the Finance Committee and I appreciate very much the Senator yielding to me so I can make a couple of points about this amendment.

First of all, I do believe in the second amendment. I believe in the right to bear arms. I think it has meaning. In the past, I measured whether or not I will vote for changes in the law that restrict a citizen's right to own a gun that reduces their right by imposing waiting periods or increased licensing requirements by a simple test: Will this reduce the number of people who are having their rights violated by either being shot at, shot, or killed as a consequence of people who acquire guns illegally, using those guns to commit a crime? I voted for Brady. I voted for the so-called assault rifle ban, though it didn't really ban rifles; it banned some
features. I feel confident when I vote for something that I think works.

What we have here, and I think both sides are agreeing, is a significant loophole in the law. There are thousands of gun shows every year where not only can law-abiding citizens go, but also convicted criminals, having to be licensed—if you go to a Guns Unlimited in Omaha, NE, you have to get not just background checks but you have to get permits from the city of Omaha and the county sheriff. It takes a while before you can do that.

If you set up a gun show in Douglas County, no licensing requirements are necessary. You can buy any gun if you are a felon or mentally unstable, no background checks are required at all.

Both sides are saying we recognize that loophole needs to be closed. I noted last week, indeed, when the amendment was offered as a motion by Senator Hatch and Senator Craig, the head of ATF, the Omaha World Herald said "Republicans Close Gun Show Loophole."

I am trying to say with this amendment is two things. One, some objections raised against the previous amendment about excessive amounts of regulation. I found that to be a credible argument. Senator Lautenberg was good enough to make significant changes in it, so all that is left now is for a gun show operator to do the same thing that a licensed dealer has to do which is to register with ATF; they pay a small fee just as any licensed operator has to do; the vendor has to show proof of identification—that is, the person who is selling—that verifies the vendor is who they claim to be. And then basically a sign has to be posted notifying people, who are either vendors or there buying, that NICS background checks are going to be done.

That is all that is required. It is a fairly simple imposition of regulations that are the same for anybody who goes to a licensed gun dealer. In addition, you have to comply with whatever the local law is, the State law, or Federal law. That is all we are attempting to do.

I urge Senators who are considering whether or not to vote for this amendment to look at the language of the law as it is currently proposed in the Juvenile Justice Act, as modified, by the Senate, and see what it is that haps the distinguished Senator from Utah can address this, or somebody else who is a proponent of this. It says that special licenses can be granted to people who are running gun shows. It does not say that all gun show dealers have to register, as all licensed gun dealers do. It says some gun show operators can be granted special licenses and then they will not have to do background checks, they will not have to determine whether or not a person who is walking in to buy a handgun is a felon, whether or not they are mentally unbalanced, whether or not they have previous crimes they have committed. None of this is going to be required if this gun show operator can get a special license.

You say maybe there are some special cases where a special license is required. I urge Members to look at the language. The language says a special license be issued if she be a tome person who is engaged in the business of dealing in firearms by, No. 1, buying or selling firearms solely or primarily at gun shows.

That is going to exempt everybody. Anybody who is out there who says do not have a gun shop, I am not a licensed gun dealer, all I am doing is operating at gun shows, is going to be able to apply for a special license and be exempted.

You tell me how that is going to reduce the opportunity for a felon—again, somebody who has committed crimes in the past with guns—to go to an operator who is engaged in a business primarily operating at gun shows and not be able to buy a dangerous weapon. The answer is, they will still be able to buy. So if anybody believes we have closed this loophole as a consequence of the Juvenile Justice Act as it is currently amended, I urge you to look at those who are buying or selling firearms solely or primarily at gun shows can be given a special license and then will not have to do background checks.

Second, for anybody who is buying or selling firearms in gun show exclusively, or firearm repair business or conduct of other activity, as in this subsection, that seems not necessarily unreasonable. You can, I suppose, craft this thing so special exemptions can be granted. But we do not grant special exemptions for somebody who is out there as a licensed gun dealer; they merely have to pay a small fee with the ATF and agree to do background checks.

If you talk to the licensed gun dealers today—many of whom opposed those background checks to begin with—they say they now basically are comfortable with it; it is operating relatively well, and it gives them increased comfort when they sell a handgun, knowing they are selling it to somebody who is not a felon; either the local sheriff or local police department signed off on it and said that person who has made that purchase is somebody who is not a felon, who does not have any thing in his background that would indicate the rest of the public is going to be at risk as a consequence of him owning a handgun.

This amendment corrects precisely what many people objected to in original language, and that is, it reduces the amount of regulation. But it clearly says if you operate a gun show and you are selling guns, you are going to have to have everybody who is licensed to do so. You pay a small fee to the ATF and you make certain you do background checks on anybody who is buying. That closes the loophole.

But current language as described here in law does not do that. Current language will still allow somebody who is primarily involved or solely involved in operating gun shows—it will allow them to say we do not have to get a license, we do not have to notify ATF, we do not have to do background checks, we can just set up shop.

You could even have a vendor at a gun show, under the proposal as this Juvenile Justice Act has been changed, a vendor who is also illegal—no back ground checks, no analysis required of the vendor as well.

There are other problems that can be identified. I am troubled as well by the pawnshop exemption in the Juvenile Justice Act as originally proposed, as is proposed today as well, because I think that also unnecessarily puts the public at risk. That is what we are talking about here.

All of us understand the Bill of Rights provide an unlimited freedom, but we also understand there are limits. I do not have unlimited first amendment rights. If I libel or slander people, they can bring a case against me. I do not have an unlimited second amendment right. My second amendment right ends when I am a threat to somebody else.

This is not about restricting law-abiding citizens; it is about trying to write the law so people who are intentionally committed to violate the law have to do something that will enable them to do great bodily harm, to, if not to kill, another member of our society. So I hope those who would genuinely want to close this loophole, who are looking for a way to basically level the playing field for somebody who is out there selling guns through gun shows and licensed gun dealers in the local community, want to have the same rules applying to both.

I hope my colleagues will consider what we will be doing if the Juvenile Justice Act, as modified, is enacted, and what we will be doing if the amendment offered by my friend from New Jersey, Senator Lautenberg, and I is accepted. I hope this will be accepted. We have significant numbers of Americans who are saying we do want to reduce this loophole, this risk that we see to our lives—not just our lives but our children's lives as well.

I hope my colleagues will consider what we will be doing if the Juvenile Justice Act, as modified, is enacted, and what we will be doing if the amendment offered by my friend from New Jersey, Senator Lautenberg, and I is accepted. I hope this will be accepted. We have significant numbers of Americans who are saying we do want to reduce this loophole, this risk that we see to our lives—not just our lives but our children's lives as well.

I hope my colleagues will consider what we will be doing if the Juvenile Justice Act, as modified, is enacted, and what we will be doing if the amendment offered by my friend from New Jersey, Senator Lautenberg, and I is accepted. I hope this will be accepted. We have significant numbers of Americans who are saying we do want to reduce this loophole, this risk that we see to our lives—not just our lives but our children's lives as well.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, during the debate and discussion here on the floor of the Senate in regard to the implementation of Federal gun laws, and also during the period of the Judiciary Committee, I think we ought to really set the record straight. The record was set straight in the Judiciary Committee by the Attorney General, but it has been misused here on the floor of the Senate by those who ask why are we considering this amendment when we are not really prosecuting all the gun laws on the books with regard to this and somehow suggesting that those of us who are concerned about the easy access of weaponry to children and criminal elements in our society really should pay more attention to the prosecutions and doing something to make it more difficult for children and for those who should not own the weapons to own them.

The fact is, overall firearms prosecutions are up. Although the number of Federal prosecutions for low-level offenders—persons serving sentences of 3 years or less—has been down, the number of higher-level offenders—those serving sentences of 5 or more years—is up by nearly 30 percent in recent years. At the same time, the total number of Federal and State prosecutions is up sharply. About 25 percent more criminals are sent to prison for State and Federal weapons offenses than in 1992, 20,000 to 25,000.

As the Attorney General pointed out, those that ought to be handled at the local level are being handled by State prosecutors, and those that are more serious are being handled by Federal prosecutors. That record has been made in the Judiciary Committee. Maybe those who oppose this kind of common sense legislation can use some kind of thrill out of misrepresenting the facts. The facts have been laid out for the sake of the record. The facts have been laid out by the Attorney General before the Judiciary Committee and they are as I have stated them, and as represented by the Justica Department.

By misrepresenting and saying total prosecutions by the Federal Government are down, they are telling half the story. They are not saying what is happening in State and local prosecutors. When you look at State prosecutions, local prosecutions, and Federal prosecutions, they are up, and up significantly. I think we ought to put that aside.

We are making worthwhile progress in the Senate on these gun control issues. I join in paying tribute to my colleagues—Senator LUTZENBERG, Senator KERREY, Senator SCHUMER, Senator BOXER, Senator DURBIN, and others on both sides of the aisle—who have been advancing sensible and responsible and wise recommendations. That is what they are. They are common sense recommendations which, when put into effect, are going to reduce the opportunity for easy access to weapons which are too often used either accidentally or intentionally, perhaps even in the increased incidents of suicide, or purposely by children or young people in this country.

One of the most important measures, which is before us, is closing the gun show loophole and closing it not just part way but all the way. As was pointed out, last week the Senate failed twice to close that flagrant loophole, and inadequately adopted it. We were riddled with so many loopholes of their own that the country was outraged by the Senate’s hypocrisy.

Now, on the third try, we have a chance to do the job right and close the gun show loophole lock, stock, and barrel.

The gun show loophole is a hole below the waterline of our gun control laws. It makes a mockery of responsible gun control. Yet, the initial attempts by our Republican friends to close it was a travesty, as has been pointed out.

It left the gun show loophole wide open. It created a pawnshop loophole. It reduced background checks from 3 background checks on 1 background check on Sundays. It allowed the interstate sale of firearms, potentially undermining State laws across the country. It prevented gun tracing. And it created a sweeping immunity for gun sellers.

The other time was the Senate at its irresponsible worst. It is time for us to stop buckling to the gun industry and do what is right.

There is a real chance that the tragedy in Littleton would never have happened without the easy access to guns that the gun show loophole supplies.

One incredible statistic summarizes the magnitude of the problem we face. In 1996, the most recent year for which information is available, handguns were used to murder 9,290 people in the United States.

I might mention why it is difficult to get gun figures. We are using 1996 figures because the power of the NRA prohibits the Centers for Disease Control from collecting that information. The only way they can get the information is to look at the death certificates, and that is enormously costly and takes an incredible amount of time. We are prohibited—the country is prohibited—from having the recent and accurate information about gun deaths. If it is not a problem, why does the National Rifle Association oppose us in having that kind of information? And they have opposed it. They prohibit us from getting that information, so use the 1996 figures—9,290 people in the United States.

In countries with tough gun control laws, the firearm homicide rate is over 97 percent lower. The number of handgun murders in 1996 were 2 in New Zealand, 15 in Japan, 30 in Great Britain, 106 in Canada, and 213 in Germany. The case for strong gun control is overwhelming. It saves lives. It

Mr. HATCH. I just want to have some idea. I would also like to have the floor protected, and I know my colleague from Vermont will, while I go to vote on this Finance Committee bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. There will be no consent entered while the Senator is gone.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.
saves children. It saves whole communities.

Another shocking statistic makes the same point. Each day across America, 13 more children die from gunshot wounds. That is the equivalent of one Littletown each day, every day somewhere in America.

How can the Senate continue to play ostrich—head in the sand, ignoring this overwhelming need? How many more Littletons do we need? How many more wake-up calls will it take? When will we finally do what it takes to keep children safe and stop sleepwalking through crisis after crisis after crisis after crisis of gun violence?

If the Senate cannot even close the gun show loophole, we may well be condemning communities across the country to a future Littletown tragedy of their own.

It is wrong for the Senate to say that easy access to guns had nothing to do with what happened at Columbine High School. It is wrong for the Senate to pretend to make minor adjustments in the gun show loophole, while the gun show loophole, needs to be closed. It is wrong for the Senate to give the National Rifle Association a veto over the reforms that cry out to be taken in the wake of that tragedy.

Littletown shocked the conscience of the country, and it finally seems to have shocked the conscience of the Senate. It is clear that the Senate should return to the gun show loophole and try again to close it before more innocent lives are lost. And, like closing the gun show loophole, there are other urgent steps that need to be taken.

Gun laws work. The facts speak for themselves. It is long past time for the Senate to have enough courage to act.

We know many examples of how tough gun laws, in combination with other preventive measures, are having a direct impact in reducing crime. In Massachusetts, we have some of the strongest gun laws in the country. There are tough restrictions on carrying concealed weapons. Local law enforcement has discretion in issuing the permits required by law, and an individual must show a clear need.

The minimum age for sale of handguns in the Commonwealth is 21.

There are increased penalties for felons who possess firearms.

Adults are liable if a child gets an improperly stored gun and uses it to kill or injure himself or someone else.

Firearms must be stored with child safety locks.

We have a gun-free schools law.

We have enhanced standards for liens on guns and gun dealers.

A permit is required for private sales.

Saturday night specials are banned.

Lost or stolen firearms must be reported.

These are common sense requirements that save lives and impose no problem whatsoever for legitimate hunters and sports persons.

Look at what has happened in terms of firearm homicides in Boston. These figures are reflected across our Commonwealth. We have seen in 1993, 65; 62 in 1994; 64 in 1995; and then 39, 24, 26, 4. So far this year, there has not been a single youth homicide in 128 schools.

Tough gun laws reduce gun deaths, tough control, tough preventive action. That is what we stand for. And the results are out there.

When we compare States with strong gun laws to those that have weak gun laws, the results are startling. The percentage of crime guns traced during 1996 and 1997 to federally licensed firearm dealers and to federally licensed pawnbrokers. While 13 percent of the federally licensed dealers had one or more crime guns traced to them, 35 percent of the federally licensed pawnbrokers had one or more crime guns traced to them.

It seems that everything cries out for this particular amendment. Let’s take action and do what is right for the children in America, the families in America, and to reduce violence in America. I thank the Chair.

Several Senators addressed the Chair:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

I think, in fundamental principles, we are not interested in the efficacy. The virtual elimination of guns in America, we cannot be together on. I think the second amendment provides for that. But tough law enforcement, as the Senator said, tough gun control—I would say, tough gun prosecutions—and prevention do work.

The Boston project is a good model for America. One of my staff members has been there to try to analyze how it is they have achieved a 50 percent drop in these trois. The reasons is they really enforce the law. They go out and deal with these young gang members. If they have them on probation, they monitor them. They talk to them. They say: You are supposed to be at home at 7 o’clock at night. The probation officers do not work from 9 to 5 in Boston. They will work from 1 until 10 o’clock at night, and they will go out with police officers and actually verify whether or not those young people are complying with the probation and parole requirements placed on them.

What is happening in America is our court systems are so overwhelmed with juvenile crime that they have not been able to even carry out their mandates. That is one thing you give them, you need to make sure they honor and comply with the terms of the probation. One possibility is to do drug testing, so that they are not getting back on drugs which may be driving them to crime. Another possibility is going to school on time; or if they have a job, showing up on time for it; if they have a curfew placed on them, being home in their bed and not running the streets at night.

These are the kinds of things in which Boston has invested. We asked: Well, what happens when a young person in Boston does not do what they say—for example, they have been caught in a burglary, have been released on probation, and have been running around with a gang. The judge says: Don’t hang around with that gang anymore; be in at 7 o’clock; and be at school on time.

When happens if they do not go to school, and continue being a gang member? What happens if they do not come home at night when they are supposed to or otherwise do not comply with the judge’s order? In most cities, unfortunately, nothing happens.

If you care about children, you will make sure something happens, because we want to intervene early in their lives in order to direct them on a new and healthy path. If we love these children, and really care about them, we will not have this revolving-door justice that goes on in America.

There was a night watchman killed by three young people in Alabama just 3 years ago when I was the attorney general of Alabama. I called the chief of police and asked the chief: Chief, what is the criminal record on these three youngsters? They were out loose. One of them had 5 prior arrests, another one had 5 prior arrests, and one had 15 prior arrests. That is the pattern in America.

Professor Butcher, who has written on this subject numerous times for the New York Times, did a study of the Chicago juvenile court system. He
found they spend 5 minutes per case. These children are not being confronted effectively by the court system when they are beginning to get in trouble. We need to make that first brush with the law their last. And it does include tough law enforcement. You have to help very young children who refuse to take advantage of the opportunities that have been given them.

So we do have money in here that would allow for alternative schools to be built, for drug treatment programs, for mediation, and counseling to occur, and for drug testing to find out whether young people are on drugs. All of those funding programs, and many more, are here to help strengthen juvenile justice.

I say to those who care about juvenile justice in America today, go down and talk to your judges, your district attorneys, and your chiefs of police. Ask them what is needed in their local juvenile court system in order to make them want to intervene and change the lives of young people who are getting in trouble. You will find that those judges will have a list of things they wish they could have. This bill would fund virtually every one of them.

It would give matching funds to expand detention facilities. It would give more money for drug treatment and other activities of this kind. It would allow each community to make application for funds to fill the municipal blanks in their system so that they can have a comprehensive, coordinated effort against crime.

I think we can make progress in that regard. I hope we can go on and move this bill to final passage.

I see the Senator from New York would like to comment.

Mr. SCHUMER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York?

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Presiding Officer for yielding and the Senator from Alabama for his courtesy, as well as all the other Senators.

I think, my colleagues, this afternoon will be a moment of reckoning on the floor of this Senate. The vote that will occur on closing the gun show loophole—really closing the gun show loophole—will be historic, because it will really mark the difference as to whether guns are going to be regulated, carefully-thought-out measures on gun control or whether we are going to continue the same game we have played for the last 4 years.

What game is that? The game is a simple one. When the public gets aroused and too often because of a tragedy, then some of us try to deal with the causes of that tragedy in a variety of different ways, including reasonable restrictions preventing children, preventing felons, from getting guns.

What has occurred is, those who oppose us have said: Oh, we agree with you. And they put in a substitute amendment which does not close the loophole. They put in a substitute which makes it appear as if the problem is being solved but does not solve it. Then, inexcusably, another tragedy occurs.

Today is the day we can stop that. We can stop this modest, simple measure to close the gun show loophole, to really close it.

Now, let me go over, for my colleagues—and then I want to talk a little bit about what the Senator from Alabama has said. He has talked about the present legislation that has passed on the floor of the Senate and what we are attempting to do with the Lautenberg amendment this afternoon. Right now, after passage of the Hatch-Craig amendment, we give with one hand and take away with another. There are, right now, three types of people under the status of this legislation who can go to gun shows and sell guns: One is the federally licensed dealers. These people, since 1968, whether they sell at gun shows or not, have to keep records and, since 1993, with the passage of the Brady law, have to do background checks. They always have and they will continue to, unless we repeal that for some unforeseen circumstance.

Of those guns which are not those licensed dealers, there are, under the present law, could they show up at gun shows and sell guns without background checks, without recording procedures. The Craig-Hatch amendment corrects that. It says that the Lautenberg amendment, prevents that from happening. A background check would have to be done, as it should. There shouldn't be any loopholes.

The country came together, in 1993, passed the Brady law, and it has worked. It has worked dramatically so. It has worked so that over 250,000 felons who walked into licensed dealers were refused guns.

Let me show you how it has worked in the last 4 years. Since last Wednesday, May 12, 1999, when the Senate missed the opportunity to close the gun show loophole once and for all, the FBI, using the Brady law's national instant check system, stopped 1,550 felons, fugitives, stalkers and others who should not have guns from buying licensed guns. In one week, 1,500 people were stopped. But in that same week, sure as we are here, some of those very same people went to gun shows and bought guns without a check. What kind of mindless logic is there when the dealer has to do the check but you can easily go to a gun show and get around it.

Over this past weekend, there were a minimum of 31 gun shows. In every one of those gun shows, children, felons, the mentally incompetent, and stalkers could go buy guns without ever being detected. Why?

Because of the public outcry about what happened in Littleton, the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Arizona, got together and said: Wait a minute, we thought we were really closing the gun show loophole. It wasn't. And so this Craig-Hatch amendment evolved.

But the same darn thing occurred. So while closing the loophole for non-licensed dealers, they opened it up for a whole new category of people called special licensees. What was the reason to have a special licensee? Nobody has figured that out. But a special licensee can go to a gun show, under the status of the Hatch-Craig amendment, and not do a background check.

It is a shell game. On the one hand, we are not saying let unlicensed dealers do this, and then we say, if you become a special licensee, you can.

The American people are just appalled at what this Senate is doing. A few years ago, a measure like closing the gun show loophole, which can be done easily and quickly and noncontroversially, can't pass. We have to do an elaborate show or anywhere else, have to keep the opportunity to close the gun show loophole. It can be done easily and quickly and noncontroversially.

So this is a moment of reckoning for the Senate. Are we going to step up to the plate and just close the gun show loophole once and for all by passing the amendment this afternoon, or are we going to continue to play games? I say to my colleagues, playing games won't do anymore. There has been a sea change in the American people in the last few weeks, because they are fed up.

After Brady, something happened. Before Brady, the gun lobby would tell citizens throughout America, if Brady passes, the hunting rifle your Uncle Willy gave you when you were 14 will be confiscated and some people in big black boots will knock on your door and take your guns. It was a message of fear.

Well, wherever I go in my great and diverse State, I ask people who are gun owners, has the Brady law interfered with your right to bear arms? And they say no. So the fear tactics that the NRA has used, the scare tactics, the big lie is losing velocity. That is why they have lost members, half a million, in the last few years. That is why they are unable to garner support.

Now, because of the tragedy at Littleton, there seems to be a whole change in public opinion. They say, enough already. It is not just among Democrats like myself who have been arguing for these changes for over a decade. You have two candidates for the Republican nomination for Senator who have had the courage to say the NRA is not always right. In 1996, no candidate, much as they wanted to,
could dare say that. That is as good an indication of the change in public opinion as any.

I respect Elizabeth Dole. I respect John McCain. They do not agree with me about everything on guns. I do not expect them to. But on logical, rational methods of closing loopholes of a law that has received overwhelming public support and, more importantly, has been successful, 1,500 felons last week stopped from getting guns by Brady, how could we turn our backs on the system to get around the law to buy those same guns we don’t know.

Not only did the Hatch-Craig amendment fail to deal with the gun show loophole; it added three more loopholes.

Pawnshops: There has been a law that has worked. It said, you are a person; you go bring your gun to a pawnshop; before you retrieve it, let there be a background check—no harm to anybody. That has been in place since, I believe, 1997; it may have been 1996. It has worked. Hundreds of felons, I think it is 254, have been caught going to pawnshops, and all of a sudden we are going to give in. Again, give with one hand take away with the other.

What are we saying? Do we want to have a loud speaker go up and down the streets of our country saying: Hey, felons, hey, kids, here are ways to get around the Brady law; you don’t need a background check. That is what we are doing here in the Senate.

Then we have opened another loophole. This one is totally befuddling. The instant check system has worked.

It was proposed by people who didn’t agree with me when we wrote the Brady law. But we said let’s see if this works.

Well, it has, in about three-quarters of the cases. So people can get their check instantly and then go out of the gun shop with their gun. No problem, as far as I am concerned. Some people think a cooling off period is important, and I agree, the main purpose we had in passing Brady was the background check. If you can do it quicker, fine. Still in about 25 percent of the cases the records are not in good shape, where there is a glitch in the computers, where the instant check doesn’t work.

Right now, the FBI has 72 hours to check. Why in God’s name did we reduce that to 24 in the Hatch-Craig amendment? Why?

Let me go to the particular relevance to gun shows, where it applies. If you have a gun show on Saturday, you have 72 hours to check. The FBI can go through their records on a Monday. If you have a gun show on Saturday and you have a gun shop, if you have a gun show, there is no check at all. Under the Hatch-Craig proposal, you would have to give that gun to someone even if they had committed 10 or 12 felonies. Why? It did not hurt anybody; it only applied to 25 percent. Yet, we persist in creating new loopholes.

One final thing. Our system has always been one that has recognized States rights. We said gun dealers can only sell within their State. Under Hatch-Craig, that principle goes. You can go across the country to sell a gun at a gun show. Why?

So not only did we fail to completely close the gun show loophole, we opened three new ones, in my judgment, three big ones. Why? Well, I know why. We all know why. It is because of the power of the gun lobby, because of the power of the NRA. There is no other reason. I have been asking for a rational reason why, and you hear “too much bureaucracy,” or something like that.

Well, in this juvenile justice bill, we are creating a lot more bureaucracy to put more kids in prison who commit serious crimes. I agree with that. I am a pretty tough-on-crime guy. But we don’t get up on this side and say: too much bureaucracy. We don’t hear colleagues on the other side say: too much bureaucracy. That is a false argument if there ever was one.

People want bureaucracy when they want Government to do something. If you want to put kids or felons away, it is more bureaucracy, more prosecutors. I am for it, but it is more bureaucracy. I believe there is a difference. But when it comes to a law that would stop the kids from getting guns, that would stop the felons from getting guns, oh, no, no, then it is too much bureaucracy and we can’t have it. I have never understood the distinction.

So the bottom line is a simple one. In the legislation we passed by one mere vote last week, we did not close the gun show loophole. We closed one little loophole and opened up another one to take its place. It is as wide open as it was before the legislation, and anyone, as my colleague from Nebraska has pointed out, could become a special license; and then we created three more loopholes.

Mr. President, we would have been better off without Hatch-Craig than we would have been with it. It was easier to stop children and felons from getting guns before Hatch-Craig than it is now, if it were to become law. So who are we kidding?

Then one final argument to my colleagues, to my friends on the other side—the Senator from Alabama is not here, but he will be even more ably represented by the Senator from Utah. That chart has been up here for a long time. I think we have heard more talk about that chart than about a lot of the legislation we are talking about. But that is fine. That is a legitimate argument, in my judgment. But I ask my friends—they say there is not enough prosecution of firearms violations. I agree with them. I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania, in the budget last month, we put in a proposal to add $38 million to what has been spent in Philadelphia, and in Rochester, NY, to do better prosecutions of those who violate Federal firearms laws.

As you know, most of the firearms laws are State. It has never been a Federal responsibility. Folks on the other side want to make it one, and that is fine with me. I am not one who says the Federal Government should not be involved in crime fighting. In fact, over many years, I have said the Federal Government should be involved in crime fighting. But, again, why does the prosecution of those who violate our firearms laws contradict the gun show loophole? It doesn’t. Both should be done.

As I mentioned before, in the debate we had with the Senator from Idaho a while back, there are grieving families in Littleton. There may be prosecutions of some who gave guns to Mr. Klebold and Mr. Harris, who created the tragedy. I am sure those prosecutions don’t make the parents of the 13 dead children feel any better.

I saw one of them begging us on television at the rally in Denver last week. They would beg us to do both—have the gun laws that would stop the kids from getting guns, and the same time prevent children like young Harris and Klebold from getting guns to begin with.

A prosecution occurs after the crime. It sometimes deters crime because people don’t want to be prosecuted. I have been tough on crime—for mandatory minimum sentences, and for incarceration—my whole career. But, in God’s name, don’t use that which is a worthy cause as an excuse to do for simple, moderate things such as closing the gun show loophole, closing the pawnshop loophole and allowing the FBI system to check when the instant check system doesn’t work.

In conclusion, I know my friends from Nebraska and Utah wish to speak. This afternoon will be a moment of reckoning on this floor. It will determine, very simply, whether we are going to persist, as we have in the last few years, about coming up with solutions that don’t do the job—that are almost designed not to do the job—or whether we can actually do some real good in a simple measure, sponsored by the Senators from New Jersey and Nebraska, and close the gun show loophole. The yeas and nays this afternoon will determine which side each Senator is on. The eyes of America will be upon this floor this afternoon. Let us pray we do the right thing.

I yield the floor.

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, I have been working very closely with the Democratic leadership to try to get this matter to a conclusion. As I understand it, including this gun amendment, there are two others, and possibly a third besides, as an amendment. We are going to try to finish this bill.

Now, my personal impression is that they have gone too far. They are pushing this way too far. As the manager of this bill, I have tried to bring both sides together, and we have made a real effort to do so. I am starting to question whether or not we are getting a fair effort on the other side.
Now, this is the second time we have debated the Lautenberg amendment—the second time. To be honest with you, there is so much more in this bill than just the gun matters. I have helped to effectuate compromise on the gun issue. I believe that we have gotten to the satisfaction of most all Democrats and most all Republicans—not all on either side. Here is where we are. We have fought back amendments on one side. I was told by colleagues on the other side that they have their list of amendments to eight and that three, maybe four, including this amendment, would be on gun control.

Today, they tell us that maybe they can agree to limit amendments. I have chatted and others on the top leadership of the Democrat side. He said they have agreed that we are going to get this done. But some have said maybe they can agree to limit amendments, but only after a vote on the Lautenberg amendment. You see, they want to vote on Lautenberg, not just twice, but three, four, five—who knows how many times. Who is holding up this bill? I have to tell you, you will vote on Lautenberg, but I want to be sure that we have a unanimous consent agreement to vote on final passage. I would like to vote on Lautenberg. But that is going to have to be the good-faith deal because what I will have represented to the other side. I think it is time to put this matter to rest. I think we can push these gun things only so far, especially when you have seen the good-faith effort I have made, and others on our side, to try to resolve these problems. The gun issue is an evolutionary issue; there is no question about it. We are trying to find ways of satisfying the vast majority of Senators. So far, we have been able to do that, except with regard to the Lautenberg amendment. There is a very good reason why we will not vote for the Lautenberg amendment, or why we are going to vote for a tabling motion.

Mr. HATCH. I appreciate my colleagues' remarks. I see that the evolution of this matter continues. This time, the supporters of the Lautenberg amendment are making changes to their proposal to bring it closer to our plan that we passed in the Hatch-Craig amendment. My sense and hope is that our efforts will continue to evolve and we will be able to find common ground. That to me would be a great, great accomplishment. But I haven't seen that yet. We are evolving towards that. I appreciate that my colleagues have recognized that the concerns we raised were legitimate and they have taken some steps in this current amendment to address the concerns. But I certainly...
don’t think they have gone far enough. I think they have gone too far in making it look like the only matter to consider on this whole bill happens to be guns.

Let’s review how we got here. Under current law, non-licensed individuals can sell firearms at a gun show without obtaining a background check. This was the loophole that the President, the Lautenberg amendment sponsors, and others said they were concerned about. Yet, the bill as amended last week requires background checks for these transactions at gun shows.

Under current law, persons who only want to sell firearms at a gun show are not licensed at all and perform no background checks. Our bill as amended requires sellers to obtain a federal license to sell firearms at a gun show. Because these special licensees, or temporary dealers, are now included in the Gun Control Act, they are subject to the background check requirements.

Our proposal also prevents the Federal Government from taxing background check transactions. The liability protection and tax relief were powerful incentives for persons to have background checks.

That is why we put them in the Hatch-Craig amendment.

Let’s look back where we first debated the Lautenberg amendment, we pointed out several problems.

First, the Lautenberg amendment’s definition of a gun show was, at best, unfocused.

If two neighbors got together with 25 guns each and sold a gun, they would have been surprised to find that they had created a gun show and were criminals under the Lautenberg amendment because they did not conduct a background check or get a permit from the ATF.

We understand that the revised Lautenberg amendment, which is the current bill, recognizes that a gun show should be defined to conform with what is already in the bill, what we put in the Hatch-Craig amendment. It isn’t totally that way because they still have their 50-person standard, and so forth, but basically they have come our way on it.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle complain that the bill’s current definition of “gun show” would allow “hundreds of guns” to be sold at flea markets that do not fall under the 10 or more exhibitor or 20 percent exhibitor rule. Of course, if a very few sellers were selling hundreds of firearms, they would in all likelihood be engaged in the business—and that is an important phrase—in the business of selling firearms without a license.

Under current law, such persons are subject to fines, prison sentences or both.

Secondly, the Lautenberg amendment allowed the imposition of taxes and fees on background checks that constitute a substantial cost for complying with the law. Now what does that do? That is going to force people not to go to gun shows where they can legitimately sell them with background checks now that we require it in this bill, and to go off and sell them on the black market.

What we are trying to do and what it seems to me will be the inevitable result of some of the approaches under the Lautenberg amendment, will be that we will create a huge black market. That is exactly the opposite of what we want to accomplish. I am sure that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey does not want to accomplish that, nor anybody else on this floor, but think it through. It doesn’t take many brains to realize that is what will happen.

We understand the revised Lautenberg amendment does not “impose” taxes on sellers and purchasers. However, the tax to which we object is paid by persons who conduct the background check, not to a nonlicensed buyer or seller. Of course, the licensee, special licensee or special registrants now in this bill will pass this fee on to the buyer or seller who will have to conduct the background check. They will pass it on. They will not just do this out of the goodness of their heart. As they do that, people will go into the black market to sell their guns, the exact opposite of what the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and I and others, who are really trying to do something constructive in this area, want to occur.

In short, notwithstanding its appearance, the revised Lautenberg amendment allows for an ATF taxing authority loophole. The revised amendment seemingly concludes that we were right, but does not correct the problem. So on this provision we have a major concern.

Third, the Lautenberg amendment required gun show organizers to obtain advanced permission from the ATF before holding a gun show. It doesn’t take many brains to realize that is something nobody wants to agree with who believes that gun shows are a time-honored right in this society under the second amendment.

We understand that the revised Lautenberg amendment currently before the Senate that will be at the end of this amendment chain to be voted upon eliminates the advance permission requirement. However, gun show organizers are still required to keep extensive records, so there is a substantial burden that would be required, over-regulatory burden.

Fourth, the Lautenberg amendment imposed extensive recordkeeping requirements for sales between non-licensed individuals, thus driving up the cost of the background check and intruding into the privacy of law-abiding citizens.

That is just typical of what we have to face around here in the zeal to score points on guns. We understand that the revised Lautenberg amendment may require less records to be kept and may require the Federal Government to destroy records held by the instant check operator, yet dealers must still keep all records on the buyer. Further, the implication that requiring records to be destroyed after 90 days conveys a new benefit is not accurate. 18 U.S.C. section 922(t)(2)(C) already requires the instant check operator to destroy records of checks that were approved, the FBI currently destroys the records after 90 days. There is no new benefit in this system compared to current law. So the Lautenberg amendment does not improve current law at all. It just obscures it.

Some have complained that the Republican plan promotes unaccountable interstate gun peddling by gun dealers. Under current law, a dealer from one State can go to a gun show in another State, conduct sales, return home to his licensed premises, however, to ship the firearm. And the shipment must be to a licensed dealer. That is current law.

Our amendment allows one federally licensed firearms dealer to deliver the firearm to another federally licensed firearms dealer who is located out of State. He still cannot deliver a firearm to a nonlicensed individual, but only to a licensed dealer. Thus, the purveyor of firearms does not have to log the firearm into his inventory, will be subject to inspection by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms to find that firearm, and will have to conduct a background check to sell a firearm to a nonlicensed dealer. This is about the most regulated sale of a firearm for which the Federal law provides.

Next, some have stated that the current bill’s provision for granting civil liability protection to persons who comply with the background check requirement is not prudent. They say that the revised Lautenberg amendment provides no immunity for people who transfer guns to felons and others who intend to use the guns to commit violent crimes or felonies.

The bill, as amended, recognizes that persons who act properly with firearms—this is the amendment by Hatch-Craig—including firearms transactions, should not be subject to suit. Indeed, only yesterday, the Senate recognized the value of providing limited immunities to persons who act properly with firearms, by bestowing qualified immunity on persons who act under use safety laws. This is a key incentive in the Kohl-Hatch-Chafee child safety lock amendment. The same reasons for affording civil liability protection apply here. Keep in mind we have to go towards some kind of agreement that brings both sides together. The current Lautenberg amendment split both sides apart and will result, in my opinion, in more black market sales in this country, to the detriment of the country.

Further, some complain that our bill dismisses certain suits. These are only those suits at which nonlicensed individuals have voluntarily sold a firearm
through a licensed dealer who conducted a background check. If persons are now voluntarily having background checks performed at gun shows, they should not be penalized for doing so. That is something we want to encourage. We want to give incentives for that.

I also note that the bill provides no immunities for criminal sales of firearms. If a seller knowingly transfers a firearm to a buyer who will use that firearm to commit a crime of violence or for a drug trafficking crime, he is subject to severe criminal penalties. Further, if the seller is convicted of that offense, the bill expressly provides that he is not entitled to civil immunities. Thus, he could be sued for compensatory and punitive damages.

Some have complained that the bill, as amended, does not impose stiff enough penalties on special licensees and special registrants for the failure to obtain a background check. However, the bill suspends the license and imposes a fine on dealers who do not conduct a background check. Our bill maintains the current penalties for background check failures and imposes tough mandatory minimums for the knowledge transfer of a firearm to a juvenile who will use that firearm in a crime of violence. That is a major change. And we put it in the bill. In fact, a lot of these things that were requested by the President we have in the bill. We had them in there before he requested them. I suspect he might have had somebody look at the bill.

Further, through our aggressive firearms prosecution program, the CUFF Program, and the prosecution reporting requirement, we ensure that some of these violations actually will be prosecuted by the Attorney General—something that hasn’t been undertaken in earnest over the last 6 years.

Remember, of the thousands of possible Brady violations, the Attorney General only prosecuted one Brady case, one Brady background check violation, from 1996 through 1998. Of the thousands they claim, 225,000 turned back felons, one prosecution.

The Lautenberg amendment not only fails to include the tough mandatory minimums found in the Republican plan, it acquiesces in the Attorney General’s almost complete failure to prosecute Brady violations. This makes no sense. Congress passes criminal statutes, it is the duty of the Attorney General to enforce those laws. Our bill recognizes that we have a problem at the Department of Justice and our bill does something about it. Some have also stated that our bill has the potential for invading the privacy of gun owners by nonspecial registrants and special licensees to conduct background checks. This argument goes that by requiring the Instant Check operator to delay recording a background check immediately, special licensees and special registrants will be able to conduct background checks on anyone, even non-gun buyers, and there will be no audit trail to catch them.

Of course, special licensees and special registrants will have to undergo a background check, a field examination, and an interview just to obtain their license or special registrant. If they must keep records of the persons for whom they used the Instant Check system. Thus, the ATF can take these records, contact the persons listed, and determine if they attempted to purchase a gun using the services of the special licent or special registrant. If they did not, the special licensee or the special registrant will be held accountable, just as dealers are now.

Further, gun owners would much rather entrust their privacy interests to special licensees and special registrants than to the Federal Government. The argument that more record keeping on lawful gun ownership by the Federal Government would protect privacy better than less record keeping by the Federal Government carries little weight.

Mr. President, all of these concerns are less than compelling. The plain fact of the matter is that the revised Lautenberg amendment, though improved to some extent, Mr. President, the Lautenberg amendment, though improved to some extent, is still not as good as the current bill as amended.

The revised Lautenberg amendment still fails to provide qualified immunity to persons who obey the law and act appropriately with firearms, even after the Senate voted only yesterday to provide qualified immunity when parents properly use child safety devices or child trigger locks.

The revised Lautenberg amendment still fails to provide tax relief to licensees and others who perform background checks. And the revised Lautenberg amendment still fails to relieve gun show operators or organizers of substantial new recordkeeping requirements.

Some are complaining that the 24-hour requirement for instant check is not good enough. They would require 3 days. But gun shows only last 3 days. If we do not have a 24-hour instant check requirement, the gun show is going to be over. The ATF has the technology and the funding to get the job done in 24 hours, and it should. We should not force people into a black market where there are no licenses, no records, and no background checks. We do not need to do that.

Further, we even offered to make the background check requirement for special licensees express. But my colleagues on the other side of the aisle rejected this, or objected to my modification of my own amendment, one of the few times in my 23 years where a Senator was refused the right to modify his own amendment to please the other side—even though it was not necessary, in my view, and I think in the view of any reasonable person who looks at it.

I want to make sure that persons who sell a substantial number of guns come inside the gun show and get a Federal license. These special licensees must submit to a background check and an ATF interview, they must comply with the Gun Control Act, and they must conduct background checks—something that many smaller gun dealers and some gun dealers simply did not do. And that is the treatment of pawn shops, gunsmiths and repair shops that have traditionally been exempt from the requirement to conduct background checks when they simply return a firearm to its owner. And that was the case with the 1993 Brady law. States required pawn shops to report the pawn of a firearm to State or local law enforcement agencies. Thus, there was already a state law check on the firearm. The Brady law, however, when it passed inadvertently required a Federal background check on returned firearms in addition to the state check. The pawn shops raised concerns because State law already required them to undergo a background check and then undergo a background check to be returned before returning a firearm to its rightful owner affected their business.

Because these were real concerns, many in Congress supported an exemption to the Brady law which exempted pawn shops, gunsmiths, and repair shops from the Federal background check. It passed the Congress as part of the 1994 crime bill. Many of the people attacking the Hatch-Craig amendment’s so-called pawn shop loophole voted to do the same thing in 1994 when the crime bill passed. Frankly, if we included in the Hatch-Craig amendment a loophole, it was a loophole when Senator LAUTENBERG voted for the crime bill in 1994 when President Clinton signed it into law.

Indeed, after the Brady law passed, Senator SCHUMER even wrote a letter to the Treasury Department asking them to draft regulations to exempt pawn shops from the Federal background check requirement. To be fair, however, I should note that then-Congressman SCHUMER did vote against the amendment to the 1994 crime bill that provided the statutory exemption for pawn shops, but he still took a position in his 1994 letter to the Treasury Department which is consistent with our amendment.

If the pawn shop exemption from a Federal background check is a loophole now, it was a loophole in 1994 when Senator SCHUMER asked the Treasury Department to draft it.

The Craig amendment that we passed last year in the Brady law since the exemption for pawn shops that had been part of the Brady law for 4 years. Thus, this was not a major change in law, but a change back to how the Brady law read from 1994 to November 1998 when the exemption lapsed as the time Instant Check system became effective.

However, I know that the good Senator from New York has legitimate..
As Mr. Kerrey stated repeatedly—it is my goal to find common ground on these issues. Wherever possible, I want to do what’s best for our children and the public in a manner which is consistent with our oath as Senator to uphold the Constitution. Frankly, I viewed this provision as a technical matter—one which should not be politicized.

I just have a minute more to go, maybe a minute and a half, because I know there is limited time here.

Let me just sum it up.

Mr. KERREY. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERREY. I have 9 minutes left.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield on that point, it is not Brady we are talking about. It is gun shows which are trying to resolve, and if we do not resolve it right, you are going to create a black market.

Mr. KERREY. But the Senator said his fear with the regulation is that we are going to have black markets. All down—and I urge colleagues, especially the public to listen—is we say to a gun show operator, like every other licensed dealer, a gun show promoter has to register with ATF and pay a small fee.

We are not passing on the cost of the background check. Brady does not allow that. I voted against that. It does not allow us to pass on the cost of the background check. All it says to the gun show operator is you have to do the same thing a licensed dealer has to do. You have to register with ATF and pay a small fee.

Secondly, the gun show vendor has to show proof of identification when they check in at the gun show to verify they are who they claim to be. And the third requirement, hardly a prohibitive burden, in my judgment, is they have to notify people at the show that there are going to be background checks. You can do that with a sign.

Neither one of these three things is what I call a burdensome regulation, for gosh sakes. They are what licensed dealers have to do, exactly what licensed dealers have to do. It is a very small fee.

Again, last week when the Craig-Hatch amendment was adopted, the headline in the Omaha World Herald was: “Republicans Close Gun Show Loophole.” Under this amendment, that is not what you have to do. It is not the same. It is not a gun show loophole. It is not the same.
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means something. I believe the right to bear arms does not give me an unlimited right to bear arms, just as the first amendment does not give me an unlimited right to speak.

There are limitations on my right to bear arms, analogous to the reasonable regulations to keep all the rest of us safe.

The leading cause of death of teenagers in the United States of America is homicides and suicides. We are the only industrial Nation that has that.

We have got to talk about picking up guns. We are talking about a serious problem out there, that, like Brady, will reduce the opportunity of felons and people who have other things in their background—such as make them unreliable—having access to guns.

This is not an unreasonable regulation. This is exactly what licensed gun dealers have to do. The Craig-Hatch amendment simply does not get the job done because it allows somebody to say: I am going to get a special exemption because I am a gun show operator.

Secondly, I do not know the history regarding the loophole having to do with pawnshops, but for gosh sakes, we do not want to allow somebody to basically go in to a pawnshop and say: Here is my 357 Magnum, and I would like to get a certificate.

Maybe they stole it. A high percentage of people are concerned about pawnshops doing business, but we want that person to have to go through a background check when they pick up that gun. It has to be that a fairly significant percentage of those guns have been stolen and acquired in some way we suspect may put other law-abiding citizens at risk. It is not unreasonable when they come back to redeem their handgun that they have to through a background check. That is not an unreasonable limitation of their second amendment right to bear arms. That is a reasonable limitation.

We can talk theoretically, but I think reality has finally begun to hit the American people. I think that is why we have seen, finally, proper attention given to sensible gun laws.

We can see here in the 11 years of the Vietnam war, tragically we lost 58,168 of our finest people. That is 58,168 families devastated—devastated—by such a loss. Who knows what the potential of those people would have been? Certainly we know that war brought this country to its knees, and whether you supported it or did not, everyone—everybody—grieved that loss.

In 11 years in America in the war at home, 396,572 gun deaths, I say to my friends on both sides of the aisle. 11 years, almost 400,000 of our people killed; 396,572 families devastated. Many of those are children. Every day in this country we have the equivalent of a Columbine loss. Thirteen children a day are killed in my home State of California. The No. 1 cause of death to children is firearms—Gunshots.

So what are we trying to do in this debate with the juvenile justice bill on both sides? I think we want to make this country safer for children. The debate comes on how you do it.

The distinguished Senator from Utah said: You're pushing gun amendments on us. And just how far do you want to go?

My answer, as just one Senator, is: As long as it takes to change this. We have to change the reality that our children face.

When you ask parents today, do they feel secure when they send their kids off to school, no, they don't.

One of the things we could do is close the gun show loophole. Senator Lautenberg offered us that opportunity. It was voted down in the Senate. Senator Kerrey have teamed up. They have made a few changes which I think strengthen the amendment. We want to try again to close the gun show loophole.

I ask unanimous consent that this op-ed in the Los Angeles Times by Janet Reno be printed in the Record. There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times]

LET'S CLOSE THE GUN SHOW LOOPHOLE
(By Janet Reno)

The U.S. Senate has a historic opportunity to make our streets and communities safer by closing the loophole that allows criminals, felons, and other prohibited people buy deadly weapons at gun shows without Brady background checks. Last week, the Senate passed a version of this amendment that would close the loophole but creates new ones, letting criminals redeem their guns from pawnbrokers without background checks, weakening the Brady checks that currently are made at gun shows and, for the first time in more than 30 years, allowing federal firearms dealers to cross state lines to sell guns. I have watched this debate unfold with sadness, but I remain committed to working with the Senate on this issue. In 1993, we worked in a bipartisan fashion to pass the Brady law, which has prevented more than 250,000 felons and others who should not have guns from getting them. I am hopeful that if we begin this spirit of bipartisanship and, together, take the common-sense step of expanding the Brady law’s protections to gun shows. So far, the Senate has passed two gun show amendments, but neither one actually closes the gun show loophole. Although the second proposal is in some ways better than the original, we regrettable—and contrary to some reports—the modified amendment leaves the most dangerous loopholes of the original amendment untouched and adds at least one more, by weakening the Brady checks currently in gun shows.

While the new proposal would require some brokers to get background checks at gun shows, it would not ensure that all such sales go through a check. Moreover, it cuts back the time that law enforcement has to complete a Brady background check from three business days to 24 hours, even though the court records that are sometimes needed to complete a check are on weekends when most gun shows take place. This increases the chances that criminals will be able to buy weapons at weekend gun shows, because if the background check cannot be completed within 24 hours, the criminal can get the gun. Although more than 70% of Brady background checks can be completed within minutes, some law enforcement officials were track down additional records.
With all of the flaws and loopholes created by this amendment, even in its modified version, is there a better alternative? Fortunately, there is. Last November, President Clinton directed Treasury Secretary Robert E. Rubin and me to make recommendations on closing the gun show loophole. We published a report in January that lays out a streamlined plan for federal licensed firearms dealers to do all the background checks at gun shows, even for unlicensed sellers. We also proposed a way to get limited federal background checks on new models of guns sold so that we would have the ability to trace the guns if they were later used in a crime. In contrast, the amendment now before us will destroy our tracing ability, because checks will be done by people who have no obligation to cooperate with tracing requests.

Our proposal allows gun shows as we know them to continue but ensures that no one who is barred from having a gun can buy one at a gun show. The carefully drafted bill by Sen. Frank R. Lautenberg (D-N.J.) follows many of our recommendations.

There is still time for the Senate to revisit this issue. Instead of adopting legislation that plugs the gun show loophole once and for all, we want to work with Congress to develop sound, workable and effective proposals to close loopholes in our gun laws. The current amendment, even as modified, moves us in the wrong direction.

Mrs. BOXER. I simply say that Janet Reno has talked here about why it is important to try to finally close this loophole. She points out that the Senators on the other side who offered their loophole closing simply did not close the loophole. Senator KERREY pointed out that new designation of licensees who were exempted.

I would like to talk about that, my friends. This weakens the law from its current status. I ask for 30 additional seconds, and then I will close.

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

Mrs. BOXER. The pawnshop loophole, which was opened up by my friends on the other side, if you are going to a pawnshop, you are five times more likely to be a criminal. What they do is pawn a gun, if not over a back counter, check it if someone comes in and asks. What else do they do to weaken the current law? They say that you can pawn an unlicensed person. That is the sale of a gun to a person who is likely to be a criminal. What they do is buy a gun, which is a criminal offense in many of our states, and sell it back to the person without a background check. So the Lautenberg amendment does not do anything particularly good on that.

Without the special license provision, gunsmiths and others will not go into a regulated gun show. It is just that simple. These people generally do not have to be licensed now. Under the bill as currently amended, we require them to keep records in conformity with all of the provisions of the Gun Control Act. If we regulate gun shows without a special licensee, we will force these people into the black market. So let’s require them to be licensed. That is one of the points I was making there. All the other points I made I do not think have been rebutted at all.

Mr. President, we now reach that point where we have the debate on four amendments, 10 minutes equally divided. If time allows, we will go to the Sessions amendment No. 358; then we will go to the Sessions amendment No. 357; then to the Ashcroft amendment No. 361; and then the Santorum amendment No. 360, with the votes to occur beginning at 1 p.m., if necessary.

Should we go with Sessions first? I will be happy to do that. Let me rearrange the order. We will start with Sessions amendment No. 357, then Wellstone amendment No. 356, then Santorum amendment No. 360, then the Sessions amendment No. 358, then to the Ashcroft amendment No. 361, and then Santorum amendment No. 360. OK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, is there a time agreement on this debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes equally divided.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, from time to time, those of us in Congress hear complaints about governmental literature, booklets, pamphlets, and booklets paid for by the taxpayers who believe there is contained within them messages, content, material, tendencies, and philosophies that they believe are unjustified.

It is not possible, frankly, for us to manage that, as probably most people think we do. Particularly, this juvenile justice bill will produce about $1 billion in new spending for juvenile crime, and over half of that will be for prevention. Much of it will then be used, as part of the system to make sure certain literature that will be used in schools and other organizations.

So the question is: What do we do about it? Someone suggested that, well, you need to pass a law that prohibits them from spending money which says things that may offend me. I am not sure how we could write a law that would say that. I am not sure we even ought to attempt to do that.

But there is a problem, a disquiet, an unease in America about some of the material being printed at taxpayers’ expense. Both liberals and conservatives sometimes are not happy with the material. So I thought this would be a suggestion that we might try with regard to the funds expended under this juvenile offender accountability grant program that we have.

There would be a disclaimer, language placed on all literature funded by this bill. It would simply say this: “These materials are printed at Government expense.”

In addition, it would have these words: If you object to the accuracy of the material, the completeness of the material, the representations in the material, the characterizations to the material’s religious beliefs, you are encouraged to direct your complaint to the Office of the Attorney General of the United States.”

It directs the Attorney General to designate an office. There is an address that will be on the literature to which they can be mailed. Every 6 months, send a summary to the Congress of what the comments received were, because we are funding these materials.

If we send a grant to a community to do a drug treatment program, a mental health program, or an antiviolence program, the Members of this body may not know what was in that material. Sometimes people get it and they do not like it. They think it is inaccurate or unfair. I think they ought to have a chance to express that.

I do not know how anybody could believe this would be an objectionable thing. If the Government is going to fund the literature, to be told that they can object and where they can send their objection. If there are numerous objections, we can take a look at them. If it is inaccurate or discriminates against a particular group, they ought to be prepared to ask questions in our oversight capacity in Congress. As chairman of the Violence Subcommittee, we have oversight over the Office of Juvenile Justice programs. We look at Office of Juvenile Justice programs. So if we are getting a lot of complaints about the material, we can raise that with them and make sure they are exercising legitimate supervision over those materials.

It is a simple amendment. I do not think it would cost anything. The Attorney General could certainly be able to receive these materials, assemble them, and summarize them for the Congress. They could be maintained so that if anybody wanted to, they could go read the complaints. I think it would result in high-quality literature.

In fact, I think that if a person knows when they are producing literature that it is required to put on it information concerning objections, writing to the Attorney General of the United States, they are probably going to take more care to see that the material is produced accurately and fairly.

Those are the comments I have on this at this time.

On the other matter regarding gun shows, I think that what is frustrating
Mr. WELSTONE. Mr. President, I do not know of any opposition to the amendment or anybody to speak on it. I wonder if the minority will yield back its time?

Mr. SESSIONS. The Senator from Alabama has expired.

Mr. WELSTONE. Mr. President, what I say here today is that I do not know about other colleagues, but as I travel Minnesota, what I hear more than anything else, above and beyond the need to get tougher on guns, is, Senator, we need more counselors. We need to have an infrastructure of support for our children in our schools. This amendment is the 100,000 school counselors amendment.

This amendment would call for funding from the Federal Government, on a one-third, one-third, one-third matching basis. It would be $340 million a year over the next 5 years. Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle may stand up and say: This is $340 million a year.

To that, I say to my colleagues on the other side: When are we going to get serious? We continue to talk about children. We continue to talk about our concern for children. Now we are talking more and more about our concern for at-risk children. Now we are talking more and more about how to get to kids before they get into trouble. And what we hear all across our land from our educators, from women and men who are working with children every day, is that we don't have the funding for counselors.

Mr. President, right now we have an average of about 1 counselor per 500 students across the land. One counselor for 500 students. That counselor can't even begin to reach out and help some of the kids who are in trouble.

This is a huge weakness in this legislation. If we want to get to kids before they get to trouble, if we want to respond to the voice in the country about what we need to do better—and I hear this from everyone in Minnesota—then we need to support this 100,000 school counselors amendment. There is nothing we can do that would be more important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I yield such time as he needs to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. The Senator from Missouri is here, and when he is ready, I will yield to him.

Mr. President, I am not hearing every day that what we need as a No. 1 priority of schools in America is more counselors. There is a lot of need in schools. Maybe we need to expand Head Start, maybe we need other programs, maybe we need computers, or mentoring programs, some of which work well. We have not had hearings on it. This is an issue that ought to be raised in the Senator's Education Committee, and it ought not to be part of a crime bill at this time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, let me once again start by complimenting the Senator from Minnesota's commitment to the problems associated with mental health conditions.

I share his commitment, but I have a number of grave concerns about his amendment to provide $1 billion a year in new funding to hire over 100,000 school-based mental health personnel.

As I noted in my statement yesterday, there is no evidence whatsoever to support the assertion that the recent tragedies in Colorado and Oregon would have been prevented by having more school counselors.

Let me reiterate what I observed yesterday: it has been reported that both Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold had gotten fairly extensive individual counseling and had undergone management training and had gotten affirmative evaluations from counselors.

One of Dylan Klebold's teachers had expressed concern about some of the things he was writing in English class to a counselor.

It has also been reported that the 15-year-old Oregon killer, Kip Kinkel was currently in counseling, along with his parents, when he killed them and went on to kill two of his classmates and injure a number of others.

Please don't misunderstand me. Mr. President, I do not want in any way to undercut the very fine and vital work done by counselors in my state of Utah.
and around the country. I respect them. Their work is important and valuable and I support their efforts 100 percent.

I merely make the point that more counselors would not have prevented these crimes.

Additionally, Mr. President, as a parent and grandparent, I have an almost knee-jerk reaction whenever I hear that the federal government is—once again—attempting to micromanage public education.

I believe that we can best support our local schools by adequately funding current federal education programs and allowing state and local education agencies the flexibility to make important education decisions unencumbered by federal regulation.

I sincerely believe that $1 billion of new federal taxpayer dollars will not do as much to encourage a renewed commitment to strengthen mental health outreach as local school boards, parents, groups and local civic mental health and law enforcement organizations working together.

This amendment is a Washington knows best, big money, unfunded answer to complicated questions that can best be addressed through local efforts.

Mr. President, I get am getting a little tired of seeing some of our colleagues throwing money at issues without regard to costs. I am getting a little tired of hearing that the answer to everything around here is simply to throw more money at it. There is no question that counselors can be effective, but a lot of other things are too, and we have a lot of effective programs in this bill. Frankly, it is time to get this bill passed and quit delaying it.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds to respond.

Mr. WELLSTONE. This is a modified amendment. It is for $340 million a year, not $1 billion, as the Senator said. All Senators should know that.

Second of all, I get a little tired of hearing that the answer to every problem is simply to throw more money at it. There is no question that counselors can be effective, but a lot of other things are too, and we have a lot of effective programs in this bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I don’t want to take too much time, but I will take 30 more seconds.

Look, you are not the only Senator on this floor who cares about kids. I have a record of 23 years of leading a fight for most of the children’s programs that have passed here. And every one of them takes carefull consideration. It should not or should not be spent—child care, the child health insurance bill; you name it, I have been there. Right now, I am raising over $2 million for the Pediatric AIDS Foundation. I don’t need to be lectured by the Senator from Minnesota, whose answer to everything is to throw more money at every problem.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to respond to that comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. I object, unless it is for 30 seconds.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I can do it in 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Senator, I would never criticize your record. You are a friend. But I want to respond to the remarks you made on the floor of the Senate that this kind of an amendment is taking up people’s time and delaying passage of this bill. This is very relevant to what we need to do to help kids before they get into trouble. I am surprised that my colleagues, with all of his good work, doesn’t understand that. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 361

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, we will proceed to amendment No. 361, sponsored by Senator ASHCROFT, with 10 minutes equally divided.

The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I want to thank a number of Senators before I begin making my remarks because this amendment is the culmination of the work of a number of individuals, including Senators HUTCHISON, DeWINE, SALARD, ARGAMAN of Michigan, GREGG of New Hampshire, HELMS of North Carolina, and Senator COVERDELL of Georgia. All of these individuals participated to assemble the components of this amendment, which is an amendment designed to promote safety in our schools and to prevent violence in our schools. So I thank all of those Senators. If any of them comes to the floor, I will happily yield to them so that they can express the emphasis to the items they brought to the table here.

This amendment contains a number of provisions that give schools and communities additional ways to prevent violence. It would allow local school districts to put Federal money to use where the Federal money will do the most good to prevent future violence.

Under this amendment, schools will be able to choose where best to spend Federal resources under titles 4 and 6 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. These are allowable uses which would include violence prevention training, school safety equipment and personnel, student mental health care.

The amendment clarifies that nothing in Federal law stands in the way of a local decision to introduce a dress code or school uniform policy. Without taking away the authority of local school districts to put Federal money to use where the Federal money will do the most good to prevent future violence. This would allow schools, if they are going to use their Federal resources, to use them, and one of the permissible ways would be to invest in establishing such a policy.

The amendment contains a provision that provides certain liability protections for school personnel when they undertake reasonable actions to maintain order and discipline in safe educational circumstances or to promote an environment of safety for education. This is a very important provision. This one, sponsored by Senator COVERDELL of Georgia, offers teachers limited civil liability against frivolous and arbitrary lawsuits.

We don’t really need for teachers, who need to be involved in disciplining students, to be thinking about the fact that they are going to be sued if they exercise the right kind of discipline.

The limits are reasonable. They are aimed at frivolous and arbitrary lawsuits—the kind of limit that we placed to help encourage volunteerism last year when we had the Volunteer Protection Act. That is the kind of thing we want to do to make sure that teachers can have better control and are free to take necessary steps to provide discipline in the classroom.

Senator HELMS’ language makes certain that a school discipline record follows a student when a student transfers to another public or private school. The language allows schools to run background checks on any school employee who works with children. I think this is reasonable. We should
know who the individuals are who are employed in our schools. Providing this kind of capacity and opportunity is a step in the right direction, a step forward. It is necessary for schools, especially given the mobility of students and families, to be able to know about the discipline record of a student who comes to the school. Learning too late can be a deadly matter, as I learned a few years ago in a tragic case in St. Louis, where a student transferred from one school to the next and the discipline record didn’t follow. And before they learned of this student’s propensity to stalk young women, he murdered another student, stalking a woman, a young woman, into the restroom of high school.

Senator DeWine has a provision that allows the coordination of adolescent mental health and substance abuse services. That is part of this amendment.

The amendment includes language from Senator Abraham that allows schools to use Safe and Drug Free Schools funds for drug testing. Students who are the subject of serious discipline problems may well be better off if the capacity of asking them to undergo drug tests. We fund it and provide the availability or the freedom to use funds in that respect.

I really want to thank my colleagues who worked with me on this task force: Senators DeWine, Hutchison, Gramm, Allard, Coverdell, Helms, and Hatch.

I look forward to the passage of these proposals that are included in this education task force package: The amendments on school safety and violence prevention, and safety and security in our schools.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

By the way, the Chair informs the Senator from Missouri that his time has expired.

Mr. Ashcroft. The Senator from Missouri that is the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. Leahy. Mr. President, I am going to speak on the Sessions amendment No. 357, and I understand there is time in opposition. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 5 minutes remaining on that time.

Mr. Leahy. Mr. President, notwithstanding my friendship with the Senator from Alabama, I will oppose his amendment.

The amendment mandates that all Federal, State, or local governments and nongovernmental entities that receive any funds under this bill have to place a written disclaimer on all materials produced or distributed to the public.

The amendment also mandates the Attorney General report every six months to Congress on all public comments from any entity that receives funds under this bill. It would apply to any nonprofit organization that uses Federal support under this bill.

For example, suppose the Boys and Girls Clubs used it to set up an after-school process. Do they have to put a disclaimer on it? Suppose they have a leaflet passed out saying: Come at 5:30 to play softball, but we want you to have this disclaimer, and if you have any comments about it, write to the Attorney General so the Attorney General can report to the Congress. I can see it: I was called out at third base. I don’t think I was out. What is the Attorney General going to do about it?

That is what this disclaimer asks for. What about the Red Cross? Well, they gave me a lousy cookie when I came in to donate blood. I want to know what the Attorney General is going to do about it.

The amendment is also dangerous because it can siphon off funds that can be used to prevent juvenile crime and punish juvenile offenders. It places an unfunded mandate on Federal, State, and local governments. It takes resources away from real crime-fighting programs. How much is it going to cost State, Federal, and local governments and nonprofit organizations to comply with this disclaimer requirement.

How much does it cost the Department of Justice? I would like to know how much it is going to cost for the 6-month reporting requirements. Obviously, the Department of Justice should have people devoted to crime fighting and who will be there to tally reports. And it will not be fanciful to think of somebody who got called out at third base in a softball game put together by the Boys and Girls Clubs who thinks the Attorney General should look into it.

The Department of Justice already prints its name and address on all publications. Why a further unfunded mandate?

Unless we have questions and answers about how much it is going to cost and how much it is going to take away from real crime fighting, I would oppose it.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? This is in opposition to the Ashcroft amendment.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. Kennedy. I believe we have 5 minutes. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. Kennedy. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. President, this amendment is harmful, though I question how effective and useful it is.

It provides for some coordinated mental health services at the level. But there is already some limited mental health coverage in the underlying bill. And I find it interesting that the Senator from Missouri rejected our proposal to give SAMHSA the resources to really do a job.

The amendment provides for background checks on school employees. That’s already allowable under current law. It allows schools to require uniforms.

There is nothing to prohibit that now. It creates a Commission on Character. That is fine.

If we really wanted to make a difference, we would fulfill the commitment made last year to reduce class sizes by hiring 100,000 new teachers. Teachers should not have to do crowd control.

If we really wanted to make a difference, we would help communities build new classrooms and schools and modernize their facilities. This means smaller classes and smaller schools, so teachers and school officials get to know the children they teach. You have heard of “road rage.” Well some schools have “hall rage.” Where hallways are so crowded that actually increase violence in schools.

If we really wanted to make a difference, we would expand after school programs to attend to children in the afternoons—keeping them off the streets and out of trouble. Each day, 5 million children are left home alone after school, and that is unacceptable.

If you asked parents what is most important to reducing youth violence—uniforms or smaller classes—I am certain that smaller classes would win hands down.

If you asked parents what is most important—a character commission or after school programs—the after school programs would win hands down.

If you asked parents what is most important—to reiterate that you can conduct background checks on teachers or building more classrooms and better classrooms—the better classrooms would win hands down.

So I see nothing harmful in this amendment, but I hope we can get to the real issues that concern parents and communities—smaller classes, better schools, more after school programs. I withhold the remainder of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is time being reserved?

Mr. Kennedy. I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on this amendment has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 360

We will now move to amendment No. 360.

Who yields time?

Mr. Santorum. Mr. President, I rise to support my amendment. The amendment is offered to address a problem in this country which we have talked a lot about here, which is the short amount of time that people serve
in prison and, in fact, are sentenced to prison for the most violent of crimes in our society.

The chart says the average prison time served for rape in this country is only 9.5 years, and that, by the way, is a slight improvement for the past decade, so where? Average prison time served for child molestation is 4 years; 4 years for child molestation. The average time served for homicide is just 8 years.

These statistics are for time served. Time sentenced, in many cases, is just a little bit more than that, but not significantly more than that.

It is a very serious problem, particularly in the area of raping and sexually molesting a child, where the recidivism rate is very high, where we are putting back on the street to terrorize our citizenry, people who should be incarcerated for a much longer period of time.

A group of Members, MATT SALMON in the House of Representatives, and I, in the Senate, have introduced a bill called Aimee’s law, named after Aimee Willard, a victim of a horrible rape and murder in the city of Philadelphia by a man, Arthur Bomar, who was released from prison in Nevada—released after serving less than half of his time served in Nevada, released after not serving his full sentence. By the way, he was violent in Nevada and had assaulted a woman while in prison, but Nevada let him out early. Unfortunately, Arthur Bomar found Aimee Willard, and Aimee was brutally murdered and raped.

Aimee’s mom, Gail Willard, has put together a group of people who said it is time to get people who are convicted of these horrible crimes to serve out their sentences and to send a message to States—many States in this country have very light sentences for many of these crimes—to send a message to States that we want tougher sentencing laws on the books for these violent crimes and violent criminals.

MATT SALMON introduced in the House, and I introduced an amendment in the Senate, which does something very simple: If someone is released from prison as a result of these kinds of violent acts, they are released from prison and go to another State and commit a crime—Pennsylvania and incarcerated of that criminal.

The above mentioned people and organizations and a variety of other national organizations consider this one of their highest priority bills, to send a message that if a State has very low sentenced someone out, that State will get hit with a bill; that State will lose some of their Federal block grant funds.

We want tougher sentences and we want truth in sentences. We have provisions in this amendment that say if you don’t live up to truth in sentencing and you are not a truth-in-sentencing State, you can be liable if someone gets out of jail in one of those States and goes to another State and commits a similar crime. You can lose Federal funds.

We are trying to send a very clear message that these crimes should be dealt with seriously. A child molester who receives 4 years in prison, when we have to recognize the recidivism rate, is an abomination.

We have 134,000 convicted sex offenders right now living in our communities because of these kinds of laws and because of the enforcement and prosecution deficiency by our courts or by our parole systems. We have to do something about this to protect our children, to protect our society from the rapists and child molesters and murderers in our society.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Voinovich). The Senator has 5 minutes in opposition.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. President, I do not oppose this amendment. I think it is, as the amendment has been described and can create a great deal of problems with some States to the extent it overrides their ability to make determinations of who they go after and how. I understand what the Senator from Pennsylvania wants. I encourage that we accept the amendment.

Of course, he is entitled to a vote if he wishes, and between now and conference we might work more on the language to see if there are areas of unnecessary complication that could be removed.

I do not oppose the amendment. I yield back the time on this side.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the Santorum amendment aims at trying to reduce the number of tragedies that result when persons convicted of serious offenses obtain early release and then repeat the offense.

But the mechanism it selects to advance that goal is so unworkable that it will undermine its laudable purpose. The same crime is defined differently by different States. Average terms of imprisonment imposed by States are different from average actual lengths of imprisonment. Indeed, that is part of the problem. Those are just two of the unworkable parts of Sec. (c)(1)(C)(ii).

One big problem in Sec. (c)(1)(B) is that the cost of incarceration of an individual can’t be known unless one can predict his or her life expectancy. An unworkable procedure will not help this cause. It will set it back. I am afraid, and I cannot vote for it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I am saddened by the tragic circumstances that have motivated my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania to offer his amendment. It is understandable that concerned citizens hope to avoid crime committed by people who are released from prison. And I might favor states increasing the length of sentences of violent offenders. But that choice should be that of the states, and not one essentially forced on states by the Federal Government for fear of losing their criminal assistance funds.

That view by itself leads me to oppose the amendment. The particular way in which this amendment will operate causes me particular concern.

States are not mere appendages of the federal government to be told what to do by the Federal Government’s bidding every time we think we’ve got a good idea. State sentencing for state crimes is a state matter.

The amendment provides that in any case in which a person convicted of murder in a particular State is released from prison and go to another State and commits a similar crime in another State, the State of the prior conviction will have the ability to exercise whatever discretion Congress has given to the States. The amendment will operate in the particular way in which this amendment provides, to the States the subsequent offense occurred, the cost of the apprehension, prosecution, and incarceration of the offender, unless the original state has: (1) adopted the federal truth in sentencing guidelines for all offenses; (2) imposed a sentence on persons for these offenses that is at least 10 percent above the average term of imprisonment for that offense that is imposed in all states; and (3) made the particular offender serve at least 85 percent of his sentence.

Mr. President, my opposition to this provision is based primarily on federalism. States should be free to adopt the sentences that they choose. They should also be able to adopt the parole policies of their choice. States that impose short sentences or lenient parole policies will bear most of the cost themselves if released criminals commit future offenses.

Under this amendment, states must adopt the federal sentencing guidelines if they wish to be certain to avoid losing federal funds. The states will have their sentencing policies for these offenses not drafted by their state legislators in their state capitals, nor even be able to adopt the parole policies of their choice. Instead, the unelected bureaucrats of the
United States Sentencing Commission will set the sentences for state criminals who commit these offenses. I have no criticism of these individuals pursuing the task that Congress has given them, particularly since their work is subject to congressional review. But they were not and should not be given the power to set state sentences, unanswerable to the states who will be forced to silently acquiesce to their efforts.

In addition, a state seeking to retain its federal funding by complying with the three conditions of this amendment would incur much greater expense than any loss of funds it would sustain if it were not to comply with the conditions. States who seek to sentence at more than 110 percent of the average will be required to spend huge sums on new prisons to hold these offenders. In addition to construction costs, there will be additional costs of personnel and other operating expenses. Such long sentences will also mean that the states will incur huge medical expenses for older prisoners, for fear of losing federal funds if they were released and committed new offenses. If a state wants to keep these costs within this amendment, it could do so, but this bill will for all practical purposes force states to do so without funding any of the resulting costs. In addition, states sentencing for such a long duration of time will be sentencing wisely. Some offenders deserve parole. Not all offenders are incorrigible. Some offenders can be helped by religion or counseling to lead law abiding lives, returning to their families, safely living among the community, avoiding the need for states to incur costly prison expenses, and actually becoming productive, taxpaying citizens. This amendment essentially deprives a state of that choice, and may result in the unjustified continuation of imprisonment of certain persons, harming that person, his family, the community, and taxpayers generally.

The 110 percent of the national average sentence requirement is troubling for other reasons as well. By definition, half the states will be below average, and even a larger number will not sentence for 110 percent or more of the national average. That will mean that most states will not be able to avoid the risk of losing their federal funds, no matter how hard they try to comply with the amendment’s conditions. And since the average is not static, a state that is above 110 percent in one year may not be at that level the following year. As a result, the amendment would result in states continually increasing their sentences in what will probably be a vain effort to be one of the above average states. And how will the average be calculated? Is a 99 year sentence longer or shorter than a life sentence? Is a death sentence imposed after a 12 year sentence? Is a life sentence without parole? I suppose sentence longer or shorter than a life sentence? Is a death sentence imposed? Is a death sentence imposed? Is a life sentence without parole? I suppose sentence longer or shorter than a life sentence? Is a death sentence imposed? Is a death sentence imposed? Is a life sentence without parole? I suppose sentence longer or shorter than a life sentence? Is a death sentence imposed?

Apart from opposing this amendment on federalism grounds, I also note the existence of significant drafting problems that will result in what I am sure the sponsors would consider to be unintended consequences. For instance, the amendment defines “murder” and “rape” by reference to state law. But some states will never be in a situation in which a person convicted of murder has been released from serving a murder sentence or rape sentence in their state. For instance, Vermont has no crime of rape, but only sexual assault. No one can be convicted of rape who was convicted of rape previously in Vermont. Wisconsin has no rape or murder statutes, but simply intentional homicide and sexual assault. One can well imagine that if this amendment passes, states will manipulate the label placed on various conduct so that it can make sure to convict their murderers and rapists or “rape” however defined under another state’s law—and in such a way as now not remotely considered to constitute these crimes—while convicting persons in their own state for “intentional homicide” or “rape” that kind of manipulation will produce virtual anarchy. While the House companion bill avoids this particular problem because it defines these offenses without regard to state law, I note that the House bill is equally objectionable in its own way, since the crimes that it covers are broader than the Senate bill, extending to crimes that few would consider exceptionally serious, and thus causing greater expense to the states than the Senate bill if loss of funds is to be avoided. Moreover, under the House bill, unlike this amendment, a state is never free from the risk of losing funding, since it will be liable for a released offender’s offense for the rest of his life, regardless of the length of his sentence or actual imprisonment before release.

We have eliminated parole at the federal level. But there are many fewer federal than state parolees. If a state would rather spend money on education and effective prevention programs than on very long sentences, it should be able to do so without federal interference. Some prisoners may deserve parole. Others may not. And so long as there is parole, as in every other human endeavor, mistakes will occasionally be made, sometimes with serious consequences. The people who make those decisions and the state lawmakers—not federal lawmakers—should continue to set parole policy, and they should continue to be held accountable for their states for those decisions. The track record of Congress in knowing just how crime should be punished should give pause to anyone who thinks states and the American people would necessarily benefit more from a congressionally mandated approach to this issue than from experimentation among the states.

Mr. President, I sympathize with those who are the victims of crimes caused by parolees. I understand the sincere motives of my colleagues who support this legislation. But I strongly believe that it is misguided and runs counter to our system of federalism. It will cost states billions of dollars without any guarantee of retaining full federal funding. It may prevent sensible parole policies in particular cases. I have also pointed out a number of practical problems with the amendment’s drafting. For all of these reasons, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent it be in order to ask for the yeas and nays on all four of the remaining amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 357

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Sessions amendment.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call of the Senate is now in order.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) would vote—“no.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Roll call Vote No. 127 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Abraham
Allard
Ashcroft
Bennett
Bond
Brownback
Burns
Burr
Campbell
Chafee
Cheney
Collins
Coverdell
Craig
CraPo
DeWine
Domenici
Enzi
Fitzgerald
Frist
Gorton
Gramm
Grassley
Gregg
Hagel
Hatch
Holms
Hutchison
Hutchinson
Inhofe
Jeffords
K inflatable
Lieberman
Lott
Lugar
Mack
McCain
McConnell
McCoy
Mansfield
Nickles
Roberts
Roth
Santorum
Sessions
Shelby
Smith (N)
Smith (O)
Snowe
Specter
Stevens
Thomas
Thompson
Thurmond
Voinovich
Warner

NAYS—43

Akaka
Baucus
Bayh
Biden
Bingaman
Boxer
Braun
Brown
Bryd
Byrd
Conrad
Daskalakis
Dodd
Durbin
Edwards
Engeldoll
Feinstein
Foster
Graham
Gaskin
Genstel
Inouye
Johnson
Kennedy
Kerry
Kohl
Lautenberg
Leahy
Levin
Lugar
Mikulski
Murray
Reid
Robb

Mr. President, I sympathize with those who are the victims of crimes caused by parolees. I understand the sincere motives of my colleagues who support this legislation. But I strongly believe that it is misguided and runs counter to our system of federalism. It will cost states billions of dollars without any guarantee of retaining full federal funding. It may prevent sensible parole policies in particular cases. I have also pointed out a number of practical problems with the amendment’s drafting. For all of these reasons, I oppose the amendment.
Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. Reid. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. Reid. Mr. President, if we are going to finish this bill, we are going to have to move things along more quickly. We are seeing end-of-this-bill possibili- ties, but we are not going to ever finish the bill if these votes are going to go on forever. Ten-minute votes should not take an hour.

I respectfully suggest that we move on more quickly so we can get to the substance of this bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mr. LEAHY. I say to the Senator from Utah, we would be willing to speed up things and accept the amend- ment of the Senator from Pennsyl- vania, if the Senator from Pennsyl- vania wishes. If they are interested in speeding up the time, we can do that. Obviously, the Senator from Pennsyl- vania is entitled to a rollcall vote, but we can save ourselves 15 or 20 minutes if we just accept it.

Mr. Hatch. Why don't we just have the rollcall vote and everybody will come immediately.

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield back my minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) is neces- sarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) would vote "aye."

The result was announced—aye 61, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 129 Leg.]

YEAS—81

Yeas—74

Yeas—61

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. Reid. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. Wellstone amendment No. 358?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, could I ask a question. We now have 1 minute each: is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. Wellstone. Could I also ask whether this is my amendment on school counselors?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the Wellstone amendment No. 358.

Mr. Wellstone. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President and colleagues, I have offered this amendment with Senator Mikulski and Senator Harkin. This amendment would provide $340 million a year for 100,000 school counselors, social workers and child psychologists to back them up.

Everywhere you go, you hear from people at the school district level: We will contribute money, but can you get some money to us so we can have more counselors in our school so that we can give more support to these kids before they get into trouble?

You will not hear your education community and your teachers and men and women who work with children talk about anything more than the need to have more counselors. One counsel for 500 students or 1,000 students cannot identify these kids in trouble, cannot help these kids. If we really care about providing these serv- ices, then we are going to be willing to make the investment.

I hope this amendment will have a very strong vote.

Mr. Hatch addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. Hatch. Is this amendment No. 358?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. Hatch. This amends the Ele- menitary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, originally to provide $1 billion more, but modified now to provide $340 million, after modification, a year in new funding to hire 141,000 school-based mental health personnel: 100,000 school counselors, 21,000 school psychologists, and 20,000 school social workers. These funds have to be matched by the States and localities.

Now look, this is another attempt to micromanage our educational system in this country—Washington. It is an expensive add-on that should not be on this particular bill.

I made the case earlier that we are in favor of counselors, but there is a limit to everything, and the counselors may not be the answer here, especially in the Klebold matter—and a number of other matters where the boys were under counseling.

The fact of the matter is, this is another “Let’s throw money at it” at the cost of society.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. Wellstone addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. Reid. Mr. President, if we are going to finish this bill, we are going to have to move things along more quickly. We are seeing end-of-this-bill possibili- ties, but we are not going to ever finish the bill if these votes are going to go on forever. Ten-minute votes should not take an hour.

I respectfully suggest that we move on more quickly so we can get to the substance of this bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 360

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. Reid. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. Wellstone addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. Reid. Mr. President, if we are going to finish this bill, we are going to have to move things along more quickly. We are seeing end-of-this-bill possibi- lities, but we are not going to ever finish the bill if these votes are going to go on forever. Ten-minute votes should not take an hour.

I respectfully suggest that we move on more quickly so we can get to the substance of this bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 357, AS MODIFIED

Mr. Hatch. Is this amendment No. 357, as modified?

Mr. Hatch. Wellstone. Could I also ask whether this is my amendment on school counselors?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the Wellstone amendment No. 357.

Mr. Hatch. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President and colleagues, I have offered this amendment with Senator Mikulski and Senator Harkin. This amendment would provide $340 million a year for 100,000 school counselors, social workers and child psychologists to back them up.

Everywhere you go, you hear from people at the school district level: We will contribute money, but can you get some money to us so we can have more counselors in our school so that we can give more support to these kids before they get into trouble?

You will not hear your education community and your teachers and men and women who work with children talk about anything more than the need to have more counselors. One counselor for 500 students or 1,000 students cannot identify these kids in trouble, cannot help these kids. If we really care about providing these serv- ices, then we are going to be willing to make the investment.

I hope this amendment will have a very strong vote.

Mr. Hatch addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. Hatch. Is this amendment No. 358?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. Hatch. This amends the Ele- menitary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, originally to provide $1 billion more, but modified now to provide $340 million, after modification, a year in new funding to hire 141,000 school-based mental health personnel: 100,000 school counselors, 21,000 school psychologists, and 20,000 school social workers. These funds have to be matched by the States and localities.

Now look, this is another attempt to micromanage our educational system in this country—Washington. It is an expensive add-on that should not be on this particular bill.

I made the case earlier that we are in favor of counselors, but there is a limit to everything, and the counselors may not be the answer here, especially in the Klebold matter—and a number of other matters where the boys were under counseling.

The fact of the matter is, this is another “Let’s throw money at it” at the cost of society.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. Wellstone addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. Reid. Mr. President, if we are going to finish this bill, we are going to have to move things along more quickly. We are seeing end-of-this-bill possibi- lities, but we are not going to ever finish the bill if these votes are going to go on forever. Ten-minute votes should not take an hour.

I respectfully suggest that we move on more quickly so we can get to the substance of this bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 357

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. Reid. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. Wellstone addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. Reid. Mr. President, if we are going to finish this bill, we are going to have to move things along more quickly. We are seeing end-of-this-bill possibi- lities, but we are not going to ever finish the bill if these votes are going to go on forever. Ten-minute votes should not take an hour.

I respectfully suggest that we move on more quickly so we can get to the substance of this bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. Reid. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. Wellstone addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. Reid. Mr. President, if we are going to finish this bill, we are going to have to move things along more quickly. We are seeing end-of-this-bill possibi- lities, but we are not going to ever finish the bill if these votes are going to go on forever. Ten-minute votes should not take an hour.

I respectfully suggest that we move on more quickly so we can get to the substance of this bill.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is the Frist-Ashcroft amendment.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we are returning to an amendment that was offered at the end of last week, which is a very simple amendment as written. It addresses the issue that is at the heart of the juvenile justice issue and discussion in the last week. It has to do with bombs and guns in schools. It is as simple as that.

It addresses the issue of how to make our schools as safe as we possibly can. We start with, I believe, the juvenile justice bill which has made real progress but absolutely to my mind must include an amendment that addresses this issue of guns in schools and bombs in schools in an area where we, because of previous legislation that we passed, have created a loophole that means that a student coming into a school who has a firearm may be treated very differently from a student who comes in the next day to that school with a weapon. Our amendment is that any child who comes into a school with a gun or a bomb will be treated equally, will be treated fairly, will not be discriminated against one way or another.

Our amendment ends a mixed message that the Federal Government today, because of legislation we passed, sends to American students on the issue of firearms in schools. “Fire-arms,” for the purpose of this amendment, are bombs and guns in schools.

We look at Littleton, CO, with 15 dead and 23 wounded. We look at Pearl, MS, with 2 dead and 7 wounded; Paducah, KY, 3 dead, 5 wounded; Jonesboro, AR, 5 dead, 10 wounded; Springfield, OR, 2 dead, 22 wounded.

These are all shootings, horrific shootings. They claimed the lives of 27 students and teachers. Thus, we come back to this simple amendment which closes a loophole that we created that has to do with bombs and bombs and firearms in schools.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is a law which I have strongly supported, and I have worked very, very hard in the past two Congresses to improve, to modernize, to strengthen. Under that act, a student with a disability who is in possession of a gun or a firearm at school is treated differently than a student who is not disabled or who is not in special education.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is a law which I have strongly supported, and I have worked very, very hard in the past two Congresses to improve, to modernize, to strengthen. Under that act, a student with a disability who is in possession of a gun or a firearm at school is treated differently than a student who is not disabled or who is not in special education.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is a law which I have strongly supported, and I have worked very, very hard in the past two Congresses to improve, to modernize, to strengthen. Under that act, a student with a disability who is in possession of a gun or a firearm at school is treated differently than a student who is not disabled or who is not in special education.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is a law which I have strongly supported, and I have worked very, very hard in the past two Congresses to improve, to modernize, to strengthen. Under that act, a student with a disability who is in possession of a gun or a firearm at school is treated differently than a student who is not disabled or who is not in special education.
must be provided alternative educational services while a nondisabled student, somebody who is not in special education who is expelled for the same offense, will not necessarily receive alternative educational services, which just shows how we are treating a student who is a child with a gun differently if they happen to be disabled compared to other students.

The amendment that I, Senator Ashcroft, Senator Helms, Senator Cogdell, and Senator Allard, as the initial sponsors, have put forward, allows principals and other qualified school personnel the flexibility to do something that seems so basic. And that is, to treat all students the same if they bring a gun into the classroom, period. No more complicated than that. It does not matter race, it does not matter financial status, it does not matter educational status, everybody gets treated the same.

It allows school authorities to discipline all students in the same way if they bring a gun, we are not talking about threats, and we are not talking about even other weapons. We have this amendment focused on guns and bombs, who are in the schoolroom.

This amendment does not force local school authorities to have a uniform disciplinary policy. We recognize that every situation needs to be judged as just that, an individual, unique situation. And simply gives them the flexibility to enforce discipline in that local school as they see fit, with the overall objective to assure, to ensure, to guarantee the safety of those students whom every day we send into those classrooms.

The amendment is firearms specific. There have been others who have asked us to at least look at expanding it to other weapons, but we have this amendment really quite narrow; we are talking about firearms.

I mentioned the Nashville statistics. These statistics are really hard to obtain. You always hesitate, when that is to be a manifestion of the disability. It

was three students who went right back into the classroom, again, potentially putting the lives of others in danger.

We might hear, well, nobody has been killed yet in the last year or the last 2 years. Really, I think that is a whole separate issue. The whole idea is that we are treating people differently who have brought a gun or a firearm into the room.

These statistics show that three people out of the eight had come back into the classroom because a manifestion of their disability was bringing a gun into the classroom. It is kind of hard to imagine, but that is what the ruling was.

With that, let me close and simply say that when it comes to possession of a firearm or a gun, the Federal Government really should not, I believe, be tying the hands of our local education authorities. Our principals, our teachers, those who are in charge of discipline.

Again, I say this. When we are focusing on guns and firearms in the classroom, I just find it hard to believe, and really there is absolutely no excuse for any student to intentionally bring a gun or a bomb to school.

Students with disabilities really should not be able to hide behind, not to treat them equally if they bring a firearm in the room. I urge its support and hope it will be brought to a vote shortly.

Mr. HARKIN. Would the Senator yield for a colloquy or engage in any kind of question and answers?

Mr. PRIST. Sure.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee knows I have the highest respect for him. In fact, I have always found him to be a very thoughtful Senator, especially when it comes to the issues of disability policy.

When the Senator first came to the Senate, he became chairman of the then-existing Disability Policy Subcommittee in the Labor and Education Committee, and I was his ranking member. I thought he did a great job.

As a matter of fact, under his chairmanship, we were able to get through the revisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, with this single provision that allows certain students to potentially hide behind the legislation, not their disability, but behind the legislation and, thus, avoid punishment that a nondisabled student would undergo.

The amendment is simple. It is straightforward. It means that all students will be treated equally if they bring a firearm in the room. I urge its support and hope it will be brought to a vote shortly.

Mr. HARKIN. I don't know that I

could speak a little slower, I would appreciate it. I understand that you said recently. I do not know if you have given me—
Mr. FRIST. The statistics from yesterday for 1999.

Mr. HARKIN. The figures you gave were for calendar year 1999.

Mr. FRIST. The figures I gave 15 minutes ago in my presentation were from 1997–1998. I just gave you the ones for 1999.

Mr. HARKIN. What you said is that for 1999, this school year; I do not know if the Senator means the school year of 1999 or January until now.

Mr. FRIST. The statistics as of yesterday, up until about 24 hours ago, there were nine infractions over the previous 10 months in Nashville, TN. Four of those were special education students, four of the nine.

Mr. HARKIN. Four of the nine were special ed. Two were expelled because it was determined not to be a manifestation. What happened to the other two?

Mr. FRIST. One right now is back in the classroom. And because of the finding, during that 45-day period you spoke of, that it was a manifestation of the disability, they could not treat the student like anybody else.

The other student case is now pending, going through the bureaucratic determination process.

Mr. HARKIN. I say to the Senator, you say that this one child was put in an interim setting for 45 days. Now this child is back in the classroom. Can the Senator tell me the principal or did the school officials ask for a hearing to keep the child in the alternative setting for an additional 45 days, which they are allowed to do under the new law? Did they do that?

Mr. FRIST. If we believe that a child with a disability is treated differently than a child without a disability—we accept that. A child with a disability has an individual education program. There are certain laws that we have passed which if a State wants to accept Federal moneys, they abide by. No local education agency has to abide by the laws of IDEA if they choose to take the money. Now, they would still have to provide a free and appropriate public education to kids under Federal court rulings.

Again, I say to the Senator from Tennessee, that as long as we treat children with disabilities differently, and we do because they are disabled, we then take it to the step that the Senator said. Should we treat a disabled child who brings a gun to school differently from a child who is not disabled? I think that is a good question. At first blush, it might seem to the casual observer that no, they should be treated the same.

I say to the Senator from Tennessee, let us take two children. One is a child with no disability, has an IQ of 120, has good grades, comes from a pretty decent family, who all of a sudden gets a mean streak and brings a gun to school. That is one kid.

The other kid we say we have another kid. He has an IQ of 60. He is mentally retarded. He has cerebral palsy. His lifetime has been one of being picked on by other kids and made fun of. Because of IDEA, he is now in a regular classroom. Some kids come up to him and say, look, junior, we know your old man has a gun at home and he has a couple of pistols. If you don't bring one of those pistols to us tomorrow, we are going to cut your ears off. The kid has an IQ of 60. He is mentally retarded. He has cerebral palsy, maybe even suffers a little bit from schizophrenia, I don't know. The kid is terrified. He goes home. He sneaks the old man's gun. He takes it to these kids, and he gets caught by the principal or someone who sees the gun, and he should be treated differently than the kid with a 120 IQ, who knew exactly what he was doing and who had a mean streak and brought that gun to school?

Mr. FRIST. Yes.

Mr. HARKIN. The Senator can say yes, I say no.

Mr. FRIST. Let me respond to the question. They absolutely should. If two children walk in, regardless of the one who has a gun, and the next one has a gun and has an IQ of 60, when it comes to removal from the room and being kept out, they should be treated exactly the same. It should be by local control. It doesn't mean let them in or keep them out. It means having the decision made by the principal and not by the well-intended legislation that has this huge loophole in it.

Treat every child who brings a gun or a bomb to the room the same, regardless of what the IQ or who they are or how ethically you can make the story seem. The big thing is that you treat them the same. It is the principal and the teacher and...
the people locally who decide, not the Senate.

Mr. HARKIN. Now, I believe the Senator made a very important point there in his first comment to me. The Senator said that if two kids—the ones I described—bring a gun to school, they should be treated exactly the same in terms of removal. I agree with the Senator. In terms of removal, they should be the same. And they are the same today. In terms of getting them out of the classroom immediately, they are treated the same.

What I think we are dealing with here is the difference occurs later on during the 45-day period, where it is examined as to why the kid brought the gun to school, and whether it was a manifestation of his disability or not.

I ask my friend from Tennessee this straightforward question: Is it true that under IDEA, as it is today, if a disabled child brings a gun to school and a nondisabled child brings a gun to school, they are both treated the same in terms of removal?

Mr. FRIST. That was totally incorrect. I just gave you an example where there were eight students in Tennessee. One was expelled because he did not have the disability, and three others were back in the classroom. Do you call that being treated the same? Absolutely not.

The whole purpose of my amendment is that, if you bring a gun or a bomb to the classroom, you be treated exactly the same. And if you don’t have a disability or not. Is it true that the principal can immediately expel both students on that day and get them out of school?

Mr. FRIST. No. He can suspend, not expel. That student has to go through a manifestation process, an initial 10 days and then 45 days with a determination, and that student can be back in the classroom as has been demonstrated in Nashville, TN, and other places. Anybody can check their own statistics.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FRIST. I’ll yield to my colleague from Missouri for a question.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Tennessee, when a student is subject to an IEP and is disciplined for bringing a gun to school now, is it not an immediate discipline of expulsion for a year as it is for others; is it for a limited period of time? What is that first interval of discipline? That is what the Senator is asking for?

Mr. FRIST. For students with a disability who bring a gun to school, there is an initial 10-day period in which they can be taken out and then a 45-day period during which that manifestation process takes place.

Mr. ASHCROFT. May I pursue an additional question. So there is a disparity right away. The student without an IEP is expelled for a year.

Mr. FRIST. It is zero tolerance in Tennessee and in most States today. If you don’t have an IEP, or are not disabled, you are expelled under zero tolerance for a year.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Under an IEP, you have an initial 10-day suspension, and legal proceedings start to determine whether it was brandishing of the gun, or bringing the pipe bomb or a firearm into the classroom was a manifestation of your disability?

Mr. FRIST. That is correct.

Mr. ASHCROFT. When you talk about a manifestation of a disability, what does that mean? That you bring a gun to school because you are disabled? Is that what you are saying? Our interpretation is that it means that you are severely emotionally disturbed, for instance?

Mr. FRIST. It certainly could. The manifestation process is a complicated process and one to reach out to people. The term can certainly mean that.

Mr. ASHCROFT. So it could be that a student who is severely emotionally disturbed is protected from being expelled for a full year, based on the fact that he is severely and emotionally disturbed and that resulted in the bringing of the gun?

Mr. FRIST. That is correct.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Then the suspension—if you got past the 10 days, you could suspend the student for 45 days. Mr. FRIST. During which that so-called manifestation process takes place.

Mr. ASHCROFT. That is related to whether or not his disability or special education status caused or was related to the bringing and brandishing of the gun?

Mr. FRIST. That is correct.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Now, these determination proceedings, do they involve substantial expense for the school?

Mr. FRIST. They certainly do, and it is very expensive. The process itself is a process that I think can be important and useful. So the overall manifestation process, as we look at IDEA, is something that I am not necessarily critical of. It is the idea of taking a disability and saying the disability and bringing guns to school. The student is back in the school with unequal treatment.

But the answer is yes. I travel around Tennessee and people tell me this manifestation process can be very expensive because it involves lawyers.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Thousands of dollars?

Mr. FRIST. Yes, thousands of dollars.

Mr. ASHCROFT. That lasts 45 days, according to the Senator from Iowa, and you have to have another hearing to have another 45 days.

Mr. FRIST. There can be an extension for another 45 days if a determination is made. You go for 45 days, and it can go another 45, although, usually if it is a manifestation, after 45 days the student is back in school.

Mr. ASHCROFT. The theory of the legislation probably provides a basis for having this series of bureaucratic trials and hearings every 45 days as people are litigating whether or not you could keep a very, very dangerous person out of school.

Mr. ASHCROFT. That is the way it is written, to take 45 days. Your fundamental question is, did the disability cause you to bring the gun to school? That is hard to imagine, to be honest. It seems to me if it is the cause, you would not want to put them back in school. The idea of having 45 days and another 45 days if they are threatening, as the Senator from Iowa mentioned, conceptually, that is pretty good. It seems to me that it is humane, or something frustrating, something that can be treated, and a kid is violent underneath, and they did bring a gun to school. You are going to want to give the kid the benefit of the doubt. You are not going to say that for another 45 days and then another. If the kid comes in and says, “I am sorry,” you say, “Go back to school.”

That is just treating people differently because they happen to have the particular illness and you are getting them back in the school. All I am saying is let’s equalize it and keep treating them the same.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Earlier the Senator said, it is hard to imagine a person would have brought a gun to school based on a disability. But in fact the determination from Davidson County, Nashville, TN, is that over the last couple of years they apparently found that a number of the individuals involved—two in 1 year and three from another year—the determination was made in this process that bringing the gun was related to a disability and therefore the student was not to be treated the same as other students but would have a very tactical set of bureaucratic rights to remain in school, or reenter school.

It seems to me that goes to the heart of what we are talking about—whether or not a student who has a problem that causes the student to be involved in bringing a gun—that is, the manifestation proceedings. Part of the evidence or manifestation of the problem is that you come to school with a gun. That provides the authority for reentering school. If I have a problem which causes you to bring guns to school becomes your license to get back into school.
Mr. HARKIN. I think that describes the loophole we have talked about. We created it here in the Senate.

Am I getting to the heart of it?

Mr. FRIST. No. It is that loophole that has been created.

I want to tell you what my theory is as I look and talk to people around Tennessee. Whether people are supporting individual disabilities or not, it is not about that. It has to do with the great fear I have in this unequal treatment of people, and allowing that special group of people with an offense of bringing a gun to school or a bomb to school to go back into school when you don’t let anybody else to go back into school. I will tell you, to me, that is a potentially devastating loophole we have created. It hasn’t anything to do with the disability. That is my greatest fear. That is why the amendment is on the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield for an observation and again for a question?

I say to the Senator from Missouri, again, I don’t mind people making a decision one way or another on these things. I hope we base it on factual circumstances. The fact is that what the Senator, my friend from Missouri, just described is the idea in the old law, going back 20 years. We had the 45-day period, at the end of which kids can go back to school. We changed that. The final regulations on that didn’t become final until March of this year when we put the 45 days in, at the end of which, if the school officials believe that the child is still a danger, they can go to a hearing officer, and say, hey, because of all these reasons, that kid should be kept out of school for another 45 days.

I say to my friend from Tennessee that I don’t have that much lack of faith in my school principals and officials. If they look at this kid and say, wait a minute, this kid is a danger, they are going to throw up their hands, and say, oh, my gosh. They want to protect their schools, and they are going to go to a hearing officer and say, wait a minute, keep that kid out.

So I want to make it clear that what my friend is talking about is the old law. That is all I want to make clear.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I think it is important to accept the fact that you have faith in the school administrator and the principal, because under the proposal, the legislation from Tennessee, under my proposal and under the Gun-Free Schools Act for schools, which we passed, a principal has the discretion of being able to allow a student to reenter. And, if you trust the principals, you trust the school officials, that is an available opportunity as it exists and would exist if we were to pass this amendment providing for uniformity, because we allow the treatment under our proposal to be identical to the treatment for any other student not under an IEP. And principals have the discretion to allow such other students back into the classroom.

So what we want to do is not punish anybody, we want to allow that principal to exercise his discretion in a way that is likely to promote safety in the classroom and in a way that it does not hamstring the principal.

Just to go to your idea, people do not understand, and I didn’t understand, what a manifestation determination is. This is a flow chart of how a manifestation determination is made under IDEA. This is a very serious process. To go through these kinds of procedures and to jump through these legal hoops and to cause the school districts—the cheapest hearing I have been able to talk to a school superintendent about in my State is between $7,500 and $10,000. Just to conduct a hearing to do in the special settings what the principal is able to do given his need to protect the safety of the school environment on his own in another setting.

I think that is what we are looking at. We are not here to try to say that we want to abuse individuals who are the subject of IEPs. We passed the statutory framework designed to help disabled children. We want them to get a good education. But I submit to you that those most exposed to the threat to safety and security in the schools when a student with a disability comes with a weapon are other disabled students.

This is not a question of pitting students with a disability against other students in the classroom, this is a question about safety and security in the classroom and allowing those individuals charged with the awesome responsibility of providing for the education of our youngsters the authority to take the steps that are necessary, absent meddling bureaucratic barriers from Washington, to secure the school environment.

Given the fact that every principal has the authority in other settings to be able to reenter a student who is appropriately at a stage to reenter the classroom, this bill would not prevent principals from having the same approach to students who were the subject of IEPs.

Mr. FRIST. I don’t want to keep going back to the underlying amendment. We again have discussed this, and we have debated it. It really comes back to treating people the same under this concept of guns and violence in the schools. I think we may come down to a fundamental disagreement that you believe the current legislation will cover and take care of what is happening, that if they have a disability and a manifestation of bringing that gun to school is related to the disability, it is OK for them to come back to school if somebody says they are not threatened.

Mr. HARKIN. If the school officials say it is a manifestation.

Mr. FRIST. That is right. I think that is going to be different, because we are basically going to say let these school principals and officials make the ultimate decision, and not an officer who happens to be assigned to manage that particular case, who is going to develop a relationship with that student and family, and who says, “Please let him go back to school.”

Let’s treat everybody the same. Let the authorities, the principals, the teachers, make that decision instead of separating them out, since we know they come back into the school.

Let me again read the amendment.

School personnel may discipline a child with a disability who carries, or possesses, a gun, or firearm to or at school, on school premises, or at a school function under the jurisdiction of a State or a local educational agency in the same manner in which such personnel may discipline a child without a disability.

Again, I have given examples of people going back into the schoolroom. Let me give two other examples.

This is an article in the Washington Times.

Fairfax County, Virginia, school officials learned that a group of students were in possession of a loaded .357 magnum handgun on school property. They moved quickly to expel the six students. Five students were expelled. One student, a special education student who had a learning disability, who they called a “weakness in written language skills,” continued to receive an education. School officials reported that this child bragged to other teachers and students that he could not be expelled because he was in special education.

That is the signal we have sent through IDEA, through this loophole in our legislation, not the overall legislation. The overall legislation is great.

In the Cobb County school system in Atlanta, not too far from where I am, two students, who were initially expelled for bringing a handgun and ammunition clip to school, were also protected by IDEA because they were special education students. There is just too much of this special treatment.

Our simple amendment basically says, disabled or not, educational status or not, whoever you are, you need to be treated the same where such personnel “may discipline” a child the same without a disability.

Mr. HARKIN. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. FRIST. Yes.

Mr. HARKIN. Does the amendment also not seek services for these kids under paragraph (b), “ceasing to provide educational services.”

Mr. FRIST. We basically say we will treat those students with a gun or a firearm the same as nondisabled students.

The whole cessation of services we are not here to debate. Everyone will be treated the same, whether disabled or not disabled.

Mr. HARKIN. It is part of the amendment?

Mr. FRIST. That is correct, but nondisabled students also have cessation of services. The 85 percent of American students out there not classified as disabled have cessation of services.

Treat them the same.
Mr. HARKIN. One of the reasons I think the Senator will find the Parent Teachers Association, Association of Police Chiefs and other police around the country opposing this amendment is they think the worst thing we could possibly do would be to take kids who are severely emotionally or otherwise—disabled and throw them out on the streets.

Mr. FRIST. We are not saying that. We are saying treat them the same. We are not telling them they have to cease services.

I hope you have more respect for the services that will be needed and helpful. We are not saying you have to cease services. You can still provide the services. We are saying treat everybody the same.

Mr. HARKIN. The reality of the situation and the reason we have IDEA—and we hear it all the time; I hear it from my principals, too, I say to my friends from Missouri—sometimes it is tough to put up with the kids with special needs. They need a lot of attention. Sometimes they are a little rascals. Sometimes the principals throw up their hands and want to get them out of the classrooms. The teachers want them to get them out of the classrooms. They are hard to deal with. These are kids with disabilities.

Time after time, for every story either of my friends relates about principals or others who are at wit’s end because they have come up with ten other stories of parents with kids who are disabled and how those kids were mistreated in school.

The reality of the situation is—and this is only my feeling—if you take two kids, one disabled maybe with a learning disability, maybe with other problems, who has been mainstreamed in school, expel him as you do a regular student and leave it up to the principal to say, OK, you can let him back in when you want, I think that principal will have a lot of pressure on him to let one kid back in, maybe, depending on the circumstances, but that disabled kid, that kid causes a lot of problems, costs a lot of money, we will keep him out.

I am just telling Senators that has been the situation for the past 30 to 50 years in this country. That is why we have IDEA. That is why we have individualized education programs for these kids. That is the reality of the situation.

Mr. FRIST. But the Senator from Iowa understands that we are not saying keep the students out forever. We are saying if you keep the nondisabled student out for the rest of the year, you are going to have to keep the nondisabled student out for the rest of the year.

In fact, if you look at nondisabled students in terms of cessation of services, because the implication is people are so bad and mean they will cut off services, you look at the nondisabled students in Nashville, TN expelled under zero tolerance, 55 percent of those are provided services.

I guess the Senator argues that of the disabled there will be such intense discrimination against that group of people, and I understand Senator HARKIN has fought the battles here for 20 years, and I respect that tremendously. I guess I have more faith in our principals in the schools that if you treat everybody the same, that is exactly what you will do.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRIST. I yield to the Senator from Missouri and then the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ASHCROFT. What I appear to be hearing is if they are treated the same as nondisabled students, that is kind of a discrimination.

That is equity and parity in treatment. It doesn’t stack up to discrimination, in my judgment.

I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee is aware of the letter from the National School Boards Association regarding the Frist-Ashcroft amendment to S. 254.

Mr. FRIST. I have not seen that.

Mr. ASHCROFT. It is an interesting letter on behalf of the Nation’s 95,000 local school boards. This is from the executive director, Anne L. Bryant, executive director of the National School Boards Association:

The National School Boards Association urges you to support the Frist-Ashcroft amendment to S. 254 that would enhance the safety of all students from gun violence.

We are not talking about the vast number of individuals that are participants in the IDEA program. The number is vast, with 13 or 14 percent in Tennessee, and 13 or 14 percent of the students in Missouri and Iowa. These are not people who show up for school with guns very often. When some of them do, they are threatening the others.

When a person shows up with explosives or a gun at school, the objective there ought to be school safety. It ought to be to address that.

The amendment provides school officials with the discretion to suspend or expel students covered by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in the same manner as other students in cases where they bring firearms to school.

It has been stated there is a lot of opposition. This is a letter from the 95,000 members of the School Boards Association stating this is the right thing to do.

Mr. FRIST. I think we have been very careful to try to get this amendment as tight and focused as we could, talking about guns in the classroom, bombs in the classroom.

We have gone so far to put wording in the bill to say they intentionally have to bring that gun into the school or the classroom. We have done our best to get it as narrow and focused as we possibly can.

It comes down to safety. We are on the juvenile justice bill. We had these terrible 27 deaths from guns in classrooms, and this bill goes right at the heart. Again, not the disability community or individuals with disabilities.

I count myself among their greatest advocates, but I am concerned that I find the letter from the Association of Police Chiefs that something drastic, devastating, is going to happen because of this loophole where we are treating students with disabilities in special education, allowing them to return to the classroom, but not letting anybody else return to the classroom.

We are treating them differently, where people who brought a gun to the classroom can return 45 days later.

Mr. ASHCROFT. In specific inquiries to the individuals who provided the Senator with the information from the Davidson County school system, is it their view that this loophole exposes the system and the students in the system to a risk they would not otherwise be exposed to?

Mr. FRIST. I talked with the officials in the major urban areas where the concentration of people are throughout Tennessee. There is general agreement of people who are concerned that in the schools, who are responsible for the safety of our children who are there every day. They say, Senator Frist, we know you are the advocate for individuals with disabilities, but how could you create a huge loophole that puts our children at risk? That is why I am here.

Mr. HARKIN. Let me ask the Senator.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Will the Senator answer a question?

Mr. FRIST. Did the Senator from Vermont have a question?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I would like to volunteer this point.

Mr. HARKIN. Come on over. We are all friends.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I listened very carefully. I think when you get right down to the basic question, the final analysis, should the school have to afford an alternative education situation and pay for it. It is a matter of dollars and cents. It has nothing to do with the safety of the children or anything else.

Under the circumstances you are dealing with here, if a child comes in with a gun, if it is somebody without an IEP or whatever, they can be thrown out of school and they can be let back into school. That is entirely the discretion of the school officials. They can say this is an aberration or whatever.

If a child with a disability comes in, then you go through the 45 days to assess as to whether or not it was as a result of a disability. If it was not the result of a disability, then the child can be disciplined as any other child. If, on the other hand, it was the result of a disability, then they are required to provide an alternative educational situation. It may or may not cost something, but that child is not in the classroom. So no child goes back into the classroom if they are a threat to the classroom.
What it comes down to, and what the school officials object to, as I understand it, is they have to set up a special 45-day program for this child, and pay for it. The reason is not to protect the school or protect the kids; it is to make sure they do not have to provide the funds. You can keep those 45 days going forever. Then that costs money. So this is not a safety question. This is a money question. The school boards are saying they don’t want to pay for those 45 days. That is what they are saying.

Mr. FRIST. That is not what I heard. Basically, what I hear from the superintendents and the principals is the safety end of it. The expense is expensive, it has been pointed out. What I am dealing with is the safety end of it, the fact that our principals’ hands are tied because of the way the legislation is written, because of the threat of lawyers, of trial lawyers who threaten to sue the school and the school district on the basis of our bill that they basically are saying the students come back in the classroom, when the student without the disability is out for the school year.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. FRIST. I will.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I ask him if his experience has been similar to mine. I have probably gone to 30 or 40 school districts in the last 3 months, visiting school districts. I have found people are very concerned about the safety of students. My own view of it has been totally different from that suggested by the Senator from Vermont. I am saying that school safety is not the question here. I talked to one superintendent. This did not happen to be an IEP student who carried the gun to school but who threatened to kill other students in school seven times.

Of course, because of the problems in effecting discipline, they kept the student in school. Finally the student shot another student. Safety issues are involved. They are very concerned about the safety of students. I have been totally different from that suggested by the Senator from Vermont. I am saying that school safety is not the question here. I talked to one superintendent. This did not happen to be an IEP student who carried the gun to school but who threatened to kill other students in school seven times. Of course, because of the problems in effecting discipline, they kept the student in school. Finally the student shot another student. Safety issues are involved. They are very concerned about the safety of students. I have been totally different from that suggested by the Senator from Vermont. I am saying that school safety is not the question here. I talked to one superintendent. This did not happen to be an IEP student who carried the gun to school but who threatened to kill other students in school seven times. Of course, because of the problems in effecting discipline, they kept the student in school. Finally the student shot another student. Safety issues are involved. They are very concerned about the safety of students. I have been totally different from that suggested by the Senator from Vermont. I am saying that school safety is not the question here. I talked to one superintendent. This did not happen to be an IEP student who carried the gun to school but who threatened to kill other students in school seven times.

Mr. HARKIN. They have to provide services for him. They have to provide the student with individualized education, you have to provide that child with an appropriate education for children with disabilities. And we funded that. We required that. That is why we are here today.

What we are now dealing with is we do not want to provide those services. If a student has a disability and provided a threat to the school, it is perfectly clear, if it is a result of a disability, you have to provide that child with an education as the Constitution requires, because, if it was the result of a disability, he is not really responsible for it, so you have to provide it. That gets expensive.

If it was not part of the disability, then the child is just treated as any other child. That would be treated differently. If it was a manifestation, you would not have to provide the services.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Is it the Senator’s position, then, if a student is the subject of a IEP, a special education student, and brings a gun to school and it is determined that student did not bring it as a manifestation of the disability?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Right.

Mr. ASHCROFT. In your position, then, that the school can expel him with no responsibility to provide services?

Mr. JEFFORDS. That is not correct.

Mr. HARKIN. They have to provide services for him. They have to provide services.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Wait a second. Apparently, there appears to be a difference between you and the Senator from Iowa. I was just going to indicate—I am not sure how to handle it. The dismissal comes because the gun was not a manifestation, that there is no responsibility?

Mr. JEFFORDS. He is just treated like anyone else at that point as far as discipline, is my understanding.

Mr. HARKIN. If I might interject myself into this a little bit?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I respond to the Senator from Missouri that services always have to be provided. Educational, medical, mental health, those kinds of services do have to be provided. But if it is not a manifestation of a disability, of course, the kid can be expelled from school.

Mr. ASHCROFT. So the distinction is not that the law provides that there can be no services, or will not be none, your view is directly contrary to that of the Senator from Vermont, that services must be provided on a continuing basis, even if it was not a manifestation. He can be kept out of the school?

Mr. HARKIN. That is in the law.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I think it is in the law. That is why I was asking the Senator.

Mr. JEFFORDS. He may not have to return to the school.

Mr. HARKIN. If the Senator will yield?

Mr. ASHCROFT. Not providing them at the school. That is where you do get into expensive treatments, where you get to $60,000, $70,000, $80,000 a year to provide the student with individualized health-based education.

But the point is, the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, which I am very grateful for the opportunity to participate in with him, is to provide an equity in services. When you suggest that there is an equity for those who are subject to an IEP, but the violation is not a manifestation of the disability, that there is not any requirement for services, that is simply not true. The law provides those services must continue.

I think the fundamental point the Senator from Tennessee and I want to make is this. There are not very many people who are bringing guns to school. There are very few of them. And even fewer who would bring guns or pipe bombs to school are students with a disability.

But for those who do, the school officials ought not to have to go through torturous legal proceedings and laboring to determine if there are massive costs. I will not deny those are very serious costs. But let us not suggest—at least to the school districts that I dealt with—that there are no safety issues involved when people bring pipe bombs to school. Does that comport with the Senator’s experience in Tennessee?

Mr. FRIST. Yes, it does. The purpose of the amendment is just that. It goes back to having safe schools. That is what we have been debating so much over the last several days.

I will yield the floor. Other people want to go forward, but let me just close and say the purpose of this amendment is real simple. That is to get rid of a loophole which allows one group of students to be treated differently. If they both brought a gun to the school, the loophole being that a group of students are ending up back in school where one group of students is expelled. All this amendment says is, let’s treat everybody the same and let’s have those decisions made locally.

Mr. ASHCROFT. The acting President pro tempore, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I would just like to sum it up. What we are talking about are the problems we have had from the beginning of time, the problems that children with disabilities have and how we handle them. The reason we created IDEA, the reason it was passed, is that we were not allowing the children with disabilities to get any education. It went to the U.S. Supreme Court. A consensus decision by a number of courts, I should say, was reached, in which they determined that if you are going to provide a free and appropriate education to the public, you have to have an appropriate education for children with disabilities. And we funded that. We required that. That is why we are here today.

What we are now dealing with is we do not want to provide those services. If a student has a disability and provided a threat to the school, it is perfectly clear, if it is a result of a disability, you have to provide that child with an education as the Constitution requires, because, if it was the result of a disability, he is not really responsible for it, so you have to provide it. That gets expensive.

If it was not part of the disability, then the child is just treated as any other child. That would be treated differently. If it was a manifestation, you would not have to provide the services.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri that services always have to be provided. Educational, medical, mental health, those kinds of services do have to be provided. But if it is not a manifestation of a disability, of course, the kid can be expelled from school.

Mr. ASHCROFT. So the distinction is not that the law provides that there can be no services, or will not be none, your view is directly contrary to that of the Senator from Vermont, that services must be provided on a continuing basis, even if it was not a manifestation. He can be kept out of the school?

Mr. HARKIN. That is in the law.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I think it is in the law. That is why I was asking the Senator.

Mr. JEFFORDS. He may not have to return to the school.

Mr. HARKIN. If the Senator will yield?

Mr. ASHCROFT. Not providing them at the school. That is where you do get into expensive treatments, where you get to $60,000, $70,000, $80,000 a year to provide the student with individualized health-based education.

But the point is, the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, which I am very grateful for the opportunity to participate in with him, is to provide an equity in services. When you suggest that there is an equity for those who are subject to an IEP, but the violation is not a manifestation of the disability, that there is not any requirement for services, that is simply not true. The law provides those services must continue.

I think the fundamental point the Senator from Tennessee and I want to make is this. There are not very many people who are bringing guns to school. There are very few of them. And even fewer who would bring guns or pipe bombs to school are students with a disability.

But for those who do, the school officials ought not to have to go through torturous legal proceedings and laboring to determine if there are massive costs. I will not deny those are very serious costs. But let us not suggest—at least to the school districts that I dealt with—that there are no safety issues involved when people bring pipe bombs to school. Does that comport with the Senator’s experience in Tennessee?

Mr. FRIST. Yes, it does. The purpose of the amendment is just that. It goes back to having safe schools. That is what we have been debating so much over the last several days.

I will yield the floor. Other people want to go forward, but let me just
a person brings a weapon to school, the principal has the right to say: You do not belong in school and you are not going to disrupt or threaten the safety of this school environment and you are not entitled to special services, especially in cases where bringing a weapon to school had nothing to do with your disability.

I believe it ought to be the case, and this amendment provides we give school administration officials the kind of discretion they have in their own states and under the Gun-Free Schools Act we passed a couple years ago where the principal has the discretion to expel them for a year, with the discretion to allow them to reenter on his or her determination or school authorities' determination.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield?
Mr. JEFFORDS. Under these circumstances which we are talking about—expelled but not a manifestation—then a child is expelled from school entitled to educational services. That is the difference. That means an additional expense. The child who does not have a disability and is thrown out of school has to find another school, has to get a tutor or do something else. We are all talking dollars and cents. We are talking about a cost that is added by virtue of the fact that you must provide special services.

Mr. HARKIN. If the Senator will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri—
Mr. JEFFORDS. I have the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.
Mr. HARKIN. If the Senator from Vermont will yield for a question.
Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I say to the Senator from Missouri, as long as it takes to reach some parameters on this, the fact is, the principal's hands are not tied right now in getting kids out of school immediately. Will the Senator agree with that or not? No?
Mr. ASHCROFT. For expelling students.
Mr. HARKIN. Getting them out of the school immediately if they bring a gun to school.
Mr. ASHCROFT. For the first 10 days, they can get them out of school.
Mr. HARKIN. For every five days.
Mr. ASHCROFT. Then it takes additional proceedings to get to the 45-day period.

Mr. HARKIN. No, it doesn't; no, no, it doesn't; no, it doesn't.
Mr. ASHCROFT. On the 11th day, you have to start a different regime that includes providing separate services, education in another setting if you don't provide it at school.

Mr. HARKIN. But they can keep them out of school for 45 days.
Mr. ASHCROFT. They can keep them out of a regular classroom.
Mr. HARKIN. Wherever they brought the gun to school, they can keep them out of that school for 45 days. The law is pretty clear. I don't know what we are debating here.

Mr. ASHCROFT. In all deference to the Senator, the law is clear and the law provides substantial disparate or different treatment, and the treatment is designed to extend the quality of education.

Mr. HARKIN. Let's take it one step at a time. I say to my friend, I am trying to get to this one point. Are the principal's hands tied if a kid brings a gun to school—I don't care if they are disabled or not. In getting that kid immediately out of school for up to 45 days, I think the law is clear, they can do that; they don't have to show anything.

Mr. ASHCROFT. They have responsibilities when they do that that they don't have with other students.

Mr. HARKIN. Again, I am just saying—
Mr. ASHCROFT. So if you are talking about hands tied, you may not tie their hands, but you force them to busy their hands doing a whole variety of other things.

Mr. HARKIN. Again, I say to my friend—
Mr. ASHCROFT. That results in different treatment, and the treatment is designed to extend the quality of education.

Mr. HARKIN. I want to take it step by step.
Mr. ASHCROFT. Sure.
Mr. HARKIN. Step by step. The first step is getting the kid out of school because there is a clear danger. You want to get him out of there.

Mr. ASHCROFT. That is different.

Mr. HARKIN. I think then while we agree that the principal can get the kid out right away and can get him out for 45 days, our disagreement, it seems to me, is not so much on getting the kid out of the school immediately and getting the immediate danger out; it seems to me our disagreement is what happens later, what happens with those kids showing up in school far earlier than they otherwise would. It may not work that way on the floor of the Senate, but that is the way it works in school.

Mr. HARKIN. I want to take it step by step.

Mr. ASHCROFT. The second step: timeframe. For the disabled child, the law provides substantial disparate or different treatment, and the treatment extends the quality of education.

Mr. HARKIN. For the disabled child, they do have to continue to provide services.

Mr. ASHCROFT. If they don't let him back in, for that student, they have to set up some other school for him, and that could even be a school that is happen to be a full-time teacher and all the kinds of assistance the student might need.

Mr. HARKIN. It would be in an alternative setting to be determined among the parents, the hearing officer and the school.

Mr. ASHCROFT. That is different.

Mr. HARKIN. I agree with you.
Mr. ASHCROFT. Good. Good. Here we are, for the first 10 days, both can be sent out of school, but after the 10th day—

Mr. HARKIN. I think then while we agree that the principal can get the kid out right away and can get him out for 45 days, our disagreement, it seems to me, is not so much on getting the kid out of the school immediately and getting the immediate danger out; it seems to me our disagreement is what happens later, what happens with those kids later on, how are they treated and how, if at all, they are let back in the school. That seems to be our disagreement.

Mr. ASHCROFT. That is a very significant point here, and if I just take you to the schools, and the best information we have in this debate is what the Senator from Tennessee has brought us, that they are treated differentially and a significant number of them are back in schools prematurely because the schools feel like they have to let them back in at a time when, according to their testimony, they are uncomfortable about it.

Mr. HARKIN. Again, I think we can work through this. I hope. We may not always agree. I am trying to get down to the nub of the problem.
Mr. FRIST. Will the Senator—
Mr. HARKIN. And it seems to me that we do agree. I understood—
Mr. FRIST. This Senator does not agree.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.
Mr. ASHCROFT. Will the Senator from Vermont yield?
Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield further?
Mr. JEFFORDS. Let me get organized here. I yield to the Senator from Iowa. Please refer back to me and then I will recognize the others, and we will have an orderly process here.

Mr. HARKIN. The point I am trying to make is that in the initial statement from the Senator, the Senator talked about the Littleton school shooting and kids bringing guns to school and getting these dangerous kids out of school. I agree.

I just wanted to point very clearly that in terms of a child bringing a gun to school, a principal right now can deal with a kid who is disabled just as they can with a kid who is not disabled, in terms of getting that kid out of school, having the police haul them away, have them book him, have them charge him with a crime or anything else. I just wanted to make that point very clear, that they can get those kids out of that school.

Now we are going to get into the next stage of what happens with those kids. That is the only point I want to make. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FRIST. Will the Senator from Vermont yield for a short period?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Yes.

Mr. FRIST. For the last 45 minutes, we have had the Senator from Iowa talking to me or talking to the body trying to explain so everybody can understand this process that we have set up for individuals with disabilities, which is a good process overall because they are very complex issues.

We have a 10-day period where we have one set of rules which I agree that basically you do the same for an individual with a disability and nondisability. Then you have a 45-day period, which, as the chart that we saw earlier shows, in terms of a manifestation process, is confusing and is a difficult process. It is an evolving process and one that has changed over time so that we can better consider individuals with their disabilities and what their special needs are.

Our point, and I know the Senator from Iowa keeps shifting away from it, but I am going to keep coming back to it, because the amendment is so simple. Our point is to close a loophole that if a disabled student brings a gun or a bomb in the classroom, they end up back in this classroom. If you do not have a disability you are not in the classroom loophole.

The point I want to make is, we can march through the whole 10-day period, 45-day period, another 45-day period of threatening and all that. That is the whole point, that we have barrier after barrier after barrier for a group of people who brought a gun into the classroom, with our children around, and they brought a gun there. We have all these barriers set up for one group of students, but for the other group of students they are out for that year. We say, that is not the same. That is all the amendment does.

Mr. JEFFORDS. That is, unfortunately, not the way the courts have ruled as to how a State has to handle those situations. Students with disabilities are entitled to an IEP. They are entitled to special education and related services. They can be denied going back into the classroom if they are in any way a threat to that classroom, the other students, the teachers. That is not going to change. And this law will not change.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Yes.

Mr. ASHCROFT. On what basis does the court say they are entitled to an IEP?

Mr. JEFFORDS. That goes back to the 14th amendment.

Mr. ASHCROFT. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, isn’t it?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Based on constitutional decisions that were levied back in the late 1960s and 1970s, which determined that we have an equal opportunity to children with disabilities. Part of that equal opportunity is appropriate education, which takes into consideration the nature of the disability.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield to me to elaborate a little further?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Yes.

Mr. HARKIN. I say to my friend from Missouri that prior to the two 1972 cases, the PARC case and the Mills case, it was determined by the courts and by others, that there were millions of kids in our country who were denied an education simply because of their disability.

In both the PARC case—that is the Pennsylvania Association of Retarded Children—and the Mills case here in the District, the courts said, basically, look, if a State provides a free public education to its children—now, a State does not have to, States do not have to provide a free public education; there is no constitutional mandate for that, by the way. But the court said, if a State provides a free public education, under the 14th amendment to the Constitution it cannot deny a free public education, just as it cannot deny it to a child who is black, because of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, it cannot deny a free public education to a child with a disability; and, furthermore, the court said, because of the disability, the education must not only be free but be appropriate.

So I say to my friend—and I will just go through this a little bit longer—the States, then, were faced with a constitutional mandate that they had to provide a free appropriate public education to kids with disabilities.

The States were panic-stricken. How were they ever going to afford to do this? They came to Congress. Congress said: OK. We will set up a law. We called it the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, passed in 1975. Both the Senator from Vermont and I were in the House at the time. We set up a law, and we said: OK. We want to have some national standards. We do not want to have 50 different standards. We want to set up national standards for providing services to kids with disabilities. We do not want 50 different things out there.

So we set up IDEA. We said our objective was to provide 40 percent of the funding. By the way, we haven’t, and we ought to.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Glad to have your support on that, Senator.

Mr. HARKIN. I always have. We ought to fully fund IDEA. But I just want to walk through this.

So we set up IDEA, and we said, if you, State of Missouri, would like to have the money we can provide, then you have to adhere to IDEA. No State, including the State of Missouri, has to abide by any of the provisions in IDEA if they do not want to accept any of the money.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I just wanted to point out, the Senator was questioning about whether or not this was a constitutional mandate. It is a constitutional mandate on the States that they have to provide a free and appropriate public education. IDEA says to the States: We will help you with money. Here are the rules of the game.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I have been traveling in my State and talking with educators. I have never had any issue that is of more concern to them than the problem of enforcing discipline caused by the IDEA Act. What we are doing in our schools today is not required by the Constitution. And sooner or later the people are going to rise up and put an end to it.

Let me just share this thought with you. Taking a gun to school by a youngster is a Federal crime. What if they are put in jail, do they have to be sent back to the school? That is just the point.

Let me read this letter I received just a few weeks ago from Alabama’s most experienced attorneys general:

He has been a leader in the State Attorney General Association.

Dear Jeff:

I am writing you this letter concerning my general outrage over the laws of the Federal Government and how they are being administered in relation to school violence. I had already been having meetings with our Superintendent of Education concerning new rules and interpretations of rules based on what I believe to be the Federal Disabilities Act.

The general thrust of the matter is that violent children are being kept in school because of the Federal Rules relative to disabilities. I can point to at least seven to nine occasions in Baldwin County—

His county—

in which I believe expulsion was called for, but could not be accomplished because of the interpretation of the Disabilities Act.

I realize that mental disorders can be a disability, but the primary concern should be
the safety of the children who are not causing any difficulties.

Our schools simply do not have sufficient resources for one on one education and I would ask that other members of Alabama's delegation would review this problem which I believe to be epidemic throughout this Country.

Here is an article in the Mobile Press Register about a 14-year-old student classified as "EC" emotionally conflicted. He had to be assigned an aide to go to school, to go to class with him. One aide to this one student because of his problems, an aide assigned to him school hours and during bus rides to and from school. The student was accused of assaulting his aide while the aide tried to stop him from trying to wreck the schoolbus.

These are the kinds of things that have happened all over America. This bill does not go far enough, in my opinion. It only says, if you bring a deadly weapon to school, and in violation of Federal law, you have to be treated like everybody else, and you do not get special protections because you are emotionally conflicted.

In fact, emotionally conflicted kids may often be the most dangerous ones, the ones most likely to come back in, say, 6 months from now and kill some innocent child in a classroom or shoot their teacher. This is a good step forward. I would like to, if I could, be listed as a cosponsor of the legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership on so many matters of education. I just wanted to share those remarks.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I appreciate the remarks.

I, again, point out, if the child is violent and it is not a manifestation of their disability, they can be treated like anyone else as far as removal from school. If it is a manifestation, then special rules apply. Those special rules may well determine that they not be in the general education classroom. That process may require maybe an aide to be assigned to them. That is the way the law works.

Many, many students who have disabilities have special aides assigned to them. We cannot let these kinds of very difficult incidents of violence throw out the whole law. We have to examine exactly how you handle students with disabilities, and situations where the disability results in school violence. I believe that when they can be removed from the classroom; they can be removed from the school.

But they must to be provided an appropriate education under the law.

Mr. SESSIONS. If a child is emotionally conflicted and brought a gun to school on one occasion, why do we think he might not do that on another occasion, even some months later? It is a safety question for the school.

This is a modest step in the sense that it doesn't say you can do anything if he beats up another student; it just says that if he brings a deadly weapon to the school, he can be treated like any other student and be removed. I think that is a good step and support the amendment.

Mr. JEFFORDS. They can be removed either way. It is just a question where they end up—whether they end up going outside of the school and joining the discipline cases, which has been suggested, or whether they get a special educational situation outside of the classroom, outside of the school. Those are the kinds of problems we must address whether or not they have a disability.

Mr. JEFFORDS. All I would say is the district attorney, David Whetstone, is a reasonable man. He is very concerned. I am hearing repeatedly from school superintendents and principals that no matter what we say about, in theory, how this law works, in practicality, it is endangering the lives of students, disrupting classrooms, causing teachers to quit, and costing untold amounts of money. In fact, the superintendent from Vermont did testify that 20 to 30 percent of the budget goes to special education students. Somehow we have gotten out of sync here. We need to move back to a more modest ground, I say.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I say if the Congress achieves the goal it is trying to do, particularly what the Republicans are trying to do, fully fund IDEA, then many of those concerns would go away. But we are far, far from providing the State and local governments the money we told them we would.

Mr. SESSIONS. You have been a champion of that, but even then our goal is to do 40 percent, not 100 percent.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I was referring to about 100 percent of the 40 percent.

Mr. SESSIONS. We haven't even honored our commitment to do 40 percent. But even then, 60 percent of it would be carried by the local school system.

Mr. JEFFORDS. You are accurate.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I wanted to respond to my friend from Alabama.

It seems to me the argument is, it costs too much money to take care of kids with disabilities. I remind my friend from Alabama, that Supreme Court right across the street, less than 2 months ago, had a case from Iowa, Garrett v. State. Here was a kid who was on a breathing device in school every day, had to have a nurse with him every day because they had to clean the phlegm out of his throat and his lungs. He was on a breathing device, severely disabled. His mind was fine, mind was great—the kid knew what was going on, a good student.

The school didn't like it because it was costing them a lot of money—I say to my friend from Alabama—so they took the case to the Supreme Court. That Supreme Court over there, in a 5-2 decision, including some of the most conservative Members of that Court, said that under the Constitution of the United States they had to provide that opportunity. We can argue about how we provide it, but, please, don't tell me that somehow, because these kids cost a lot of money, we have to give them less in their lives than kids who are not disabled.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I am glad to yield to one of you, and then I am yielding myself off the floor. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I want to bring the attention of the Senate to what I believe to be the law in this situation, that absent specification in the IDEA law itself, the extension of continuing services is not required according to, I think, the best on-point legal decisions in cases where a person would otherwise have forfeited his right to school because of the disciplinary problem.

The case of Virginia Department of Education v. Riley, from the Fourth Circuit, found that the plain language of IDEA did not condition the receipt of IDEA funds on the continued provision of educational services to expelled children with disabilities and that in order for Congress to place conditions on the State's receipt of funds, Congress must do so clearly and unambiguously. Therefore, that is one of the reasons the law was changed following that.

Mr. HARKIN. What was the date of that case?

Mr. ASHCROFT. That is prior to the change in the law, I say to the Senator from Iowa. I am explaining, that is one of the reasons the law was changed. I think you changed the law, and the source of the mandate that services be provided, according to that case and according to the response of the Congress, was the change of the law.

So the Constitution does not provide a mandate that people have to be given continuing services forever in disciplinary cases, which has been suggested.

The point is, the Constitution hasn't been so construed, I don't believe. I think what the law has basically said is that that comes from what we did in the amendment of the law a year or two ago. Was that in 1997? Given that, if the source of that responsibility is the law, it becomes clear to me that we can change the law and alter the responsibility. We have not, I think this has been both entertaining and somewhat instructive.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I want to say to my friend from Missouri—

Mr. JEFFORDS. I want to let the Senator from Missouri finish so I can depart.

Mr. ASHCROFT. How nice.

Mr. HARKIN. I want to tell him he is right.

Mr. ASHCROFT. If the Senator wants to tell me I am right, first of all, I need relevant moments here to catch me when I fall over. But I am delighted.

Mr. HARKIN. I wanted to say that the Senator was right and I misspoke...
myself. That Court across the street said the law was clear, that they had to do it. It was not the Constitution.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I want to get back to the fundamental point, and there are about three of them. I will try to make this as quickly as I can, that the law does provide for differential treatment. If it didn’t provide for differential treatment, we wouldn’t have the law. As a matter of fact, part of it was in response to this Fourth Circuit opinion, and the Congress acted. In so providing, it created a big loophole for guns and firearms to school in the school.

We basically provided a basis for differential treatment for people who are the subject of IEPs, these special education students, who might be—I forget what the Senator from Alabama said—emotionally distressed, or troubled, or severely emotionally distressed. They might be able to come to school and have different treatment if they carry a gun to school than if someone else does.

The simple fact is that the Senator from Tennessee and I believe we ought to give authority to school principals to deal with such cases as forthrightly as they do with other cases. This is in light of the fact that when you get out, not in the Chamber of the Senate, not in the theory of the bureaucracy, but when you get out into local schools, the law operates to constrain those school officials to have students come back to school who have carried guns to school and pipe bombs to school. They have carried them in, and it is not in the best interest, according to school officials, to have the students back in, but they are back in.

We simply want to liberate school principals and school officials to say to people who bring guns and pipe bombs, firearms, to school, you can’t do that, you are out until we say you can come back, in the same way we say that under the Gun-Free Schools Act, which is now the Gun-Free Schools Act, which students are entitled to go to school in a place that is not full of guns and firearms.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for providing me this opportunity to make that simple statement, that we want to provide parity for students: No matter who you are, when you bring firearms and guns to school, we want the principal to be able to send you home.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I think that narrows it down to all that I am saying which is, yes, they do that, but they have to provide an alternative educational circumstance, which is something different than other people without disabilities may not have been entitled to. With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Vermont?

The Acting President pro tempore. The Senator has just yielded the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator from Vermont thanks the Senator from Vermont. The Senator from Vermont will now take the floor.

The Acting President pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, there has been an amicus brief here by the Senators from Missouri, Iowa, Vermont, Tennessee, and others who have spoken about this. I know these are extremely important amendments, especially to the primary sponsors, and the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Missouri, and the other.

My perspective is that as ranking member and floor manager on this side of the bill, I look at a whole lot of amendments. At one time, we had a couple hundred amendments. We whittled those down. Dozens of Senators on both sides of the aisle have agreed to withhold their amendments. I spent the weekend talking with Senators, asking them to withhold their amendments. And they did. Others were willing to bring their amendment, a managers’ package, something I am still waiting to hear back on from the other side. I assume we will get that. Many Senators on both sides will see the bulk of their amendments in the managers’ package. But at some point we have to go on.

I suggest, for whatever it is worth, whatever is done, whatever is passed, whether it is the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, or whether it is the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, this issue will be in conference. The Senator from Utah and the Senator from Vermont, as the two main conferees, will have to try to work out yet another overall compromise. We have had debate for almost 2 hours. We are beyond reasonable to ask that the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Iowa simply allow the Senate to accept both amendments by a voice vote. They will be in the bill. The practical effect of that, I might say, will not be practiced, a voice vote to be had on the floor because we still have an issue that will be resolved ultimately in conference. The one difference will be that we have had a debate that extended for almost 2 hours. The debate will then be completed and we could go on to other issues.

I would like to see us finish this bill tonight. I am not proponenting this as a unanimous consent request, but I am suggesting it to the Senators. The Senator from Utah is not on the floor, and I don’t wish to speak for him, but the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Vermont would find that agreeable.

Mr. FRIST. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEAHY. Yes.

Mr. FRIST. When the Senator says accept the two amendments by voice vote, does he mean the Harkin proposal and ours?

Mr. LEAHY. Yes, to accept them both. My reason for doing that is—

Mr. FRIST. That would be unacceptable. We spent a lot of time talking about the fundamentals. We have spent a lot of time debating this. We will object to that.

Mr. LEAHY. I am not doing this as a unanimous consent request. It is just an idea. The Senators have an absolute right, on both sides, to ask for a vote on every amendment. My amendment is going forward, especially even if we have votes on them, the practical results will be much the same because we are still going to have to revisit it in the committee of conference.

We can finish this bill tonight. I just throw it out for what it is worth. I have been here 25 years and I know the Senator has a right to get a vote on his amendment. I am just trying to get to the practical result, which will, in the end, still be the same.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator COLLINS as a cosponsor, along with Senator Sessions, if he has not already been added, to the Frist-Ashcroft amendment.

The Acting President pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, there is no need for this amendment. IDEA already contains provisions to ensure that schools are able to remove truly dangerous children from the classroom. But it also ensures that these children receive the services they need—not only educational services, but counseling, behavior modification, and other related services—so that their bad behavior will hopefully not happen again. This makes more sense than simply sending kids out of the streets, which is exactly what the Frist-Ashcroft amendment proposes to do.

The worst example of what happens when students are sent home without necessary services happened last year in Springfield, Oregon. When Kip Kinkel brought a weapon to school, he was immediately suspended. He went home with his gun, killed his parents, then returned to school and started firing.

The greatest protection a school can provide to its students and community is to be aware of the warning signs of danger and provide the services that can prevent the student from using violence.

Why would we want to strip those very protections from our schools and communities by amending IDEA to end all services to students with disabilities? In fact, why don’t we have these protections in place regarding all children, not just those children served under IDEA?

Although several of our colleagues here today have pointed to all sorts of horror stories allegedly involving IDEA students, I would urge my colleagues to get the facts straight.

1) For the vast majority of children with disabilities, most discipline problems can be handled by implementing their individualized educational plan, which now includes behavior management strategies.

2) IDEA currently allows a school to suspend a child for up to 10 days per incident.
Moreover, IDEA allows a school to discipline a child with a disability just like it would discipline any other child, so long as that child’s behavior is not a manifestation of his or her disability. Mr. President, IDEA took three long years to reauthorize, and was the product of bipartisan negotiations involving both chambers of Congress and the Administration, with extensive public input.

The IDEA regulations have just been issued, and they particularly strengthen the area of disciplinary procedures.

In many places, schools are only starting to learn the tools that are available to them under current law in cases where disciplinary actions that could be prevented with early intervention.

In fact, GAO is currently doing a study as to whether schools have enough flexibility to discipline children with disabilities.

In this letter I received dated April 29, they stated that work on this study should take two reasons:

1. Nationwide data on school discipline for special education students is not currently available, but is being collected this year.”

2. Recommendations have only recently been published, allowing insufficient time for their results to be felt and measured.

I ask that the text of this letter be printed in the Record following my remarks.

Mr. President, at this point I believe it is not necessary and in fact it would be unconscionable and premature to amend IDEA and risk compromising the implementation of this landmark legislation.

Special education students should not be the scapegoats here. And let me state again, not one of the children involved in the tragedies that we have witnessed over the past two years was a special ed. student. We need to focus this legislation on strengthening all schools for all of our children, and stop blaming IDEA.

Mr. President, I want to join with the sheriffs, district attorneys, leaders of police organizations, violence prevention scholars, and school psychologists and counselors, in urging all my colleagues to vote against the Frist-Ashcroft amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I intend to vote in favor of the pending amendment offered by my colleague, Senator ASHCROFT, to enhance school safety. This bill is based in large part on the work of the Republican Juvenile Crime Task Force, on which I served. I am pleased to see that the amendment includes three provisions I proposed to the Task Force to help make our children’s schools safer.

The first provision authorizes the use of funds to train for school personnel, including custodians and bus drivers. These key people on and near school grounds can be helpful in finding suspicious objects, pipe bombs, or other means of harm if they had the proper training. These personnel can be utilized for identifying potential threats, crisis preparedness, and emergency response. I intend to build on this work in the FY 2000 Treasury appropriations bill by supporting the role of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms in training school personnel in the detection of weapons and explosives.

Mr. President, the second provision authorizes the use of funds for the purchase of school security equipment and technologies, such as metal detectors, electronic locks, and surveillance equipment. This provision is S. 296, the “Students Learning in Safe Schools Act of 1999” which I introduced on May 11, 1999.

The third provision would invest more resources in School Resource Officers, including community policing officers. This important initiative expands the Cops in Schools program which I was pleased to author as S. 2235 in the 106th Congress. This bill was enacted into law in 1998 and this Spring the Justice Department is making $60 million available for this program in this year alone. School Resource Officers work with children, parents, teachers and principals to identify dangers and potentially dangerous kids before violence erupts and innocent children get hurt. The amendment includes many other important provisions to enhance school safety. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this amendment.

I thank the Senator and yield the floor.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, let me briefly comment on what I think is most appropriate. We have spent a couple of hours discussing Amendment 1 to the Ashcroft amendment. It is a pretty clear and pretty straightforward amendment. We have debated some very useful aspects. I would like a vote on this amendment, because I think it will improve safety in our schools. It closes this loophole. I feel very strongly about not postponing it until later, or deferring it, or handling it in conference. I would like to see an up-or-down vote on it and move on after that.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered. Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, we have had a pretty good debate, and it has been said that it has taken 2 hours. That doesn’t bother me. I have spent years on this bill. I spent years on it. I spent my entire lifetime with a disabled brother. Do you think 2 hours means anything to me? It doesn’t mean anything to me. We spent 3 years on this bill—3 years—bringing IDEA up to date. Do you think 2 hours bothers me? Not a bit.

I am going to say something to my friend from Tennessee. He is a good man; he has a good heart. I am going to read back to my friend from Tennessee his words spoken on the floor May 14, 1997. The issue then was a Gorton amendment, which would basically have turned back to the local school districts the right to basically discipline kids with disabilities. I want to read back to my friend from Tennessee what he said then:

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise to speak in strong opposition as well to this amendment before the Senate, put forth by the Senator from Washington, an amendment which would instruct agencies to set out their own policy—a potentially very different policy—in disciplining students with disabilities. In short, under his amendment, each school district potentially would have its own distinct policy in disciplining disabled children. And with 16,000 school districts, the potential for conflicting policies is very real. And I am afraid this would be a turn-back to the pre-1975 era before IDEA. Is this a double standard? I say no. Clearly, we have outlined a process in IDEA. If there is a manifestation of a disability, would go down this process. And if a discipline problem was not a manifestation of a disability, that student would be treated just like everyone else.

I am continuing to quote from the statement of the Senator from Tennessee on May 14, 1997:

I think this is fair, this is equitable. Remember, if behavior is not a result of that disability, all students are treated the same in this bill. If behavior is secondary to a disability, there is a very clear process which is outlined in detail. Yes, it does take several pages to outline that, but it sets up a balance between the school, between school boards, between parents, and between children.

Senator GORTON claims this amendment is about local control, and I feel that it will be used. I am afraid, to turn back the hands of the clock to the pre-1975 conditions where we know that children with disabilities were excluded from the opportunity to receive a free and appropriate public education.

I say to my friend in Tennessee that he was right then. Mr. President, he was right then. Now we are caught up with the issue of guns and bombs.

Mr. FRIST. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. The Senator was always kind enough to yield to me. I would certainly respond with the same kind of favor in response to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. Does the Senator from Iowa believe there should be two standards, if one child with a disability walks into a school with a gun and a child without a disability walks in with a gun, if there is a zero tolerance policy for the States, the individual who walks in with the gun should be handled the same as the classroom within 45 days when the person without a disability is totally disabled?

Mr. HARKIN. I say to my friend from Tennessee, I use his own words. He said this is a “double standard.” I say no.

Mr. FRIST. Let me also say that in this bill, if you look on page 3, lines 1 through 8, in terms of intentional or not intentional, in terms of whether or not someone brings a gun or a fire arm.

Mr. HARKIN. Where is the Senator reading from?

Mr. FRIST. In terms of “intent.” We have narrowed this bill so specifically
in terms of an individual bringing a gun or a firearm with intent into the classroom that they should all be treated the same. I think it is important that this amendment is all about is equal treatment, fair treatment, a fair process. Whether or not you have a disability, whatever your educational status is, that you are treated the same, if you bring a firearm into the classroom or you bring a firearm onto the campus.

Mr. HARKIN. Is the Senator talking about subsection (a)(2) on page 3?

Mr. FRIST. Yes.

Mr. HARKIN. I read that. It says, "Nothing in clause (I)(1) shall be construed to prevent a child with a disability who is disciplined pursuant to the authority provided under clause 1—that is, expulsion—from asserting a defense that the carrying or possession of the gun or firearm was unintentional or innocent."

I ask the Senator, to whom does that child belong, theDefender?

Mr. FRIST. To whom?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes.

Mr. FRIST. To the people he jeopardizes to that classroom a gun. Is it intentional or not intentional when you come in? It should not matter other than it is intentional. He needs to be treated the same as everyone else. If you are placed out of the classroom, if you do not have a disability, you ought to be placed out of the classroom for that same period of time whether you have a disability. All children should be treated the same.

Mr. HARKIN. We have already been through that. I don't know if we need to go over it again. We have already decided that if a kid brings a gun to school, the principal can take that kid out of that school immediately, can call the police and have the police come and haul them away.

Does the Senator disagree with that?

Mr. FRIST. That is the not the issue. It is when you go back into the classroom. I pointed out again and again the statistics of individuals with disabilities, because of this special loophole, who end up within 45 days back in the classroom bringing a gun the first time, the second time, and ending up back in the classroom. If you do not have a disability, you cannot end up in the classroom. Let's treat everyone the same if they bring a gun or if they bring a bomb into the classroom. That is what the amendment is about.

Mr. HARKIN. The Senator says a kid can assert a defense that the carrying or possession was unintentional. I ask, to whom? It doesn't spill it out here. They can assert a defense. But assert it to whom? The principal?

Mr. FRIST. Yes. To the local authority, to the principal, to the teacher. That is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. He can assert that defense?

Mr. FRIST. That is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. That it was unintentional. And what kind of process is set up which would ensure that there would be a fair and impartial hearing on that?

Mr. FRIST. The same process that applies to every other student, the other 85 percent of the students in the classroom. That is the whole point. Let's treat everyone the same. If they come into a classroom with a gun or a bomb, or firearm, they treat them the same. The local authorities do. The principal does. The teachers do. That is the whole point. Let's treat them the same. It is what equity is all about when we are talking about guns in the classroom and bombs in the classroom. You treat them the same. They don't end up back in the classroom. That is the fundamental essence of what this amendment is all about. You treat them the same.

Mr. HARKIN. If I might remind the Senator that he started off talking about the Littleton incident. I am going to get into this because I think it is important. I ask the Senator—I will start with a statement. I hope it is not disputable that in the last 39 months there have been eight school shootings in which kids have died. How many of those involved a child with a disability?

Mr. FRIST. I have not seen those statistics. I would be happy to take a look at them.

Mr. HARKIN. I will say it and open it up to any repudiation. There have been eight school shootings in 39 months. Not one of those involved a kid with a disability—not one. Yet we have an amendment going after kids with disabilities. Yet not one involved a kid with a disability. In fact, I will point out that four of the kids killed at Littleton were kids with disabilities.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. Of course, I yield.

Mr. FRIST. How many people have to die or be murdered before the Senator from Iowa is willing to close this loophole? Do you want to wait? Is that the point of using statistics? Wait until people are murdered? We know people with disabilities who bring a firearm or a bomb to school are ending up back in school when students without disabilities can't wait to until statistics show people are murdered?

Mr. HARKIN. No. That is why we changed IDEA 2 years ago. I say to my friend, to provide that whoever brings a gun or weapon to school can be immediately removed by the police and taken down to the police station. That is why we did that.

Mr. FRIST. That gets them out for 10 days?

Mr. HARKIN. No. Mr. FRIST. Then what?

Mr. HARKIN. During that 45 days, I say to my friend, during the 45 days—he should know this; I am sure he does—during the 45 days there is an Individualized Education Program, an IEP, developed during that 45 days. That IEP will address behavior modification, the services, and intervention to make sure the behavior does not occur again. This IEP protects not just the child but protects the school. The only way a school needs to let a kid back in is if that kid is meeting the objectives in the IEP and the school wants them back in. That is the process.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRIST. Sure. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. FRIST. There were eight students in Tennessee a year and a half ago brought firearms in the school. We have gone through this. I know. Two had no disability and were expelled. They are out. Six of the eight were disabled students, individuals with disabilities, and were in special education. For three of those who brought the gun to the classroom, it was related to a manifestation of their disability. It has to be that the individuals with disabilities have individual needs that have to be addressed. They should be addressed. Constitutionally, they should be addressed. Ethically, they should be addressed.

When it comes to a firearm, or a when it comes to a bomb, after those 45 days, three of those eight students in Tennessee who brought a bomb to the classroom, or a gun, or firearm, firearm, deadly weapon, ended up back in school through this loophole. When none of the other students without a disability had that loophole. They entered back into the school.

When you keep saying get them out for 10 days, in truth, whether it is 35 or 45 days, they are back in the classroom and treated in a different way. I say treat them the same.

Mr. HARKIN. Again, I ask my friend from Tennessee, was that under the old law or the new law?

Mr. FRIST. Those eight, may have been under the old law, I am not sure. I gave other statistics with the nine students from this year. I will have to check on that.

I don't want to stress the statistics too much. I keep using them because I have a great fear something bad will happen as a result of the law we created.

I can say on the 45-day period which we have talked about and worked on writing together, if a person is a threat during that 45 days, and your team says you are a threat, the Senator is exactly right, they can be kept out another 45 days. After that 45 days, what? I guess it can keep going on. We have great faith in that.

As someone who has, as the Senator, seen a lot of individuals with disabilities, if somebody brings a gun into the classroom and they are expelled like everybody else for 10 days and go through a manifestation period, I don't know exactly how to know whether that individual is threatening. We have to go through all the disabilities. That will be a tough diagnosis to make in terms of saying, no, you are too threatening. A lot when parents are there who are saying go back; teachers, lawyers, who say he hasn't done anything over the last 15 or 20 days, maybe we should let him go back.
Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I say to my friend from Tennessee that the example he keeps using in Tennessee did occur under the old law, not the new law. I hope we can forget about using that example.

Under the new law we passed, we do provide that 45 days can be extended indefinitely if the school officials feel that child is a threat either to himself or herself or to the school.

Again, I just hope that example is not used because it confuses people. We shouldn't be confusing people when the new law is different than the old law. I take a back seat to no one when it comes to the issue of safety in schools. I just put two daughters through public schools all their lives. One just graduated from college; my second daughter is a senior in public high school—student body president, too, I might add. Why not brag? If you can't brag about your kids, what can you brag about?

Both my wife and I have always been concerned about safety at school. We have talked a lot about it with our daughter, Jenny, so I don't take a back seat to anyone in terms of safety. There are few things as critical to any parent as making sure the kids are safe when they go out the door in the morning and when they come home in the afternoon.

I think the recent tragedies in Colorado are the culmination, the end result, of eight school shootings in 39 months—Oregon, Kentucky, Mississippi. In each case, to my friend from Tennessee, the kid in Oregon was expelled, went home, got a gun and came back and shot kids. I don't know if expulsion helped in that case.

If you want to base this on the fact that expulsion will make the kids safer in school, I say look what happened in Oregon. It didn't seem to work there.

I do believe that what has happened during these 39 months and what happened in Littleton is, indeed, a call to action to our families, to our churches, schools and communities.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I am just getting on a roll.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield to his friend on the other side?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. HATCH. I have to ask the Senator, this debate has gone on for quite a while. It has been one of the better debates I have seen or listened to, on both sides.

It is clear we have a difference of opinion. It is clear both sides think they have a legitimate case to make. I know the distinguished Senator is one of the champions for persons with disabilities, as am I. We have worked closely together through the years. I understand the difficulties that are involved here. I understand his sincerity.

I also want to acknowledge the leadership of the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Tennessee. They are decent people. They are good men. The Senator from Tennessee is a major force on the Labor Committee, as is the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

We are in the middle of a bill that really needs to be passed now. This is our seventh day on this bill. It is not a full-blown crime bill that took a tremendous amount of time. This is a limited, narrow bill with a lot of provisions that will make a difference with regard to children in our society. I would like to bring it to conclusion.

I guess I am asking my friend from Iowa, can we get an idea of how much time you will talk to me? Will you talk to me? Am I putting people on my side to try and shorten our time so we can proceed with the rest of the amendments on this bill and hopefully lock in the final time agreement on all the remaining amendments and try to get everyone in the Senate will know what we are doing. I just want to ask my colleague if he will cooperate with me and set a time agreement so we can move this bill ahead, rather than have this stay in the logjam.

It is a sincere set of differences. It seems to me the way to resolve those differences is time honored. We go to a vote on this amendment and then I ask unanimous consent that the next amendment be the Senator's amendment which rebuts this amendment. So we go to a vote on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa and let the chips fall where they may.

I don't see any reason to delay this bill. It is time for us to make that offer. I will see that the Senator gets an amendment immediately following.

If you win, you win; if you lose on this one, you lose.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, while the Senator is thinking over his offer, and he will yield without losing his right to the floor, during the few moments when the Senator from Utah was otherwise engaged on the Senate floor and I discussed this with him, I made a suggestion that I think would be appropriate in this context. It would be the Senator from Missouri and the amendment that the Senator from Missouri wants a vote on their amendment. It is a legitimate way to resolve an issue. I don't know which way the votes will go on either issue and I take a great interest in this as well. But there will be a conference and we will probably resolve these issues in the best interests of all.

My position is we have had a lengthy debate. I have deliberately stayed off the floor because I wanted Senators to have a free and open debate on this. But it seems to me we have had the debate. Basically, both sides have really explained their positions. Everyone knows what they are.

My suggestion is we go to a vote on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Missouri, up or down, and then if they lose, they lose. Then I will ask unanimous consent, whether they win or lose, that the Senator be entitled to immediately bring up his amendment which would undo everything they are doing and we go up or down on a vote there. And we even could have an additional period of time to do it. We could hear one last explanation on the differences between the two sides.

What I want to avoid is a filibuster. I want to avoid the Senator feeling he has to now delay this whole bill because he feels deeply about this issue. I feel deeply about it, too. I think these Senators on this side feel deeply about it. You feel deeply about it. Frankly, there is still a conference where we can work with both sides to see if we can resolve this as we go to conference. But I would like to see this bill move forward, because it is an important bill and every day we delay—we all know once we get it through the Senate, the
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bill has to come through the House. Then we have to go through conference. Then we have to send it down to the President. If he signs it, then it becomes law.

We are talking weeks or months before the House, if we say that the Senate is not passed that might prevent more Columbine High School massacres. But we have to get this done.

We also have a supplemental appropriations bill that has to be brought up, important. It is not fair to hold this bill hostage—either side—now. It is not fair to hold this bill hostage because of a dispute that literally is a legitimate dispute on both sides that can be resolved by voting. Let the chips fall where they may. I have had to do that. I have had to eat a lot of stuff here on the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. As have I.

Mr. HATCH. As has the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

As floor managers, we are trying to bring people together. I say to the distinguished Senator from Iowa, I believe he has faith that I will always try to do what is right for persons with disabilities. I will use my optimum good efforts to try to make sure this matter is resolved in the manner that is credible and acceptable to both sides—or at least as acceptable as can be to both sides. But I would like to set a time limit for further debate, which I hope will not be very long because you have been debating for hours. I think virtually everything has been said that needs to be said. Then let’s just go to those votes.

The Senator is not on a list right now, to come up. I do not believe, after this amendment. But I will get you on the list. I will ask unanimous consent you be given that privilege. I think it is fair. I think it is a way of resolving this. I don’t want to see a filibuster here at the last minute on a bill of this importance. When this could be resolved through voting and when I am giving the Senator a shot at his amendment, which basically rebuts theirs, immediately following it. I think that is fair. It is a reasonable way of doing it.

You are dealing with two managers who have done their utmost to bend over backwards for everybody on the floor. I have even bent over backwards for the Senator from Minnesota, time after time—I finally got a smile out of him. It is the only time he smiled all day.

But I would like to see my friend from Iowa do that. If he would, I would personally appreciate it. I would like to get this bill done, at least pushed forward as far as we can. I believe we can finish this bill tonight if we have time today. We have had 7 days on this bill. I would hate to go on 8 days, but I would even do that if we have time agreements on all these amendments, time agreements on when we vote, and let the chips fall where they may and let’s go at it.

I intend to call up an amendment as soon as these two are disposed of, if that is what we do, and we will move ahead on the other amendments and we will try to shorten the time on all the amendments. I am asking the distinguished Senator from Iowa to shorten the time, agree to a time agreement, and I will certainly live up to asking unanimous consent on getting his amendment immediately following the amendment of the distinguished Senators from Tennessee and Missouri.

Will the Senator please help me in that regard—help us, Senator LEAHY and me?

Mr. HARKIN. I will respond to my friend from Utah, and he is my friend and someone I like a lot, and respect a lot.

Mr. HATCH. And vice versa.

Mr. HARKIN. He has made a very impassioned plea here, and I know he feels strongly about the bill.

But I just have to respond this way. This bill may be cited as the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability Act of 1999, and the LEAHY amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Right. That is if we ever get it passed.

Mr. HARKIN. Kids with disabilities haven’t been shooting anybody. I mean, let’s be honest about it. The reason this bill is on this floor is because of what happened in Littleton, CO. The Senator from Tennessee, when he first started out—

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield on that point, just on that point? I am sorry to interrupt him, but this bill has been in the works for 2 solid years. We have worked with our colleagues on the other side repeatedly. I think the distinguished Senator from Vermont and I are together on the managers’ package. It is very comprehensive. This is not some quick thing. We have worked very hard on it. Littleton—yes—

Mr. HARKIN. But what precipitated bringing it to the floor?

Mr. HATCH. I would have brought it to the floor before Littleton, but we didn’t have the time to do it. But it certainly helped.

Mr. HARKIN. Everyone hears talk about school shootings and school violence. As I have pointed out, as I said to my friend from Utah, there have been eight school shootings in 39 months and 27 have been killed. Not one of those involved a kid with a disability. Not one. Two years? We spent 3 long years, and I spent years before Act of IDEA in 1997. We spent 3 years hammering out an agreement because there was this clash between the school boards and the principals and the teachers and the parents of kids with disabilities—3 years we sat in room here.

Mr. HATCH. And I am a strong supporter.

Mr. HARKIN. We finally got it resolved. I can remember as though it was yesterday when we went to the Mansfield Room. It was Newt Gingrich, Hubert Humphrey, the two Demo- crats and Republicans and the disability community and representatives of the principals and the school boards.

We sat in that room right there, that Mansfield Room, and we all said hallelujah, we all agree. We didn’t all get what we wanted. Parents had to give up something. Principals gave up something. But we got a bill we all agreed we were going to live with and work with.

We agreed in that room that we were not going to go back and make changes on this bill. We were going to give it a chance to work. These are the changes we made.

I talked again to my friend from Tennessee, he keeps bringing up this example—that happened under the old law, not the new one. The new law. I say to my friend, the regulations for the new IDEA, just went into effect in March of this year. I have been on the Department of Education for a year to get these regs out, but they received them in March. We have not even given it a chance to work. Yet, that great bipartisan effort, that bipartisan solution that we had that the IDEA amendments of 1997, somehow is now being torn apart.

Why? Because of school shootings—what is going on?—when none of these kids were disabled?

Mr. HARKIN. The Senator from Missouri is a nice guy. The last thing he would want to do is to be mean to anybody. But I have to tell you, if you back up and see it from where I am coming from, I have to tell you honestly, with no kid—none of these kids were disabled?

Mr. HARKIN. I will respond to my friend, the regulations for the new IDEA and see it from where I am coming from. We sat in that room right there, that Mansfield Room, and we all said hallelujah.

Mr. HATCH. And the last thing he would want to do is to be mean to anybody. But I have to tell you, if you back up and see it from where I am coming from, I have to tell you honestly, with no kid—none of these kids were disabled?

Mr. HARKIN. He has made a very impassioned plea here, and I know he feels strongly about the bill.

But I just have to respond this way. This bill may be cited as the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability Act of 1999, and the LEAHY amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Right. That is if we ever get it passed.

Mr. HARKIN. Kids with disabilities haven’t been shooting anybody. I mean, let’s be honest about it. The reason this bill is on this floor is because of what happened in Littleton, CO. The Senator from Tennessee, when he first started out—

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield on that point, just on that point? I am sorry to interrupt him, but this bill has been in the works for 2 solid years. We have worked with our colleagues on the other side repeatedly. I think the distinguished Senator from Vermont and I are together on the managers’ package. It is very comprehensive. This is not some quick thing. We have worked very hard on it. Littleton—yes—which is almost scapegoating kids with disabilities. I know you do not mean to do that. But I have talked to so many parents out there. They talked to me about this amendment and said: Why are they scapegoating my kids? My kids didn’t shoot anybody. My kids with disabilities haven’t done anything. Why are we doing this?

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield without losing the right to the floor?

Mr. HARKIN. Let me please finish. This amendment does not belong in this bill.

If I am going—if I am taking time, I say to my friend, the only reason I am taking time is because I think there are a lot of Senators here who do not understand what is going on. They have not had the privilege I have had of working on disability issues for 25 years. I believe they need to be informed.

It took us 2 hours today simply to get to us to agree that if a kid brings a gun to a school, regardless of whether that kid is disabled or not, they can kick him out right away and take him to the police station. It took us 2 hours just to get that agreement.

Now we are onto another phase, and that phase is what happens after they are removed. I do not think it has been fully fleshed out yet as to why there is a process set up for kids with disabilities. Then we have to get to the third phase and that is what happens at that point in time, at the end of 45 days. If I take some time, I say to my friend from Utah, it is because I believe I
have an obligation to my families with kids with disabilities—

Mr. HATCH. I know that.

Mr. HARKIN. To be able to look them in the eye and say: I did everything humanly possible to make sure that every Senator who comes down and does that we know exactly what that vote is about. I do not believe I have done my job yet. I, obviously, have not done my job yet.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. And I am going to take more time to do my job.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. HATCH. I am suggesting we take some more time, but that we agree on a time limit so everybody in the Senate knows. What that does for you—you are concerned about Senators learning, knowing what to do and hearing your position—when they know there is a certain that is when Senators generally try to listen. I am not asking you not to take more time. I am not asking you to not filibuster. I am asking you—

Mr. HARKIN. I am just not certain how well time it is going to take me. That is why—

Mr. HATCH. I am asking you to set a reasonable time limit. I am also suggesting, as somebody who has been around here as long as the Senator from Iowa, that the time-honored way to resolve these matters when you have a legitimate, honest difference of belief is to vote. Right now, the Senator does not have the right to a vote on his amendment, as I understand it.

Mr. HARKIN. I have my amendment filed.

Mr. HATCH. You cannot bring it up.

Mr. HARKIN. I have my amendment filed.

Mr. HATCH. I want your amendment to come up after this.

Mr. HARKIN. I have my amendment filed.

Mr. HATCH. You cannot get it up in this context without unanimous consent. I will get that for you.

Mr. HARKIN. I can get it up anytime.

Mr. HATCH. Sure you can. What I am saying is, let’s vote, but do it after you have a reasonable time to explain your position. But let’s set a time limit so 99 Senators are not held up.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I wonder—

Mr. HARKIN. I still have the right to the floor. I yield, again, without losing my right.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we are trying to do a number of things. One, the Senator from Utah and I are reflecting our respective parties. We want to get through the bill, get a final vote one way or another and do it in such a way as to protect Senators on both sides of the aisle. He has a responsibility for his side of the aisle, and I have responsibility for my side of the aisle. I take that responsibility strongly. Senators have a right to be heard and a right to vote. But at some point, we have to wrap it up and vote.

Mr. HATCH. That is right.

Mr. LEAHY. May I suggest this: Senators may have good, strong debates on this—and I yield to nobody in my admiration for Senator from Iowa and what he has done. I have taken his lead on so many issues involving the disabled because he is a recognized national expert on this.

My suggestion, another possibility, is we set a time limit and start voting on some of the things we have already done. We finished debate, or all but the last couple of minutes of debate, on the Lautenberg amendment. Let’s vote on that. Let’s vote on something on the chairman’s side of the aisle and maybe set it in such a way that those votes will come within a few minutes of each other.

During that time, Senators will be able to talk more. The Senator from Utah and I will be able to bring up the amendment and then see if it is possible to have time agreements, but time agreements in such a way that Senators will know this amendment comes up at this time, this amendment comes up at another time, so there will be no surprise. I suggest that as a possibility. We also know that as much as we talk, oftentimes these things are worked out during a rollcall vote. That is one way we can do it.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Again, I yield without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will take just a moment. I certainly pay tribute to the—I have not heard more passionate, more heartfelt, more substantial, more powerful, oratory and argument on the floor of the Senate than what Senator HARKIN has done. I thank him as a friend.

I say to my colleagues, if I can get their attention for a moment—Senator LEAHY and Senator HATCH—if there is agreement to see what can be resolved in discussions while Senators come to agreement with one another, I would be very pleased, on behalf of myself and Senator KENNEDY, to have the pending amendment come up at another time, so there will be no surprise.

I suggest that as a possibility. We also know that as much as we talk, oftentimes these things are worked out during a rollcall vote. That is one way we can do it.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will take just a moment. I certainly pay tribute to the—I have not heard more passionate, more heartfelt, more substantial, more powerful, oratory and argument on the floor of the Senate than what Senator HARKIN has done. I thank him as a friend.

I say to my colleagues, if I can get their attention for a moment—Senator LEAHY and Senator HATCH—if there is agreement to see what can be resolved in discussions while Senators come to agreement with one another, I would be very pleased, on behalf of myself and Senator KENNEDY, to have the pending amendment come up at another time, so there will be no surprise.

I suggest that as a possibility. We also know that as much as we talk, oftentimes these things are worked out during a rollcall vote. That is one way we can do it.

Mr. LEAHY said to the Senator from Iowa:

I, obviously, have not done my job yet. I, obviously, have not done my job yet. I, obviously, have not done my job yet. I, obviously, have not done my job yet.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HARKIN be permitted to offer his amendment, and that the regular order be, for voting purposes: the Frist-Ashcroft amendment, then the Harkin amendment—so Senator HARKIN’s amendment will immediately follow—the Wellstone amendment and then the Lautenberg amendment, and then we will go back to our side as well at that point. Is there any objection to that order?

Mr. HARKIN. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. HATCH. I am putting it in the order I think you want to be in.

Mr. HARKIN. I reserve the right to object, and I say this—

Mr. HATCH. This is not the vote. I am just putting the order together.

Mr. HARKIN. I understand. I am saying if there is a vote on the Frist amendment, then what kind of time is allotted to the Senator from Iowa for his amendment?

Mr. HATCH. We have to agree on this. We are not setting time limits.

Mr. HARKIN. You are just setting the order.

Mr. HATCH. I want to set a time—

Mr. HARKIN. Will you read that again?

Mr. HATCH. I am asking unanimous consent that the order of the next group of amendments to be voted upon be Frist-Ashcroft, Harkin, Wellstone and then Lautenberg and then one from our side.

Mr. HARKIN. I think there may be some people here who may want—I don’t know what the majority leader’s predisposition is on this. Maybe some people want to move to Wellstone and vote on that before they get to this. I hate to preclude that possibility with a unanimous-consent request that this is the only order we will take. I would object to that.

Mr. HATCH. You would object to having yours put into the appropriate order?

Mr. HARKIN. Only if that order is locked in totally.

Mr. HATCH. It is locked in, but it is locked in in a way that protects you—that is what I am trying to do here—so everybody knows what the matter is. I am putting in an order so that you can immediately follow the Frist amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. You say that upon completion of a vote on the Frist-Ashcroft amendment—

Mr. HATCH. Then you have a right to call up your amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. Then I have a right.

Mr. HATCH. That is what I am saying.

Mr. HARKIN. Don’t put it in that wording because that locks in the order and because there may be votes before the Frist amendment.

Mr. HATCH. No, there will not be votes before Frist.

Mr. HARKIN. Then I object.

Mr. HATCH. Why? This protects you.

Mr. HARKIN. We may want to lay it aside and go to another amendment.

Mr. HATCH. We can do that. This is to benefit you. You don’t give up one
thing other than you get in line; you are not in line now, behind the Frist amendment. To be frank with you, my purpose is to give you a shot at your amendment. If theirs happens to be adopted, you have a shot at yours which comes after theirs.

Mr. HARKIN. Actually, it does not do away with it. It modifies it; it does not do away with it.

Mr. HATCH. But it puts you in a position, and you don't lose a thing.

Mr. LEAHY. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object. I suggest, again, what I suggested earlier: if this can be set aside, go to the Lautenberg amendment and vote on it very quickly, one on your side that can be voted on quickly thereafter, and then go back to the Frist-Ashcroft amendment, partly so that we can talk during the votes. I don't make that as a request, but I suggest that really as a way out of this, which does away with theirs.

Mr. HARKIN. It is an advantage to you.

Mr. LEAHY. I say to Senator HARKIN again with the same understanding that Senator HARKIN has the right to the floor, that is just not acceptable. The Senators from Missouri and Tennessee want a vote on their amendment. They are willing to go ahead with Senate HARKIN's amendment immediately following, if I understand it, and let the chips fall where they may.

I just want to move this ahead. I am trying to protect you so you are in order to come in at that point. If you don't want to, that is fine with me. It is an advantage to you.

Mr. HARKIN. I don't know that it makes a lot of difference.

Mr. HATCH. It keeps the thing focused so people know what you are talking about. To me, that is a reasonable request.

Mr. HARKIN. Well —

Mr. HATCH. Let me withdraw it then. I don't care. What I am trying to do, I am trying to help Senator HARKIN again without you losing the right to the floor, I am trying to move this ahead. I am making a legitimate good-faith effort to move it ahead. It is apparent that we are not going to have a vote until we have the Ashcroft-Frist, Frist-Ashcroft amendment voted on.

I would like, then, to give you the opportunity to have your amendment called up, which modifies their amendment. Then we will have a vote on your amendment. Then we go and just keep going, as we have done. We are not going to move ahead until we vote on this amendment. If you are going to filibuster, that is another matter.

Mr. HARKIN. I say to the Senator that, I may still move to table the Frist-Ashcroft amendment.

Mr. HATCH. That is a right the Senator has.

Mr. HARKIN. I have a right to do that.

Mr. HATCH. Sure.

Mr. HARKIN. I may move to table; whereupon, after that motion to table is dispensed with, one way or the other—obviously, I am sure I would lose on that—the bill then becomes open to amendment. I may have some amendments to the Frist-Ashcroft amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Amendments or an amendment?

Mr. HARKIN. Amendments. And that could only occur, if I understand the parliamentary procedure, after a motion to table is dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No amendment is in order at this point.

Mr. HARKIN. All points.

Parliamentary inquiry. If I move to table the Frist-Ashcroft amendment, and that is disposed of, as I understand the unanimous-consent request, the bill then would be open for amendment—or the amendment would be open then after there is an action on it, on that amendment, on the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Frist amendment were tabled, the question would recur on the Lautenberg amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. No. No. What would happen if the Frist amendment were not tabled?

Mr. HATCH. Parliamentary inquiry. I do not think the Lautenberg amendment is next on the list.

Mr. HARKIN. If I might, Mr. President, reclaiming my right to the floor—

Mr. HATCH. Could I have that parliamentary inquiry? I just want to know, what is the order? I do not think Lautenberg is next.

Mr. HARKIN. On the parliamentary inquiry, I just want to read from the unanimous-consent request, Order No. 8.

Ordered further, that the following amendments be the only remaining first-degree amendments in order, with relevant second-degree amendments in order thereto only after a vote on or in relation to the first-degree amendments and the amendments limited to time agreements, where noted, all to be equally divided in the usual form.

So, obviously, a tabling motion would be a vote in relation, and therefore reading that, I submit, that then relevant second-degree amendments would be in order. I make that parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is correct that a second-degree amendment would be in order if the motion to Frist fails. Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. HATCH. What I propose does not change that at all. If we put these amendments in order, the Frist-Ashcroft, Harkin and Wellstone and Lautenberg, that still does not take away your right to move to table and then file a second-degree amendment, if you desire. We would have to dispose of the Frist-Ashcroft amendment first. And you would have every right to do that.

Mr. HARKIN. Again—

Mr. LEAHY. Is that correct?

Mr. HATCH. Is that correct? All I am doing is setting the order in which these things would follow. He would not be deprived of moving to table the Frist-Ashcroft amendment, and if it is not tabled of offering amendments.

Mr. HARKIN. Offering amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the interpretation of your consent request, a vote on Frist would include either a motion to table or an up-or-down.

Mr. HATCH. I do not understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If your interpretation of your consent request is that a vote on Frist includes a vote to table, then we would be correct in that we have agreement on that.

Mr. HATCH. Well, I think we would. Mr. HARKIN. You want to read that unanimous consent request again? I am still —

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that Senator HARKIN be permitted to offer his amendment, and that the regular order be the Frist-Ashcroft amendment, and if there is a motion to table by Senator HARKIN, and it is not tabled, then it would be open for —

Mr. HARKIN. Or any motion to table.

Mr. HATCH. Any motion to table, and it is not tabled, then it would be open for a second-degree amendment. But immediately following the disposition of that would be the Harkin amendment with the same conditions, the Wellstone amendment with the same conditions, and the Lautenberg amendment with the same conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. Reserving the right to object, then under his proposal, how many second-degree amendments could be offered to the Frist-Ashcroft amendment if, in fact, the tabling motion was not agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How many angels can dance on a pin?

Mr. LEAHY. I did not hear the response.

Mr. ASHCROFT. How many angels can dance on the head of a pin?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the motion to table the Frist fails, then that amendment is open to relevant second-degree amendments.

Mr. HARKIN. Relevant second-degree amendments, in the plural?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. Let me ask one other question about this unanimous consent request. Let's say someone wants to set this aside and move on to another amendment. Would that be allowed under this proposal?

Mr. HATCH. With unanimous consent, it would.

Mr. LEAHY. That would require unanimous consent, I would assume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would require unanimous consent.

Mr. HARKIN. Just as it does now.

The unanimous consent request, again, because I really want to protect my rights, and I just want to make sure that if I am fully and adequately protected. I ask the Senator if perhaps it could be reduced to writing or something just so I can take a look at it. I
am going to be here for a while talking anyway.

Mr. HATCH. We will be happy to do that.

Mr. HARKIN. I just want to make sure my rights are protected. That is all.

Mr. HATCH. I withdraw my unanimous consent request at this particular point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn.

Mr. HATCH. We may want to set this aside for that purpose. If we do, I will ask the Senator, would the Senator please give some consideration to my request that we have a time agreement—I am not suggesting what time, but that we have a time agreement on the Frist-Ashcroft amendment so that everybody here knows what is going on? Then people will listen to his recitation of what he believes as to the situation. Can you give us a time agreement?

Mr. HARKIN. Not at this time I cannot, I say to my friend. I cannot at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, as I said, take a backseat to no one in my concern for safety in schools, having a daughter who is a senior in high school now and a daughter who just graduated from college, both of whom have attended public schools all of their lives. I assure you that that has precipitated this bill has been the recent tragedy in Littleton, CO, and the eight shootings over 39 months in our public schools in America. These tragedies have, indeed, called us to action, called us as families, churches, schools, communities, parents, teachers, and, yes, as lawmakers.

I hope these tragedies lead us all to take positive and constructive steps to reduce the likelihood of any recurrence. We want to make sure all of our schools are places of learning, not of fear.

But we should not let this tragedy of Littleton lead us into emotional, unfounded, though well-intentioned actions which can harm the most vulnerable in our society, and those are our kids with disabilities.

I know that the amendment is well-intentioned. The Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Missouri are good friends of mine. This would amend the Individuals with Disabilities Act, and I believe in the deepest part of my being that this amendment will have just the opposite effect. If enacted, it will do a couple of things. It will make our schools and communities less safe, and it will take the clock back on all the advances we have made in our country to ensure that kids with disabilities have a fair shot at the American dream.

This amendment targets a group of students who are more likely to be the victims of school violence than the perpetrators. It is the kids with disabilities, now mainstreamed into our schools, who are beat up on, preyed upon, made fun of by nondisabled kids. Time and time again, it is the kids with disabilities who are the victims of the violence. This has been true for a long time, a long time.

Why are we singling them out with this amendment? None, not one, of the eight school shootings in the last 39 months was perpetrated by a child in special education. So why do we have this amendment?

Well, I want to point out, sadly, four of the students shot in the rampage at Columbine High School were special ed kids—four of them. So why are we singling out kids with disabilities? Why are we changing a law that we passed 2 years ago, that we just got the regulations issued in March of this year, which has not had even an opportunity to work? Why are we doing it?

Well, I forget which Senator it was who said, well, we do not want to wait until something bad happens. My gosh, under what philosophy, what else can we do to our schools? How about all the kids with disabilities? What are we going to do with them if we don't want to wait until something bad happens? That philosophy can take you down a lot of small alleys of dead-end alleys. I think the answer to “we don't want to wait till something bad happens” is exactly why we passed the amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2 years ago. That is why we have had, if a kid is violent, brings a gun to school, school can get them out immediately to protect the school.

I hope everyone heard here today—we finally got an agreement on that— if a kid brings a gun to school, regardless of whether that kid is disabled or not, they can call up the police and have that kid hauled down to the police station immediately, immediately. Now, when there is some thought around here that somehow because a kid is disabled, the principal has to go through a bunch of hoops to get them out of school, I say that is not true. And we finally at least got that nailed down today.

I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. WELSTONE. I want to ask the Senator one question.

Mr. HATCH. Would the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WELSTONE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. Who has the floor?

The Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HARKIN. Of course.

Mr. LOTT. I think everybody is trying in good faith to find a way to deal with this issue and move on. I thought that idea just proposed might work, but it looks as if that would be objected to.

I think everybody is trying in good faith to find a way to deal with this issue and move on. I thought that idea just proposed might work, but it looks as if that would be objected to.

What I would like to propose as an alternative—and it is being typed up now, and we want both sides to look at it—is that we go forward. We set aside the pending amendment, and we go forward with a series of votes, including probably the managers' package, which a lot of people have been interested in and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I would like to listen to his suggestion.

Mr. LOTT. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HARKIN. Of course.

Mr. LOTT. I think everybody is trying in good faith to find a way to deal with this issue and move on. I thought that idea just proposed might work, but it looks as if that would be objected to.

What I would like to propose as an alternative—and it is being typed up now, and we want both sides to look at it—is that we go forward. We set aside the pending amendment, and we go forward with a series of votes, including probably the managers' package, which a lot of people have been interested in and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I would like to listen to his suggestion.

Mr. LOTT. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. I think everybody is trying in good faith to find a way to deal with this issue and move on. I thought that idea just proposed might work, but it looks as if that would be objected to.

What I would like to propose as an alternative—and it is being typed up now, and we want both sides to look at it—is that we go forward. We set aside the pending amendment, and we go forward with a series of votes, including probably the managers' package, which a lot of people have been interested in and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I would like to listen to his suggestion.

Mr. LOTT. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. I think everybody is trying in good faith to find a way to deal with this issue and move on. I thought that idea just proposed might work, but it looks as if that would be objected to.

What I would like to propose as an alternative—and it is being typed up now, and we want both sides to look at it—is that we go forward. We set aside the pending amendment, and we go forward with a series of votes, including probably the managers' package, which a lot of people have been interested in and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I would like to listen to his suggestion.

Mr. LOTT. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. I think everybody is trying in good faith to find a way to deal with this issue and move on. I thought that idea just proposed might work, but it looks as if that would be objected to.

What I would like to propose as an alternative—and it is being typed up now, and we want both sides to look at it—is that we go forward. We set aside the pending amendment, and we go forward with a series of votes, including probably the managers' package, which a lot of people have been interested in and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I would like to listen to his suggestion.

Mr. LOTT. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. I think everybody is trying in good faith to find a way to deal with this issue and move on. I thought that idea just proposed might work, but it looks as if that would be objected to.

What I would like to propose as an alternative—and it is being typed up now, and we want both sides to look at it—is that we go forward. We set aside the pending amendment, and we go forward with a series of votes, including probably the managers' package, which a lot of people have been interested in and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I would like to listen to his suggestion.

Mr. LOTT. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. I think everybody is trying in good faith to find a way to deal with this issue and move on. I thought that idea just proposed might work, but it looks as if that would be objected to.

What I would like to propose as an alternative—and it is being typed up now, and we want both sides to look at it—is that we go forward. We set aside the pending amendment, and we go forward with a series of votes, including probably the managers' package, which a lot of people have been interested in and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I would like to listen to his suggestion.

Mr. LOTT. Who has the floor?
At some point, I hope the Senator from Iowa—like on Lautenberg and on these others, we worked through this without second-degreesing, without obstructing. You all have had some amendments you don’t like, and we have had a few amendments you don’t like, but in the end you vote. If you win, you win: if you lose, you lose. It still has to go to conference and all that. I hope we can get an agreement on this. I don’t think anybody is disadvantaged. I think everybody will be happy. Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa can talk during the votes and see if we can’t find a way to bring it to a conclusion.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Iowa to yield for a question.

Mr. HARKIN. I will yield without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. My question is really a-vi-sa the Senator from Iowa to my colleague from Utah. The amendment I have been trying to get on the floor is the Wellstone-Kennedy amendment dealing with disproportionate minority confinement. I assume when we listed the amendments that already has a 2-hour limit set.

Mr. LOTT. If the Senator from Iowa will yield, he is getting to be a really good traffic cop here.

Mr. HARKIN. Red light, green light.

Mr. LOTT. I am inquiring because I don’t see off the radar screen your understanding is that you would like to have your vote maybe earlier in the lineup, I don’t see a problem with that. We try to alternate, Republican and Democrat.

Mr. WELLSTONE. That is fine. We already have a 2-hour time limit on that. We agreed on that.

Mr. LOTT. Two hours more debate? Mr. WELLSTONE. It is on disproportionate minority confinement. It is the amendment I have with Senator KEN- NEDY.

Mr. LOTT. I think that is another amendment. Don’t you have another Wellstone amendment?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I have another one.

Mr. LOTT. This is regarding your other Wellstone amendment.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I have been waiting on the floor forever. I am pleased at what the Senator from Iowa is doing. The one laid aside is going into the managers’ conference. We have been waiting patiently. When you put it in order, please put in the Wellstone-Kennedy amendment, which deals with a very important question that we have been trying to debate for days.

Mr. LOTT. This one is No. 356, identified as a Wellstone amendment. It is not the amendment you are speaking of. If I understand you correctly, you are talking about a Kennedy-Wellstone amendment, and you need 2 more hours for debate.

Mr. WELLSTONE. This has been agreed to for days. That is right. The amendment, I am assuming, in the sequence that we are talking about is the Wellstone-Kennedy amendment dealing with disproportionate minority confinement. Two hours to be equally divided is the agreement on that. No. 356 has been allegedly put in the managers’ amendment. If we can please put this one on it.

Mr. HATCH. Nobody ever agreed to 2 hours. I don’t know if we ever had an agreement on that. Of course you have to have enough time to argue, but I hope it is not 2 hours.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa has the floor, and I ask if he will yield without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. I yield under those conditions.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask if it might be in order to suggest the absence of a quorum, which I am not doing, but to do that under a unanimous consent, that at the completion of it the Senator from Iowa would be allowed to reclaim the floor.

Mr. LOTT. I ask the Senator from Iowa if he will be willing to have a vote on his amendment in the sequence we are talking about here?

Mr. HARKIN. I want to see the lay of the land before I answer a question like that.

Mr. LOTT. I am inquiring because I had nobody to ask that. You all have had a good, full debate. I wondered if you would not be ready to go to a vote now.

Mr. HARKIN. No. I don’t feel that I am. I haven’t even finished my statement yet. As I said earlier to my friend from Utah, I believe there are a lot of misperceptions out there on this amendment, and being the poor debater that I am and the poor teacher that I am, I don’t believe that I have fully and adequately represented what this means to families with kids with disabilities. It will probably take a little longer simply because I am so poor at getting across my point, it seems. So I am going to have to take a look at that before I make any decisions. I am not going to answer hypothetical questions.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HARKIN. I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I will yield to the leader to do that. I ask unanimous consent that when the quorum call is dispensed with, this Senator, the Senator from Iowa, be given the right to the floor at that point in time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. If the Senator will yield the floor, you will have the floor when we return, too. That was agreed to. I will put in a quorum call to try to work this out.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.
Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privileges of the floor be granted to Lucille Zeph for the pendency of the bill. The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Under the previous arrangement, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Under the previous arrangement, I further suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. We make it clear at the beginning, Mr. President, we don’t want to in any way dispossess the Senator from Iowa from his opportunity to be further heard, if he so desires, on his position with regard to the Ashcroft-Frist amendment. I ask in this agreement that discussion be set aside and we go to four other amendments and have the debate and stacked votes on those amendments.

I state the agreement which Senator Daschle had a chance to review. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside and the Senate proceed immediately to the managers’ package, and following that amendment, the following amendments be considered for votes in the following sequence, under time agreements where noted, in the usual form.

I want to emphasize, the managers’ package would go first; there would be some description of that. We understand that would probably not require a recorded vote. I further ask consent that the amendments be voted in the order listed below, with 2 minutes for debate prior to each vote for explanation. In other words, we will have 2 hours of debate on the first one, then go to the other amendments, but before the actual votes occur there will be 2 minutes for final explanation, and that all provisions of the consent agreement of May 14 be in place.

The amendments are as follows: The Wellstone amendment for 2 hours of debate; the McConnell amendment regarding public schools, 30 minutes; the Boxer amendment regarding afterschool time, 10 minutes; and the Gordon Smith-Jeffords amendment regarding pawnshops. We will specify the time when we have had a chance to review that.

That is the order. The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there are no second-degrees; is that correct? Mr. LOTT. It would be the usual agreement of no second-degrees prior to a vote on the motion to table.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, a Wellstone-Kennedy amendment is listed? Mr. LOTT. Yes. Mr. ASHCROFT. Reserving the right to object, frankly, there is addressing the amendment which is pending, and it is rather complex. I would be grateful for an opportunity to look at this agreement if it is written up. I would like to have a chance to consider it.

Mr. WELLSTONE. As I told the Senator from Iowa—and I believe Senator Frist has been on the floor most of the time—this is in no way intended or will not disadvantage or eliminate this amendment. It will just set it aside so we can make some progress on amendments where time agreements are already locked in. We will have votes on those amendments at the end of those agreed-to times.

Mr. DASCHLE. Reserving the right to hours, let me just remind everyone that we have approximately 24 hours left of this week. In that timeframe we have to do not only the rest of this bill but the supplemental appropriations bill. The only way we are going to finish this is if everybody is willing to cooperate a little bit more and indulge the leadership and the managers of this bill in such a fashion that will allow completion.

It has been difficult, and, I must say, increasingly frustrating, for those who have tried to work through all of this in a way that would allow some reasonable conclusion. It seems the longer we work on it, the more everyone’s back is up. It is in our interest to work together and try to resolve this matter. We have been on this bill now for over a week. It is time to bring it to a successful conclusion.

I ask the cooperation in the remaining hours of this debate on the part of Members on both sides, so that we can finish it.

I have no objection. Mr. LOTT. I want to thank Senator Daschle for his comments. I very strongly feel the same way. We have come a long way on this bill. The underlying bill was one that had bipartisan support.

We have narrowed down the number of amendments to a finite list. Senator Reid has worked very diligently to accomplish that. We must deal with the supplemental appropriations bill before we go. In order to do that, we will have to have some cooperation.

I have been criticized because I have maybe tried to be too fair, everybody has that fair, straight-up shot: No second-degrees, make your point, have the vote, win some, lose some. If we go with that attitude, we can complete this list and the other amendments and complete this bill and do the supplemental.

Mr. LEAHY. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I think this is a good step forward. The Senator from Utah and I and the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Mississippi have worked very hard, along with appropriate other people, to cut down the list.

I ask one question, because it is one we are obviously going to be asked: Under this agreement, when will we vote on the Lautenberg gun amendment? When would the leader expect we would be voting on the Lautenberg amendment?

Mr. LOTT. There will be an effort for that to be either the first or the second vote. The pending business, I believe, would be the Ashcroft-Frist issue. We would have to dispose of that and then we would go to, I hope, a series of additional stacked amendments which would lead off, I presume, with Lautenberg right at the front.

In order to do that before we did Ashcroft-Frist, we would have to get another agreement. I would like to do it because I think that is an issue that a lot of people feel very strongly about. I would like to do it like the rest. It is time to vote.

Mr. LEAHY. The distinguished leader is saying it would not be voted on tonight? Mr. LOTT. No, it would not be voted on tonight. What we would do, for these four amendments, is debate and then vote, and the pending business would be the Frist-Ashcroft amendment at the end of that. I want to make that clear so you are not dispositioned by that.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Is it possible to modify this consent request to say the Frist-Ashcroft amendment would be the pending business at the conclusion of the first vote, and no later at the outset of the business tomorrow morning?

Mr. LOTT. That is the status. But I would be glad to modify it to that extent, because it just confirms what the status is, procedurally, anyway.

The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. Is there objection to the unanimous consent as amended?

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I agree with Senator Ashcroft with one provision, if we say “Senator Harkin retaining the right to the floor when the Senate returns to the Frist-Ashcroft amendment.” I have the right to the floor now. I had the floor. I just want to make sure when this amendment comes back up that I have the right to the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Is that the procedure? Did he have the floor anyway?

I am told you have that right anyway, so I don’t think we give anything up by including it in the unanimous consent request.

Mr. HARKIN. OK. The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. Is there objection?

Mr. LOTT. Then I would add we would then pass this amendment by voice vote. I was just kidding, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. That last part was not included.

Mr. LOTT. That was not there.

Mr. LEAHY. That was not included.

The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. Without objection, it is so ordered.
Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we are now anxiously awaiting the comments of the Senator from Minnesota. We hope he will feel free to condense his time. Oh, the managers' amendment would be first. We expect there would be stacked votes in sequence between 7:30 and 8.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have a managers' amendment which has been cleared on both sides as far as I know. This amendment is a compilation of amendments by Members on both sides. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order. The Senator from Utah has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. I now ask unanimous consent that any pending amendments be temporarily set aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 363

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I send a managers' amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], for himself and Mr. LEAHY, proposes on bloc an amendment numbered 363.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Chairman and I have been able to put together a managers' amendment, a package of amendments that improve S. 254 in a number of ways that should please Members from both sides of the aisle. We have accomplished this task by finding the middle ground, and the bill will be a better one for it.

I said last week during the Senate's consideration of this bill that we should not care whether a proposal comes from the Republican or Democratic side of the aisle. A good proposal that helps both sides should get the support of all of us. Our first question should be whether a program or proposal will help our children effectively, not whether it is a Democratic or Republican proposal.

This managers' amendment and package of amendments reflects that philosophy. It shows that when this body rolls up its sleeves and gets to work, we can make significant progress. I commend the Chairman for his hard work and this effort and I am glad we were able to work together constructively to improve this bill.

Many Members had good additions and modifications to make to this bill, and we have agreed to accept them in the managers' package of amendments.

In addition to the amendments included in the package, the chairman and I have worked together on a managers' amendment to address a number of my longstanding concerns with the underlying legislation, and I have worked with the chairman to address a number of those changes.

I noted my concern at the beginning of this debate that the State prerogative to handle juvenile offenders would be undermined by this bill. The changes we made to the underlying bill in the managers' amendment satisfy my concerns. For example, S. 254 as introduced would repeal the very first section of the Federal Criminal Code dealing with "Correction of Youthful Offenders." This is the section that establishes a clear presumption that the States—not the federal government—should handle most juvenile offenders—18 U.S.C. section 5001. While the managers' amendment removes the provision, the managers' amendment retains it in a slightly modified form.

In addition, the original S. 254 would require Federal prosecutors to refer most juvenile cases to the State in cases of "concurrent jurisdiction ... over both the offense and the juvenile." This language created a recipe for sharp lawyering. Federal prosecutors could avoid referral by simply claiming there was no "concurrent" jurisdiction over the Federal or other differences between the federal and state crimes. Even if the juvenile's conduct violated both Federal and State law, any difference in those criminal laws were written could be used to argue they were different offenses altogether. This was a huge loophole that could have allowed federal prosecutors to end-run the presumption of referral to the State.

We fix this in the managers' amendment. Whenever the federal government or the State have criminal laws that punish the same conduct and both have jurisdiction over the juvenile, federal prosecutors should refer the juvenile to the State in most instances.

Finally, I was concerned that, contrary to current law, a federal prosecutor's decision to proceed against a juvenile in federal court would not be subject to any judicial review. The managers' amendment would permit such judicial review, except in cases involving serious violent or serious drug offenses.

Another area of concern has been the ease with which S. 254 would allow federal prosecutors to prosecute juveniles 14 years and older as adults for any felony.

While I have long favored simplifying and streamlining current federal procedures for trying juveniles, I believe that juveniles older than 14 should not be treated in the same manner as adults, and it is important that juvenile offenders be handled by juvenile courts.

I noted my concern at the beginning of this debate that the State prerogative to handle juvenile offenders would be undermined by this bill. The changes we made to the underlying bill in the managers' amendment satisfies my concerns. For example, S. 254 as introduced would repeal the very first section of the Federal Criminal Code dealing with "Correction of Youthful Offenders." This is the section that establishes a clear presumption that the States—not the federal government—should handle most juvenile offenders—18 U.S.C. section 5001. While the managers' amendment removes the provision, the managers' amendment retains it in a slightly modified form.

In addition, the original S. 254 would require Federal prosecutors to refer most juvenile cases to the State in cases of "concurrent jurisdiction ... over both the offense and the juvenile." This language created a recipe for sharp lawyering. Federal prosecutors could avoid referral by simply claiming there was no "concurrent" jurisdiction over the Federal or other differences between the federal and state crimes. Even if the juvenile's conduct violated both Federal and State law, any difference in those criminal laws were written could be used to argue they were different offenses altogether. This was a huge loophole that could have allowed federal prosecutors to end-run the presumption of referral to the State.

We fix this in the managers' amendment. Whenever the federal government or the State have criminal laws that punish the same conduct and both have jurisdiction over the juvenile, federal prosecutors should refer the juvenile to the State in most instances.

Finally, I was concerned that, contrary to current law, a federal prosecutor's decision to proceed against a juvenile in federal court would not be subject to any judicial review. The managers' amendment would permit such judicial review, except in cases involving serious violent or serious drug offenses.

Another area of concern has been the ease with which S. 254 would allow federal prosecutors to prosecute juveniles 14 years and older as adults for any felony.

While I have long favored simplifying and streamlining current federal procedures for trying juveniles, I believe that juveniles older than 14 should not be treated in the same manner as adults, and it is important that juvenile offenders be handled by juvenile courts.

The managers' amendment extends the time to make a reverse waiver motion to 30 days, which begins at the time the juvenile defendant appears to answer an indictment.

Second, S. 254 requires the juvenile defendant to show by clear and convincing evidence that he should be tried as a juvenile rather than an adult. This is a very difficult standard to meet, particularly under strict time limits. Thus, the managers' amendment changes this standard to a "preponderance" of the evidence.

Initially introduced, S. 254 would require juvenile criminal records for any federal offense, no matter how petty, to be sent to the FBI. This criminal record would haunt the juvenile as he grew into an adult, with no possibility of expungement from the FBI's database.

The managers' amendment makes important changes to this record requirement. The juvenile records sent to the FBI will be limited to acts that are felonies or committed by an adult. In addition, under the managers' amendment, a juvenile would be able after 5 years to petition the court to have the criminal record removed from the FBI database, if the juvenile can show by clear and convincing evidence that he or she is no longer a danger to the community. Expungement of records from the FBI's database does not apply to juveniles convicted of rape, murder, or certain other serious offenses.

Much of the debate over reforming our juvenile justice system has focused on how we treat juvenile offenders who are held in State custody. The Federal government for years has required States, in order to qualify for certain grant funds, to provide certain core protections, including separating juveniles from adult inmates, keeping status offenders out of secure facilities, and focusing prevention efforts to reduce disproportionate confinement of minority youth.

In the last Congress, S. 10 either eliminated or gutted each of these core protections. The chairman and Senator Sessions significantly improved S. 254 in this regard, and I commend them for that. The managers' amendment continues to make progress on the "sight and sound separation" protection and the "jail removal" protection.

Specifically, the managers' amendment would make important modifications to the parents in rural areas give their consent to have their children detained in adult jails after an arrest, the parents may revoke their consent at any time. In addition, the judge who approves the juvenile's detention must determine it is in the best interests of the juvenile, and may review that detention—as the judge must periodically—in the presence of the juvenile.

The managers' amendment also clarifies that juvenile offenders in rural areas may be detained in an adult jail for up to 48 hours while awaiting a court appearance, but only when no alternative facilities are available and
appropriate juvenile facilities are too far away to make the court appearance or travel is unsafe to undertake.

The managers' amendment contains a significant improvement in the sight and sound separation requirement for juveniles offenders in both Federal and State custody. S. 254 has been criticized for allowing "brief and incidental" proximity between juveniles and adult inmates. This amendment fixes that by incorporating the guidance of the current regulations for keeping juveniles separated from adult prisoners. Specifically, the managers' amendment would require separation of juveniles and adult inmates and excuse only "brief, inadvertent or accidental" proximity in non-residential areas, which may include dining, recreational, educational, vocational, health care, entry areas, and passageways.

I am pleased we were able to make this progress. I appreciate that a number of Members remain concerned, as do I, about how S. 254 changes the disproportionate minority confinement protection in current law. This will be an important debate, and I continue to believe we should support an amendment intended to correct that part of S. 254.

S. 254 includes a $200 million per year Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Challenge Grant to fund both primary prevention and intervention uses after juveniles have come in contact with the juvenile justice system. I and a number of other members were concerned that in the competition for grant dollars, the primary prevention uses would lose out to intervention uses in crucial decisions on how this grant money would be spent.

With the help of Senator Kohn, we have included in the managers' amendment a clear earmark that 80 percent of the money, or $160 million per year if the grant is fully funded, is to be used for primary prevention uses and the other 20 percent is to be used for intervention uses. Together with the 25-percent earmark, or about $112 million per year if that program is fully funded, for primary prevention in the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant that was passed by the Senate in the Hatch-Biden-Sessions amendment, this bill now reflects a substantial amount of solid funding for primary prevention uses.

I expressed some concern when the Senate passed the Hatch-Biden-Sessions amendment authorizing $50 million per year for prosecutors and different kinds of assistance to prosecutors to speed up prosecution of juvenile offenders. We had included in the amendment did not authorize any additional money for judges, public defenders, counselors, or corrections officers. The consequence would be to only exacerbate the backlog in juvenile justice systems rather than helping it.

The managers' amendment fixes that by providing $50 million per year available in grant funds to be used for increased resources to State juvenile court judges, juvenile prosecutors, juvenile public defenders, and other juvenile court personnel.

I mentioned before that S. 254 includes a sense-of-the-Senate resolution urging States to try juveniles 10 to 14 years old as adults for crimes, such as murder, that would carry the death penalty if committed by an adult—the resolution does not urge the death penalty for such children. While Vermont is pursuing legislation that expressly allows for the trial of juveniles 10 years and older as adults for certain crimes, I do not believe that this is a matter on which the Senate must or should opine. The managers' amendment correctly deletes that sense-of-the-Senate from the bill.

These improvements to S. 254 in both the managers' amendment and in the managers' package of amendments make this bill worthy of our support, and I am pleased with its progress.

The chairman and I have agreed that Members from both sides of the aisle had good additions and modifications to make to this bill, and we have agreed to the managers' amendment. Let me give some examples of amendments we have agreed to incorporate into the bill.

**Senators Landrieu and Schumer proposed amendments to the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Challenge Grant program to help abused, foster, and adopted children so they will not fall through the cracks and become at-risk for delinquency:**

**Senator Fink provided an amendment to help schools use caller-ID to deal with bomb threats:**

**Senator Feingold sponsored an important amendment to clarify the intent requirement in the new gang prevention provisions of the bill:**

**Senators Sessions, Robb, Allard, and Byrd joined together on an amendment to authorize a national hotline for the confidential reporting of people who have threatened school violence:**

**Senator Knoll, Biden, Dorgan, Dodd, and others from both sides of the aisle, including Senator Hatch, have made a number of good proposals for prevention and intervention of juvenile crime:**

**Mr. Domenici, Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague from Connecticut, Senator Dodd, to talk a little bit about a program we understand has been accepted by the Senate for inclusion in this bill:**

**Five amendments, during the last re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Senator Dodd, Senator Nunn and I included a provision in that Act to allow for several pilot projects around the nation centered on increasing character education in our schools:**

That legislation helped foster the growth of the Character Counts movement across a few schools in a few states.

The amendment that the Senate has agreed to accept today will expand upon that effort. The bill provides $25 million in funding for character education through the Department of Education, including $15 million for schools and $10 million for after-school programs.

My colleagues have heard me talk before about the Character Counts program, where children and teachers use six pillars of character and incorporate them into their daily lessons. Things like trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship.

After five years, I believe that I can say that the effort to bring character education to our schools has been a success. In New Mexico, 200,000 kids and 90 percent of our schools participate in some form of character education. The character education has empowered them in a way to teach and reinforce positive behavior by their students.

Schools which have utilized Character Counts report lower instances of teacher, student, and classmate discipline, and student violence. Character Counts makes schools better places to learn for our children, and teaches them values in the process.

I have heard colleagues say that six pillars of character are the best way to teach our kids the values of our country. My colleagues have heard me talk before about the Character Counts program which teach character education programs which teach character and integrity should be a high priority for their schools. Improving character education is the number three overall concern parents express about the quality of their children's education in Albuquerque. The amendment accepted today will allow more schools to address this concern.
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agreed to help bring Character Counts to other areas of the country where maybe it has not caught on quite as well as it has in my state or Connecticut. I thank the Senate for accepting my amendments and I yield the floor.

PREVENTING DELINQUENCY THROUGH CHARACTER EDUCATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico in offering this amendment to provide support for character education projects in schools and in after-school programs. These programs, organized around character education, would provide alternatives to youth at risk of delinquency and work specifically to reduce delinquency, school discipline problems and truancy and to improve student achievement, overall school performance, and youths’ positive involvement in their community. Our amendment—which I understand will be considered as part of the managers’ package—would authorize no less than $25 million per year for character education in schools and in after-school settings.

I am not here today to claim that character education is the answer to all the questions that have been posed to us as policy makers, parents and community members in the wake of the tragedy at Littleton, CO.

But character education is part of the answer. Today’s children have so many obstacles to overcome, including violence, drug use, peer and cultural influences, and too much unsupervised time on their hands. As a society, we must find ways to help these children become responsible citizens, to distinguish between right and wrong. To do this, we must build on traditional education by nurturing students’ character.

That is fundamentally what character education is about. It is about reinforcing those elements of character which bind us together into communities and into this great nation. Ideas like—trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring and citizenship—underlie all of our government and civic organizations. We must reinforce these beliefs with our children at every opportunity.

Parents have the primary responsibility here. Churches and other community organizations support these efforts. But character education is a key part of the equation. And these ideas must be a part of a child’s day—after school—when they are often unsupervised and most at risk of negative behaviors.

And that is what this amendment does. It would set aside $25 million for school-based and after-school programs in character education. Schools could use these funds to work with parents and develop a character education program for their schools. We have seen so many successful programs in schools in my state and in other areas currently participate in these activities. And the schools report amazing turn-around with reduced absenteeism, discipline problems, graffiti and fighting and improved student achievement and student participation in positive extra-curricular activities.

In addition, this amendment would support after-school programs that are organizing and coordinating. And if these out of school hours are a key opportunity for our youth. We can provide enriched academic activities, sports and the arts. Or we can leave them to the alternatives—smoking, drug use, teen pregnancy, delinquency, and the easy road route. These are options. Quality after school programs—and these programs will be even stronger with the inclusion of a character education focus, such as provided in this amendment.

I commend my friend and colleague from New Mexico for his dedication to our children and to character education. I am pleased to be here with him again today to move forward this critical initiative that truly gets at the core of the managers’ package.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I thank the managers of this bill for accepting the mentoring amendment that I offered, and I want to thank my colleague Mr. DORGAN for cosponsoring this amendment.

I believe that youth mentoring is an important piece of our effort to decrease violence among our young people. This amendment encourages us to take youth mentoring seriously. It provides tools for assessing the quality and effectiveness of mentoring programs and to reward those programs that do a good job. It also asks the Departments of Justice and Education to disseminate information on best mentoring practices, so that mentors can receive guidance on how to make the best use of their time with students.

Since the school shooting in Littleton, Colorado, a few weeks ago, Congress has been grappling with the question “How do we prevent such a terrible tragedy?” The answer to this question is complex, and, as we know from our debate here on the floor of the Senate, there are many different points of view as to what more we should do to keep our kids healthy and safe.

I believe that one of the things we must do is increase the amount of quality time our young people have with caring, responsible adults. That is why I’ve been arguing, as have both the senators from Colorado, that we increase the number of individuals who are close enough to a young person to detect problems when they arise, we increase our chances of keeping those problems from spiraling out of control.

Mr. President, we know that mentoring works. In 1995 a Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America Impact Study showed that at-risk young people with mentors were 46% less likely to begin using illegal drugs; 27% less likely to begin using alcohol; 53% less likely to skip school; 37% less likely to skip a class; and 33% less likely to hit someone than at-risk children without mentors.

In a 1989 Louis Harris poll, 73% of students said their mentors helped raise their goals and expectations. And a Partners for Youth study completed in 1993 revealed that out of 200 non-violent juvenile offenders who participated in a mentoring relationship, nearly 90% avoided re-arrest.

I believe in the power of mentoring, because I’ve seen it firsthand in my own state of Nebraska. In Nebraska, we have a fantastic program run by Tom and Nancy Osborne called TeamMates.

Tom and Nancy started TeamMates in 1991, and the success they saw in that first year inspired them to continue. They started out with 25 matches, and of the students in those matches, 20 graduated from high school and 18 pursued postsecondary education.

The response to TeamMates has been highly encouraging. Principals and administrators have commented on the positive impact mentoring has had. They see in students in just the first year of their relationship with a mentor. And 99% of the mentors choose to continue their relationship with their students after the first year.

Right now there are 475 TeamMate matches throughout Nebraska. And they hope to have a total of 900 a year from now.

We have another terrific mentoring program in Omaha called All Our Kids, which began in 1989 at McMillan Junior High School. At present, nearly 30 mentors are providing guidance to at-risk junior and senior high school students.
And All Our Kids enjoys a strong relationship with the Omaha Public Schools System. OPS staff work closely with All Our Kids staff to identify students who need the services provided by its long-term mentoring and scholarship programs.

With our help, TeamMates, All Our Kids, and other promising mentoring programs throughout the nation will be able to expand the horizons of more young people by providing them with caring adults to show them the way.

I also want to thank the managers for accepting my Sense of the Senate urging the President of the United States to allow each Federal employee to take one hour a week to serve as a mentor to a young person in need.

Recently, Jim Otto, Nebraska State Director of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, called me and said, “I read what you said about the importance of youth mentorship and I want to let you know that I’m a mentor in the TeamMates mentoring program in Lincoln. I want you to know it’s been a great experience.”

Jim said he was fortunate that his employer allowed him to take one hour a week of administrative leave to spend time with his student. But he also said that some of his colleagues in other Federal agencies and departments were not so fortunate. Many employees would like to become mentors, but they just can’t take time away from work.

Now, we have a lot of dedicated individuals throughout the nation who serve as mentors. Several members of my own staff participate in the Everybody Wins program in the D.C. Public Schools. And, as I mentioned earlier, we have great mentoring programs in Nebraska. But we need more adults to say, “I want to make a difference to help a child.”

The purpose of this legislation is to enable more adults to take the time to contribute to the well-being of their communities. It’s just one hour a week, but in a child’s life it can make a world of difference.

Mr. President, whether it’s helping a student take an interest in schoolwork, helping build a young person’s self-esteem, or helping a young man or woman communicate more effectively with parents, friends, and teachers, a mentor can be that invaluable safety net that keeps a child from falling into despair.

Now, there are many steps we can take to try to prevent violent acts once an individual reaches that point of desperation, but it is better for all of us if we intervene before that point—and it is also less costly.

With additional support for good mentoring programs we will be able to reach more young people before they become lost to substance abuse, isolation, or any other destructive behavior that leads them to commit acts of violence against themselves or others. In helping these programs continue their good work, we raise the hopes of more of our children. And when our children’s hopes are high, we all benefit.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am glad to be a cosponsor of the mentoring amendment offered by my colleague from Nebraska, Mr. KERREY, and I commend him for his work on this issue. I also want to thank the managers of this bill for their work.

When it comes to juvenile delinquency, I subscribe to the notion that “an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.” I think it makes a great deal of sense to spend a dollar to help our young people from becoming criminals in order to save the thousands of dollars it would cost later to incarcerate and rehabilitate them.

I believe one of the most effective forms of prevention is mentoring. I have seen firsthand that mentoring can make an important difference in a child’s life through my participation in a wonderful program started by Senator Judd Gregg and family. Every single week, I have the privilege of spending an hour or so with a boy named Jamal. It has been a pleasure to watch him learn and grow into a fine, confident, young man. I would encourage any of my colleagues who want to make a real difference to become a mentor.

At-risk young people with mentors are 46 percent less likely to use illegal drugs and half as likely to skip school than at-risk youth without mentors. Nearly three-quarters of young people with mentors indicate that their mentors have helped to raise their goals and expectations.

Unfortunately, there are too many at-risk youth who do not have an adult willing or able to give them the regular, individual attention they need. The amendment offered by Senator KERREY and I would help to ensure that mentoring programs in each of our states are funded by the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Challenge Grant program established in this bill. I believe this would be a good investment in our young people, and I again thank my colleagues for their support of this amendment.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise to express my appreciation to the managers of this bill for agreeing to include in the manager’s package my amendment to authorize the FAST (Families and Schools Together) program.

Over the last few weeks, we have all spent much time mourning lost children—whether they are lost to bullets, or to the lure of a violent culture, whether they end their lives holding a gun or facing one. And we have spent much time discussing the many factors that can lead our young people to be some kind of gun or mindless T.V., or savage movies, or violent video games, or illegal drugs. But we know that a child is most likely to be lost—most likely to fall under the influence of these evils—when he or she is alone, cut off from parents, teachers, and the community.

FAST is a successful program that finds troubled youth and reconnects them with their schools and families. FAST brings at-risk children, parents, and educators together to help them learn to succeed at home, in school, and in their communities. FAST helps ensure that youth violence does not proliferate to our schools and communities by empowering parents, helping to improve children’s behavior and performance in school, preventing substance abuse, and providing support and networking for families by linking them to community resources and services.

Currently, the FAST program—which was created in my home state of Wisconsin—is being implemented in 184 schools in 34 States and five countries. It has received numerous national honors and awards, and is supported by the Department of Education, Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, National Institute of Mental Health, Head Start, the Harvard/Ford Foundation, and the United Way of America.

My amendment is simple and effective. It authorizes $12 million a year for the next five years to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Programs in the Department of Justice for FAST sites and programs. Of this amount, $10 million will go toward the implementation of local FAST sites and programs and $2 million will be used for research and evaluation of FAST. This amendment will allow more communities across the nation to reap the benefits of FAST—and will go a long way toward preventing youth violence in this country.

Mr. President, one of the best ways to prevent youth violence is by building and preserving close, healthy relationships within families. The FAST program is instrumental in achieving this goal, and has been a major help in reducing behavioral problems among troubled youth. I am pleased that Senators HATCH and LEAHY have recognized the importance of this small, yet vitally important program by including the FAST amendment in the manager’s package. I thank them for their efforts in working with me on this amendment.

I yield the floor.
NIH currently provides modest support for behavioral research related to violence, but the research is seriously under-funded in light of the obvious magnitude of the problem. In addition, the current funding is spread across many NIH institutes and some important research is underfunded at important levels.

This coordinated initiative, relying on the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research at NIH, will enable NIH to respond more quickly to the crisis of youth violence, eliminate the gaps in current knowledge, and focus more effectively on the important high priority questions that scientists in the field have identified.

Violence is also a public health problem, and it is as pernicious as any epidemic. The tragic shooting rampage by the two students in Colorado shocked the country into a greater sense of urgency about youth violence. Many elements contribute to violent behavior, and it is seldom traced to any single cause.

These causes need to be better understood if we are to design effective methods for treatment and prevention. We also need a greater understanding of how to apply the knowledge that we already have.

More effective school, family, and community prevention activities can be designed on the basis of what we learn from research and from the practical experience of clinicians, educators, and social scientists. The goal of part of this research effort will be to develop better organizational models of effective partnerships among scientists, public agencies, and community members. The research will also address the psychological impact of violence on the victims, since many perpetrators of violence were themselves victims of violence earlier in their lives.

Our proposal for greater NIH research is an essential part of the answer we are seeking to the tragedies of juvenile violence, and I urge the Senate to support it.

FAST PROGRAM

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to support Senator KOHL’s amendment which was included into the Juvenile Justice bill’s Manager’s Package. Mr. President, Senator KOHL’s amendment would expand the Families and Schools Together or FAST program. The unique FAST program is today being used in 484 schools in 34 states and five countries.

Research indicates that to be most effective, substance abuse prevention programs that intervene when children are young. Researchers also believe that prevention efforts that focus on family and peer relationships can greatly reduce risk factors for our children. While no one solution will rid our country of the almost epidemic drug abuse, it is critical that we make available to students, parents and schools successful programs that can make a difference. FAST has a proven track record: it has been tried, adapted, implemented and studied. It is clearly a program that has proven successful and should be expanded to reach more families in need.

It is important to note, Mr. President, that we are not powerless to help prevent destructive behaviors, such as drug abuse, in our children. The FAST program requires a strong, committed partnership between schools and families to help the students at risk and to intervene successfully to prevent the downward cycle of drug abuse, which too often leads to violence.

I support this amendment, Mr. President, because I know that FAST is a prevention program which helps young children at risk for developing problems later on—by working with them and their family members. The past few years and is expected to continue its growing trend of youth violence. While the law also ensures the quality of the services provided by these workers.

This amendment will make sure that existing collective bargaining agreements, and the rights under those agreements, would not be disturbed when a state program receives a federal grant. The amendment allows for the displacement of current workers when a state program receives a federal grant. For workers who are not covered by a collective bargaining agreement, this amendment may be the only job protection they have when their program is funded under a federal grant.

We all agree that the juvenile justice system must be improved. Let’s also agree that preserving the existing rights of state juvenile justice workers, protecting existing employment relationships, are essential components that must be part of an improved system. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR HIGH RISK YOUTH

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, America is struggling with a disturbing and growing trend of youth violence. While it is true that crime is generally down in many urban and suburban areas, it is equally true that crime committed by teens has risen sharply over the past few years and it is expected to continue to rise. Crime experts who study demographics warn of a coming crime wave
based on the number of children who currently are younger than 10 years old. These experts warn that if current trends are not changed, we might someday look back at our current juvenile crime epidemic as “the good old days.”

Thirty years ago, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, then an official of the Johnson Administration, wrote that when a community’s families are shattered, crime, violence and rage “are not only to be expected, they are virtually inevitable.” He wrote those words in 1965. Since then, arrests of violent juvenile criminals have tripled.

If we have learned anything from this debate and from all the research that has been done on juvenile violence, it is that there is no magic bullet, no single solution or panacea to the problem of rising juvenile crime. Juvenile crime is a complex problem that demands a myriad of responses. It is a problem that demands a partnership solution involving families, community, religious institutions, the media, the schools and law enforcement.

The amendment I am offering today with Senator Lieberman is a multi-tiered approach. First, the proposal targets those at the highest risk of leading lives that are unproductive and negative; youth who have been or are likely to be incarcerated. Second, it brings together representatives of local government, juvenile detention probation officers, youth street workers, local educational agencies, and religious institutions to provide highly intensive, coordinated, and effective intervention services to high risk youth.

We provide seed money ($4 million a year with a 30% match) to enable the establishment of a collaborative partnership in 12 cities: Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Denver, Cleveland, San Francisco, Austin, Memphis, and Indianapolis. We also provide grants to grass roots entities in 8 cities to fund intervention models that establish violence-free zones through mediation, mentoring, coordination with law enforcement and local agency partnerships and the development of long term intervention strategies.

Research has documented that this is the approach that yields sustainable results. We at Venture for America have partnered with Ventures, Inc., which has been engaged in the study of programs for children, youth and families, interventions for seriously at-risk older youth and youth who have already become involved with the juvenile justice system require an innovative, law of youth development and crime reduction strategies. This amendment does just that.

At the same time we must recognize that government solutions are limited. Government is ultimately powerless to force the human conscience that chooses between right and wrong. Locking away juveniles might prevent them from committing further crimes, but it does not address the fact that violence is symptomatic of a much deeper, moral and spiritual void in our Nation.

In the battle against violent crime, solid families are America’s strongest line of defense. But government can and must partner with private efforts to create institutions (families, churches, schools, community groups, and non-profit organizations) in preventing and confronting juvenile crime with the moral ideals that defeat despair and nurture lives.

This amendment is a step in that direction and I urge its adoption.

“PARTNERSHIPS FOR HIGH-RISK YOUTH”

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I support Gregg’s “Partnerships for High Risk Youth” amendment. This amendment establishes a national demonstration project to identify the most effective practices and programs for reducing youth violence. This initiative will provide 12 high-risk cities across the nation with funds to carry out local demonstration projects. These initiatives will help us learn more about the best programs for reducing youth violence. Communities across the country will benefit from the knowledge.

The most successful violence prevention programs take a comprehensive approach to youth violence. The goal is to reach out to youth and their families on a variety of levels. Diverse groups—law enforcement, schools, mental health professionals, religious organizations, parents, and teachers—all need to join forces. This amendment supports this vital type of cooperation. The knowledge we gain will save lives. Communities across the country will be able to learn from these successful models and develop similar programs in their own towns and cities.

Boston has long understood the importance of community cooperation, and the city has been identified in this debate. We have discussed have proven effective there. Boston’s strategy is based on three strong commitments—tough law enforcement, heavy emphasis on crime prevention (including drug treatment), and effective gun control. Neglect of any one of these commitments undermines the whole strategy.

Several years ago, concerned groups in Boston joined forces to develop community-based solutions that made it possible for children, youth and families to thrive. Successful partnerships have included the pairing of mental health professionals, police and probation officers and school administrators with clergy, community leaders, and even gang members themselves. Statistics show that this strategy works. During the period from July 1995 through December 1997, there was only one juvenile death in Boston that involved a firearm.

Boston’s Ten Point Coalition has received national acclaim for its work with troubled youth. This is exactly the type of program that Senator Gregg’s amendment will support. The Ten Point Coalition which was founded by Rev. Eugene Rivers, is an ecumenical group of clergy and lay leaders who are working to mobilize the community on issues affecting African-American youth—especially those at risk. The Coalition is committed to helping at-risk children reach their full potential, and it offers training, technical assistance, resource development, and networking opportunities to churches and other community groups interested in mentoring, advocacy, economic alternatives, and violence prevention. Its goal is to build a coalition of churches nationwide, united in their commitment to changing children’s lives and reducing violence.

This amendment will help outstanding initiatives like this across the country, and I urge the Senate to support it.

VIOLENCE PREVENTION TRAINING FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, one of the best ways to approach juvenile justice is to prevent violent offenses from occurring in the first place. Therefore, I am pleased to offer the “Violence Prevention Training for Early Childhood Educators” amendment to S. 254. This amendment—which I understand will be contained in the Managers’ amendment—would authorize no less than $15 million in grants for teachers to learn violence prevention skills.

All of us have been shaken by the tragedy at Littleton, CO. Americans are left searching for answers to many questions. How could these teenagers have committed such brutality? What happened to the innocence and joy of youth? How can society help prevent such deadly behavior from happening again?

One of the most effective solutions is to begin violence prevention at an early age. This program is a carefully thought-out program aimed at true prevention. It is designed to help early childhood educators—the people who work directly with young children in preschools, child care centers, and elementary schools—learn the skills necessary to prevent violent behavior in children. This program will provide support to programs that prepare these professionals so that early childhood teachers, child care providers, and counselors are able to teach children how to resolve conflicts without violence. In addition, these professionals are in the perfect position to reach out and extend these lessons to parents and help whole families adopt these powerful skills.

Research has demonstrated that aggressive behavior in early childhood is the single best predictor of aggression in later years. Children observe and imitate aggressive behavior over the course of many years. They certainly
have plenty of exposure to violence, both in the streets and at home. A Boston hospital found that 1 out of every 10 children seen in their primary care clinic had witnessed a shooting or stabbing before the age of 6.

I am proud to report that in my home State of Connecticut, 1 in 10 teens have been physically abused. Alarmingly, more than a third of teenage boys report that they have guns or could get one in less than a day. In these circumstances, aggression becomes very well-learned by the time a child reaches adolescence.

We must provide children with strategies for altering the negative influences of exposure to violence. Early childhood offers a critical period for overcoming the risk of violent behavior and later juvenile delinquency. And the proper training of professionals who work with young children offers a source of teaching social skills and acceptable behavior. Instead, these teachers should demonstrate these skills with the children in their care and be encouraged to work with the whole family to address conflict without violence and aggression.

In 1992, Congress enacted similar legislation to provide grants for programs that address the needs of young children in early childhood education and violence counseling. These grants funded some remarkable programs. In my home state, a program at Eastern Connecticut State University trained students—half of whom were minority, low-income individuals—to be teachers in their own communities, and trained child care providers in violence prevention with young children.

Unfortunately, just as these efforts were getting off the ground and starting to show promising results, the funding for the program was rescinded as part of the major 1994 rescission bill. Looking back, after the horrible events in Littleton, CO, Springfield, OR, and too many other communities, I think we can clearly see that was a mistake. Hindsight is always clearer—but let’s not make the same mistake going forward. Let’s reinvest in these efforts so that we can prevent our children from developing into violent juvenile offenders.

Preventing future acts of violence is an issue that rises above partisan politics. I think we can all agree that steps need to be taken to reduce the development of violent behavior in children. Please join me in this effort to begin creating a safer society for everyone, especially our children.

TRUANCY PREVENTION

Mr. DODD. As many of my colleagues know, I have worked consistently for the last several years to address what I believe is the key "gateway" of trends leading to delinquency and serious crime among our youth—Truancy. Working with Senator Sessions, we have been able to include language encouraging states and local communities to pursue truancy prevention programs with the assistance they will receive under this bill. I want to thank Senator Sessions for working with me on this effort.

Truancy is a dangerous and growing trend in our nation’s schools. It not only prevents our children from receiving the education they need, but it is often the first warning of more serious problems to come. Truant students are at greater risk of falling into substance abuse, gangs, and violent behavior. For many students, truancy is the beginning of a lifetime of problems.

It is estimated that, in the past ten years, truancy has increased by as much as 67 percent. On an average school day, in the United States, as many as 15 percent of junior and senior high school students are not in school. In some urban schools, absentee rates approach 50 percent. Alarmingly, the truant students are those most prevalent in our elementary schools. Almost one quarter of Connecticut’s truants were 13 or younger.

By some estimates, truants cost our nation more than $240 billion in lost earnings and forgone taxes over their lifetimes. Yet this sum does not include the billions more in dollars spent on law enforcement, foster care, prisons, public assistance, health care and other social services.

Fortunately, truancy is a solvable problem. Many communities, including many in Connecticut, have set up early intervention programs—to reach out and prevent truancy before it leads to delinquency and more serious criminal behavior. A number of Connecticut cities have brought back truant officers, hired drop-out prevention workers, held parents accountable for their students’ absences, denied credit to students with unexecuted absences, and have created truancy courts.

These programs are showing signs of success. Several towns have reported dramatic drops in daytime burglary rates—some as much as 75 percent—after instituting truancy prevention initiatives.

Unfortunately, communities have had difficulty implementing these programs as truancy is considered an educational rather than a criminal justice issue, and, with growing classroom enrollments, many financially-strapped schools simply do not have the resources to adequately address this problem.

The provision that Senator Sessions and I are adding to the juvenile justice bill will ensure that communities have the wherewithal they need to respond to this increasingly serious problem. The legislation’s goal is to promote anti-truancy partnerships between law enforcement agencies, schools, parents, and, community organizations. While each state can design a program which works for it, I believe that there are certain key components of successful programs.

First, parents must be involved in all truancy prevention activities and they must be given incentives to face up to their own responsibilities. Second, students must understand that they will face firm sanctions for truancy. Third, all hubs of this partnership wheel—law enforcement, educational agencies, parents, and youth serving organizations—must work together to help solve this problem.

Truancy is an early warning that a child is heading in the wrong direction. I am hopeful that states and communities will use this new authority to support high quality truancy partnership projects. And we can move on to spend more time celebrating the accomplishments of our children than grieving over lost opportunities to stop the cycle leading to violent crime.

FEDERAL SON OF SAM LEGISLATION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, last year, I introduced a bill to correct problems with the Federal Son of Sam Law. As the United States Supreme Court found, the statute is both over inclusive and under inclusive: Over inclusive because the statute included all expressive works, no matter how tangentially related to the crime; under inclusive because the statute included only expressive works, not other forms of property.

To correct the deficiencies perceived by the Court, this bill changes significantly the concepts of the Federal statute. Because the Court criticized the Federal statute for singling out speech, this bill is all encompassing: It includes various types of property related to the crime from which a criminal might profit. Because the Court criticized the statute for being over inclusive, including the process from all works, no matter how remote to the crime, this bill limits the property to be forfeited to the enhanced value of property attributable to the offense. Because the Court found fault with the statute for not requiring a conviction, this bill requires a conviction before the property is forfeited.

The bill also attempts to take advantage of the long legal history of forfeiture. Pirate ships and their contents
Mr. SCHUMER. We need to support parents, not attack them. Sylvia Boelet and Carol West said it best in the title of their recent book, "The War Against Parents." That’s exactly how it feels to many of today’s parents. Like parents of their recent book, "The War Against
were once forfeited to the government. More recent case law addresses the concept of forfeiting any property used in the commission of drug related crimes, or proceeds from those crimes. I hope that courts interpreting this statute will look to this legal history and find it binding in persuasive.

The bill utilizes the Commerce Clause authority of Congress to forfeit property associated with State crimes. This means that if funds are transferred through banking channels, if UPS or FedEx are used, if the airwaves are utilized, or if the telephone is used to transfer the property, to transfer funds, or to make a profit, the property can be forfeited. In State cases, this bill allows the State Attorney General to proceed first. We do not seek to preempt State law, only to see that there is a law in place which will ensure that criminals do not profit at the expense of their victims and the families of victims.

One last improvement which this bill makes over the former statutes: The old statute include only crimes which resulted in physical harm to another, this bill includes other crimes. Examples of crimes probably not included under the old statute, but included here are terrorizing, kidnapping, bank robbery, and embezzlement.

Mr. President, our Federal statute, enacted to ensure that criminals not profit at the expense of their victims and victim’s families, is not used today because it is perceived to be unconstitutional. I believe victims of crime deserve quick action on this bill, drafted to ensure that they are not the source of profits to those who committed crimes against them. I ask for your support.

AMENDMENT NO. 352

Mr. CHAFEE. I just want to be clear about the civil liability provisions. Does this bill create civil liability immunity for gun manufacturers, dealers of guns accessed in the home, or manufacturers or distributors of safety devices?

Mr. KOHL. No. It creates civil liability immunity only for gun owners.

Mr. CHAFEE. Does this bill create civil liability immunity only for gun owners who use a safety device?

Mr. KOHL. That is correct.

Mr. CHAFEE. Does that immunity apply if the gun owner is negligent—even if he doesn’t actually give anyone permission to use the gun, but for example leaves the key to the lock sitting next to the gun?

Mr. KOHL. No.

Mr. CHAFEE. And is it correct that this section does not change in any way existing product liability law?

Mr. KOHL. That is correct.

Mr. CHAFEE. And, finally, is it correct that any pending suits against gun owners would be allowed to continue?

Mr. KOHL. That is correct.

Mr. CHAFEE. I thank the Senator once again. On another matter, I want to make equally clear for the record exactly what a "secure gun storage or safety device" is and is not. Specifically, would the Senator from Wisconsin agree with me that the definition of such devices in our amendment is intended solely to include personal-ized guns, lockable devices which either are affixed to a firearm directly, or to the safe or owners or safe?

Mr. KOHL. I would agree.

Mr. CHAFEE. Finally, would you further concur with me that our definition of a "secure gun storage or safety device" is not intended to include a permanent feature of a home or motor vehicle, such as a closet or glove box, even though such environments also may be locked?

Mr. KOHL. I would agree.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, for the past several days, we have debated the best practices and programs for preventing youth violence. We have disagreed on a number of issues including the need to restrict guns, invest in after-school programs, and counseling services and mental health services for troubled youths and children. But there is one issue that members on both sides of the aisle agree on—parents play an important role in their children’s lives. Everywhere we look, children are under assault: from violence and neglect; from the break-up of families; from the temptations of alcohol, tobacco, sex, and drug abuse; from greed, materialism, and the media. These are not just issues of time; they have become increasingly serious. Against this bleak backdrop, the struggle to raise children and to support families, emotionally as well as practically, has become more difficult.

Parents bear the first and primary responsibility for their sons and daughters—to feed them, to shelter them, to talk to them, to teach them to ride a bike, to encourage their talents, to help them develop physically and emotionally and make decisions that influence their growth and development.

Parents are the most important influence in their children’s lives, but they are being pulled in many different directions. Healthy development depends on strong parental guidance. Spending time together is an essential part of building positive parent-child relationships. Yet time together is increasingly scarce.

Parents neglecting fewer meals and having fewer conversations with their children. Between 1988 and 1995, a significant drop took place in parent-child activities. Sixty-two percent of mothers reported eating dinner with their child on a daily basis in 1988, but only 55 percent reported doing so in 1995. Fifty percent ate dinner with their child in 1988, but this rate dropped to 42 percent in 1995.

We need to support parents, not attack them. Sylvia Boellet and Carol West said it best in the title of their recent book, "The War Against Parents." That’s exactly how it feels for many of today’s parents. Like parents before them, they struggle to keep children at the center of their lives. But major obstacles stand in their way, undermining their efforts.

Over the course of the last thirty years, public policy and private decision-making have often tilted heavily in favor of activities that undermine the essence of parenting. A myopic government increasingly fails to protect or support parents, while the competitive forces in the marketplace are rewarded for making the toughest decisions at the expense of time. We talk as though we value families but act as though families are a last priority. Sooner or later, worn-out parents get the message that devoting their best time to raising children is a lonely, thankless undertaking that cuts against the grain of other activities that are apparently valued more highly by society.

Last week, I spent time in Boston talking to students about violence and other issues affecting their lives. I asked them whether they felt their parents were too busy to talk to them—and 3/4ths of the students raised their hands.

Parents need to spend more time listening to children—and the nation needs to ask, “How important is it for the country to pay more attention to teenagers and their problems?” Eighty-nine percent of those polled replied that it is very important. If parents are not raising their children, we need to worry about who is.

The wrong kind of parenting can cause problems as well. Inconsistent or overly harsh discipline, may lead children to develop aggressive behavior. Inconsistent discipline is often associated with poor behavior in school and at home. These children also tend to have more trouble establishing strong relationships with their family, their teachers and their fellow students.

Parents and caregivers who can make a significant difference in avoiding such problems. A recent study published in the American Psychological Association’s Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology found that mothers who participated in Head Start parenting programs showed a decrease in their use of harsh criticism and an increase in their use of positive and competent discipline. The children were happier and their behavior was more satisfactory than children whose mothers did not receive parenting education.

When parents have the skills to deal effectively with their children, they are less likely to be abusive. Unfortunately, too many parents lack these essential skills. Each year over 3 million children are identified as victims of abuse or neglect. The consequences are devastating. Traumatized children are more likely to have alcohol and substance abuse problems and learning difficulties. They are also more likely to be arrested as juveniles and to engage in abusive behavior toward their own children when they become parents.
We know that suffering abuse as a child is strongly related to subsequent delinquency and abusive behavior later in life. But improved parenting skills can help break this vicious cycle. Parenting support and education have been proven to reduce abuse. In the Prevention of Early Infant Physical Abuse Act, high-risk mothers were randomly assigned to one of two groups. One group received visits by specially trained nurses who provided coaching in parenting skills and other advice and support. The other group received no services. For those who received the assistance, child abuse was reduced by 80% in the first 2 years. 15 years after the services ended, these mothers had only one-third as many arrests, and their children were only half as likely to be delinquent.

Law enforcement officials also recognize the benefits of training parents. More than 9 out of 10 police chiefs (92%) agreed with the statement, "America could sharply reduce crime if government invested more in programs to help children and youth get off to a good start" by "fully funding Head Start for infants and toddlers, preventing child abuse, providing parenting training for high-risk families, improving schools, and providing after school programs and mentoring."

These law enforcement officers are right. Parenting classes in conjunction with early education programs improve caregiver characteristics, reduce crime dramatically and they reduce the likelihood of later delinquent behavior. A High/Scope Foundation study at the Perry Preschool in Michigan provided at-risk 3 and 4-year-olds with a quality Head Start-style preschool program, supplemented by weekly in-home coaching for parents. Two decades later, more than 25 years after the children entered the program, the children who received visits were five times more likely to be delinquent by age 16. We pay a high price for abuse and neglect. In addition to its damaging psychological consequences, it is estimated that $22 billion is spent each year on services for abused children, their families, and foster care families. Investing in prevention programs, particularly parent support and education, will significantly reduce these abuse-related expenditures.

There is no question that investing in parents will pay off. When we don’t make this investment, we all pay more later, not just in terms of lives and fear, but also in tax dollars. The "Parenting As Prevention" Act, which Senator STEVENS and I are proposing, will invest in services that will improve parenting skills.

To identify the best parenting practices, a National Parenting Support and Education Commission will be established. The Commission will identify the most effective parenting practices, including the best strategies for disciplining children and youth, the best approaches for building integrity and character, and the best techniques for ensuring healthy brain development. The Commission will also conduct a review of existing parenting support and education programs, and will provide Congress with the Administration with a detailed report of its findings. Perhaps, most important, essential parenting information will also be provided to parents—no new family will leave a hospital or adoption agency without information on how to best care for a baby. In Massachusetts, such an initiative is already underway.

Our amendment also supports the establishment of a grant program to strengthen state initiatives for supporting and educating parents. Block grants from the Department of Health and Human Services will provide child development and health services for parents of young children and teenagers. The grant program will support a wide variety of parental support initiatives including: home visitation programs for new babies; the distribution of parenting and early childhood development materials; the development of support programs for parents of young children and teenagers; respite care for parents of children with special needs; and the creation of a national toll-free number that will offer counseling and referral services for parents.

Finally, our amendment will improve mental health services for violence-related issues and address the country will be established to provide special training and research in psychological counseling and treatment. We know that the early years are essential to healthy development and that inadequate care during this critical period can have a devastating impact on future behavior. To reverse the impact of negative early experiences, regional centers on psychological and trauma response will identify the best practices for dealing with these problems. If the long-run, successful early intervention is the best way to modify the culture of violence instilled in so many youth.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Investing in parents and children is one of the best ways to prevent youth violence and we clearly need to do more in order to achieve this important goal.

I ask unanimous consent that letters of support for this amendment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Latins School of Chicago, Chicago, IL, May 18, 1999.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I am writing to support your efforts at adding The Stevens-Kennedy Amendment to S. 254—the Parenting as Prevention Act. I have working at parenting education for two decades. I have taught parent education to lawyers, social workers, teachers, parents and students in k-12 settings in some of the most violent neighborhoods in Chicago. I have been able to prove that it does help children and parents to have more options to understand the needs of parents and others and to choose non-violent solutions to problems.

I have also been working for several years on doing this for years at our own expense because we know how important parent education and support is to parents and future parents. Thank you for your efforts and please call upon me in any way I can to support the new Act to do our good work.

Very sincerely yours,

DANA MCDERMOTT MURPHY, Adjunct Professor, Family Studies Program—Loyola of Chicago; Coordinator, Parent Education Initiative, The Latin School of Chicago; Member, Advisory Council of the National Parent Education Network; and Member, Advisory Board of the Parenting Project-Boca Raton, FL.


DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: It is with pleasure that I write to express my full and enthusiastic support for S. 254 entitled ‘’PARENTING AS PREVENTION.’’

The provision of the Amendment, including the establishment of a Parenting Support and Education Commission, a State and Local Parenting Support and Education Grant Program, and the Problems of Violence Related Stress to Parents and Children, could not be more needed, or more timely. I am confident that the Amendment will make an essential contribution in addressing the pressing needs of parents in our country, and thus in preventing the tragic problems among children and youth that confront our nation today.

You are to be commended for your leadership in bringing forward this critically important legislative initiative.

In addition to serving as Administrator of Parenting Programs at MIT, I am Chief Consultant to the Harvard Parenting Projects and Director of the Harvard Project on the Parenting of Adolescents or the Harvard School of Public Health. I am also Founding Chair and National Liaison for the National Parenting Education Network.

If there is any assistance that I can provide to the new Commission, I would be very happy to do so.

Respectfully yours,

A. RAR SIMPSON, Ph.D.
Administrator, Parenting Programs.
and support the premise that parents are the single most important factor in determining the success or failure of their child. Beyond a doubt, based on the very latest research, parents are their child’s most influential teachers. Therefore, it stands to reason that parents truly desire to learn the skills and attitudes they need in order to be the best parent they can be for their child. They need the skills and attitudes not to come naturally; they are learned. We need programs that will ensure that parents are taught those skills and attitudes used in the most positive methods available. Too many of them have learned negative parenting through the bad examples of their own parents.

We are working positive messages to our children instead of the poor, often confusing scenarios, we present to them now. I believe providing the states with funds to help them implement such programs would be most desirable, but only if we have a true method of determining that the monies are being spent correctly on parenting material that have been proven to make a difference in the lives of both parents and their children, and that such programs are making a difference.

Sincerely,

GRETCHEN GLEAVES, Vice President.

THE HEATHS, Haverford, PA, May 18, 1999.

BELINDA ROLLINS, President, Parenting Coalition International, Inc., Washington, DC.

DEAR BELINDA: Thank you for the privilege of reviewing and commenting on the provocative Stevens-Kennedy Amendment to S. 254.

Establishing a Parenting Support and Education Commission must be a component of any effort to improve the lives of America’s children. It is widely recognized that anyone who has made a commitment to care for a child from now until the child reaches adulthood, provide their children with continuity of understanding and love as those children move through their growing years. That continuity is vital given the complexity of the society in which our children live, the range of experiences that they have and the vast number of choices which they have to make.

Senator Kennedy and his staff are to be congratulated for incorporating into the existing bill this additional component that will provide a means of strengthening parents’ ability to nurture their children. My experience with years of working with parents as well as consulting with parent programs world wide has led me to recognize the need for a Commission that focuses on the role of parents in the lives of their children, the effects of that role on the parents themselves and how to support parents that may more effectively nurture their children. The Commission created by this bill will address these needs in at least three ways.

(1) Establishing such a commission will give substance to the importance of parents in the lives of their children. No educational or social agency provides the continuity of love and care that parents give to children. This commission will keep in the national consciousness the unique role of the parent.

(2) The Commission will provide a means for investigating in depth social issues related to parenting. For example, rather than the public argument over whether or not mothers should work, the commission could investigate the conditions that allow parents to have the time they need with their children while also carrying on their own lives and earning a living for their families.

(3) Having state and local initiatives, as described in the bill, will provide a means for raising issues from the local level to national attention as well as a means of passing down current research and information.

This amendment to S. 254 adds a significant component in supporting children by recognizing the important role that parents have in the lives of their children and by providing support and information. Through this work, we can enhance their ability to nurture their children.

Again let me thank you for giving me an opportunity to respond to this innovative amendment.

Sincerely,

BELINDA: Thank you so much for giving me the opportunity to review this amendment. I am amazed that you were able to get it put together and through the channels to be added to the bill. Congratulations.

I hope my letter supports the amendment is the way you had hoped.

I do have some comments on the amendment itself, as I think you were also asking for. I find it fascinating the groups you have included and see the political reasons for doing so. Your political savvy is amazing and so necessary if you are going to achieve your goals. And I am so glad that you are there working towards the betterment of parents.

A few comments: In your list of Commission members you need people knowledgeable about parental development and about the role of the parent in child development. I am not sure I am saying this very clearly but the writing on parents tends to focus on what parents do with and to their children, not on the determinants of the parental behavior themselves. Parenting tends not be discussed as it affects the parent except for specific periods such as the early adjustments to parenthood and parenting the adolescent when the mother may be menopausal and the father seeing limits to what he may accomplish.

I am uneasy about the dichotomy that seems to exist in the 8th and 9th listing. A good parenting education program, not including that produced through the media, has a strong supportive component.

In 8 are you speaking of family support programs such as 24 hour crisis lines and medical services as well as parenting education and support or are you referring to parenting programs that are defined as totally emotion-centered and are without a component except what the parents offer each other? Speaking of “best practices” gives me visions of a cook book. It implies there are good recipes and all we have to do is identify them. I have not yet figured out how to write these scenarios for parents who are developing plans for specific situations.

Planning involves considering several key factors which include obvious such as the development level of the child, the temperament, the needs, and the less often mentioned factors such as what are the parents’ values and beliefs. The fact that parents deal with the issues they face by considering key factors must be recognized, and supported because, as we all know, one approach does not meet the needs of all children. But maybe all this is too complex for a bill.

One other issue—for future consideration. You pass over the elementary school years. They are a time when much of parenting is developing plans for specific situations.

Planning involves considering several key factors which include obvious such as the developmental level of the child, the temperament, the needs, and the less often mentioned factors such as what are the parents’ values and beliefs. The fact that parents deal with the issues they face by considering key factors must be recognized, and supported because, as we all know, one approach does not meet the needs of all children. But maybe all this is too complex for a bill.

One other issue—for future consideration. You pass over the elementary school years. They are a time when much of parenting is developing plans for specific situations.

Planning involves considering several key factors which include obvious such as the developmental level of the child, the temperament, the needs, and the less often mentioned factors such as what are the parents’ values and beliefs. The fact that parents deal with the issues they face by considering key factors must be recognized, and supported because, as we all know, one approach does not meet the needs of all children. But maybe all this is too complex for a bill.

The amendment to S. 254 adds a significant component in supporting children by recognizing the important role that parents have in the lives of their children and by providing support and information. Through this work, we can enhance their ability to nurture their children.

Again, thank you Belinda for the work you are doing and for including me in it.

I will send you a paper copy of the letter. Should it go somewhere else also?

Best wishes. See you Friday,
Perry of Baylor College of Medicine says, “If anything we now know that children are more vulnerable to trauma than adults.” Perry estimates that over 5 million children in the United States are witness to or experience traumatizing violence every year, including 1 million who are victims of abuse or neglect.

Programs that help parents raise responsible, healthy adults save lives and money. For example, a RAND cost-benefit estimate of the PEIP program concluded that the savings to government alone (excluding other benefits to society at large) were four times the costs, and that figure did not include many savings, such as expected lower welfare costs, reduced crime, and rise in adult IQ. The extra taxes they may pay as adults. RAND found that government savings from the program exceeded program costs by the time the kids were four years old.

If we can do more to help you as you consider this amendment, please don’t hesitate to call us.

Sincerely, 
SANFORD A. NEWMAN, 
President.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the following amendment to the Prevention Act be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE STEVENS AMENDMENT—PARENTING AS PREVENTION ACT

The Parenting as Prevention Act addresses youth violence and juvenile delinquency by providing support and training to parents and potential parents to improve their parenting skills and foster appropriate development, attention, and stimulation to improve early childhood development.

A RAND study shows that for every dollar invested in parenting and improving early childhood education through brain stimulation, at least $4 are saved in later prison costs, rehabilitation costs, special education expense, welfare payments, etc. GAO puts the savings at above $7 for every dollar invested.

This state block grant program would be administered by the Secretary of Health and Human Services and developed in cooperation with the Attorney General who has responsibility for justice prevention programs such as the Boys and Girls Clubs, the Secretary of Education who provides support to early childhood learning, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development who would help distribute materials on parenting through public housing programs, the Secretary of Labor who offers parent training to welfare mothers as part of the Welfare to Work program, the Secretary of Agriculture who operates the WIC program and distributes information to rural America through the Extension services, and the Department of Defense who runs child care centers and provides other services to children of military families.

A National Parenting Support and Education Commission would be established to identify the best practices for parenting on issues ranging from discipline to character development to brain development or distribute already available materials. No new family would come home from the hospital or adoption agency without information on how to raise the baby. Referral information on existing federal, state, and local programs would also be collated on one sheet of paper for distribution which would include eligibility criteria, phone numbers, and addresses.

The Commission must wrap up its work within 18 months. The funds as are necessary are authorized for appropriation.

A State and Local Parenting Support and Education Grant Program is established which would provide a block grant to states with a small state minimum: States with Indian populations over 2% would provide 2% of the money to tribes.

The State would establish a State Parenting Support and Education Council to award grants at the local level which would include state government, bipartisan representation from the state legislature, and interested groups to be appointed by the Governor. If a state had an existing group, it could use that.

The State Council would award grants for:

1. Parenting support programs for young children including distribution of parenting materials on brain development and best parenting practices, one visit to mothers of new babies on brain development and best parenting practices (cited as the best way to reduce child abuse, a leading cause of juvenile and violent crime); and parent training programs.

2. Parenting support for teenagers including providing parenting materials in conjunction with existing programs such as Boys and Girls Clubs, YMCA, after school programs, and parent training classes, support groups, and mentors.

3. Parenting support and education resource centers including a national 800 toll free number offering counseling, parenting advice, and referral to existing programs; and respite care for children with special needs (retarded, mentally ill, behavior disorders, FAS/FAE).

A state which got a grant to provide statewide program or a local group would only have to report back every two years, but would have to use specific performance measures, i.e. things like improvement in IQ scores, school grades. No more than 5% of the money could be used for administrative costs. The typical rate is 18-20 percent.

A state would have to maintain its existing effort, i.e. it can’t cut its existing state program and replace it with a federal grant. The program is authorized at such sums as are necessary.

Finally, the bill creates a program to reverse bad brain wiring caused by exposure to physical or sexual abuse or family/community violence. Research shows early intervention to be much more effective than later rehabilitation efforts as an adult.

Again, best practices for dealing with these problems would be identified by regional centers of excellence on psychological trauma and response.

Indian tribes, Native Hawaiians and other non-profits would be eligible for grants which would last for 3 years.

This program is authorized at such sums as are necessary.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider was disagreed to. No. 363 was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

The Senator will withhold. The Senate is not in order. The Senator from Minnesota.

AMENDMENT NO. 364

(Purpose: To make an amendment with respect to disproportionate minority confinement)

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself, Senator KENNEDY, Senator FEINGOLD, and Senator FEINSTEIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN, proposes an amendment numbered 364.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 129, strike lines 6 through 14, and insert the following:

“(24) address juvenile delinquency prevention efforts and system improvement efforts designed to reduce, without establishing or requiring numerical goals or targets, the disproportionate number of juvenile members of racial minority groups who come into contact with the juvenile justice system.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, let me talk in a general way about this. This legislation deals with juvenile justice. This amendment focuses on the justice part. We speak to what is called disproportionate minority confinement. What that really means, in concrete terms, to use one example, is African American kids ages 10 to 17 make up 15 percent of the population, but 26 percent of all juvenile arrests, 32 percent of delinquency referrals to juvenile court, 46 percent of juveniles in public long-term institutions, and 52 percent of cases judicially waived to criminal court; that is, adult court.

In the current legislation, what we have done is we turn the clock back a long ways. In the past, since the late 1980s, we have always tried to deal with this question of disproportionate minority confinement. What this legislation does is to essentially reverse this progress. I think, roughly speaking, about 33 percent of the population, ages 10 to 17, are minority youth. They represent about 66 percent, or thereabouts, of kids who are now incarcerated. The question is, Why?

There are lots of different reasons. Let me just list some that come from Department of Justice reports, some lessons that have been learned from some five different States. Some of the factors that can contribute to minority overrepresentation can be: racial ethnic bias, insufficient diversion options, system labeling, barriers to parental access, poor juvenile community integration, low-income jobs, few job opportunities, few community support services, inadequate health and
The proportion of juveniles detained or confined in secure detention facilities, jails and lockups, who are members of minority groups if such proportion exceeds the proportion such group represents in the general population. S. 254 guts the current law and talks about segments of the juvenile population. What does that mean? Boys? Girls? It does not deal with the issue of race and the severe overrepresentation of young kids of color who are locked up. That is the issue.

This amendment that I bring to the floor with Senator KENNEDY, Senator FEINGOLD, and Senator FEINSTEIN essentially says that we call upon the States to address the juvenile delinquency prevention efforts and system improvement efforts designed to reduce, without establishing or requiring numerical standards or quotas, the disproportionate number of juvenile members of minority groups who come into contact with the juvenile justice system.

This is an eminently reasonable amendment, but it goes to the heart of the debate about racial justice in our country. S. 254 undermines this DMC core requirement of the Juvenile Delinquency and Prevention Act which directs States to identify this disproportionate confinement, to assess the reasons it exits, and to develop strategies to address the disproportionate number of minority children in confinement.

This legislation, as now written, takes those efforts—some good efforts by our States, some 40 States involved with this—and basically heads down and speaks to the issue.

This amendment has nothing to do with quotas. It does not require or suggest the use of numerical quotas for arrests or release of any juvenile from custody based on race. No State’s funding is based upon quotas or anything less. But the key to an effective juvenile justice system is to treat every offender fairly, and to provide the needed services to all. All youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system should receive fair treatment. Surely every Senator agrees with that proposition.

The disproportionate minority confinement requirement in the current law is bringing about change and focusing attention on the problem. The current law says we call upon States to try to come to terms with this question. We call upon States to collect the data. We call upon States to think about whether or not there are steps that they can take to put into effect some of these programs and some of the steps that could be taken to deal with this problem, to bring about more fairness, to end some of the discrimination.

As you look at this graph here, when you have 15 percent of young people ages 10 to 17, African American, but 46 percent of the juveniles in public, long-term institutions are African American kids, this ought to bother all of us. We ought to be concerned about that. Isn’t this juvenile delinquency prevention efforts and system improvement efforts designed to reduce, without establishing or requiring numerical standards or quotas, the disproportionate number of juvenile members of minority groups who come into contact with the juvenile justice system.

At the very least, they are the type of numbers that ought to prompt criminal justice authorities across America to take a closer look at what they are doing.

That is what is so incredible about this legislation right now. It is as if starting in the late 1980s and then going to 1993 we recognized this problem, we learned some lessons from this. William Raspberry wrote in the Washington Post last week:

These numbers strongly imply not disproportionate lawlessness, but dissimilar treatment throughout the juvenile justice system.

At the very least, they are the type of numbers that ought to prompt criminal justice authorities across America to take a closer look at what they are doing.

That is what is so incredible about this legislation right now. It is as if starting in the late 1980s and then going to 1993 we recognized this problem, we learned some lessons from this. William Raspberry wrote in the Washington Post last week:

These numbers strongly imply not disproportionate lawlessness, but dissimilar treatment throughout the juvenile justice system.

At the very least, they are the type of numbers that ought to prompt criminal justice authorities across America to take a closer look at what they are doing.

This amendment has nothing to do with quotas. It does not require or suggest the use of numerical quotas for arrests or release of any juvenile from custody based on race. No State’s funding is based upon quotas or anything less. But the key to an effective juvenile justice system is to treat every offender fairly, and to provide the needed services to all. All youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system should receive fair treatment. Surely every Senator agrees with that proposition.

The disproportionate minority confinement requirement in the current law is bringing about change and focusing attention on the problem. The current law says we call upon States to try to come to terms with this question. We call upon States to collect the data. We call upon States to think about whether or not there are steps that they can take to put into effect some of these programs and some of the steps that could be taken to deal with this problem, to bring about more fairness, to end some of the discrimination.

As you look at this graph here, when you have 15 percent of young people ages 10 to 17, African American, but 46 percent of the juveniles in public, long-term institutions are African American kids, this ought to bother all of us. We ought to be concerned about that. Isn’t this juvenile delinquency prevention efforts and system improvement efforts designed to reduce, without establishing or requiring numerical standards or quotas, the disproportionate number of juvenile members of minority groups who come into contact with the juvenile justice system.

At the very least, they are the type of numbers that ought to prompt criminal justice authorities across America to take a closer look at what they are doing.

That is what is so incredible about this legislation right now. It is as if starting in the late 1980s and then going to 1993 we recognized this problem, we learned some lessons from this. William Raspberry wrote in the Washington Post last week:

These numbers strongly imply not disproportionate lawlessness, but dissimilar treatment throughout the juvenile justice system.

At the very least, they are the type of numbers that ought to prompt criminal justice authorities across America to take a closer look at what they are doing.

That is what is so incredible about this legislation right now. It is as if starting in the late 1980s and then going to 1993 we recognized this problem, we learned some lessons from this. William Raspberry wrote in the Washington Post last week:

These numbers strongly imply not disproportionate lawlessness, but dissimilar treatment throughout the juvenile justice system.

At the very least, they are the type of numbers that ought to prompt criminal justice authorities across America to take a closer look at what they are doing.

That is what is so incredible about this legislation right now. It is as if starting in the late 1980s and then going to 1993 we recognized this problem, we learned some lessons from this. William Raspberry wrote in the Washington Post last week:

These numbers strongly imply not disproportionate lawlessness, but dissimilar treatment throughout the juvenile justice system.

At the very least, they are the type of numbers that ought to prompt criminal justice authorities across America to take a closer look at what they are doing.

That is what is so incredible about this legislation right now. It is as if starting in the late 1980s and then going to 1993 we recognized this problem, we learned some lessons from this. William Raspberry wrote in the Washington Post last week:

These numbers strongly imply not disproportionate lawlessness, but dissimilar treatment throughout the juvenile justice system.

At the very least, they are the type of numbers that ought to prompt criminal justice authorities across America to take a closer look at what they are doing.

That is what is so incredible about this legislation right now. It is as if starting in the late 1980s and then going to 1993 we recognized this problem, we learned some lessons from this. William Raspberry wrote in the Washington Post last week:

These numbers strongly imply not disproportionate lawlessness, but dissimilar treatment throughout the juvenile justice system.

At the very least, they are the type of numbers that ought to prompt criminal justice authorities across America to take a closer look at what they are doing.

That is what is so incredible about this legislation right now. It is as if starting in the late 1980s and then going to 1993 we recognized this problem, we learned some lessons from this. William Raspberry wrote in the Washington Post last week:

These numbers strongly imply not disproportionate lawlessness, but dissimilar treatment throughout the juvenile justice system.

At the very least, they are the type of numbers that ought to prompt criminal justice authorities across America to take a closer look at what they are doing.

That is what is so incredible about this legislation right now. It is as if starting in the late 1980s and then going to 1993 we recognized this problem, we learned some lessons from this. William Raspberry wrote in the Washington Post last week:

These numbers strongly imply not disproportionate lawlessness, but dissimilar treatment throughout the juvenile justice system.

At the very least, they are the type of numbers that ought to prompt criminal justice authorities across America to take a closer look at what they are doing.

That is what is so incredible about this legislation right now. It is as if starting in the late 1980s and then going to 1993 we recognized this problem, we learned some lessons from this. William Raspberry wrote in the Washington Post last week:

These numbers strongly imply not disproportionate lawlessness, but dissimilar treatment throughout the juvenile justice system.

At the very least, they are the type of numbers that ought to prompt criminal justice authorities across America to take a closer look at what they are doing.

That is what is so incredible about this legislation right now. It is as if starting in the late 1980s and then going to 1993 we recognized this problem, we learned some lessons from this. William Raspberry wrote in the Washington Post last week:

These numbers strongly imply not disproportionate lawlessness, but dissimilar treatment throughout the juvenile justice system.

At the very least, they are the type of numbers that ought to prompt criminal justice authorities across America to take a closer look at what they are doing.

That is what is so incredible about this legislation right now. It is as if starting in the late 1980s and then going to 1993 we recognized this problem, we learned some lessons from this. William Raspberry wrote in the Washington Post last week:

These numbers strongly imply not disproportionate lawlessness, but dissimilar treatment throughout the juvenile justice system.

At the very least, they are the type of numbers that ought to prompt criminal justice authorities across America to take a closer look at what they are doing.
of fact, it is very important that we continue to identify some of the problems we have to confront as a nation that deal with race. We are not talking about segments of the population; we are talking about the question of race. And I want to focus the attention on this—takes the House language, which was passed by 400 votes, and we talk about the importance of addressing the juvenile delinquency prevention efforts and the treatment of offenders designd to reduce, without establishing or requiring numerical standards or quotas, the disproportionate number of juvenile members of minority groups who come into contact with the juvenile justice system.

The current law, before this piece of legislation, acknowledges race is an issue. Whether we want to talk about it or not, whether we want to recognize it or not, whether we are comfortable with it or not, this issue is an issue that arose overnight.

In 1988, over a decade ago, the Coalition for Juvenile Justice released a report to Congress in race in the system called "Criminal Balance." They made the point, and this became part of the law that we had to do better as a nation, and that we should be troubled by this, that we should be troubled that close to 70 percent of the kids who are locked up are kids of color, minority youth.

We want to make sure there is no discrimination. We want to make sure kids are treated fairly. We want to make sure all of our citizens have some confidence in this justice system. Well, this piece of legislation takes us a long way back, a long way back.

For those who want to talk about the constitutionality of the DMC provision, it is just a scare tactic. It is just a fable. I read the language of the amendment which makes it crystal clear that we are not talking about numerical standards or quotas. I would like to read from a letter and ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. WELLSTONE. This is from 23 law professors endorsing the constitutionality of the disproportionate minority confinement amendment. I just read:

There can be no serious constitutional objection to the DMC requirement in existing law. First, it does not single out members of racial minorities for any sort of distinctive treatment, nor does it impose any burden on anyone else. The Supreme Court's decisions made it clear that constitutional questions arise, not merely from the use of racial terms, but also from the imposition of otherwise compelling census information about race would be unconstitutional—but only if there is some burden or benefit allocated on the basis of race.

The amendment does nothing that crosses this minimum threshold.

This letter goes on and makes really a very strong case, signed by 23 law professors in our country, I want to just make it real clear that the disproportionate minority confinement amendment that I bring to the floor with Senator KENNEDY is about race. Can I say this one more time to colleagues? Because when you vote on this, please understand this amendment is about race. Please understand that this amendment has the support of probably every single civil rights organization in our country. Please understand that this amendment has the support of just about every single children's organization you can think of, starting with the Children's Defense Fund.

Please understand that this amendment and your vote is all about race, because please understand that we are doing better, but to have a really better America we have to do even better when it comes to questions of race and discrimination.

Please understand that many citizens in our country do not have complete confidence in the minority community sees that close to 70 percent of their kids are locked up, when their kids make up not even 35, 33 percent of the population, and when they see that kids of color wind up in the system, kids do not, having committed the same offense, or given longer sentences, and when they see all the ways in which there is discrimination—and we have not come to terms with what is really going on with so many kids in these communities. It really makes the point to us. The point of this amendment is to make certain that we do not close our eyes to the reality. The statue of justice can keep a blindfold over her eyes, but we cannot put a blindfold over our eyes. We have to be open to the reality that if we are discriminating against any group of Americans, regardless of their background or color, ethnic origin or race or religion, we have to be sensitized to it.

I do not know why this bill takes a step backwards. Thank goodness for the amendment offered by Senator WELLSTONE and others which puts us back on the right track to be honest and fair in the administration of justice in America. I proudly stand in support of your amendment. I thank the Senator for his leadership.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank Senator DURBIN. He would like to be added as an original cosponsor. I would be very proud for him to do that. I ask unanimous consent that Senator DURBIN be added as an original cosponsor. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Thank you, Mr. President.

I have visited some of these facilities and they are pretty troubling. When you visit—I think, again, of the visit to Tallulah, LA—there and there is just a sea of, in this particular case, African American faces, young kids—many of them, by the way, locked up for as long as 23 hours in solitary confinement, 23 hours a day; that is part of what they do there—it is troubling.

I think in the State of Louisiana—I do not know what the overall percentage of the population is, but I think about 30 percent of the kids that are confined there are African American. Here is what makes this so troubling.

It would be easy—I want every Senator and others to hear—that we have attributed this large discrepancy to the fact that young people of different racial groups commit different types of crimes.
In 1992, though, there were significantly higher rates of admission of African American juveniles for every offense group. Please listen to that, because I do not want some colleague to come out on the floor and say: Well, there is a reason for this. These kids commit the crime more times per capita, and so forth.

Crimes against persons: Black males and females were six times more likely to be admitted to State juvenile facilities than their white counterparts—same offenses, six times more likely.

Property crimes: Black males were almost four times more likely to be admitted to State juvenile facilities than white males, and black females were almost three times more likely to be committed than white females.

Drug offenses: Black males were confined at a rate 30 times that of white males. In fact, among all offense categories, black youth were more likely to be detained than white youth during every year between 1985 and 1994. Black males were also more likely to be removed from their families than white youth. Black youth are also much more likely to end up in prisons with adult offenders.

In 1995, nearly 10,000 juvenile cases were transferred to adult criminal court by judicial waiver. Of those proceedings, cases involving black youth were 50 percent more likely to be waived than those involving white youth. Overall, again, black youth were more likely than white youth to be committed to adult court, and in most States minority juveniles were overrepresented on average in these adult jails at a rate more than 2½ times their proportion of the total youth population. These are damning statistics.

When he was director of the Massachusetts Department of Services, Commissioner—Member Jerome Miller wrote damning statistics. He said:

The obvious is demonstrated by the statistics I have mentioned on the floor and those read by my colleagues on the other side. I hope it will be enacted as part of this legislation. I say, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, every Senator should take this amendment very, very seriously.

I yield back to the Senator.

So there is also a connection to this problem, I argue, in the fact that, roughly speaking, in 1999 one-third of all African American men between the ages of 25 and 29, and roughly one-quarter of African American men between the ages of 20 and 26, are either in prison or waiting to be sentenced, or have been paroled. Five times as many African American men of this young age are in prison as are in college, in higher education, in the State of California. We have to ask ourselves what is going on.

Again, we were making progress up to this legislation. We were making progress. We did something that made sense to our States. We called upon our States to really look at this problem and try to address this problem.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HATCH. As usual, I have to comment the Senator from Minnesota for one more reason.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. Hatch. As usual, I have to comment the Senator from Minnesota for one more reason. The amendment makes an overt racial classification. This amendment is unconstitutional.

As the late Mr. Marbury can con- clude, there is a civil rights violation in the bill for law enforcement and accountability purposes and 55 percent of the money for prevention purposes. But, you know, you still can't ignore the fact that these kids are committing crimes. Just because you would like the statistics to be relatively proportionate, if that isn't the case, because more young people commit crimes from one minority classification group than the other, it doesn't solve the problem by saying states should find a way of letting these kids out.

Now, if there is another problem, if there is literally a civil rights violation or a discrimination against minority youth, then the problem is not that the law would fix. But I don't think that is a case that has been made so far.

The Democrats' amendment requires States to address efforts to reduce the proportion of juveniles who have contact with the juvenile justice system who are members of minority groups, if such proportion exceeds the proportion such groups represent in the general population. It fails to take into consideration who is committing these crimes. If a higher proportion of young African Americans are committing the crimes, do we just ignore that because we don't like the fact that it is disproportionate compared to Hispanic Americans, Anglo Americans? I don't think we go around the fact that the ones who are committing the crimes are the ones who are arrested or incarcerated.

This amendment is not only ill-advised as a matter of policy and principle, but it is also unconstitutional. The amendment makes an overt racial classification. Juveniles must be classified according to race in order for this amendment to be followed. This amendment is unconstitutional.

The Supreme Court in the 1979 decision of Personnel Administrator of the State of Massachusetts v. Feeney: A racial classification, regardless of its purported motivation, is presumptively invalid and can be upheld only upon an extraordinary justification.

Now, such a classification could be upheld if there is an extraordinary justification, but that is not evident here. I just hear that there are more young African American kids who go to jail than white kids, therefore, there must be something wrong with the system.

I don't agree with that. If there are more young African American kids in jail, that means there is a problem with the system.

Mr. Hatch. As usual, I have to comment the Senator from Minnesota for his heart and for his desire to try to resolve problems that are difficult in our society. I have to say that I am concerned that the Senate's commitment to confinement of minority youth, especially young African Americans and Hispanics, in our society—especially African Americans because it is disproportionate. If you really stop and think about it, the issue is who is committing the crimes.

I also agree it would be wonderful if we had a perfect system of rehabilitation for these young people. The juvenile justice bill provides an additional $47 million in additional to the $4.1 billion we spend annually for helping young people to get rehabilitated or to prevent crime to begin with. I think that is the right direction. It is probably the closest thing in history that has 45 percent of the money in the bill for law enforcement and accountability purposes and 55 percent of the money for prevention purposes.
committing crimes, and especially vicious crimes and violent crimes, you don’t help the problem by saying they should not be punished and they should not be incarcerated somehow or other be sent to—unless there is a justification for that.

Now, according to Personnel Administrator of Massachusetts v. Feeney, a 1979 decision:

A racial classification, regardless of its purported motivation, is presumptively invalid and can be upheld only upon an extraordinary justification.

That is the law, and I think it is a correct law.

More recently, in Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena, the Supreme Court held that the Constitution requires the strictest judicial scrutiny “of all race-based action” by Government. What does that mean? It means that this amendment is subject to strict scrutiny and remediation. Thus, you may ask: if it is, under Adarand, “narrowly tailored to achieve a compelling governmental interest.”

This amendment does not pass strict scrutiny. “Compelling interest” the Supreme Court has recognized in this context is the remediation of past discrimination. Moreover, the Court requires a particularized showing of past discrimination. I don’t think anybody would disagree with that.

Here there is no such proof of discrimination, and the current law, which this amendment replicates—and, I might add, expands—is not narrowly tailored to remedy past discrimination. In fact, the Justice Department regulations under current law require States to intervene regardless of the cause of disproportionate confinement. Instead of remedying past discrimination, much of the current law is aimed at preventing future discrimination, not past discrimination. Here, the current law it replicates, and the current law it replicates, cannot pass strict scrutiny.

I wish I could support this amendment, but its constitutional flaws prevent me from doing so. And, frankly, I believe that this amendment is bad social policy, because basically this amendment just says that these young people who have been engaged in criminal activity, somehow or other, should be proportionately given a break because there are more—in this case—young African Americans than young whites who are convicted. Now, that is unconstitutional in the light of Adarand and the Feeney case, and, frankly, under any principle of racial neutrality in the juvenile system.

The proponents of this amendment are motivated, in my opinion, by the best of intentions. I share their concern. That is one reason I want this juvenile justice bill to pass, so we can get serious about violent juvenile crime and so we can use the tools of this bill to help prevent that in the future. And we have significant prevention money in this bill to help get these kids away from ever committing crime again.

Like I say, the proponents are sincere. They want to help minority children avoid detention. However, I believe the best way to prevent the detention of juveniles is to prevent juveniles—of all races—from committing crime. I am proud that S. 254 provides $547.5 million in new funds for prevention programs. I have had to fight to have that appropriation and in addition to the $4.4 billion that we already have on the books every year for prevention programs.

It is unhealthy for the Government to focus only on reducing the detention of minority juveniles. We should focus on preventing crime committed by juveniles of all races and recognize that detention of juvenile offenders is sometimes necessary. As this current debate illustrates, it is inherently divisive when the Government makes racial classifications.

Look, if there is discrimination against minority kids, then you can count on me. I will fight alongside of my Democrat colleagues to end that discrimination. In fact, I believe that discrimination is inherently divisive without consideration to what crimes were committed, it seems to me, is not only unconstitutional, it is wrong.

S. 254 has a better provision. It requires that detention resources be directed to “segments of the juvenile population” that are disproportionately detained. Such “segments of the population” could include, for example, certain socioeconomic groups that are more likely to be at risk. S. 254 directs prevention resources to such groups who need these resources the most.

Finally, not only is this amendment unconstitutional, it sets a terrible precedent. The premise of this amendment—requiring States to provide racial groups special attention if members of those groups are disproportionately likely to be detained—could be used to justify racial profiles. In my opinion, racial profiling is also unconstitutional. I believe there is a significant number of constitutional authorities would agree with my analysis on that.

The Government simply cannot use race as a classification or a factor in the criminal justice system, because our system of justice should be color blind. If it is not, then I will work to correct that. But I don’t have any evidence that it is not at this particular point, other than the visceral feeling of some that because more young African Americans than whites are convicted and sentenced to detention, there must be something wrong with the system.

Mr. President, I strongly urge the Senate to oppose this amendment.

I also understand that in our society a lot of young African American kids, a lot of young Hispanic kids, a lot of young Native Americans—and you can just go down almost every minority; there are literally dozens of minorities in this country—a lot of them don’t have the best chance in this life. They are born into poverty. They are born into situations where there is no father, or they have a father who takes off on them, or they have a father who won’t accept responsibility. They start off with a couple of strikes against them. I acknowledge that. We have to do something about that. But that doesn’t mean we have to start racial profiling or that we have to start racial classifications to get there, unless we can show that there is a reason we can show that there is a reason to have this amendment.

If I might add a final note. I have bent over backwards to craft language which addresses the concerns raised by my colleagues. This language is constitutional and it has bipartisan support. Senator BIDEN supports the underlying amendment, and with good reason, because it is constitutional.

Having said all of that, again I will reiterate that I respect my colleagues. I respect their desire to right wrongs in our society. They know that I work on that too. I respect their desire to make sure that everybody is treated equally and in a decent manner. I respect their desire to try to prevent discrimination in our society. I join with them in those matters. But this particular amendment, it seems to me, is unconstitutional, and I certainly hope our colleagues will vote against it when I move to table it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. President, I want to start of all, thank my friend and colleague, Senator WELLSTONE, for offering this amendment and say that I welcome the opportunity to join him and urge the Senate to accept this amendment, and to say that I think it is very basic and fundamental to the underlying purpose of the legislation, which is to try to deal with the challenge of juvenile violence in our country today.

Mr. President, the fact is that we should not have to be taking the time to try to make my language. Because I am sure, as Senator WELLSTONE has pointed out, that this language which we are attempting to place into the juvenile justice bill is effectively the language that has been there since 1992. It was placed there as a result of extensive hearings that were held by Congress and the Senate—during that period of time—that showed the disparity of treatment between blacks and whites in the juvenile justice system.

There is a range of different aspects of this particular proposal, there must be something wrong with the system.

I say at the outset that we will include in the RECORD a very comprehensive review on the constitutionality of this issue. It is interesting to hear that argument raised at this particular time, because the language has been in effect since 1992 and not challenged on a constitutional basis. It has just been mentioned during the course of this evening.

But, Mr. President, we should not look at this particular undertaking really in the abstraction of just juvenile justice. What we have to understand is that we as a country inscribed
time to talk about this and to debate it, you would find that States are making important progress in many different areas to try to deal with fundamental and underlying causes in their various communities. That is what we need to encourage—quiet, competent, effective work done that can have an impact in terms of trying to make our juvenile justice system fair and equitable for all of the young people in our society.

Mr. President, this issue is of such importance, to be brought back in the time of the evening with the limitations I think really does a disservice to the importance of it. But we are where we are.

Let me mention the particular quote from the director of our Massachusetts Department of Youth Services, Mr. Miller, a very thoughtful, distinguished leader in terms of understanding the problems of juvenile justice. This is what Mr. Jerome Miller wrote about the cumulative effect of decisions made throughout the juvenile justice process:

I learned very early on that when we got an African American youth, virtually everything, from arrest summaries to family history to psychiatric exams to waiver hearings as to whether he would be tried as an adult, the final sentence was skewed. The middle-class white youth sent to us was more likely to be dangerous than the African American teenager with the same label. Usually the white kid had been afforded competent legal counsel, appropriate psychiatric testing, had been tried in a variety of privately funded options, and all in all had been dealt with more sensitively and individually at every level of the juvenile justice process. For him to be labeled dangerous, he usually had to have done something very serious, indeed. By contrast, the African American teenager was dealt with by stereotype from the moment the handcuffs were first put on, to be easily and quickly moved along to the most dangerous end of the violent/nonviolent spectrum. The official record meant to validate the series of decisions.

It goes on and on.

That is state of the juvenile justice system in too many constituencies across this country. All this language does is remind us when we are talking about using the word “justice,” we are talking about equal justice, equal justice for blacks and browns in our system, equal justice for young people, equal justice for all.

Fundamentally, when we understand the problems we have in our society, to represent here on the floor of the Senate that somehow the juvenile justice system is an exception to all the kinds of challenges that we have in this Nation, fails, I think, the basic reason and rationality about what is going on in this country. It is not the accepted. That is the effect of this, to try and not prescribe quotas, not get into the numbers game. That has never been part of this provision on this proviso, but just to hope that communities and States will, hopefully, develop a process and system that will be somehow more sensitive to the challenges we are facing as a country, as a community and in our States in juvenile justice.

This amendment cannot solve the problem and it won’t even probably solve the majority of the problem, but perhaps because of it, there will be communities and there will be States that will have a truer system of justice for all the young people of this country. That is really what we ought to be undertaking and what we should be about.

The statistics on the treatment of minorities in the criminal justice system require an immediate response—especially the treatment of juveniles. I strongly support this amendment and I commend Senator WELLSTONE for his leadership. It deals with one of the most serious problems in current law—the disproportionate confinement of minority youths in state juvenile justice systems. In fact, the underlying bill only sticks the problem worse, because it eliminates all references to “minority” or “race” and instead refers only to “segments of the juvenile population.”

In 1986, after extensive testimony comparing the significant over representation of minority youth in state juvenile justice systems, Congress amended the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act to require states to address this issue. In the 1992 amendments to the disproportionate confinement became a core requirement, by linking future funding to a State’s compliance with addressing this basic issue.

Under current law, states are required to do three things: (1) identify the extent to which disproportionate minority confinement exists in their states; (2) assess the reason that it exists; and (3) develop intervention strategies to address the causes. The law defines “confinement” and requires States to offer meaningful funding to a State’s compliance with addressing this basic issue.

This issue has festered in the juvenile justice system for years. To pretend otherwise is to ignore the facts. Over the past 10 years, documented evidence shows that disproportionately occurs at all stages of the system.

African-American youths age 10-17 constitute only 15% of the U.S. population. But they account for 26% of juvenile arrests, 32% of the delinquency referrals to juvenile court, 41% of juveniles detained in delinquency cases, 46% of juveniles in secure correction facilities, and 52% of juveniles transferred to adult criminal court after judicial hearings.

As these statistics indicate, the over representation of minority youth in the juvenile justice system has become more pronounced and more involved in the criminal justice system. The result is that African-American youths are twice as likely to
be arrested and seven times as likely to be placed in a detention facility as white youths. Black males are 6 times more likely to be admitted to state juvenile facilities for crimes against persons than white youths—4 times more likely for property crimes and 30 times more likely for drug offenses. Black youths are also much more likely to end up in prison with adult offenders. In 1995, nearly 10,000 juvenile cases ended up in adult criminal court, and black youths were 50% more likely to be transferred than white youths.

A study of the juvenile justice system in California found that minority youth consistently receive more severe punishment than white youth, and are more likely to be incarcerated in state institutions than white youth for the same offenses. A 1998 University of Washington study confirms the justice within the juvenile system Narrative reports prepared by probation officers prior to sentencing portrayed black juveniles differently from white juveniles. Black youth offenders were perceived as having character defects—condoning criminal behavior. White youth offenders were perceived as victims of bad circumstances.

For example, two 17-year-old boys, one black and one white, are charged with first degree robbery. Neither had a criminal history, nor used firearms, and were accompanied by two friends. Listen to the probation officers' evaluation of the two boys—keeping in mind that 99% of the time, judges follow the recommendation of probation officers:

For the African-American youth, the probation officer wrote:

This appears to be a pre-meditated and willful act by Ed. . . . There is an adult quality to the referral. In talking with Ed, what was evident was the relaxed and open way he discusses his lifestyle. There didn't seem to be any desire to change. There was no expression of remorse from the young man. There was no moral content to his comment.

For the white youth, the probation officer wrote:

Lou is the victim of a broken home. He is trying to be his own man, but . . . is seemingly easily misled and follows other delinquents against his better judgment. Lou is a tall emaciated little boy who is terrified by his own medication. It appears that he is in need of drug/alcohol evaluation and treatment.

In 1993, Allen Iverson—who is the NBA’s leading scorer and so far has led his team to the second round of the playoffs—was a senior in high school in Virginia. At the time, he was the top rated high school point guard and quarterback in the nation. One night, he and a group of other friends, all of whom were black, went to a local bowling alley and a racially motivated fight broke out. One of the white kids threw a racial epithet toward Iverson. Although punches and chairs were thrown by both blacks and whites during the fight, no white kids were arrested or charged with a crime. Iverson, however, was convicted of “maling by mob” and was sentenced to 15 years in prison with 10 years suspended. He was denied bail pending the appeal, even though felons convicted of more serious crimes were routinely granted bail. It was not until then-Governor Wilder granted Iverson partial clemency, that he was released from jail. He then went on to play basketball for John Thompson at Maryland. He then left for the NBA where he became the first-round draft pick of the Philadelphia 76’ers. The only reason why Allen Iverson’s case has a happy ending is because he is a star athlete. Otherwise, he would still be in jail like the thousands of other young black men who find themselves behind bars in much larger numbers than their white peers.

It is wrong to deny minority youth the right to fair treatment by the criminal justice system. This legislation says to the African-American community, the Hispanic community, and other minorities that Congress will continue to look the other way while minority youths are confined at disproportionately high rates by the current system.

What this bill says to minorities is that although we recognize that your children are more likely to be arrested than their white counterparts, we don’t care that although your children are being referred to juvenile court and adult court, at significantly higher rates than white youths, we’re turning our backs on you.

It is essential for this legislation to retain fair requirements to deal effectively with this crisis. Current law does not require the release of juveniles. It does not require incarceration quotas. It does not require any other specific change of policy or practice. It does not take prevention money away from white youths and give it to minorities.

Disproportionate minority confinement is a serious problem requiring an ongoing and continuous effort to achieve a juvenile justice system which treats every youth fairly, regardless of race or background.

Examples of what the states are doing to address this challenge are numerous. In Pennsylvania, the State Commission on Crime and Delinquency prevention fund provided seed money to begin prevention and intervention programs, including:

A drop-out prevention program; a program to help young minority females learn work and life skills; a program to decrease the delinquency rate and increase the level of school retention and success among targeted youth through life skills workshops, tutoring and homework assistance, physical fitness and sports, community service projects, and monthly parent group meetings.

By contrast, the underlying legislation encourages states to prosecute even more juveniles as adults. It allows records of juvenile arrests—not necessarily convictions—to be made available to schools, colleges and vocational schools. It requires school districts to mandate policies to mandate expulsion from school for regular possession of drugs, alcohol, or even tobacco. Disproportionate minority confinement are harsh and unacceptable:

- The Sentencing Project reported that ¼ of all African-American males aged 20 to 24 in the United States are under the jurisdiction of the criminal justice system—either in jail, in prison, on probation, or on parole.
- The juvenile justice system often acts as a feeder system for minority youth into the adult criminal justice system.
- In most states, the result of an adult felony conviction is the loss of voting rights. In 1 of 7 of the 10 million black males of voting age are now either currently or permanently disenfranchised through voting restrictions that are politically powerful of the African-American community.

A significant impact of arrest or incarceration is often the reduction of future wage earning and employability. One study showed a 25% reduction in the number of hours worked over the next 8 years.

The truly tragic consequences of disproportionate minority confinement are removal of large numbers of potential wage earners, a disruption of family relationships and a growing sense of isolation and alienation from the larger society. These statistics only give us a small glimpse of the harsh consequences. They don’t begin to tell the story of young black youth being targeted, harassed, intimidated, and treated differently because of their race.

The United Methodist Church has said that ignoring discrimination in juvenile sentencing is “careless, callous, and discriminatory enforcement of law.”

Ed Blackmon, Jr., Mississippi State House of Representatives, has said the “So many of these young people have great potential for overcoming their troubles, and becoming successful young men and women in their communities. However, with the absence of good legal representation, and families that are not ‘well-connected’, they find themselves locked up, with very little hope. It appears that the criminal justice system works as a feeder system for minority males of voting age are now either currently or permanently disenfranchised through voting restrictions that are politically powerful of the African-American community.

A significant impact of arrest or incarceration is often the reduction of future wage earning and employability. One study showed a 25% reduction in the number of hours worked over the next 8 years.

The truly tragic consequences of disproportionate minority confinement are removal of large numbers of potential wage earners, a disruption of family relationships and a growing sense of isolation and alienation from the larger society. These statistics only give us a small glimpse of the harsh consequences. They don’t begin to tell the story of young black youth being targeted, harassed, intimidated, and treated differently because of their race.

The United Methodist Church has said that ignoring discrimination in juvenile sentencing is “careless, callous, and discriminatory enforcement of law.”

Kweisi Mfume, President and CEO of the NAACP, has said, “The fact that S. 254 eases the requirement that states address the disproportionally high numbers of children of color in juvenile detention facilities is, in itself, a catch-22.”

Marian Wright Edelman, Founder of the Children’s defense fund, has said “With troubling reports of police brutality and racial profiling, Congress must continue to work with the states to ensure that the juvenile justice system affords our youth equitable and fair treatment, and not repeat the previous decade’s worth of progress.”
This past weekend, in her address to the National Conference on Public Trust and Confidence in the Justice System, Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O’Connor emphasized the need for racial equality and better legal representation, and called for improvements in family and juvenile courts. She also cited a 1999 survey entitled “How the Public Views the State Courts”. According to that survey, 70% of African-American respondents said that African-Americans as a group, received “Somewhat Worse” or “Far Worse” treatment from the courts than whites. A substantial number of whites agreed with this assessment.

As Justice O’Connor so aptly stated, “Concrete action must be taken” to erase racial bias.

At the very least, we cannot offered to retreat from the requirements of current law that the states must recognize and address this festering problem. To do less is unacceptable, I urge the Senate to accept our amendment and do the right thing on this critical issue of racial justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I will speak on our time in opposition to another subject for 10 minutes. I refer to the issue of the media and teen violence. I am sure I cannot do better than Senators who have spent so much time this month on this issue. I congratulate Senators McCain, Hatch, Brownback, Bond, and Lieberman for their efforts.

However, because last year I had a personal, although long-distance encounter, with one of the more notorious characters in the media world, I thought I might share that event. The event was a wake-up call for observations of a more general nature.

First, just four short observations:

One, clearly a large body of research proves that the media target violence to teenagers. The movie and television rating system is too often unenforced. I urge my colleagues to read Sissela Bok’s book, “Mayhem,” for a systematic look at the selling of carnage and rage to our youth by the media pushers.

Second, this issue is not new. Indeed, in 1993 Senate bill 943, the Children’s Television Violence Protection Act, was introduced in this body. Before that, we had a wide-ranging debate about television and movie violence in the 1960s.

So far, the entertainment industry, using the best public relations that money can buy, and by hiding their refusal to accept any restriction on their poison behind the first amendment of the Constitution, have been able to increase the violence and mayhem of their products without any accountability.

In 1954, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, chaired by then Senator Estes Kefauver, asked whether violence in media was destructive. The media kings said more research was needed. In 1969, the National Commission on Violence concluded that years of exposure to violence were the vulnerable among us to engage in violence much more readily and more rapidly.

I should add that CBS executives censored the script of CBS reporter, Daniel Schorr, when he tried to report this finding on the network.

In 1972, a massive report by Surgeon General Jesse Steinfeld concluded that a definite and causal relationship existed between violence viewing and acts of aggression. Then, in 1981, data further supporting Surgeon General Steinfeld’s report was issued. This report was published by the American Psychological Association, a group of Boston pediatricians. They summarized 30 years of research on the subject: Watching aggressive behavior. That is their conclusion. To use the technical finding, there is a causal link between exposure of children to violent images and subsequent violent behavior.

As Senator Brownback pointed out earlier, there is more and more evidence every single year that violence on television, in music, in movies, damages our children and leads some of them to act out of some of their violence in their lives.

Look at the trend lines. As violence has proliferated in the movies and on TV, juvenile violence has come right along with it and proliferated just as the violence in movies and on television.

Recently, at an event at which he raised $2 million from Hollywood, even President Clinton said, “As studies show, hundreds of (vulnerable children) are more likely to commit violence themselves after watching violence on television or in the movies.”

Both the American Medical Association and the American Association of Pediatrics have warned against exposing our children to violent entertainment. These doctors have to help rebuild the lives of children emotionally, sometimes physically maimed by elements of the entertainment industry.

Number 4, finally it is clear to me that the relevant committees of the U.S. Congress must continue to focus on this subject because the Congress sometimes has a short attention span, and the mind polluters know this. We have not had a comprehensive, intensive series of investigations.

But Congress should do this: We have subpoena power, which the relevant committees have, and should be used to compel those who hide to come forth and reveal the memos, the research, and the marketing tools they use to sell death and dismemberment to our children.

Mr. President, I hope that Senators will investigate the selling of movies that have the PG-13 ratings to those that are 7, 8 and 9 years of age as happened with Jurassic Park. As Senator Lieberman said recently, “The evidence strongly suggests that Joe Camel has sadly not gone away, but has been adopted by the entertainment industry in America.”

In addition, we hope that committees will work on innovative legislation along the lines suggested by Senator Bond that will simply do one thing, the one thing the industry cares about: Making it less profitable to make and sell death and hate. Only by doing that will we force change. We have tried moral suasion and it is not working, although it is by far the best solution.

Let me conclude, Mr. President, with a personal interaction with one of the more outspoken opponents of change, Mr. Edgar Bronfman, chief executive officer of Seagrams Limited, which owns, among other things, Universal Studios and Universal Music Group, the world’s largest record label.

On October 5, 1998, I wrote a letter to him. In that letter, I endorsed the plea of the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill, that Universal Studios, owned by Mr. Bronfman, add a statement to the studio’s remake of the film “Psycho.”

As most of my colleagues know, the subject of mental illness and efforts to help those afflicted, the work to remove the stigma of mental illness has been one of the issues I have worked on for much of my career.

When I made my appeal I suggested that the industry merely noted that in the years since 1960, when Alfred Hitchcock first made his movie, we have seen major advances in the treatment of major mental illnesses. We asked the statement also note that millions of Americans affected by those brain disorders are leading fulfilled lives because of medical research. We wanted to end the stigma attached to people who are mentally ill, and the letters for a special favor.

I ask unanimous consent my letter of October 5 to Edgar Bronfman be printed in the RECORD, as well as the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill bulletin about the movie.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. BRONFMAN, President and CEO, The Seagram Company Ltd., New York, NY.

DEAR MR. BRONFMAN: As you may know, I have a strong interest in improving the awareness and treatment of mental illness. Improving perceptions and policies toward the mentally ill has become an important goal for both my wife, Nancy, and me.

I am aware that your company, as the owner of Universal Studios, is sponsoring the remake of the film, “Psycho”. The National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAMI), has suggested that a message, such as the one below, should be displayed at the beginning of the film. This message would be an important preface to a film that depicts mentally ill characters in extreme forms. I support this initiative to recognize the availability of treatment and improve awareness.
Times have changed since 1960 and I believe it is important to recognize that the mentally ill have a right to medical attention without undue stigma from society.

The Underwood amendment might read: “Since 1960 when the original film Psycho was made, knowledge of the major mental illnesses has grown enormously. People who suffer from these brain disorders are treated and are no more violent than the general population when they are under treatment.

“Please view this remake of Psycho keeping in mind that millions of people are affected by these brain disorders. They can now lead long, productive, and contribute to society because of medical research and treatment that has occurred over the past three decades.

"It is vitally important that we erase the stigma that surrounds mental illness." I appreciate your consideration of this matter and appreciate a positive response. Sincerely,

PETE V. DOMENICI, U.S. Senator.

STAND AGAINST UNIVERSAL STUDIO’S REMAKE OF THE FILM “PSYCHO”

Universal Studios is starting this week to remake the 1960 film “Psycho,” called a classic because of its master film maker Alfred Hitchcock.

However, NAMI members and friends know—and need to share with the film makers of this film—the necessities of the film, and the title itself, simply refuel the damaging and pervasive stigma that already envelopes the lives of people with mental illness.

NAMI is out to Bust Stigma wherever it exists. Each of us must help by letting the owners of Universal Studios know that stereotyping persons with mental illness in “Psycho” is as unacceptable and offensive as stereotyping race, religion, ethnicity or any other physical illness.

Research shows that persons with mental illness do not commit violent acts when they are under treatment and taking their prescribed medications.

Send your letters to: Mr. Edgar Bronfman, Jr., President & CEO, The Seagram Company Ltd., 575 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10152.

Place your office with your letters! Write yours today and get your friends at home to do the same!!!


Whereas, NAMI, the Nation’s Voice on Mental Illness, works to provide education, advocacy, and support for all affected by serious brain disorders, such as schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, manic depression, major depression, obsessive compulsive disorder, panic disorder;

And whereas, the 1990’s, known as the “Decade of the Brain,” has shown through advances in scientific research and varied treatments for mental illness, there are no-fault brain disorders that can be effectively diagnosed and treated;

And whereas, it has been documented that individuals with brain disorders who are in treatment and responsibly managing their illness are no more prone to violence than those in the general population;

And whereas, NAMI, ever working to combat the pervasive stigma surrounding mental illness, finds images in the mass media that negatively influence the public’s perception of serious mental illness, such as those portrayed in the 1960 Alfred Hitchcock film “Psycho”, to be unfounded, hurtful, and demeaning to 11,000 members;

Resolved, That, although NAMI recognizes Alfred Hitchcock as one of the film industry’s most respected, innovative, and influential craftsmen, preeminence for his work in the “thriller” genre and for often focusing on the psychological motivations and underpinnings of his characters. NAMI believes that Alfred Hitchcock’s acknowledged classic “Psycho” was based on outdated, stigmatizing notions of family culpability and inherent violent tendencies in those with mental illness;

And therefore NAMI registers its strongest objection to a remake of the film “Psycho”, which has been mentioned in the press wherein inviduals with serious mental illnesses are portrayed inaccurately and alluded to in disparaging terms.

Mr. DOMENICI. About 3 weeks after I sent my letter, on October 29 I received a response, not from Mr. Bronfman, but from one of his lawyers. I ask unanimous consent this letter of October 29, 1998, be printed in the RECORD as follows:

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: Universal, Universal City, CA, October 29, 1998, Hon. PETE DOMENICI, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DOMENICI: Edgar Bronfman, Jr. forwarded you a 1998 letter regarding the film “Psycho.” He asked that we carefully consider the issues that you raised.

As you know, “Psycho” is a remake of Alfred Hitchcock’s 1960 film—a work that is widely regarded as a “classic.” The cultural, historic and aesthetic significance of the film was recognized by the Librarian of Congress when he selected it for inclusion in the National Film Registry.

The film that Universal Pictures will be releasing later this year is as true to the original as any “remake” in the history of our industry. While it is updated for today’s audience in that it is filmed in color and uses modern special effects, it follows the original dialogue and images almost scene-by-scene.

Universal’s Motion Picture Group has given the issues that you raised a good deal of thought. We believe it is significant that the film does not trivialize the issues that you raised or in any way ridicule or belittle those who suffer from mental illnesses. Importantly, the marketing campaign for the film tracks the storyline and does not attempt to undermine the important progress that society has made toward better understanding mental illness.

The art of storytelling, by its very nature, can involve subject matter that some may find disturbing or uncomfortable. We believe that the film does what the he suggested was, you are being a little sensitive, but do not have the creative genius that is at work here.

Then I read in recent weeks more accounts of the distinguished Edgar Bronfman. It seems he was one of the entertainment kings who refused to attend the Conference on Teen Violence and the Media. He also refused to participate in hearings into teen violence and marketing of violence to teens that Senator BROWNBACK held on May 4 of this year. But this time the gentleman found time to pontificate about those who tried to show leadership and the relationship between the music and television shows and movies he produces and the violence affecting our teenagers. He said that if he was given a choice, he would choose the violence.

I decided to learn more about him. It turns out he inherited a business from his family—nothing wrong with that. He decided to branch into the media. He now heads Universal Studios, which produced, among others, “The Mummy.” He should be proud. It turns out that one of his musicians is Marilyn Manson, winner of the MTV award for the new best artist of the year. Manson is the author of such classics as “Irresponsible Hate Anthem,” which contains the line, “Let’s just kill everyone and let your God sort them out.” And then using the “F” word.

This was just one song on the Bronfman-produced album, “Anti-Christ Superstar.” I think he should be proud of what he produces.

I say that obviously not meaning it. Even when thoughtful members of the entertainment industry, like Rob Reiner and Joel Schumacher call for real, honest review of the guts, gore, and godlessness Hollywood turns out, the distinguished Bronfman disagrees.

Mr. DOMENICI. To put it in polite terms, the lawyer suggested that maybe those of us concerned about mental illness could meet with Universal Studio lawyers to talk things through, sort of a therapy session for those too sensitive to the world. But the lawyer was clear, Universal Studios is not going to sit down and say that the Alliance for the Mentally Ill had asked of them. After all, the movie is a classic, they said, and critics have said so. In short, the message was, you are being a little sensitive, but do not have the creative genius that is at work here.

And having delivered himself of such nonsense, Mr. Bronfman departed to Florida to dedicate a theme park.

Petitioned for the new best artist of the year. Manson is the author of such classics as “Irresponsible Hate Anthem," which contains the line, “Let’s just kill everyone and let your God sort them out.” And then using the “F” word.

This was just one song on the Bronfman-produced album, “Anti-Christ Superstar.” I think he should be proud of what he produces.

I say that obviously not meaning it.

Congressional Record — Senate May 19, 1999
be. After all, who are we? Parents? Grandparents? Public officials? American citizens? Who are we to criticize them?

These people should look at their deeds and be proud—really proud.

Let us ask that, to this one question: What in the world would our Founding Fathers make of an interpretation of this great document called the Constitution that claims that the glorification of rape, disembowelment, violent death is unequivocally and absolutely protected by freedom of speech?

The result is we are seeing kids imitating art, taking their guns to school, joining gangs, and committing acts of violence. I suspect the Founding Fathers would simply have said: Is this the pathetic pass you people have come to? Shame on you. And we would not have made them proud.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time on the amendment? The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator HATCH and the managers of this bill, I would like to make a few remarks at this time on the time of Senator HATCH.

Senators DOMENICI. I thank you very much for your willingness to become engaged in this issue, to confront some of these problems. I, like you, do not believe the airwaves and all this country are necessarily free for every use piped or otherwise, for our children, when people are not ready to deal with it.

I wonder if you remember the time when the Pope came to Hollywood, 10 or 12 years ago, and met with movie moguls—at least a decade ago I suppose. I have a vivid recollection of members coming out of that meeting. He had all the Hollywood titans and moguls there. He talked to them about the need for them to improve the entertainment they were putting out. He urged them to do better.

The Hollywood titans came out and they were interviewed on the television. They said: He made some very good points. We have to consider that. We have to do better.

I remember Charlton Heston came out at the very end and they said: Mr. Heston, do you think anything is going to change?

He looked right in the camera and said: They wouldn’t change if the Lord himself spoke to them. They are after ratings and the almighty dollar.

If we do not have power under the first amendment to constrain some of this, I think it is quite appropriate that they be taken to task and they be urged, in the name of decency and humanity, to clean up their act. If you have to make money, do you have to make it at this low a level?

I wonder if the Senator has a comment on this.

Mr. DOMENICI. I do. I talked to the Senate a little bit lately about character education. I am putting a statement in the record regarding Character Counts, an education program which utilizes six pillars of character. One of them is responsibility and another is trustworthiness. We are all excited about this program and hoping our children will learn responsibility and trustworthiness, but I don’t tell lies, be responsible for the agreements you make, to the covenants you have, to the institutions you support.

Isn’t it interesting, everybody says we ought to be promoting this because our children need it. Actually, I do not know how to stop them from doing what they described about Hollywood tonight. I do not know how we can do it in law. But sometime or another, somebody has to be responsible. Somebody has to step up to the bar in the movie industry and say we ought to challenge those who work in the industry, who produce these products that are going out to our children and to our people, and see if we can’t turn it in another direction. Do we have to pick the easiest prey, the easiest film that will make money? You know they all make money if you load them with this kind of violence and degradation. Can’t the movie industry work on something better? I think that is the challenge we meet.

I do not have an answer, but maybe a group will be formed and among them they will grow up. Maybe some board of directors of some corporation with a mother or a grandmother on the board will say for once ask: What are we putting on television? Can we look at the programs that we are spending our corporate dollars on and see?

Wouldn’t that be something, if every chief executive, instead of listening only to his advertising man, had a board that wanted to see what they were buying. Not only by way of advertisements, but also programs they bought? That might be a nice idea, if people started doing that, you might hear some mothers and some grandmothers and some parents speaking out.

Mr. SESSIONS. I think the Senator is correct. We do have authority as Senators to speak out.

The President spoke out in a radio address just a few days ago, according to the Washington Post. He broadcast a radio address bluntly challenging the purveyors of violent movies and video games to accept a share of the responsibilities for the tragedies, such as the Columbine High School massacre, based on the evidence that some people become desensitized and are more prone to emulate what they see on the screen.

However, reading this very same article, when he went out, within hours of that radio address, and met personally with the titans of Hollywood, he delivered that message “with all the force of a down pillow.”

The Washington Times said he assured the filmmakers that they were not bad people, as they showered him with $2 million. He assured them they had no personal responsibility for the Columbine High School massacre in Littleton, CO. Instead of blaming Hollywood for making violent films, he said the real blame lies with theaters and video stores that show them and sell them to minors.

Cancelling the audience of movies and studio moguls that they should not blame the gun manufacturers either, but he blamed the Republican Members of Congress who will not enact his gun control laws. The President sandbagged the state attorney general who came to him personally to try to get him to enact his gun control laws. The President tersely suggested at the Saturday night fundraiser in Beverly Hills that sustained exposure to “indiscriminate environments can push children into destructive behavior,” but he added quickly, the producers, directors, and actors who ponied up $2,500 per couple are not at fault. “That doesn’t make anybody who makes any movie or any video game or television program a bad person or personally responsible with one show with a disastrous outcome. There is no call for fin”.

We need to send a clearer message than that. Perhaps his radio message was a better message. It is unfortunate that when he met face to face, he toned it down an awful lot, apparently. I suggest, if the Senator will comment, which one does he think those media moguls are going to believe was his real view, the one he said on the radio or the one he said to them personally?

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me first respond by saying what I forgot to say when the Senator from Alabama first stood up. I should have congratulated him for the excellent job he has done on this bill. He has been on the floor when we have handled lengthy budget bills and a lot of amendments. He was there to encourage me. I think we worked nicely together. He learned some things during the budget resolution. But I marvel that the Senator has done under very tough circumstances. I commend him for that.

Frankly, it seems to me we need every bit of leadership we can get to assess this issue and be realistic about it. From the President on down, leaders have to tell the truth. Those people who are involved in the business of producing movies and films which our young people view, which we know are more apt to cause them to use guns, are more apt to cause them to do violent things, they need to acknowledge the truth.

For those in the entertainment industry to say there is no proof that movies cause violence, what kind of proof do you need? There are multiple studies that say there is a relationship.

Does the Senator remember when he was growing up that people would say, ‘Well, if you read a good book, it is good to be good, but you can’t it follow that if you read something that is not good, you are apt to learn that also? Whoever defines good or bad, that is up to them. But it is just obvious.
that one cannot see all of this violence and not be adversely affected by it.

Just starting with that and saying let’s all acknowledge that, what do we do about it? There may be a lot of different things. Certainly I do not have the perfect answer, and I did not say I did. But I think we ought to begin by saying that we should not get this into the minds and hearts and senses of our young people. We ought to find a way to avoid it. We ought to find a way to give them better things to view, better things to focus on.

It seems to me the country would be so relieved if some of those leaders in that industry were to step forth and say: We just formed a group that is going to try to do that. We don’t know how successful it will be.

They might be shocked. It might be very successful.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I will briefly make some comments concerning the Wellstone-Kennedy amendment and share some thoughts on this situation with which we are wrestling.

Right across the street on the marble of the U.S. Supreme Court are the words, "Equal Justice Under Law." That is a cornerstone of American thought. It is a cornerstone of our belief of who we are as a people. It is critical that we maintain that in our juvenile and adult court systems, and that in all aspects of our American court system. We recognize that people come before the court must be treated equally, regardless of their station, regardless of their race, regardless of their sex, and regardless of their religion. That is so basic to who we are as a people.

We have not always been perfect in that. In fact, we have made a number of errors over the years. Less than an hour ago, I met in my office with Dr. Glenda Curry, who is the president of Troy State University in Montgomery. She is completing work on the Rosa Parks Museum. Rosa Parks was a victim of an unfair system, and when asked to move to the back of the bus in Montgomery, AL, in the 1950s, she said no. She refused to move, and she challenged an unjust law and was able to overturn that.

To say we have never had problems or we do not have problems in the fairness of law is not accurate. This Nation has made mistakes and serious mistakes. People are moving well to eliminating those kinds of things. They are just not showing that.

I will tell our concerns which are so troubling. Under the previous legislation, that Senators WELLS and KENNEDY proposed to use again in this bill, the law required, before a State can receive money, they have to submit a plan and their plan shall "address efforts to reduce"—reduce—"the proportion of juveniles detained or confined in secure detention facilities, secure correctional facilities, jails, and lockups who are members of minority groups if such proportion exceeds the proportion such groups represent in the general population." It says the numbers have to be reduced based on race.

We need to strive to make sure that nobody is incarcerated who is not guilty of a crime, but we ought not be the only ones who are retaliating. Statistics show that the proportion of the juvenile confined if it simply does not meet a perfect numerical percentage.

I believe, as a result of my study of the Supreme Court decision in Adarand as well as other cases, that this is unconstitutional, and it is certainly bad policy.

Under the leadership of Senator HATCH, who is a scholar on these issues and who has held hearings on what to do about quotas and affirmative action, the Judiciary Committee developed and passed this legislation with this language, and we changed it slightly. This plan, which the States have to submit to be eligible for funding shall, to the extent that segments of the juvenile population are detained or confined in secure detention facilities, secure correctional facilities, jails and lockups, to a greater extent than the proportion of these groups in the general juvenile population, address prevention efforts designed to reduce such disproportionate confinement, without requiring the release or the failure to detain any such individual.

In other words, this focuses on the problem more directly. It says that when you have $1 billion of prevention money in this juvenile justice bill, that prevention money needs to be directed to try to prevent crime. But it also suggests that that prevention effort ought to be directed to those kids if they are in a minority population that exceeds the number in the general population in the juvenile court system.

So I think this is a reasonable and constitutional provision. I think it is a good step. I simply and reluctantly must say I have to oppose this amendment. I just do not believe it can be justified under what I understand to be a legitimate constitutional law.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time if the other side is. But let me just put an article in the Record. It is by the Center for Equal Opportunity entitled "Unconstitutional of 42 U.S.C. Sec. 5633(a)(23)." It is written by Roger Clegg. I think it makes an awful lot of sense. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(From the Center for Equal Opportunity, May 5, 1999)

UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF 42 U.S.C. SEC. 5633(a)(23)

(Roger Clegg)

42 U.S.C. sec. 5633(a)(23) requires states that wish to participate in the Formula Grants Program of the Juvenile Justice Delinquency and Prevention Act to submit a plan that shall, inter alia, "address efforts to reduce the proportion of juveniles detained or confined in secure detention facilities, who are members of minority groups if such proportion exceeds the proportion such groups represent in the general population."

In our view, this provision is not only misguided as a matter of policy but also unconstitutional.

The Supreme Court has made clear that any use of a racial classification by any government is presumed to be unconstitutional. It declared in Personnel Administrator of Massachusetts v. Fenney, 442 U.S. 256, 272 (1979): "A racial classification, regardless of its purported motivation, is presumptively invalid and must be upheld by extraordinary justification." More recently, the Court held that the Constitution "requires strict scrutiny of all race-based action." Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Portland, 515 U.S. 202, 222 (1995); see also City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co., 488 U.S. 469 (1989).

It cannot be seriously argued that subsection (23) does not use racial classifications and does not encourage funding recipients to do so. Juveniles must be classified according to race in order to be eligible for subsection (23). We do not know how successful it will be.

We ought to try to do that. We do not know how successful it will be. We are just not showing that.

But I think we ought to begin by saying that we should not get this into the minds and hearts and senses of our young people. We ought to find a way to give them better things to view, better things to focus on.

It cannot be seriously argued that subsection (23) does not use racial classifications and does not encourage funding recipients to do so. Juveniles must be classified according to race in order to be eligible for subsection (23). We do not know how successful it will be.

But I think we ought to begin by saying that we should not get this into the minds and hearts and senses of our young people. We ought to find a way to give them better things to view, better things to focus on.

It cannot be seriously argued that subsection (23) does not use racial classifications and does not encourage funding recipients to do so. Juveniles must be classified according to race in order to be eligible for subsection (23). We do not know how successful it will be.

But I think we ought to begin by saying that we should not get this into the minds and hearts and senses of our young people. We ought to find a way to give them better things to view, better things to focus on.
means that they were born in 1982 or later. Thus, they were not alive during the days of slavery or Jim Crow, let alone sufferers during them. Moreover, there is no evidence that upbringing recipients had a current or even recent history of racial discrimination, and there is no requirement under subsection (23) that only recipients with a required to racial classifications. The Supreme Court has made clear that a particularized showing of past discrimination in the specific context being remedied is necessary. See Crocco, 498 U.S. at 498-506 (subpart III-B); see also Bakke, 438 U.S. at 307-10 (subpart IV-B) (opinion of Powell, J.). We note that one study of recent data from the Bureau of Justice Statistics found that, for cases filed in state courts in the seventy-five largest counties in May 1992, blacks were actually more likely than whites to be acquitted in jury trials for most felony crimes. Robert Lerner, “Acquittal Rates by Race for State Felonies,” in Race and the Criminal Justice System (Center for Equal Opportunity 1996). It is also noteworthy that the federal government is not administering subsection (23) in a way that requires that the racial classification be aimed at ending discrimination in the criminal justice system. To the contrary—if the September 1998 Juvenile Justice Bulletin (“Disproportionate Minority Offenders—1997 Update”), published by the U.S. Justice Department’s Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, which administers subsection (23), is any indication—most subsection (23) programs are not aimed at the criminal justice system at all, but are instead aimed at preventing antisocial behavior in juveniles from ever occurring in the first place. See also 28 C.F.R. sec. 31.303(j)(3) (1998) (Justice Department regulations require intervention irrespective of cause of disproportion).

This approach makes a great deal of sense—and it underscores why the race-based approach of subsection (23) itself does not. The criminal justice system is not to blame for the disproportionate number of offenders from some minority groups, and the problem of juvenile crime is not limited to any one racial or ethnic group, even if some groups may be disproportionately represented among juvenile offenders. Urging that funding recipients view the problem of juvenile crime as a racial issue is not the right thing to do. Programs for at-risk youth should not be limited to minorities, as if only blacks and Hispanics commit crimes and as if it is not equally tragic when a white youth becomes a criminal.

Indeed, it sets a very dangerous precedent to argue that the government may target racial and ethnic groups for special attention if members of those groups are disproportionately likely to run afoul of the law. Such precedent could be used to justify, for instance, the use of racial profiling by the police. We are, therefore, surprised that the NACCP is urging its members to support subsection (23). See NACCP, Urgent Action Alert “Re: Juvenile Crime Bills” (Mar. 31, 1999).

*Roger Clegg is vice president and general counsel of the Center for Equal Opportunity, a Washington, D.C.-based research and educational organization. Mr. Clegg is a former Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Justice Department’s Civil Rights Division and teaches employment discrimination law as an adjunct professor at George Mason University School of Law. He is a graduate of the Yale Law School. He is a graduate of the Yale Law School. He is a graduate of the Yale Law School.

2 A recipient may also be tempted to avoid subsection (23) by showing that it is making progress under it, by treating minority and nonminority offenders differently—either releasing minority offenders from incarcerated and confining nonminority offenders. Thus, subsection (23) may actually encourage discrimination in the criminal justice system in situations where it was not occurring.

3 A recipient may also be tempted to avoid subsection (23) by showing that it is making progress under it, by treating minority and nonminority offenders differently—either releasing minority offenders from incarcerated and confining nonminority offenders. Thus, subsection (23) may actually encourage discrimination in the criminal justice system in situations where it was not occurring.

Mr. SESSIONS. Object. Reserving the time.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, just before we go forward with this time, I understand the Senator from California is going to make a request. For the record, before I get started responding, could I ask unanimous consent that this time not be counted against any of ours because there may be an interruption here for another amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. Object. Reserving the right to object, we have been using time. On what subject?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I say to my colleagues, we would not count this time. I am trying to be accommodating to Senators over here who may want to have an amendment and let them use our last 10 minutes. I just want to see——

Mrs. BOXER. Go ahead.

Mr. WELLSTONE. OK. I guess that did not work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, colleagues, 15 percent, ages 10 to 17, of the kids in this country are black; 26 percent of all juvenile arrests are black; 32 percent of the detention referrals to juvenile court are black; 46 percent of juveniles in public long-term institutions are black; cases judicially waived to
Mr. DURBIN. Does the Senator recall that the floor of the Senate an argument that race is not the critical consideration.

When the police are out there in the streets, and we get to which kids are searched on the streets and which kids are not, you don’t think that has anything to do with race? When we get to the question of which kids are arrested and which kids are not, you don’t think that has anything to do with race today.

When we get to the question of the evaluation of youth by probation officers, you don’t think that has anything to do with race when we get to the question of which kids are arrested and which kids are not, you don’t think that has anything to do with race?

When we get to the question of sentencings, you don’t think that has anything to do with race? You are sleepwalking through history. You are sleepwalking through history.

This is all about race. This is a civil rights issue and this is a civil rights vote. You are sleepwalking by because they commit more crimes. We have been told that these statistics, whether it be for African American or Latino or Native American or Southeast Asian, they are a reflection of the number of kids who commit the crimes and who get the justiciable cases.

We have already recited study after study that shows for the same crime many of these kids get stiffer sentences or many of these kids wind up incarcerated as opposed to other kids. This is all about race. I cannot believe that I have heard on the floor of the Senate an argument that race is not the critical consideration.

When you prove that, I will be right beside you. Nor have I proven that there is discrimination here. I haven’t heard one shred of information that proves there is discrimination here. When you prove that, I will be right there beside with you. Nor have I heard much of a reason how you get around the fact that crimes are committed, and it is the type of crime and the quantities of crime and who is doing it that makes a difference in our society and why people are locked up. I think you look at the crime. You can’t just get out here and say, well, there is disproportion; therefore, there has to be something wrong. You have to show what is wrong.

Frankly, I do not think the other side has shown what is wrong here. Mr. McCaffrey. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has 19 minutes 25 seconds.

Mr. HATCH. Let me say a few words. I think everybody in this body wants to do whatever they can to end discrimination wherever it is. I haven’t heard one shred of information that proves there is discrimination here. When you prove that, I will be right there beside with you. Nor have I heard much of a reason how you get around the fact that crimes are committed, and it is the type of crime and the quantities of crime and who is doing it that makes a difference in our society and why people are locked up. I think you look at the crime. You can’t just get out here and say, well, there is disproportion; therefore, there has to be something wrong. You have to show what is wrong.

Frankly, I do not think the other side has shown what is wrong here. Mr. HATCH. Let me say this again, what are the crimes? What is the extent of the crimes? How serious are the crimes?

The fact that 13 percent of the offenders are African American and 67 percent of those incarcerated are—I don’t see any information here saying that this higher percentage was unjustifiably put in use. These percentages don’t tell us what the crimes were in the individual cases. If these individuals committed a crime, then they go to jail. Does that mean there are a lot of white people getting off? I don’t see any evidence of that, either.

Do you have evidence that minority juveniles are more likely to be detained for the same crime as white juveniles? I don’t think you do. For example, is there evidence that African Americans who are charged with possession of crack cocaine are given more severe sentences than whites for crack cocaine? Is there evidence? I don’t know of any.

My point is, I don’t think my colleagues on the other side are arguing that if people commit heinous crimes and they are convicted and sentenced to jail that they shouldn’t be. Now, if there is some evidence that law enforcement is ignoring white people who commit these same heinous crimes, then I am with you. I don’t know of any evidence of that.

Statistics are statistics are statistics, but when people go to jail, it is generally because they have committed a crime.

What is your solution? To let them out of jail? Crack cocaine distributors? Is your argument that white crack dealers get away with it because they are smarter or they are protected somehow or other? I don’t think you are making that argument. I can’t imagine you would make that argument. So I don’t know why there is a higher percentage, but I do know that almost without exception—there certainly are some instances when the argument applies, and I am aware of that—but almost without exception, people who commit these heinous crimes go to jail for them.
I don’t think you are arguing to let them out of jail. But then, again, how can you argue, then, that if they are committing the crimes and are going to jail, that for some reason or other there is some reason why they are going to jail when others aren’t. I don’t see your argument myself. Plus, you are adding racial classifications, mandated racial classifications in this amendment. To me it is not even a question of constitutionality. There is no question it is unconstitutional.

With that, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Let me retain it for a second and say one other thing. One would think, listening to my friend from Minnesota, that our bill does absolutely nothing to deal with this problem. You hear this very emotional set of arguments as though the Hatch-Biden-Sessions bill does absolutely nothing about these problems. S. 254, in my opinion, has a much better provision to solve these problems than the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

The bill as written, as before the Senate, requires that prevention resources be directed to “segments of the juvenile population” who are disproportionately detained. Now, such a “segment of the population” could include, for example, certain socioeconomic groups who are more likely to be at risk. S. 254 directs prevention resources to such groups who need those resources the most. So we try to do something about it rather than just cite statistics.

I don’t see how you get around the fact that these people are sentenced and sent to jail because they have committed crimes. Just because there are statistics that indicate that more than a proportionate share of the general population is going to jail, I don’t know how in the world you get around the fact that these crimes are being committed by individuals—individuals who are members of one group or another. But we do try to address it by directing prevention resources to such groups who need those resources the most. I think that is the way to do it.

I will work with my friends on the other side to see that we do things that make sure those moneys work.

A National Research Council study, published by the National Academy of Sciences no less, found that:

Few criminologists would argue that the current gap between African American and white levels of imprisonment is mainly due to discrimination of sentencing or in any other decisionmaking process in the criminal justice system.

If the National Academy of Sciences is wrong, show me the evidence. Just because this disparity exists, liberals throw their hands in the air and say there must be something wrong, but they can’t prove it, other than to show statistics. I hope they will be with me in saying that people who are justly sentenced for heinous crimes shouldn’t be let off just because there is a disproportionate sentencing because more crimes are committed by one group than another. I don’t see how anybody can argue with that point. You know, it must be nice to always act like you are caring for the little guy, when, in fact, you are not willing to do what has to be done in order to help resolve these problems.

Now, 55 percent of this bill is for prevention—55 percent of it. I don’t remember any crime bill in my time here—there may have been one, but I can’t remember it—where we put more money into law enforcement and accountability. But we have done it here, and one reason is to try to solve these problems. If there is a segment of our population that seems to have certain socioeconomic problems that literally have caused them to be disproportionately convicted—I don’t even think the word “disproportionate” is right—but more convicted than their racial group’s percentage in population group might suggest, we need to do something on prevention for those people. And that is what this bill does. It doesn’t take a lot of sense to recognize that is a pretty good proposition, and we have it in the bill.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, in all due respect to my colleague from Utah, I don’t think anybody in the civil rights community all across this land will be reassured. I will work with you on the language. With all due respect, some of these arguments about surely you are not for letting blacks out of jail—of course not. The Senator knows what the amendment says. The Senator knows it is not about quotas; it is not about letting anybody out of jail. The Senator is all about calling on States to study the problem. The Senator knows that. We have had this core protection since 1993. Why do you think it is the case? There has been a history for this. It started in 1986. Then we passed this amendment in 1993. It is based upon all kinds of studies, all kinds of work, which has provided the empirical evidence, which should be of no surprise to any Senator here, that we have a problem in our country of disproportionate minority confinement.

We want to try to understand why minority kids who represent about 33 percent of the population represent about 66 percent of the kids who are locked up. We want to come to terms with that. Could it have anything to do with their race, in terms of who gets swept up in the streets? Could it have anything to do with who actually ends up getting a good evaluation or not by a probation officer? Could it have anything to do with who gets or doesn’t get detained by a judge? Could it have anything to do with who is sentenced and for how long a period of time?

My colleague doesn’t think race has anything to do with this. If you don’t think race has anything to do with this, that we don’t have any problem with discrimination in our country, or that States right now are collecting data, trying to work out the problems, which is exactly what our amendment says—continue with this good work—then you should not vote for this amendment. But if you think this is an issue that deals with race in America, that this is a civil rights issue, and you think it was a good thing that we had this core protection, this core requirement in our juvenile justice legislation and it would be a tragic mistake for us to take this protection out that just calls for States to study the problem and try to redress the problem, then you should vote for this amendment.

This is the language of the amendment:

Establish juvenile delinquency prevention efforts and system improvement efforts designed to reduce, without establishing or requiring numerical standards or quotas, the disproportionate number of members of minority groups who come into contact with the juvenile justice system.

Senators, Democrats and Republicans alike, that is what you are voting on. This is a civil rights vote. The majority of my colleagues and—I will hear my colleague from Utah doesn’t want to say that. He thinks race has nothing to do with it, but I think that is what this vote is all about. I can argue with that point. You know, some Senators don’t think there is an issue with discrimination. There are some Senators who don’t think there is a problem of disproportionate sentencing. There are some Senators who think we should remove this protection. There are some Senators who want to turn the clock back. But I am telling you, this is a civil rights issue for the civil rights community in this country and for child advocacy groups.

I certainly hope we will be able to pass this amendment. If we don’t pass this amendment, this juvenile justice legislation will be turned back when it comes to justice. I don’t think it will be a piece of legislation that will be worth supporting. I don’t think Senators should support legislation that turns the clock back on the progress we have made dealing with racial justice. I don’t think Senators should support that, and I think Senators should support this amendment. This is the civil rights question, the civil rights issue, and the civil rights question of this bill. Disproportional sentencing, this core requirement in our juvenile justice legislation and it would be a tragic mistake for us to take this protection out that just calls for States to study the problem and try to redress the problem, which is exactly what our amendment says—continue with this good work—then you should not vote for this amendment. But if you think this is an issue that deals with race in America, that this is a civil rights issue, and you think it was a good thing that we had this core protection, this core requirement in our juvenile justice legislation and it would be a tragic mistake for us to take this protection out that just calls for States to study the problem and try to redress the problem, then you should vote for this amendment.

This is the language of the amendment:

Address juvenile delinquency prevention efforts and system improvement efforts designed to reduce, without establishing or requiring numerical standards or quotas, the disproportionate number of members of minority groups who come into contact with the juvenile justice system.
were convicted for, that somehow there is something wrong with that. Everybody in America knows that people are sentenced to jail because they have committed crimes. I admit that occasionally there are injustices in our court systems, but they are very rare. When they do Occur, I will denounce them as much as my friend from Minnesota.

This is what you call a bleeding heart amendment. They can't show the facts; they don't have any facts on their side. They are using statistics. They are ignoring the fact that people are convicted of these crimes and need to serve time for them, regardless of skin color; and they are ignoring the fact that we take care of this problem by providing a disproportionate amount of the prevention funds to help segments of the population having difficulties because of socioeconomic difficulties.

That is the way to face it and solve the problem. Don't just complain about the problem. What is the solution? Is it that someone should not serve their time? Should they not be convicted when they sell drugs to our kids? Everybody knows that it happens.

It is nice to talk about civil rights. The fact of the matter is that nobody is more concerned about civil rights than I am. If anyone can show me where there is prejudice, if they can show me where these people are not justly convicted, that is another matter. I will be right there marching with them after they do it and they know it.

Mr. President, I am going to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, and then I will yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah for his leadership. He raises a good question about statistics and how they can be misleading. Of course, Senator Breaux, as attorney general of Alabama, and I have a brief here that was submitted on statistics involving whites and blacks on death row in Alabama. Now, 52 percent of those on death row in Alabama are white; 48 percent are black. But that percentage of the black population is substantially higher on death row than in the State. But the study goes on to show that the percentage of homicides committed in Alabama by blacks was 71 percent; yet, they represent 46 percent of the people on death row.

So I don't know what any of those numbers mean. I am not sure they are very beneficial to anybody. But if you look at it one way, it looks like it is unfair. If you look at it another way, it looks like it is not unfair. So the Senator is correct that we need to have proof of individual wrongs instead of passing a law that is going to require the reduction of people in prison based on a statistical study.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes.

Mr. HATCH. How much does the other side have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Zero.

Mr. HATCH. I yield back the remainder of my time and we can yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk reads as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL) introduced an amendment numbered 365. The amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 1. PROHIBITION ON PROMOTING VIOLENCE ON FEDERAL PROPERTY.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—A Federal department or agency shall:

(1) consider a request from an individual or entity for the use of any property, facility, equipment, or personnel of the department or agency for commercial or governmental purposes; and

(2) make a determination as to whether granting a request described in paragraph (1) is consistent with—

(A) United States policy;

(B) the mission or interest of the department or agency; or

(C) the public interest;

shall not grant such a request without considering whether such motion picture or television production glorifies or endorses wanton and gratuitous violence.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

(1) any bona fide newsreel or news television production;

(2) any public service announcement.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, my understanding is I have 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask the Chair to notify me when I have 3 minutes left.

Mr. President, the amendment that is now pending before us when granting permits necessary for filming a movie or a TV show on Federal property, or with Federal equipment, the relevant agency's approval criteria now would include a consideration of whether the film glorifies or endorses wanton and gratuitous violence. The message is simple: The Federal Government will not allow Hollywood to promote excessive and wanton violence in our house.

America's children are exposed to incessant, endless hours of violent movies and television productions each year. Exposure to this violence desensitizes our children to brutality and killing and gives them "glamorous" murderous acts to emulate. This exposure is like pouring gasoline on fire.

Yes, the children who commit terrible acts of violence must have a number of deep and troubling problems. However, the glorified wanton violence depicted in movies and on TV is fuel that Hollywood is dousing on those children and their subtle internal problems. This is not a revelation. Indeed, a 1996 American Medical Association Study concluded that the link between media violence and real life violence has been proven by science time and time again.

Most people know, intuitively, that there is a strong link between media violence and real life. Why is it that no one in Hollywood seems to care? Are they the only ones who are oblivious to this phenomenon? Why is there no shame about the violent junk they are making and MARKETING to our kids? Why do we hear Hollywood people with speech after speech on every fad-driven cause under the sun, and yet rarely ever do we hear them mention reforming themselves and refraining from marketing violence to our children.

Let's take a look at some of the media violence that our children are exposed to.

First, let's go to the movies.

Now, I'm told that Leonardo DiCaprio and Keanu Reeves are two of the biggest teen idols out there today. These photographs are both from recent hit movies—"The Basketball Diaries" and "The Matrix." Thanks to the occupant of the Chair, Senator BROWNBACK, the Republican Senators had an opportunity to see some of the scenes from "Basketball Diaries" recently. That is one of the scenes from it here on my left.

The "Matrix," featuring Keanu Reeves, is here on my right.

You can see from these photographs that Hollywood is taking the biggest teen idols and turning them into glamorous, powerful, violent images to send out to our young people. These are role models for children.

As you can see here, in "Basketball Diaries," teen idol DiCaprio is wearing a long, black trenchcoat and packing a shotgun. In this movie, DiCaprio's character has a fantasy of walking into his high school classroom and opening fire on his schoolmates and his teacher.

Thanks to the Senator from Kansas, Mr. MCCONNELL, we had an opportunity to see this scene from that film. I think we would all agree—those of us who saw it—it literally turns your stomach.

These violent images became reality in the community of Paducah, Kentucky, barely 17 months ago. In a Paducah high school, the DiCaprio Dream was played out in real life. I'd like to read for my colleagues an excerpt from a Newsweek article about "Basketball Diaries" and the senseless tragedy in Paducah.

"The Basketball Diaries" may not have been 14-year-old Michael Carneal's favorite
movie. But one scene in particular stayed with the awkward Paducah, Ky., freshman: a young character’s narcotic-tinged dream of striding into his school, pulling a shotgun from under his seat and opening fire. The real-life scene in the bloodied halls of Heath High School last Monday was a long way from Hollywood. Unlike handsome actor Leonardo DiCaprio’s dramatic entrance in 1995’s “Diaries,” skinny, bespectacled Michael bummed a ride to school that day from his 17-year-old sister, Kelly. Instead of cinematic kicking down a classroom door and wrapping a blanket around naked bodies, “a poster for my science project,” Loitering in the hall, Michael waited for a prayer group of 35 students to lift their bowed heads and say “Amen.” He then took a fifth gun, a semiautomatic .22, from his backpack and fired off 12 shots, killing three students and wounding five. Before the police arrived, Carneal would tell a teacher, “it was like I was in a dream.”

Looking back at Paducah, and now Littleton—and looking at these Hollywood images of teen idols—can leave no doubts. Hollywood violence DOES influence our children, in the worst way.

Let me tell you about this other hit movie—“The Matrix.” The image of this character is strikingly similar to that over here of Mr. DiCaprio. Let me read to you how an article in the Washington Post described watching the Matrix.

The sold-out theatre was filled with younger teens, despite the R rating, and at times I felt as if I were watching a dramatization of the same day that had just occurred in Littleton, Colorado.

In one scene, protagonists played by Keanu Reeves and Carrie-Anne Moss arrive at an office building where their adversaries are holed up. Dressed in black leather coats, the pair sprays the lobby with automatic weapons fire. The scene is a gorgeously choreographed battle of mass killing, a triumph of Hollywood’s ability to represent graphic violence. As bullets riddle a dozen twitching bodies, spent shell casings cascade on the floor as music plays. The same basic mechanisms that we use, step by step, to make killing a conditioned response in our soldiers, are being done in the games that the kids go and play.

Mr. President, let me tell you what Colonel Grossman had to say about Paducah, Kentucky and Michael Carneal. Colonel Grossman, a 14-year-old boy, has never fired a pistol before in his life. His total experience was countless, thousands and thousands of rounds in the video games. When Michael Carneal opened fire, he fired eight shots... [He] got eight hits on eight different kids. Five of them were head shots. The other three were torso shots. Now, the F.B.I. says in the average engagement, the average officer hits with less than one bullet in five.

Grossman concluded:

GROSSMAN. Here’s what’s fascinating about this crime... He held that gun and he fired one shot at every target. Now, that is not natural. [A]nybody that’s ever been in combat will tell you that the natural thing is to fire at a target until you hit the target. In the video games they train you if you’re very, very, very, very good, what you’ll do is you’ll fire one shot—don’t even wait for the target to drop—you don’t have time—go to the next, and the next. And the video games give bonus effects for head shots.

Mr. President, I understand that the Motion Picture Association has been lobbying heavily against this amendment. I want to make sure everybody understands what this amendment really does. It is quite mild.

The problems evidenced by these video games and movies are complicated and complex. We are not going to solve them overnight. I do believe it is time that Hollywood take more responsibility. We need to send the message to Hollywood: Don’t bombard our children with glamorous portrayals of gratuitous and wanton violence.

Under the first amendment, we cannot and we do not have the right to deny the right of free speech to anyone. However, as the Senate, we can encourage Hollywood to take responsible steps to protect our children. We can make sure the Federal Government does not co-star with Hollywood in any movies that glorify or endorse wanton and gratuitous violence.

The Federal Government already curbs federal filming privileges based on whether a production “appear[s] to condone or endorse activities...” but only in the United States. We have been together on more issues than we have been apart. Mr. DiCaprio’s dramatic entrance in “The Matrix” and the “Top Gun” action scenes did not take place in the United States. We have been apart on many issues, but we can agree on one thing: We can make sure the Federal Government does not co-star with Hollywood in any movies that glorify or endorse wanton and gratuitous violence.

The problems evidenced by these video games and movies are complicated and complex. We are not going to solve them overnight. I do believe it is time that Hollywood take more responsibility. We need to send the message to Hollywood: Don’t bombard our children with glamorous portrayals of gratuitous and wanton violence.

Under the first amendment, we cannot and we do not have the right to deny the right of free speech to anyone. However, as the Senate, we can encourage Hollywood to take responsible steps to protect our children. We can make sure the Federal Government does not co-star with Hollywood in any movies that glorify or endorse wanton and gratuitous violence.

The Federal Government already curbs federal filming privileges based on whether a production “appear[s] to condone or endorse activities...” but only in the United States. We have been together on more issues than we have been apart. Mr. DiCaprio’s dramatic entrance in “The Matrix” and the “Top Gun” action scenes did not take place in the United States. We have been apart on many issues, but we can agree on one thing: We can make sure the Federal Government does not co-star with Hollywood in any movies that glorify or endorse wanton and gratuitous violence.
it was filmed in Australia, so this amendment, I assume, notwithstanding the graphic picture with Keanu Reeves, would not be covered?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend from Vermont that particular movie was shot on Federal property. I am sure my friend from Vermont would not be arguing that it ought to have been made on Federal property.

Mr. LEAHY. I am not one who is particularly interested in violent movies. I have been to too many crime scenes, too many murder and shooting scenes in a prior public life to do it.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I feel very strongly that this amendment should not pass.

I wanted to add to what Senator LEAHY has said. As far as I know, none of the movies or programs he talks about—none of the video games—because games are made from computers—were ever made on Federal property as far as I could tell. I think that is an important point.

It is interesting that just today, just today, one of the committees here in the Senate is now hearing testimony about some new rules that would govern the filming on Federal property. It was voted out of the committee. I think it is unfortunate we are bringing this up just while we are trying to resolve all of these questions.

I think it is important to realize this amendment. I have it in front of me, and it uses words that are very subjective, words like “wanton violence.” I looked that up in the dictionary because under this amendment we are giving Federal bureaucrats who are not trained as critics of film or critics of television programming the job of deciding whether there is wanton violence.

One of the meanings of “wanton” is excessively luxurious. So, somebody deciding this could decide to go with that definition. Another meaning of “wanton” is without adequate motive or provocation. These words carry different meanings for different people. The Senator from Kentucky has his definition of gratuitous violence, of wanton violence. The dictionary has another. Who knows what the bureaucrat at the FAA will decide violence is, when it is up to him to decide whether his plane is used, or a bureaucrat at the Department of the Interior? I got a call from a Republican friend who said: Senator, I hope you fight this. We couldn’t make a western, we couldn’t make a war movie. What about a movie that talks about a family in which there are violent relationships and these all get resolved in the movie? Some of the scenes are rough and difficult, but there is a purpose.

I am sure my friend would say that is not gratuitous, but that is his opinion. It may be the opinion of the bureaucrat sitting in the agency or department that he is now charging with becoming a film critic.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. BOXER. I yield on the Senator’s time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I don’t have that much time. I ask the Senator if she thinks the standards that currently apply and are used by DOD and mandated by statute for the Coast Guard, which are very subjective, should be repealed?

Mrs. BOXER. I am addressing the Senator’s amendment and the Senator’s amendment says any department. It uses the words “wanton, gratuitous.” I think these words are very subjective. It is the reason I didn’t vote for Senator HOLLINGS’ amendment when he came to the floor—it was the same idea.

My constituents are concerned this amendment would potentially prevent war movies, westerns, or stories about abusive relationships which find peace and harmony in the end from being filmed on Federal property. It gives bureaucrats in many Federal agencies the authority to decide what violence is. I didn’t run for this job to be an art critic. That is why when we criticize the art world, I think we have to be very careful, because we are not art critics. Most Members are pretty good at what we do, but we are not art critics; neither is a bureaucrat over at Interior or FAA or any of the other departments that will now deal with this.

I say, as a parent and a grandparent, I do not want to give this kind of power, this kind of job to an elected, let alone an unelected, person sitting at some Federal agency. I think it is pretty incredible. I do not know where we go from here, I say to the good Senator.

Why not, if you want to take this to the ultimate extreme, then say private property cannot be used, private property cannot be used for this purpose, and tell the people of America how they should use their private property? Where do you stop? This is a slippery slope.

We all know that every one of us has to look inside ourselves and do something about this problem of violence. Whether you are a parent or a grandparent or a Senator, whether you are in the movie business, in the TV business, whether you are in the video game business, we all have an obligation—or whether you are a firearms manufacturer. The bottom line is we all have to do more.

But to then say that bureaucrats in the Federal Government are going to make these subjective decisions? I want the people at FAA to fly the planes. I want the people at the Department of Interior to take care of the parks. I want the people at the Department of Transportation to regulate transportation. I do not want to give them this job of deciding for the people of America what the definition of “wanton” is; or “gratuitous,” for that matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s 5 minutes has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for 1 additional minute, and then I will conclude.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I was involved in this debate once over at the Committee on Commerce. Others thought it was me versus the “scholar’s list.” Others thought it was about “Cousin Edith’s List” was one of the best movies ever made and it would be important for our children to learn about the Holocaust.

Why do I say this? Because it shows how subjective it is. I do not want Federal Government employees who are not trained as critics to become movie critics and TV critics.

I thank my colleague for yielding me this additional time. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Vermont have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEAHY. Wait a minute, Mr. President. I yielded the Senator a total of 6 minutes, the Senator from California, out of 15 minutes. How do I have 6 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes before yielding to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. LEAHY. I see. Fast clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this amendment prohibits any Federal agency, such as the Marines, Army, Navy, or Air Force, from granting permission to use Federal property or resources or cooperating if the motion picture or TV show is designed to glorify or endorse wanton and gratuitous violence.” If any portion of the movie uses any Federal property, the entire movie is subject to Federal scrutiny.

Federal agencies, other than the military, would be given these new censorship powers, too. The Department of Agriculture could determine if it is on forest lands or rights of way of the Interior Department and otherwise. Congress has kept “North By Northwest” with Cary Grant off because the visitors center scene at Mount Rushmore was in it? What about “Fargo”? What about the Presidio military base in San Francisco that was used as a setting for the Sean Connery movie, “The Presidio”? This amendment is flawed. What glorifies violence is in the eye of the beholder.

Even movies, like legislation, have last-minute changes. Would you have to have a Department of Agriculture and a Senator sitting in that way through? Many scenes in the movie “Top Gun” would have had to be carefully monitored during production to
ensure they did not glorify violence. The naval base that was used was Miramar in California.

The fight in “An Officer and a Gentleman” also might be considered excessive by some. What about the gratuitous punch by Jimmy Stewart in “Mr. Smith Goes to Washington”? “The Treasure of the Sierra Madre,” uses the vast national forest lands in its filming, even though most of it was filmed in Mexico. Could part of it be knocked out?

There are only exceptions for news and public service announcements, but any movie that is a historical depiction of a war would subject to agency bureaucrats deciding whether violence was gratuitous or glorifies violence. Sponsors may say: Let them go somewhere else and do their filming, let them go to private property or parklands or military bases. I think that is a shortsighted response. Some may want to use that property to be authentic.

I am concerned how this is going to work. Do we turn over our script? If you are a movie producer or maker, do you turn over the script to the Department of Agriculture, Department of the Interior, Department of Defense first and decide whether it is safe? We may not like all that we see from Hollywood. But I have no confidence in the decisions the agency censors make. I am perfectly capable of censoring what I see. I was perfectly capable, when my children were young, to censor what they saw. But I do not want an official, however well intended, in the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Defense to determine what I see.

I retain the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HATCH. I want to thank the Senator from Kentucky for his amendment. I want to be clear on one matter, however. It is my understanding that lands under the BLM, Park Service, and Forest Service are in no way covered or affected by the amendment because they do not consider subjective criteria when determining whether to cooperate or grant permits to a film or TV production. Is that correct?

Mr. MCCONNELL. This is correct.

Mr. HATCH. How much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes 56 seconds in opposition to the amendment and 1 minute 47 seconds on the proponents.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent to make but 3 minutes on the side of Senator MCCONNELL and an equal amount of extra time on the side of the minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY. I didn’t hear the request.

Mr. HATCH. I made a unanimous consent request to give Senator MCCONNELL 3 minutes, which would give him another minute and a half, and give you an equal amount of time on your side.

Mr. LEAHY. You are asking for an extra minute and a half—

Mr. HATCH. For Senator MCCONNELL.

Mr. LEAHY. And an extra minute and a half for this side?

Mr. HATCH. For you.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to respond that the observations by the other side have nothing to do with the amendment, nothing whatsoever to do with the amendment.

Any movie company is free to go make a movie anywhere it wants to in the country and say anything it wants to and be as depraved as it wants to be without interference from Government. This amendment is only related to the use of Federal property.

In many federal agencies and departments there are subjective standards being used now to approve or deny cooperation with film production companies. The thing the Senator from Vermont and I are talking about is already occurring. The Department of Defense has very subjective standards it applies to movies now. For example, it did not allow “GI Jane” to be made on Federal property or for the military. It did not keep the movie from being made, but the Defense Department did not like it; it had a very subjective standard. They said go make your movie somewhere else. They liked “Top Gun.” They allowed it to be made. There is a very subjective standard that applies now.

DOD considers whether a production “appears to condone or endorse activities that are contrary to U.S. Government policy.” That is clearly very subjective. Fact is, in NASA’s policy it includes whether the story is reasonably plausible, does not advocate or glorify unlawful acts or present as factual history things which did not take place—that is fairly subjective.

At the Coast Guard, under statute, the Coast Guard does not provide facilities or assistance to film producers unless the Guard determines it is “appropriate”—very subjective—and that it will not interfere with Coast Guard missions.

Mr. President, a movie company now does not have the inalienable right or constitutional right to come onto Federal property and do anything it wants to. All we are saying, to Federal agencies that have either a policy or a statute giving them the authority to clear these movies for content—and we’ve seen that some have them now—that they simply add to the list of subjective evaluations they already make a consideration of wanton and gratuitous violence. People who have spoken on the other side of this are not arguing we ought to repeal the current standards because they are very subjective. Maybe they do not want any standard at all to apply with respect to the use of Federal property.

With regard to the parks system, they do not currently have subjective criteria and standard, so this would not apply to them. They are clearly outside of the amendment.

This is a very narrowly crafted message to Hollywood not to produce this kind of gratuitous and wanton violence on Federal property with federal cooperation. It certainly does not take away anybody’s constitutional right to go out and act in an awful manner as they want to and put it on film. They just wouldn’t be able to do it on Federal property.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we are well aware of what the military does. The military will permit use—in fact, some suggest even will help write, indirectly, the costs of a film if it makes the military look good.

The military has been known in the past to withdraw support, even classic films, if they suggest the military may have made a mistake anywhere—Vietnam, Afghanistan, and even Korea. We have seen that kind of censorship.

I understand they are using military areas. I do not necessarily agree with it. I think they have been very sensitive about that, but then the military is used to censorship. Do not let your children go to them. Stop them from going to private property or parklands or military bases. I think that is a shortsighted response. Some may want to use that property to be authentic.

I am concerned about, though, is when you talk about the vast forest land and somebody one day in the Department of Agriculture, who works on, I don’t know, dairy price supports, and the next day is going to be the person to censor what goes in that movie, whether that forest can be the backdrops. If it is used for military, the Department of the Interior controls so much land—I can think of movies, shoot ‘em up, with Ronald Reagan galloping by the sites in areas controlled by the Department of the Interior. It might have been declined because somebody did not like him. Maybe somebody who normally does fishing permits in the Department of the Interior would determine what movies will be made or what they like or do not like. That is a reason to be concerned.

Those who are opposed to wanton violence should do as I do—don’t go to those movies. Nothing votes better than your checkbook. If you do not want your children to go to them, do not spend money there. Take your money elsewhere.

Do not put our Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, and Department of the Interior into censorship. Do not let them make some of the mistakes the Department of Defense has made in the past in refusing permission for something because they are afraid it will show a general or a colonel or admiral
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

AMENDMENT NO. 319

(Purpose: To reduce both juvenile crime and the risk that youth will become victims of crime and to improve academic and social outcomes for students by providing productive activities during after school hours)

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 319. It is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. Boxer] proposes an amendment numbered 319.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE

AFTER SCHOOL EDUCATION AND ANTI-CRIME ACT

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "After School Education and Anti-Crime Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to improve academic and social outcomes for students and reduce both juvenile crime and the risk that youth will become victims of crime by providing productive activities during after school hours.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Today's youth face far greater social risks than did their parents and grandparents.

(2) Students spend more of their waking hours alone, without supervision, companionship, or activity, than the students spend in school.

(3) Law enforcement statistics show that youth who are ages 12 through 17 are most at risk of committing violent acts and being victims of violent acts between 3 p.m. and 6 p.m.

(4) The consequences of academic failure are more dire in 1999 than ever before.

(5) After school programs have been shown to be effective in helping youth who are at risk of dropping out of school or offending.

(6) Many of our Nation's governors and local officials recognize the importance of after school programs and have formed partnerships to ensure that these programs are available to students.

(7) Over 450 of the Nation's leading police chiefs, sherrifs, and prosecutors, along with presidents of the Fraternal Order of Police and the International Union of Police Associations, which together represent 300,000 police officers, have called upon public officials to provide after school programs that offer recreation, academic support, and community service experience, for school-age children and teens in the United States.

(8) One of the most important investments that we can make in our children is to ensure that they have safe and positive learning environments in the after school hours.

SEC. 4. GOALS.

The goals of this Act are as follows:

(1) To increase the academic success of students.

(2) To promote safe and productive environments for students in the after school hours.

(3) To provide alternatives to drug, alcohol, tobacco, and gang activity.

(4) To reduce juvenile crime and the risk that youth will become victims of crime during after school hours.

SEC. 5. PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.

Section 10902 of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Act (20 U.S.C. 8201) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking, "States," and each place thereafter "States" and inserting "States and among"; and

(B) by striking 

"and" and inserting "or to" and "and" preceding "States and among", and each place thereafter "States" and inserting "or the States"; and

(2) in subsection (b) as so redesignated—

(A) by striking "United States" and inserting "a local educational agency"; and

(B) by striking "or the States" and inserting "or among"; and

(3) in subsection (c), by striking "and" and inserting "or".

SEC. 6. APPLICATIONS.

Section 10904 of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Act (20 U.S.C. 8204) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "States, and among" and replacing "States," with each place thereafter "States" and inserting "or States and among"; and

(B) by striking "and" preceding "United States" and inserting "or United States".

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-four seconds.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is interesting, in Hollywood lobbying efforts, they always scream censorship. This amendment has nothing to do with censorship. It has to do with the use of Federal property and federal assistance, which is a privilege, not a right.

The Federal Government, through various departments and agencies, already has very subjective standards. We are simply adding to those kinds of standards one more factor—wanton and gratuitous violence. No movie company in America has a right to use any and all Federal property and get federal assistance away. We are just adding one more criterion.

This is a very reasonable amendment. I hope it will be approved by my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute 17 seconds.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I can think of some ads I see on local TV at night that are not violent but I find of a personal nature offensive, some of which are filled with backgrounds of Government land. Should we start taking those out?

The fact is, we have a lot of Government sites. Do we stop a movie, for example, that is filmed with somebody driving down Pennsylvania Avenue because the Department of the Interior, the Justice Department, and other Government buildings are seen in the background? Do we make sure there is never any depiction of the Capitol? One of the most violent things was "Independence Day" when a model of the Capitol was blown up. There may have been in the shots actually made of the Capitol prior to that time.

Does that go out?

I suggest these because we are getting into a terribly subjective area, and we are asking people who are trained to do very good things for our Government, whether it is fishing permits, lands permits, or agricultural subsidies—they are not trained, nor should they be, in this Nation especially to be censors.

I know the time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired. I yield back all my remaining time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.
"(5) an assurance that the local educational agency, in each year of the project, will maintain the agency’s fiscal effort, from non-Federal sources, from the preceding fiscal year toward the activities the local educational agency provides with funds provided under this part.");

SEC. 7. USES OF FUNDS.
Section 7 of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Act (20 U.S.C. 8245) is amended—

(a) In general.—Grants awarded under this part may be used to establish or expand community learning centers. The centers may provide 1 or more of the following activities;:

(1) mentoring programs;

(ii) academic assistance;

(iii) recreational activities; or

(iv) technology training; and

(b) Limitation.—Not less than 2/3 of the amount appropriated under section 10907 for this part may be used to establish or expand community learning centers. The centers may provide 1 or more of the following activities;:

(1) mentoring programs;

(ii) academic assistance;

(iii) recreational activities; or

(iv) technology training; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(14) After school programs, that—

(A) shall include at least 1 of the following—

(i) drug, alcohol, and gang prevention activities;

(ii) health and nutrition counseling; and

(iii) job skills preparation activities.

(b) Limitation.—Not less than 2/3 of the amount appropriated under section 10907 for each fiscal year shall be used for after school programs, as described in paragraph (14). Such programs may also include activities described in paragraphs (1) through (13) that offer expanded opportunities for children or youth.

SEC. 8. ADMINISTRATION.
Section 10906 of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Act (20 U.S.C. 8246) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c) Administration.—In carrying out the activities described in subsection (a), a local educational agency or school shall, to the greatest extent practicable—

(1) request volunteers from business and academic communities, and law enforcement organizations, such as Police Athletic and Activity Leagues, to serve as mentors or to assist in other ways;

(2) involve that youth in the local community participate in designing the after school activities;

(3) develop creative methods of conducting outreach to youth in the community;

(4) request donations of computer equipment and other materials and equipment; and

(5) work with State and local park and recreation agencies so that activities carried out by the agencies prior to the date of enactment of this subsection are not duplicated by activities assisted under this part.

SEC. 9. COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTER DEFINED.
Section 10906 of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Act (20 U.S.C. 8246) is amended in paragraph (2) by inserting "including law enforcement organizations such as the Police Athletic and Activity League and other "governmental agencies".

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.
Section 10907 of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Act (20 U.S.C. 8247) is amended by striking "$50,000,000 for fiscal year 1995" and all that follows and inserting "$800,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, to carry out this part.

SEC. 11. EFFECTIVE DATE.
This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, take effect on October 1, 1999.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, my amendment calls for an expansion of afterschool programs. The purpose of the juvenile justice bill is to cut down on crime, and the debate has been, how do we do that?

There are many ways of cutting down on juvenile crime. Certainly one is the gun control amendments which we have been debating and which have received less attention. Another is tough enforcement, tougher penalties. We have been doing that. And another is prevention. I believe this bill is short on prevention. There is not anything in this bill that specifically talks about afterschool programs.

I share with my colleagues a chart, which is basically from the FBI, which shows when juvenile crime is committed. One does not need a degree in chart reading to see what is happening. At 3 o’clock the crime rate goes up, and it does not go down until the parents start coming home from work. We know it is very important in that period of time to look at ways to keep our kids out of trouble. One proven way is after school programs.

Right now, we do have afterschool programs funded by the Federal Government, but we are falling short. Out of the 2,000 school districts that applied for afterschool Federal assistance, only 287 applications were awarded grants because of the lack of funds.

President Clinton understood this. In his budget, he asked us to authorize $600 million. That is what my amendment does. It authorizes $600 million. It allows us to accommodate 1.1 million children, many of whom are waiting on line to get into afterschool programs. These are mentoring programs, academic assistance, recreational activities, drug-alcohol prevention programs, et cetera.

The American people understand the importance of afterschool programs. I want my colleagues to see this. Senator Lautenberg, 85 percent of the people supported the gun show loophole. Mr. President, 92 percent of the people favor afterschool programs. We have a chance to do what the American people want us to do.

I-law enforcement supports our after school program, as do over 450 police chiefs, sheriffs, and prosecutors. It is important to look at this list because they are from all over the country.

Let’s see what the Police Activities Leagues says about afterschool programs. In a letter of endorsement, they write:

Afterschool youth development programs, like those proposed in your amendment, have been shown to cut juvenile crime immediately, sometimes by 40 to 75 percent. Name one other thing we have in this bill that can have such a dramatic impact immediately on our children.

I saw an interesting letter to the editor in today’s Los Angeles Times. It is from the Republican mayor of that city, Richard Riordan. He says:

Studies have shown that LA’s best—

Which is their afterschool program—students enjoy school more, show improvement in their grades and feel safe. The kids do better at school. They do better in all the various schools across this Nation, because they have afterschool.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-four seconds.

Mrs. BOXER. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. HATCH. Let me just say a few words.

I must object to the amendment of the Senator from California. I appreciate the necessity of afterschool programs. I am concerned about the programs’ authorization from $20 million annually to $600 million annually. That adds up to $3 billion over 5 years. The entire underlying bill, which we have been working on for 2 years, only authorizes a little over $1 billion in spending a year—our whole bill.

Again, I express my concerns with attempting to solve a problem by simply throwing more money at it. This amendment attempts to throw $3 billion at a problem that our bill will solve because it is effectively written and we know what to do with the money. Our underlying bill will solve many of the problems this amendment by the distinguished Senator from California cannot solve. This is a better way to spend such an inordinate amount or settled amount on a single program.

Finally, the Labor Committee is undertaking reauthorization of the ESEA this year. Let that committee do its job. I am not in the business of making the works bills. That would be the place for the distinguished Senator to make her case when that comes up, both in the Labor Committee and on the floor.

I yield such time as he may need to the distinguished chairman of the Labor Committee.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I agree very strongly with Senator BOXER’s goal of increasing the availability of positive, engaging activities for school-aged children and youth during the nonschool hours. This is a very important issue that cannot, and should not, be decided within the context of a floor amendment on the juvenile justice legislation.

Even without this year’s Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization, I would have reservations about this amendment. But we do have the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization in progress, and that is the time when this amendment, or something similar to it, ought to be considered.
As the author of the original 21st Century Community Learning Centers Act, I have an enormous interest in any changes to this legislation, much less changes as dramatic as those proposed in this amendment.

When Senator Steve Gunderson and I drafted the 21st Century Learning Centers legislation, our purpose was to promote the broader use of school facilities, equipment, and resources. Our largest investment in education is for buildings and equipment, and in most communities these resources are closed more than they are open.

By encouraging schools to share their facilities, equipment, and other resources to meet the broader needs of the community, these centers can expand educational and social service opportunities for everyone in the community.

Until 2 years ago, the Clinton administration failed to support the 21st Century Community Learning Centers, even going so far as to repeatedly requesting that funds for the program appropriated by Congress be rescinded.

Then, last year, the administration, through the competitive grants process, substantially changed the focus and nature of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program. Overnight, this initiative to expand the use of existing facilities became an afterschool program, almost to the exclusion of the multi-purpose community centers which were envisioned when I wrote the legislation.

This dramatic change in direction for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program raises questions which must be answered before we can consider such a huge expansion of the program. We will be doing that during the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is now being considered in the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions. We must address questions such as: Can the legislation still serve the purposes for which it was originally intended, with the current, overwhelming focus on providing afterschool programs? If it is to be an afterschool program, are there changes needed in the legislation to make it more effective?

If this program is to serve primarily as an afterschool program, where do community organizations such as the Boys and Girls Clubs, YMCA, fit in? Public schools currently profit from less than one-third of the afterschool care, with other community groups providing most of the care.

The current grant program clearly demonstrates that schools are, by and large, failing to coordinate their afterschool services with those of other care providers in the community. And the Boxer amendment does nothing but perpetuate that situation. The amendment by Senator Boxer proposes changes that will dilute the act.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. The time in opposition to the amendment has expired.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Thank you, I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the 1992 Carnegie Corporation report, "A Matter of Time," called for a major national investment in after-school programs for youth. It said, "Risk can be transferred to our youth by turning their non-school hours into the time of their lives."

But, we have not done enough to give children the kind of opportunities they need after school. Just ask children if this is true, and they will admit that their after-school hours can be some of the most unstructured time of their lives.

Amy, age 14, said "Sometimes there are so many things you can’t do. I can’t leave the house. If I talk on the phone, I can’t let any one know I’m here alone. But I really think they’ve figured it out, you know."

Cindy, age 16, said, "We need someone to listen to us—really take it in. I don’t have anyone to talk to, so when I have a problem inside, I just have to deal with it. There would be more adults that ask questions because that shows that they care and want to know more."

Each day, 5 million children, many as young as 6 or 8 years old, are left home alone after school. approved are more likely to be involved in anti-social activities and destructive patterns of behavior.

We also know that juvenile delinquent crime peaks in the hours between 3 p.m. and 8 p.m. A recent study of gang crimes by juveniles in Orange County, California, shows that 60 percent of all juvenile gang crimes occur on school days and peak immediately after school dismissal.

We need to do all we can to encourage communities to develop activities that will engage children and keep them off the streets, away from drugs, and out of trouble.

Crime survivors, law enforcement representatives, and prosecutors have joined together in calling for a substantial federal investment in after-school activities. Over 450 of the nation’s leading police chiefs, sheriffs, prosecutors, and leaders of local fraternal orders of police, which represent over 360,000 police officers, have called upon public officials to provide more after-school programs for school-age children.

Clearly, financial assistance is needed for activities in states across the country. Too often, parents cannot afford the thousands of dollars a year required to pay for after-school care, if it exists at all. In Massachusetts, 4,000 eligible children are on waiting lists for after-school care, and a third of those more have parents who have given up on getting help. Nationwide, half a million eligible children are on waiting lists for federal child care subsidies. The need for increased opportunities is obvious and this amendment helps to meet it.

Senator Boxer’s plan will triple the funds for the 21st Century Community Learning Center initiative so that more than 1 million children each year will have access to safe and constructive after-school activities. It also strengthens the current program by including mentoring, academic assistance, and anti-drug, anti-alcohol, and anti-gang activities as allowable uses of the funding.

Additional federal support is essential for communities across the country. This year, the initiative was funded at $200 million. Over 2,000 applicants from across the country submitted proposals to the U.S. Department of Education for that assistance—but only 184 new grants could be funded. We must do more to meet the high demand for after-school programs across the country.

Communities are working hard to provide these after-school activities for children—but they can’t do it alone. They want Uncle Sam to be a strong partner in the effort.

Boston’s 2:00-to-6:00 After-School Initiative was created in 1998 to expand and enhance quality after-school programs across the city. It has already succeeded in increasing the number of school-based after-school programs by nearly 50 percent. A total of 43 programs now serve children in Boston. This year, Mayor Menino has pledged to open 20 more school-based programs. Boston and communities like it throughout the country deserve more assistance in meeting these needs.

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers program is helping to meet these needs. Last year, Boston received $305,000 to help the Lewis Middle School and the Tobin Community Middle School in Roxbury, and the Martin Luther King Jr. Middle School in Dorchester to create after-school programs for children.

Springfield received $315,000 to expand their “Time Out for Communities” initiative that is helping the Springfield Public Schools to provide after-school programs to 15,000 students, in conjunction with the Springfield Libraries and Museums, the YMCA, Springfield College, and other organizations in the community.

Worcester received $3.6 million over 3 years to support ten community centers that will serve 4,000 students and 5,000 community members. The Worcester after-school program, called the “Community Learning Centers for Worcester’s Children of Promise,” will provide a wide range of services, including academic support to help students meet state academic standards; drug and violence prevention programs; information on family health; day care for school-age children; tutoring and mentoring; access to technology for students and their families; summer activities; and adult education.

But much more needs to be done in Massachusetts and across the country, if we are going to keep children safe and help them succeed in school.

We know that after-school programs work. In Waco, Texas, students participating in the Lighted Schools program...
Mrs. Boxer. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—52
Abraham
Allard
Ashcroft
Bennett
Bond
Brownback
Bunning
Burns
Campbell
Cochran
Collins
Corzine
Craig
Crapo
Dole
Domenici
Reno
Fitzgerald

NAYS—48
Akaka
Baucus
Bayh
Biden
Bingaman
Bingaman
Bingaman
Bingaman
Boxer
Braun
Bryan
Byrd
Chafee

Mrs. Boxer. I thank my friends.

Mr. Hatch. Let me defer my motion to table and give 2 minutes equally divided.

The PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont once again opposes this. This isn’t a new program; it is an expansion of the program that was started by President Clinton. And guess what, I say to my friend. They can only fund a minuscule proportion of the applications from the school districts coming from all over the country.

What we would do in this amendment is allow those applications to be funded. This is nothing new. This is nothing extraordinary. It is expanding this program—the same program—to meet the incredible need.

I agree with law enforcement on this one: Keep our kids busy and happy after school. We will see that crime rate go down.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time expired on the amendment. Mr. Chafee. Let’s vote.

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, am I correct, the first vote is the Wellstone amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the first amendment that will be voted on.

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and ask for the yes and nays, and I request at the same time that the following two votes be 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. Hatch. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 364. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 130 Leg.]
The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 365

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHISON). On the McConnell amendment, there is 1 minute on each side.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the amendment we are about to vote on is very narrowly drafted to add one additional factor to those Federal agencies that have subjective standards they apply prior to allowing the shooting of a movie on Federal property.

The subject of the amendment is the making of movies on Federal property, and with federal assistance. There are at least three federal entities—the Defense Department, NASA, and the Coast Guard—that currently have quite subjective standards which they apply to the movie industry when asked for permission to make a movie on Federal property or with their cooperation and assistance.

All this amendment does is add one more factor—one, wanton and gratuitous violence—to those standards. Bear in mind this amendment has no first amendment implications at all. Any movie company that wants to make a movie and do anything and say anything and depict anything they want to can continue to do that. They just won’t do it on Federal property.

This is a mild amendment that sends a message to Hollywood.

I hope my colleagues will support it.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the problem with this, of course, is that nobody wants to start out on a movie, knows exactly what form their movie is going to be in in the end. Basically what you are saying is somebody in the Department of Agriculture—for example, if you want to do something on the eastern forest or have eastern forest in the background—some bureaucrat in the Department of Agriculture has to determine, before you even start filming the movie, what the final edited copy of the movie will look like at the end before the decision can be made. That person at the Department of Agriculture might do dairy price supports one day and Block Buster Steven Spielberg movies the next day.

I understand what my friend from Kentucky wants to do. But the best way to censor violence in movies is don’t go to violent movies. But don’t ask somebody at the Department of the Interior who does fishing permits, for example, to determine whether a national forest can be used as a background somewhere in a movie that has not yet been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. This will be a 10-minute vote. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 365

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment is the BOXER amendment. There are 2 minutes equally divided.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, all we do in this amendment is authorize the amount of money we need to fill the need of all those local school districts which have applied for afterschool programs. We know that at 3 o’clock—this is from the FBI—the crime rate goes up and it does not go down until the parents come home from work. We know that afterschool programs will prevent crime.

We also know the reason all these various law enforcement agencies support this is that this is the way to stop crime from happening in the first place.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may we have order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in order.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we hope to cut down juvenile crime. What better way to do it than to listen to law enforcement, including the Police Athletic Leagues and the National Sheriffs Association, and so many police chiefs who tell us: Senators, prevention is the name of the game. Once the kids get into the system, we cannot turn them around.

If we will vote for this, we will authorize the appropriate amount of money the local school districts are telling us meets the needs of 1.2 million children. I hope my colleagues will support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. This adds $3 billion to programs we already covered in our prevention programs and does it in a way that has more Federal intrusion.

I move to table the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 319.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced, yeas 53, nays 47, as follows: [Rollcall Vote No. 132 Leg.]

YEAS—53

NAYS—47

Abraham  Dodd  Kyl
Abourezk  Domenici  Lieberman
Baucus  Enzi  Nickles
Bingaman  Krasicky  Nickles
Boxer  Inouye  Reed
Boren  Moynihan  Robb
Boumediene  Murray  Santorum
Brownback  Peterson  Sessions
Byrd  Harkin  Shelby
Campbell  Hatch  Smith (ND)
Collins  Hutchinson  Smith (OK)
Conrad  Inhofe  Snowe
Cupiron  Johnson  Specter
Crist  Johnson  Thomas
Crump  Johnson  Thomas
DeWine  Kerry  Warner

AKAKA  BAUCUS  BOXER  BOND  BORING  BURBANK  CALDWELL  DASCHLE  DURBIN  DEMPSEY  HOLLINGS  HOUGHTON  ROBB  ROBINSON  SARABANES  SCHUMER  SMITH (OR)  SMITH (NH)  SPECTER  STEVENS  THOMAS  THUENEN  WYDEN

Abraham  Baucus  Bingaman  Boxer  Boren  Brown  Bunning  Byrd  Campbell  Cooper Craig  Craig  Crapo  DeWine  Dodd  Domenici  Enzi  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingold  Feingol
have all been willing to at least make concessions so that we can make progress. Senator DASCHLE and I appreciate that. The consent we will ask would provide for two amendments to be brought up in the morning, and it would be the Gordon Smith-Jeffords amendment, followed by the Lautenberg amendment, with a vote on both of those at 10:30. The pending business is still the Harkin amendment, but we would intend at that time to go to the supplemental bill. We are going to try to get a 2-hour time agreement on that. When that is over, we will be back where we stood with the Frist-Ashcroft amendment. That summarizes the agreement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the Gordon Smith-Jeffords amendment there be 60 minutes for debate, equally divided in the usual form on the Gordon Smith amendment and amendment No. 362, the Lautenberg amendment, to come concurrently beginning at 9:30 a.m. Thursday, and all other provisions of the consent agreement of May 14 remain in place and the amendment be laid down tonight prior to the close of Senate business.

I further ask consent that the vote occur on the Gordon Smith-Jeffords amendment just prior to the vote on amendment 362, under the same time restraints and provisions as provided above.

I further ask that the Senate resume amendment No. 355 immediately following the disposition of amendment No. 362.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object. That is with the understanding that the Senator from Iowa is represented under the same circumstances as when we broke off. Is that correct?

Mr. LOTT. He still would have priority recognition under the agreement and under the procedures anyway, but also under the agreement that was included. Both sides of this issue don’t want to lose their positions. But this will allow us to do these two amendments and to do the supplemental, and then that will be the pending issue. We know we have to find a way to get to a conclusion.

I want to emphasize now that we will do the supplemental after those first 2 votes.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object. Mr. Leader, would it be possible for the unanimous consent request to be amended to reflect that 15 minutes of the time on the Smith amendment be controlled by Senator SCHUMER, that he take 5 minutes of the 15 minutes, and then the remaining 10 minutes are free to the amendment?

Mr. LOTT. I think I got lost. Is it just a division of how the time would go on your side?

Mr. REID. Yes. One of our Members wanted to control 15 minutes. He is going to use 5 minutes of it and give the rest to Senator LAUTENBERG.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I amend that UC request to that effect, based on the assurance of the intent given by the distinguished Democratic whip. If it turns out that it is somehow or another not fair, we will revisit that tomorrow. I change the UC to include that request.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Reserving the right to object, and I don’t intend to object, I want to indicate that this is about the fourth time we have displaced this amendment, which I have been working on in conjunction with Senator Frist. This amendment has been the pending business since last Friday. This is not a novel amendment.

I just want to indicate that I intend to get a vote on this amendment. Votes have been taken on amendments on both sides. The right way to resolve any dispute on this amendment is to vote on it. I have been ready to vote on this amendment for quite some time. I think everyone on both sides of the aisle knows what the amendment is about.

I would just indicate that when this amendment comes back up I will persist in expecting the same courtesy that this body has accorded all other amendments to be accorded to this amendment, and I will work hard to make sure we have an opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I again express my appreciation to Senator ASHCROFT for his willingness to agree to this unanimous consent tonight. He is right. He, Senator FRIST, and Senator HARKIN have agreed to put it aside. I think it will be the fourth time we wouldn’t have been able to get this agreement without their cooperation. I understand their determination on both sides of the issue. I appreciate the fact they were willing to agree to this. Did we get an agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 366

(Purpose: To reverse provisions relating to pawn and other gun transactions)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senators Smith of Oregon and Jeffords.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerks will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), for Mr. Smith of Oregon, and Mr. Jeffords, proposes an amendment 366.

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 6. PROVISIONS RELATING TO PAWN AND OTHER GUN TRANSACTIONS.

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the repeal of paragraph (1) and amendment of paragraph (2) made by sub-section (c) with the heading "Provision Relating to Pawn and Other Transactions" of section 4 of the title with the heading "General Firearms Provisions" shall be null and void.

(b) COMPLIANCE.—Except as to the State and local planning and zoning requirements for a licensed premises as provided in sub-paragraph (D), a special license shall be subject to all the provisions of this chapter applicable to dealers, including, but not lim-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. NICKLES. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, May 18, 1999, the federal debt stood at $5,593,840,202,404.86 (Five trillion, five hundred ninety-three billion, eight hundred forty million, two hundred thousand, four hundred dollars and eighty-six cents).

One year ago, May 18, 1998, the federal debt stood at $5,497,225,000,000 (Five trillion, four hundred ninety-seven billion, two hundred twenty-five million).

Five years ago, May 18, 1994, the federal debt stood at $4,590,202,000,000 (Four trillion, four hundred ninety-two billion, two million).

Ten years ago, May 18, 1989, the federal debt stood at $4,108,266,202,404.86 (Four trillion, one hundred eighty-five billion, five hundred seventy-four million, two hundred twenty million).

Fifteen years ago, May 18, 1984, the federal debt stood at $1,485,574,000,000 (One trillion, four hundred eighty-five billion, five hundred seventy-four million), which reflects a debt increase of more than $4 trillion—

$4,108,266,202,404.86 (Four trillion, one hundred eighty-five billion, five hundred seventy-four million, two hundred twenty million).

The very bad debt boxscore.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, section 314(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to adjust the appropriate budgetary aggregates and the allocation for the Appropriations Committee to reflect an amount provided and designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act.

I hereby submit revisions to the 1999 Senate Appropriations Committee allocations, pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act, in the following amounts:

CHANGES TO THE BUDGETARY AGGREGATES AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ALLOCATION FOR H.R. 1141

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, section 314(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to adjust the appropriate budgetary aggregates and the allocation for the Appropriations Committee to reflect an amount provided and designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act.

I hereby submit revisions to the 1999 Senate Appropriations Committee allocations, pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act, in the following amounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Authority</th>
<th>Outlays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Allocation</td>
<td>Defense discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>271,403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>