

Further, if the child wants to use an assault weapon for target practice, hunting, or several other things, then it is lawful for them to have the assault weapon. I do not think this is control of assault weapons.

I do not think that the provisions of this act will do anything effective to prevent juveniles from owning and possessing assault weapons. I think that is a shame. Therefore, I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I think that if anything, it goes in the opposite direction and specifically authorizes children to possess assault weapons. I think that is a preposterous situation, and would urge opposition.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this evening we heard the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) in a very eloquent entreaty to this House asking us to do something right. But she also said something else to us, that this is not the end, it is only the beginning. We are not finished, there is much more to be done.

That amendment on gun show loopholes was, unfortunately, not passed. This amendment in fact could go further. It is well known that much of the crime in the use of guns falls between the ages of 18 to 20. A recent report issued by the Department of the Treasury and the Justice Department shows that persons in the age group of 18 to 20 account for the highest number of gun homicides, the highest rate of gun use and nonlethal gun crimes, and the highest number of crime gun possessors when compared to other age groups.

The report concludes that the high rate of gun crime in the 18 to 20 age group is linked with easy access to firearms. Prohibiting the ownership of automatic assault weapons and guns with automatic feeding devices for persons under 21 will help reduce gun crimes committed by persons in the age group 18 to 20.

We have just begun. There is a lot more work that could be done on this. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I would argue that the amendments that Democrats had that were not made in order would have made this whole discussion and the remedies much better. The amendment that I had to prohibit young people from going into gun shows without adults was not allowed.

But since we have to start somewhere, I believe it is important that we join and support this amendment that prohibits juvenile possession of semi-automatic assault weapons for individuals under the age of 18.

□ 0200

Maybe my colleagues will see the value of their work and move it up to ages higher than that. Maybe they will see the value of their work and close the loopholes that have been noted by my colleague from California, but at this time I would ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I will not consume very much.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to recapitulate what this amendment is about. It is a very straightforward, very simple amendment. There are not any loopholes in it, with all due respect to my colleagues who may think there are.

It deals with conforming the law with respect to these long guns that are labeled under the law, whatever one's views on whether they should be or not, assault weapons, with the laws that exist today with respect to juveniles and handguns.

The reality is that the law a few years ago defines assault weapons made and imported and whatnot after a certain year, I think it was 1994, for everybody. But for those that existed and do exist pre-1994, I think, or the year in which that ban occurred, there is still a lawful possession of those weapons for any of those that anybody may have owned.

Yet, there is a loophole that exists in current law with regard to minors. They are allowed to possess these weapons. So consequently, it is my desire and what this amendment does I think pretty clearly is make it clear that there is going to be, if this is adopted, absolutely no opportunity for youngsters to possess, use or otherwise have in their possession any of these pre-1994 pre-banned weapons that may be around, unless there is the same adult supervision or under the same conditions that that youngster might possess a handgun.

Those are very restrictive conditions under the current law on handguns.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCOLLUM. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. McCOLLUM), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, when I found the amendment I did go read through the statutory scheme and I could see very clearly that the gentleman was conforming this amendment to the scheme that he has just referenced.

The question I have is whether or not assault weapons should not be treated a little bit differently than rifles? And as I mentioned earlier, 17-year-olds out on the ranch out in the Mount Hamilton range where the wild boars and rattlesnakes are, and they are out in the pickup trucks with the cattle with the rifle, and to me that is a lot different than having a semiautomatic assault weapon.

So the question is, did the gentleman mean to make assault weapons really in the same posture and standing as rifles on the farm?

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, if I could reclaim my time, I would simply say to the gentlewoman that a regular rifle that does not fit this definition,

even after this amendment is passed and under current law, can be possessed by a juvenile without the same restrictions that there are on handguns. The law is not going to change with regard to that. With regard to these peculiar weapons, the adult supervision will be required. Maybe the gentlewoman, as she says, thinks the child should not be able to possess this peculiar set of weapons even if there is adult supervision. I understand that concern. However, we could redebate, I suppose, that old assault weapon debate all over again.

My point, if I could just make the point, is that all of these weapons that we are talking about, all this category of rifles have the same functional characteristics, the same firepower, the same killing power, whatever we want to call it, whatever we label them. It is just that this particular category of weapon has been perceived by some having characteristics of a certain type of stock and so forth to not be one that certainly children should have in their possession, because they are glamorized so much by so many people who use these weapons in very bad ways.

So I think that the gentlewoman and I probably agree on one point, and that is that children, certainly without supervision, should not be touching these weapons, but I think the gentlewoman would just like to go further than I do in some manner in this amendment, but I would not think the gentlewoman would have any problem with the amendment because I can assure her that the amendment does not in any way create additional loopholes to current law. It is just restrictive. It is not in any way expansive.

I simply want to be sure, if we have a disagreement, we understand what we are disagreeing over.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCOLLUM. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think we do disagree, but if the gentleman's point is that right now children can lawfully possess assault weapons, without any restrictions and therefore this is better because they can have assault weapons if they are farmers or if they are employed they could have an assault weapon, is that essentially the point that the gentleman is making?

Mr. McCOLLUM. That is the point I am making. They can have these weapons under the conditions that they could have a handgun. That is my point.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, then I do object.

Mr. McCOLLUM. There is absolutely no restriction right now whatsoever.

Ms. LOFGREN. We do very much disagree, and I thank the gentleman for yielding for this question.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I think the point is well made and I think the bill is very self-explanatory.

It is restrictive. It does restrict the availability of these weapons very severely from current law for young people. Maybe we ought to go further than the amendment goes even, but it nonetheless is a very restrictive amendment and that is the purpose of offering it.

With that, I urge the adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 209, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) will be postponed.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARR of Georgia) having resumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2122) to require background checks at gun shows, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999 AND FOR THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FISCAL YEAR 1999 THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KASICH, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, to facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 1999 and for the 5-year period fiscal year 1999 through fiscal year 2003.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature as of June 16, 1999.

The first table in the report compares the current level of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by the interim allocations and aggregates printed in the RECORD on March 3, 1999, pursuant to Section 2 of H. Res. 5 for fiscal year 1999. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate lev-

els. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 1999 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays of each direct spending committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations for discretionary action made under the interim allocations and aggregates submitted pursuant to H. Res. 5 for fiscal year 1999 and for fiscal years 1999 through 2003. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority or entitlement authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 1999 with the revised "section 302(b)" sub-allocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. This comparison is also needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, because the point of order under that section also applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation.

The fourth table compares discretionary appropriations to the levels provided by section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Section 251 requires that if at the end of a session the discretionary spending, in any category, exceeds the limits set forth in section 251(c) as adjusted pursuant to provisions of section 251(b), there shall be a sequestration of funds within that category to bring spending within the established limits. This table is provided for information purposes only. Determination of the need for a sequestration is based on the report of the President required by section 254.

Enclosures.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: STATUS OF THE INTERIM ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999 AND FOR FISCAL YEARS 1999 TO 2003—REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JUNE 16, 1999

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year	
	1999	1999-2003
Appropriate level (as authorized by H. Res. 5):		
Budget authority	1,456,578	(¹)
Outlays	1,396,441	(¹)
Revenues	1,368,374	7,284,605
Current level:		
Budget authority	1,455,743	(¹)
Outlays	1,396,751	(¹)
Revenues	1,368,401	7,284,615
Current level over (+)/under (-) appropriate level:		
Budget authority	-835	(¹)
Outlays	310	(¹)
Revenues	27	10

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for Fiscal Years 2000 through 2003 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

Budget Authority—Enactment of any measure providing new budget authority for FY 1999 in excess of \$835 million (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 1999 budget authority to further exceed the appropriate level set by the interim allocations and aggregates submitted pursuant to H. Res. 5.

Outlays—Enactment of any measure providing new outlays for FY 1999 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 1999 outlays to further exceed the appropriate level set by the interim allocations and aggregates submitted pursuant to H. Res. 5.

Revenues—Enactment of any measure that would result in any revenue loss for FY 1999 greater than of \$27 million (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by the interim allocations and aggregates submitted pursuant to H. Res. 5.

Enactment of any measure resulting in any revenue loss for FY 1999 through 2003 greater than \$10 million (if not already included in the current level) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by the interim allocations and aggregates submitted pursuant to H. Res. 5.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—Comparison of Current Level with Committee Allocations Pursuant to Budget Act Section 602(a) Reflecting Action Completed as of June 16, 1999

[Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	1999		1999-2003	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation			28,328	27,801
Current level				
Difference			(28,328)	(27,801)
Armed Services:				
Allocation				
Current level				
Difference				
Banking and Financial Service:				
Allocation				
Current level				
Difference				
Education & the Workforce:				
Allocation			610	367
Current level				
Difference			(610)	(367)
Commerce:				
Allocation				
Current level				
Difference				
International Relations:				
Allocation				
Current level				
Difference				
Government Reform & Oversight:				
Allocation			14	14
Current level				
Difference			(14)	(14)
House Administration:				
Allocation				
Current level				
Difference				
Resources:				
Allocation				
Current level				
Difference				
Judiciary:				
Allocation				
Current level				
Difference				
Transportation & Infrastructure:				
Allocation	1,205			10,845
Current level	845			845
Difference	(360)			(10,000)
Science:				
Allocation				
Current level				
Difference				
Small Business:				
Allocation				
Current level				
Difference				
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation			4,503	4,342
Current level				
Difference			(4,503)	(4,342)
Ways and Means:				
Allocation			19,551	17,310
Current level				
Difference			(19,551)	(17,310)
Select Committee on Intelligence:				
Allocation				
Current level				
Difference				
Total Authorized:				
Allocation	1,205		63,851	49,834
Current level	845		845	
Difference	(360)		(63,006)	(49,834)