United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 26, 1999 No. 106

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 26, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JIM GIBBONS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, almighty God, that we will have the maturity and the spiritual insight to realize that Your goodness and Your blessings come to us not because of our righteousness, but because of Your grace to all people. Give us, O God, a greater sense of humility in our minds and a wonderful simplicity of faith so that we see more clearly the wonder and the majesty and the grandeur of Your gifts to us. For Your love to us and Your reconciling spirit, for Your peace that passes all human understanding, we offer this prayer of thanksgiving and praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. NORWOOD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1480. An act to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the United States Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 1480) ''An Act to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the United States Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, thereon, and appoints Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. MOYNIHAN, and Mrs. BOXER, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 900) ''An Act to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, insurance companies, and other financial service providers, and for other purposes,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GRAMM, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. MACK, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DODD, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. EDWARDS, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONGRESS SHOULD ENCOURAGE MINERAL DEVELOPMENT, NOT TAX IT

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, time and time again we have heard the opponents of the 1872 mining law come

Printed on recycled paper.

down to the well and state that the United States is the only major country which does not charge a Federal royalty for mining on government land. These same anti-mining critics want to add a 5 to 10 percent tax on all U.S. mineral production.

A recent survey was conducted on 17 major mining countries that compete with the United States. These 17 countries account for about 85 percent of all metal and minerals produced by the free world market economy. The average royalty they pay in these 17 countries surveyed was just under 1 percent, that is right, less than 1 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must remain competitive internationally, and these proposed changes to the mining law would not allow us to do so. The United States is already a net importer of most minerals. Why is it that we are so worried about the trade deficit, and here we are talking about potential legislation that would render us completely dependent upon foreign nations for necessary goods and minerals that could be produced right here at home?

Mr. Speaker, Congress would be wise to encourage mineral development to offset the trade deficit and our dependence on foreign countries. In the meantime, this would create jobs, thereby increasing tax revenues and lowering social costs to the government.

SHOULD A GYMNASIUM FOR THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY AT WEST POINT COST $85 MILLION?

(Mr. COBLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, the Army has requested an $85 million construction project for a gymnasium at the United States Military Academy at West Point. Apparently the showers are to be gold-plated, since the average cost for a military physical fitness facility is $7 million. This request is outrageous.

I am advised that the Army has requested no family housing construction, yet an $85 million gym enjoys priority status.

Only last week the Republican tax package emphasized the significance of taxpayers retaining more of their hard-earned money. This approach emphasizes compassion and common sense, while the Army struts front and center demanding an $85 million gymnasium.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for all of us to redirect our priorities and practice prudence in lieu of recklessness.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that it will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken later today.

LAKE OCONEE LAND EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 604) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to complete a land exchange with Georgia Power Company.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 604

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Lake Oconee Land Exchange Act''.

SEC. 2. LAKE OCONEE LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DESCRIPTION OF THE BOUNDARY.—The term ''description of the boundary'' means the documents entitled ''Description of the Boundary'' dated September 6, 1996, prepared by the Forest Service and on file with the Secretary.

(2) EXCHANGE AGREEMENT.—The term ''exchange agreement'' means the agreement between Georgia Power Company and the Forest Service dated December 26, 1996, as amended on August 17, 1998, on file with the Secretary.

(3) GEORGIA POWER COMPANY.—The term ''Georgia Power Company'' means Georgia Power Company, a division of the Southern Company, a Georgia corporation, or its successors or assigns.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) LAND EXCHANGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Simultaneously with conveyance by Georgia Power Company to the Secretary of all right, title, and interest in and to the land described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall—

(A) convey to Georgia Power Company all right, title, and interest in and to the land described in paragraph (3), except as provided in the exchange agreement; and

(B) make a value equalization payment of $23,250 to Georgia Power Company.

(2) LAND TO BE CONVEYED TO THE SECRETARY.—The land described in this paragraph is the land within or near the Chattahoochee National Forest and Oconee National Forest in the State of Georgia, comprising approximately 1,175.46 acres, described in the exchange agreement and the description of the boundary.

(3) LAND TO BE CONVEYED TO GEORGIA POWER COMPANY.—The land described in this paragraph is the land in the State of Georgia, comprising approximately 1,275.80 acres, described in the exchange agreement and the description of the boundary.

(c) PARTIAL REVOCATION OF WITHDRAWALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The orders issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission under section 24 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 818), authorizing Power Project Numbers 2413 and 2354, issued August 6, 1969, and October 1, 1996, respectively, are revoked insofar as the orders affect the land described in subsection (b)(3).

(2) NO ANNUAL CHARGE.—No interest conveyed to Georgia Power Company or easement right retained by Georgia Power Company under this section shall be subject to an annual charge for the purpose of compensating the United States for the use of its land for power purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Lake Oconee Land Exchange Act, which would enact a mutually beneficial exchange of land between the USDA Forest Service and the Georgia Power Company.

The exchange would result in consolidation and more efficient management of national forests, increased protection of wildlife and habitats, and improved recreational access for citizens.

The Forest Service will exchange Forest Service lands that lie under Lake Oconee behind Georgia Power's Wallace Dam on the Oconee River in northern Georgia, flood rights on contour strips around the lake, and two parcels in neighboring counties, in exchange for lands Georgia Power owns within the Chattahoochee and Oconee National Forests.

The exchange involves approximately 1,200 acres of Forest Service land for approximately 1,100 acres of Georgia Power land.

The exchange will allow the Forest Service to acquire one of two remaining non-Federal properties within congressionally designated wilderness areas in north Georgia. This tract is in the middle of the Rich Mountain Wilderness, and totally surrounded by other National Forest lands.

The vast majority of lands to be transferred by the Forest Service lie at the bottom of Lake Oconee and are not actively conveying any public benefit. The remainder of the properties being relinquished to Georgia Power is currently occupied by Georgia Power facilities in Rabun County. These properties are of minimal value to the National Forest, and would be more appropriately owned by Georgia Power.

The Forest Service, as detailed by the Forest Supervisor's Decision Memo, has determined that the transfer complies with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and is supportive of the bill.

In addition, 67 percent of the lands of Rabun County are currently part of the Chattahoochee National Forest. This concentrated ownership poses a considerable strain on the ad valorem tax base of Rabun County. Included within the land exchange is the conveyance to Georgia Power Company of over 145 acres of property in Rabun County that currently houses Georgia Power facilities. The divestment of this property will facilitate Rabun County and their problem with their limited tax base.

I urge Members' support of this legislation, with the assurance that this exchange will allow improved management by both parties, resulting in increased environmental protection and enjoyable utilization by all citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 604, the Oconee Land Exchange Act. The companion bill in the House is H.R. 1135.

The Oconee Land Exchange Act would require the Secretary of Agriculture to complete a land exchange with the Georgia Power Company. Provisions of S. 604 allow the National Forest Service to acquire five tracts of land in a single transfer, while conveying four tracts of land of equal value to the Georgia Power Company.

This bill eliminates the need to preserve and maintain over 20 miles of boundary line and seven property corners, saving the National Forest Service $10,160 over a 10-year period.

This bill requires the Federal Government to pay $23,250 to the Georgia Power Company, which is the difference between the appraised value of the Forest Service transfer to Georgia Power and the appraised value of the 1,175 acres of land being conveyed by Georgia Power Company to the Forest Service.

S. 604 gives full consideration to the opportunity to achieve better management of National Forest lands and resources by consolidation of split estates. Under this transfer, the Forest Service will be acquiring from Georgia Power Company 50.71 acres of land, less flood rights.

Presently, the Forest Service and Georgia Power manage a meandering boundary that separates the National Forest from the shoreline of the lake owned by Georgia Power Company. The exchange under consideration would eliminate 20.3 miles of boundary lines and seven property corners. By acquiring this specific tract of land, the Nation's forest lands would be extended to the water's edge, instead of following a meandering boundary around the flood pool of the lake.

According to the National Forest Service, this meandering contour area has been a management problem since the lake's inception. Federal acquisition of these 50.7 acres of land less flood rights will allow the Forest Service to manage to the edge of the lake without interfering with the rights of Georgia Power.

Under this exchange, the National Forest Service would acquire a 625 acre tract wedged between the Oconee National Forest and the Piedmont National Wildlife Management Area, and an additional 157-acre property would become part of the Oconee National Forest.

These lands would add approximately 179 acres of wetlands and provide recovery habitat for the red cockaded woodpecker, an endangered species.

Furthermore, the Forest Service would acquire from Georgia Power a 173.4 acre tract within a congressionally designated wilderness area located in the middle of Rich Mountain Wilderness, and totally surrounded by other National Forest land.

The Georgia Power Company will acquire 1275.8 acres of land owned by the National Forest Service, along with an easement right to flood 240.84 acres of National Forest in the flood pool of Lake Oconee. This conveyance includes a small unmanageable remnant, a 1.6 acre tract, and a second tract that adds land lines and boundary corners while serving only minimal National Forest purposes.

This transfer will permit the public lands to be managed in a manner that will protect the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air and atmospheric, water resources and archeological values.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, as a Georgian I rise today in support of the Lake Oconee Land Exchange Act, which would enact a mutually beneficial exchange of the land between the USDA Forest Service and the Georgia Power Company. The exchange would result in consolidation and more efficient management of National Forests, increased protection of wildlife and habitat, and improved recreational access for all our citizens.

The Forest Service will exchange Forest Service land that lie under Lake Oconee, behind Georgia Power's Wallace Dam on the Oconee River in northern Georgia, flood rights on contour strips around the lakes, and two parcels in neighboring counties, in exchange for lands Georgia Power owns within the Chattahoochee and Oconee National Forests.

(1415)

The exchange involves approximately 1,200 acres of Forest Service land for approximately 1,100 acres of Georgia Power land.

The exchange will allow the Forest Service to acquire one of two remaining non-Federal properties within congressionally designated wilderness areas in north Georgia. This tract is in the middle of the Rich Mountain Wilderness and totally surrounded by other National Forest lands.

The vast majority of lands being given up by the Forest Service lies at the bottom of Lake Oconee and are not actively conveying any public benefit. The remainder of the properties being relinquished to Georgia Power are currently occupied by Georgia Power facilities in Rabun County. These properties are of minimal value to the National Forest and would be more appropriately owned by Georgia Power.

In addition, 67 percent of the lands of Rabun County are currently part of the Chattahoochee National Forest. This concentrated ownership poses a considerable strain on the ad valorem tax base of Rabun County. Included within the land exchange is the conveyance to Georgia Power Company of over 145 acres of property in Rabun County that currently houses Georgia Power facilities. The divestment of this property will facilitate Rabun County and their properties with their limited tax base.

As the primary sponsor of the House companion bill, H.R. 1135, I urge my colleagues' support for this legislation with the assurance that this exchange will allow improved management by both parties, resulting in increased environmental protection and actually more enjoyable utilizations by the citizens.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am an original cosponsor of the House version of this bill, and I rise in support of the Lake Oconee Land Exchange Act to improve the management of the Chattahoochee and Oconee National Forests.

For some time, there has been an awkward patchwork of land ownership between the USDA Forest Service and the Georgia Power Company. The current land arrangement includes a meandering boundary around the flood pool of Lake Oconee and even a 173.4 acre tract of Georgia Power land in the middle of the Rich Mountain Wilderness. These twisting boundaries and scattered patches of private and public land make it difficult for Forest Service personnel to efficiently carry out their management activities.

This land exchange will allow the Forest Service to consolidate its holdings within the Chattahoochee and Oconee National Forests, and will simplify the administration of the Forests' borders. This consolidation will be achieved through the Forest Service acquiring one of two remaining non-Federal properties within congressionally designated wilderness areas in North Georgia. Forest boundaries around Lake Oconee will be improved by extending National Forest lands to the water's edge, instead of following the meandering border of the flood pool of the lake.

These changes will allow the Forest Service to better manage prescribed burns in the Oconee National Forest. Presently, the Forest Service has to bulldoze trenches along its meandering border with Georgia Power to ensure the controlled fires do not spread to

private lands. Bulldozing trenches requires a commitment of valuable personnel and heavy equipment and carries a risk of releasing excessive silt into Lake Oconee.

The increased efficiency of management of National Forests allowed by this land exchange will lead to reduced risk to Forest Service personnel and improved preservation of habitat and wildlife.

The Forest Service will gain a habitat for the red-cockaded woodpecker and a quality trout stream, and the Georgia Nature Conservancy and the Georgia Wildlife Federation have informed me of their support for this legislation. I urge my colleagues to join us in passing this legislation.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 604.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 604, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

CLARIFYING EXPORT-IMPORT BANK BOARD REQUIREMENTS

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2565) to clarify the quorum requirement for the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2565

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF QUORUM REQUIREMENT FOR THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(c)(6) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(c)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

''(6) A quorum of the Board of Directors shall consist of at least 3 members.''.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding section 3(c)(6) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, if, during the period that begins on July 21, 1999, and ends on October 1, 1999, there are fewer than 3 persons holding office on the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, the entire membership of such Board of Directors shall constitute a quorum until the end of such period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH).

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2565, a bill to clarify the quorum requirements for the Export-Import Bank of the United States. This bill is designed to remedy a serious problem that has developed with regard to vacancies in Ex-Im's Board of Directors. Without prompt congressional action, this situation could result in the suspension of the Bank's ability to make new financial commitments and jeopardize billions of dollars in pending U.S. export transactions.

The background is as follows: The Bank's charter requires a quorum of its five-member board in order to conduct business. Prior to July 20, two vacancies existed on the board. On July 21, the term of a third board member expired.

Although there is some ambiguity as to whether the quorum requirement refers to a majority of the statutorily prescribed five-person board or, instead, to a majority of board members currently in office, the former interpretation is legally preferable.

As explained in legal analysis provided by the General Accounting Office, the quorum requirement for the five-member board necessarily requires at least three members to be present and transact the board's business. Thus, with only two incumbent members, the board lacks its legally required quorum.

This unfortunate problem is compounded by the fact that no nominations have been made for these vacancies, nor has any intent to nominate been sent to the other body. In this awkward circumstance, Congress has no alternative but to act expeditiously to advance the Nation's interest and remedy this situation. Failure to do so would put America's exports and American jobs at risk.

Therefore, H.R. 2565 clarifies Ex-Im's charter by explicitly providing that a quorum of the board shall consist of three members. At the same time, it provides the Bank with authority to continue operations with only two members of the board until October 1 of this year. This brief window should provide sufficient time for the administration to forward qualified nominees and for their expeditious consideration in the other body.

I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) for his leadership and cooperation on this issue. Likewise, I would like to express my appreciation for the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first, may I clarify for the RECORD that, unfortunately, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) wanted to be here today to support this legislation, but his plane has been tied up, and he is unable to make it and asked me to substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2565. This legislation, as amended, permits the Export-Import Bank to operate with only two board members until October 1, 1999. During this interim period, the other body should be in a position to confirm additional board members.

This legislation is necessary to allow the bank to make legally-binding financing commitments on nearly $7 billion in pending U.S. export transactions. Mr. Speaker, in this era of record trade deficits, we must ensure that significant export transactions continue uninterrupted. Continued operation of the Export-Import Bank will allow U.S. companies to compete on a level playing field with their counterparts in other industrialized nations, who also have access to the important export financing tools, such as loan guarantees, that are offered by the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, for sponsoring this legislation, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) for his assistance on this issue and for his long-time quality representation on the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

This is an issue primarily between the Executive Branch and the other body, but it is something that requires a shift in law, and this body, I think, at this time ought to recognize that particular problem and move as cooperatively as possible with the other body and the Executive Branch in this issue.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2565, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING RELEASE OF RECORDS ON MISSING PERSONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 172) to authorize and direct the Archivist of the United States to make available for public use the records of the House of Representatives Select Committee on Missing Persons in Southeast Asia.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 172

Resolved, That the Archivist of the United States is authorized and directed to make available for public use the records of the House of Representatives Select Committee on Missing Persons in Southeast Asia (94th Congress).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the question of a final resolution on military and, indeed, even civilian personnel in Southeast Asia, principally in Vietnam, has been one that this country has wrestled with for some time.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) was a member of the Select Committee on Missing Persons in Southeast Asia during that Select Committee's existence in the 1970s. That particular committee was dissolved in the 94th Congress, and portions of its records, including 20 executive sessions, were, according to the appropriate procedures at the time, sealed for 50 years. Less sensitive records were sealed for 30 years.

As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Subcommittee on Trade, it was my pleasure a few years ago to travel with then subcommittee Chairman Sam Gibbons on the first official congressional visit to Vietnam prior to our recognition of that country. We spent 2 days in Hawaii being briefed on the extensive, laborious, scientific pursuit of all leads in terms of missing in action and prisoners of war. We also carried on a number of discussions with Vietnamese officials and with individuals in the private sector, indeed loved ones who had sons, daughters, husbands, missing in that war.

It just seems appropriate, according to H. Res. 172, that the conditions in which we now relate to the country of Vietnam, as it pertains to records that were sealed, would only make it more difficult to conclude once and for all the question of prisoners of war and missing in action. In fact, opening up reports so that any number of people can examine and find leads they find most appropriate, especially the ability to move into the country and talk to individuals, would maximize the opportunity for closing this particular chapter in America's history.

For that reason, and especially since the Senate has already taken similar action, I would urge all Members to support H. Res. 172.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), and others who cosponsored this resolution and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the House Committee on Administration, in support of House Resolution 172.

□ 1430

This action, hopefully, will help both historians, researchers and, most of all, loved ones of missing American servicemen in Southeast Asia; and we should strive, when at all possible, for a policy of openness with respect to the records of loved ones who fought overseas on behalf of our country.

Simply put, this resolution would declassify the records of the House Select Committee on Missing Persons. It would authorize and direct the archivist of the United States to make these records available to the public.

In the 1970s, Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee investigated and tried to determine whether American servicemen had, in fact, been left behind in Southeast Asia after the Vietnam War. As has been explained, House rules mandated when the Select Committee was dissolved that its records be kept secret for 50 years. Similar rules governed the records of the Senate Select Committee that studied the same issue.

However, several years ago, Mr. Speaker, the Senate agreed to reduce the period of secrecy to 20 years and, thus, directed all its committee files be declassified. We should do the same thing, and we should do it for two principle reasons:

First, the families and loved ones of missing servicemen in Southeast Asia deserve and ought to know what the House Select Committee uncovered, and they should not have to wait even another day. These families should not have to fight their government on the release of these files, particularly since many of their loved ones fought so valiantly, so bravely, on behalf of our government, our people, and our commitment to democracy.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe that secrecy only fuels suspicion. While there are, of course, secrets the government must keep for national security reasons, this is not the case in this instance. As the Senate Select Committee stated in its final report, and I quote, ''Nothing has done more to fuel suspicion about the government's handling of the POW-MIA issue than the fact that so many documents related to those efforts have remained classified for so long.''

Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to end that suspicion, and we certainly should do it. I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), who introduced this resolution, and I am pleased to rise on behalf of its immediate passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the principal sponsor of H. Res. 172, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I am pleased to rise today in support of H. Res. 172, a measure designed to declassify the records of the House Select Committee on Missing Persons in Southeast Asia.

I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), as well as the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for allowing this bill to be brought to the floor under suspension of the rules in this timely manner.

I helped to create and served as a member of the Select Committee on Missing Persons in Southeast Asia during the 94th Congress. At that time the Select Committee was tasked with the responsibility of determining whether American servicemen had been left behind in Southeast Asia after the Vietnam War.

When the Select Committee was dissolved, after completing its work, some 35 boxes of material were sent over to the National Archives and Records Administration. Of that total, 11 boxes contained classified information. This material was subject to House classification rules, which mandated that the material be kept classified for a period of 50 years.

Earlier this decade, the Senate Committee on POW and MIA Affairs declassified all of its files on this issue, making them open to both the families and to researchers. This legislation simply allows the House to follow suit by making a change in House rules and opening all of the Select Committee's files and boxes of material to the public.

In approving this measure for suspension, the committee staff expressed some concern that privacy rights might be compromised if the files were declassified. They were subsequently

assured by the archivist that any cases where privacy is a concern, such as an individual who testified on conditions of anonymity, would be honored and such files would not be made public.

Mr. Speaker, the end of the Cold War has resulted in the discovery of literally hundreds of documents which had previously been out of reach behind the Iron Curtain. I see no need for the House to maintain a veil of secrecy over its Select Committee files, especially when such information may provide some insight into the fate of some of the more than 2,000 service members who still remain unaccounted for from the Vietnam conflict.

Accordingly, I ask my colleagues to join in supporting this worthy legislation which would bring the House rules on this subject in accord with those of our counterpart committee in the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time, once again thanking the gentleman from New York for this resolution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time, adding that the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) asked me to make his comments known and his expressions of appreciation to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and others for their leadership on this, and he joins us very strongly in supporting this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 172.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORGAN DONOR LEAVE ACT

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 457) to amend title 5, United States Code, to increase the amount of leave time available to a Federal employee in any year in connection with serving as an organ donor, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 457

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. INCREASED LEAVE TIME TO SERVE AS AN ORGAN DONOR.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Organ Donor Leave Act''.

(b) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of the first section 6327 of title 5, United States Code (relating to absence in connection with serving as a bone-marrow or organ donor) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) An employee may, in any calendar year, use—

''(1) not to exceed 7 days of leave under this section to serve as a bone-marrow donor; and

''(2) not to exceed 30 days of leave under this section to serve as an organ donor.''.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The second section 6327 of title 5, United States Code (relating to absence in connection with funerals of fellow Federal law enforcement officers) is redesignated as section 6328.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 6327 the following:

''6328. Absence in connection with funerals of fellow Federal law enforcement officers.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 457.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 457, the Organ Donor Leave Act. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for introducing this important bill. I know that my colleagues in the House are strong supporters of organ donation; but whenever we have a chance to highlight this important issue, we should do so.

More than 54,000 people are currently on the organ transplant waiting list, and about 4,000 each year die while waiting for a transplant. I believe that Congress should do whatever it can do to encourage our citizens to consider becoming organ or bone marrow donors and that the Federal Government should be a leader in this effort.

The Organ Donor Leave Act does that. Mr. Speaker, the least we can do for those who are giving so much of themselves is to give them the time to rest and recover with their families as they save the lives of others.

H.R. 457 will make it easier for Federal employees to become organ donors by providing those who donate organs with 30 days of paid leave in any calendar year. Under current law, employees are permitted to take 7 days of leave in order to donate bone marrow or organs.

H.R. 457 retains the 7-day leave period for bone marrow donors but increases the leave available to organ donors to 30 days. This leave is separate and distinct from the annual or sick leave available to Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, my home State of Illinois has been a leader in organ and tissue donation through our Secretary of State's office. In fact, I signed up as a potential organ donor when our Secretary of State, now Governor George Ryan, came to the House floor of the Illinois General Assembly and personally signed up every legislator on our driver's license on the back.

Illinois is one of the few States with an organ/ tissue donor registry. In Illinois, this registry makes use of the existing driver's license and ID card database to identify individuals who are willing to be organ or tissue donors after death. Since October 1992, everyone applying for or renewing an Illinois driver's license or identification card is asked if they want to participate in this registry.

The response has been terrific. Approximately 3 million Illinoians have joined the registry and nearly 100,000 more enroll each month. The average participation rate statewide is 38 percent compared to a national average of 13 percent, and some counties have reported participation rates of over 70 percent.

The bottom line is when we make it easier for individuals to become organ donors, more people will become donors. H.R. 457 is an important step towards making it easier for Federal employees to be organ donors, and I hope we will see the same kind of response with Federal employees that we have seen in Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to support H.R. 457.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for her kind comments, and certainly I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), for making sure that we moved in a bipartisan effort to bring this bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced already 457, the Organ Donor Leave Act, because it supports Federal employees who make the lifesaving decision to become living organ or bone marrow donors by granting them additional leave time to recover from making the donation.

In the last 20 years, important medical breakthroughs have allowed for a larger number of successful organ and tissue transplants and a longer survival rate for transplant recipients. In many cases, transplantation is the only hope for thousands of people suffering from organ failure or in desperate need of corneas, skin, bone, or other tissue.

Despite the success rate of organ transplants, the need for donated organs and tissues continues to outpace the supply. Currently, however, 60,000 Americans are waiting for life-saving transplants. Tragically, every day 12 people die while waiting for a transplant. Every 16 minutes another name is added to the waiting list. This is a

solvable problem and the Federal Government and its employees can help.

In December of 1997, Vice President AL GORE and Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala launched a national organ and tissue donation initiative. In 1998, after the first full year of the initiative, organ donations increased 5.6 percent, the first substantial increase since 1995. During 1998, HHS issued a new regulation to ensure that hospitals worked collaboratively with organ procurement organizations in identifying potential donors and approaching their families.

HHS has conducted a national conference aimed at identifying the most effective strategies to increase donation and transplantation. In conjunction with dozens of partner organizations in the private and volunteer sectors, HHS has worked to increase the awareness of the need for organ and tissue donation.

Recognizing that Federal employees also have a role to play, I first introduced the Organ Donor Leave Act last year. The bill passed the House, but the Senate failed to take action before adjournment. This session, Senator AKAKA introduced companion legislation in the Senate, S. 1334. I am not only pleased that he did so but that his bill is cosponsored by Senator FRIST, one of the Nation's leading transplant surgeons, and the only active surgeon serving in the Congress.

□ 1445

The Organ Donor Leave Act is supported by the American Society of Transplantation, the largest professional transplant organization in the United States.

In a letter expressing their support for the bill, the AST stated that ''a lack of leave time has served as a significant impediment and disincentive for individuals willing to share the gift of life.''

Currently, Federal employees may use up to 7 days of leave in each calendar year to serve as an organ or bone marrow donor. Yet, experience has shown that an organ transplant operation and postoperative recovery for living donors may take as long as 6 to 8 weeks.

In order to address this disparity, I worked with the Office of Personnel Management and the Department of Health and Human Services in drafting this legislation to increase the amount of leave that may be used for organ donation to 30 days.

The amount of leave that may be used for bone marrow donation will remain at 7 days because that is generally viewed to be adequate.

Under this legislation, donors will not have to be concerned with using their personal sick or annual leave for these vital medical procedures because the leave granted is in addition to what they routinely earn.

Ultimately, this bill will benefit the 62,000 people who are on the organ transplant waiting list.

I urge all Members to give their support to this very, very important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, one of the arguments that is often made about transplantation is that there are two types. One is where, of course, a person dies and their organs are used. And the other is where the person is still living.

A lot of people wonder why is it so important that organs be transplanted from living people. I mean, do not get me wrong, those who have died are very important also. But the living are very important because of the following reasons.

The time shown from harvesting of an organ until the time of transplantation is as follows: If a person dies and it is a heart transplantation, it would be 4 to 6 hours; heart and lung 4 to 6 hours; lung 4 to 6 hours; pancreas 8 to 16 hours; a liver 12 to 24 hours; kidney 24 to 36 hours. And so, therefore, when the person is living, doctors have a lot more time to plan and to carry out the procedure.

So often what has happened is many people have donated their organs, but by the time doctors find out after death, they simply to not have enough time to work within the parameters that I just spoke of.

Finally, let me just say this. While we are talking here about the organ donations from those who are living, there is a very fitting quote that comes from Stephanie Kristine Crosse of the University of Dayton School of Law where she talked about organ donation. Although this talks about donations of the dead, I think that it still says a lot for donations.

She says, ''The day will come when my body will lie upon a white sheet, neatly tucked under four corners of a mattress, located in a hospital busily occupied with the living and the dying. At a certain moment a doctor will determine that my brain has ceased to function and that, for all intents and purposes, my life has stopped.

''When that happens, do not attempt to instill artificial life into my body by use of a machine. And don't call this my deathbed. Let it be called the bed of life, and let my body be taken from it to help others lead fuller lives.

''Give my sight to the man who has never seen a sunrise, a baby's face, or love in the eyes of a woman. Give my heart to a person whose own heart has caused nothing but endless days of pain. Give my blood to the teenager who was pulled from the wreckage of his car so that he might live to see his grandchildren play. Give my kidneys to one who depends on a machine to exist from week to week.

''Take my bones, every muscle, every fiber, and every nerve in my body and find a way to make a crippled child walk. Explore every corner of my brain. Take my cells if necessary, and let them grow so that, some day, a deaf girl will hear the sound of rain against her window. Burn what is left and scatter the ashes in the winds to help the flowers grow. If you must bury something, let it be my fault, my weaknesses and all the prejudices against my fellow man.

''Give my sins to the devil. Give my soul to God. If by chance you wish to remember me, do it with a kind deed or word to someone who needs you. If you do all I have asked, I will live forever.

''Make a miracle, be an organ donor.''

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for introducing this legislation and working to bring this bill to the floor.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, for his strong support; the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON) of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member who deserve our thanks for expediting House consideration of H.R. 457.

The Organ Donor leave Act is an important step forward in making the Federal Government a leader by example and encouraging our citizens to become organ or bone marrow donors.

I urge all Members to vote for 457 and make it easier for Federal employees to help save a life through organ donation. The Congressional Budget Office has determined that this bill will not have a significant impact on the Federal budget.

I urge all Members to strongly support H.R. 457.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 457, the ''Organ Donor Leave Act.'' This legislation will assure that federal employees will be granted an adequate amount of leave if they choose to undertake organ or bone marrow donation.

Over 50,000 people are currently awaiting an organ transplant, but because of a national shortage, over 4,000 people die each year for lack of a suitable organ. Research points to a clear need for incentive programs and public education concerning organ donation. We need to use every possible option to increase the number of donated organs. This legislation is one way to meet this goal.

Currently, federal employees may use up to 7 days of leave to serve as an organ or bone marrow donor. However, experience indicates the need for additional time for organ transplant operation and post-operative recovery for living donors—up to six or eight weeks in many cases. The ''Organ Donor Leave Act'' increases the amount of leave that federal employees may use to serve as an organ donor to 30 days.

This legislation also goes hand-in-hand with the ''Gift of Life Congressional Medal Act of

1999'' which Senator FRIST and I introduced this past March. This non-controversial, nonpartisan legislation creates a commemorative medal to honor organ donors and their survivors. I ask that our colleagues act to support both the Gift of Life Congressional Medal Act as well as the Organ Donor Leave Act to increase organ donation and to bring an end to transplant waiting lists.

Today's vote in an important step toward increasing organ donation, but there are many additional steps that we should also be making to improve our national organ donation rate. I look forward to working with my colleagues in implementing additional future improvements.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, organ donation falls into the category of things you never think will affect you or your family—it happens to ''other people.'' Well, let me tell you—I lost that false sense of security a few years ago.

My husband, John, spent three awful, debilitating years on dialysis—three years hoping that his name would come up on the waiting list—before finally receiving a kidney.

He was one of the lucky ones. This gift not only gave John a new lease on life, but it has also given my children back a father, and me, a loving husband.

Mr. Speaker, John is not alone. Every year, thousands of Americans wait anxiously on the organ donation lists, and they are entirely dependent on those kind enough to give. They are entirely dependent on those aware that there is a genuine need.

In simple terms, this is a supply and demand problem—a problem which is turning into a health care crisis:

The disparity between the supply and demand of organs contributes to the deaths of eleven people daily.

Between 1988 and 1996, the number of people on the organ transplant waiting list increased by 312 percent and the number of wait list deaths increased 261 percent.

Additionally, in 1996, a new name was added to the transplant waiting list every nine minutes.

I applaud Representatives CUMMINGS for taking a lead in narrowing this gap.

Living organ donation is the wave of the future, and increasing the frequency of living organ donation will not only increase the availability of organs, but also lessen the transplantation rejection rate and reduce costs associated with dialysis.

Now that we have taken this important leap forward, it is my hope that Congress can take a step further and provide living organ donation leave time for all employees under the Family and Medical Leave Act.

We could also increase donation by reimbursing donors for the costs associated with their donation which are currently not reimbursable by Medicare: For example, travel, lodging, meals and child care.

I have introduced legislation to do just this. H.R. 1857 would (1) expand the F.M.L.A. to include living organ donation and (2) establish a grant program to assist organ donors with the high costs associated with transplantation.

Mr. Speaker, we need a concerted and well-established policy on living organ donation in this country. And I would like to thank representative CUMMINGS for his leadership in moving the Congress forward in this endeavor. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Thank you.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 457.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIGITAL COPYRIGHT LAW TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1260) to make technical corrections in title 17, United States Code, and other laws.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1260

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PERFORMANCES AND DISPLAYS ON EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS.—Section 110(5) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''(A) a direct charge'' and inserting ''(i) a direct charge''; and

(2) by striking ''(B) the transmission'' and inserting ''(ii) the transmission''.

(b) EPHEMERAL RECORDINGS.—Section 112(e) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (10) as paragraphs (2) through (9), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking ''(2)'' and inserting ''(1)'';

(3) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking ''(3)'' and inserting ''(2)'';

(B) by striking ''(4)'' and inserting ''(3)'';

(C) by striking ''(6)'' and inserting ''(5)''; and

(D) by striking ''(3) and (4)'' and inserting ''(2) and (3)''; and

(4) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking ''(4)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(3)''; and

(B) by striking ''(5)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(4)''.

(c) DETERMINATION OF REASONABLE LICENSE FEES FOR INDIVIDUAL PROPRIETORS.—Chapter 5 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating the section 512 entitled ''**Determination of reasonable license fees for individual proprietors**'' as section 513 and placing such section after the section 512 entitled ''**Limitations on liability relating to material online**''; and

(2) in the table of sections at the beginning of that chapter by striking

''512. Determination of reasonable license fees for individual proprietors.''

and inserting

''513. Determination of reasonable license fees for individual proprietors.''

and placing that item after the item entitled

''512. Limitations on liability relating to material online.''.

(d) ONLINE COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT LIABILITY.—Section 512 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) by amending the caption to read as follows:

''(e) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY OF NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.—''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''INJUNCTIONS.—''; and

(2) in paragraph (3) of subsection (j), by amending the caption to read as follows:

''(3) NOTICE AND EX PARTE ORDERS.—''.

(e) INTEGRITY OF COPYRIGHT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION.—Section 1202(e)(2)(B) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking ''category or works'' and inserting ''category of works''.

(f) PROTECTION OF DESIGNS.—(1) Section 1302(5) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking ''1 year'' and inserting ''2 years''.

(2) Section 1320(c) of title 17, United States Code, is amended in the subsection caption by striking ''ACKNOWLEDGEMENT'' and inserting ''ACKNOWLEDGMENT''.

(g) MISCELLANEOUS CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 101 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by transferring and inserting the definition of ''United States work'' after the definition of ''United States''; and

(B) in the definition of ''proprietor'', by striking ''A 'proprietor' '' and inserting ''For purposes of section 513, a 'proprietor' ''.

(2) Section 106 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking ''120'' and inserting ''121''.

(3) Section 118(e) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''subsection (b).'' and all that follows through ''Owners'' and inserting ''subsection (b). Owners''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

(4) Section 119(a)(8)(C)(ii) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking ''network's station'' and inserting ''network station's''.

(5) Section 501(a) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking ''118'' and inserting ''121''.

(6) Section 511(a) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking ''119'' and inserting ''121''.

SEC. 2. OTHER TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) CLERICAL AMENDMENT TO TITLE 28, U.S.C.—The section heading for section 1400 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1400. Patents and copyrights, mask works, and designs''.

(b) ELIMINATION OF CONFLICTING PROVISION.—Section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Commissioner of Patents, Department of Commerce.''.

(c) CLERICAL CORRECTION TO TITLE 35, U.S.C.—Section 3(d) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking '', United States Code''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S. 1260.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1260, a bill to make technical corrections in title 17, United States Code, and other laws, and urge the House to adopt the measure.

This bill is nearly the same as H.R. 1189, a bill to make technical corrections to title 17, United States Code, and other laws, which passed the House under suspension of the rules on April 13, 1999. This legislation makes significant and necessary improvements to the Copyright Act.

The Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property and the Committee on the Judiciary support S. 1260 in a bipartisan way. I urge its adoption today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the ranking member of the subcommittee, is delayed and asked me to stand in for him, which I am glad to do.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1260, a bill making technical corrections in title 17 of the Copyright Act. If ever a bill were truly technical, this is it.

The House Committee on the Judiciary labored long, hard, and successfully last Congress to reduce landmark legislation in the copyright area. This past spring we brought to the House floor H.R. 1189, making a number of technical corrections to the copyright code. As we noted then, the brevity of that bill was testimony to a job well done by all concerned in our efforts last Congress.

Subsequent to passage in this body of H.R. 1189, a small number of additional glitches were identified by our staffs and the staff of the Copyright Office. S. 1260 differs from our House-passed bill for the simple reason that it makes several additional and necessary technical corrections.

I commend the bill to my colleagues and urge its passage. I commend this technical corrections bill to my colleagues.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) mentioned, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) is not able to be with us today. But the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the ranking member, has worked very closely with me on this bill. He concurs, and I appreciate the effort that he has given.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1260.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRADEMARK AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1999

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1259) to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 relating to dilution of famous marks, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1259

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Trademark Amendments Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. DILUTION AS A GROUNDS FOR OPPOSITION AND CANCELATION.

(a) REGISTRABLE MARKS.—Section 2 of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes'' (in this Act referred to as the ''Trademark Act of 1946'') (15 U.S.C. 1052) is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentences: ''A mark which when used would cause dilution under section 43(c) may be refused registration only pursuant to a proceeding brought under section 13. A registration for a mark which when used would cause dilution under section 43(c) may be canceled pursuant to a proceeding brought under either section 14 or section 24.''.

(b) OPPOSITION.—Section 13(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1063(a)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting '', including as a result of dilution under section 43(c),'' after ''principal register''.

(c) PETITIONS TO CANCEL REGISTRATIONS.—Section 14 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1064) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting '', including as a result of dilution under section 43(c),'' after ''damaged''.

(d) CANCELLATION.—Section 24 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1092) is amended in the second sentence by inserting '', including as a result of dilution under section 43(c),'' after ''register''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and shall apply only to any application for registration filed on or after January 16, 1996.

SEC. 3. REMEDIES IN CASES OF DILUTION OF FAMOUS MARKS.

(a) INJUNCTIONS.—(1) Section 34(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1116(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''section 43(a)'' and inserting ''subsection (a) or (c) of section 43''.

(2) Section 43(c)(2) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1125(c)(2)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting ''as set forth in section 34'' after ''relief''.

(b) DAMAGES.—Section 35(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1117(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''or a violation under section 43(a),'' and inserting ''a violation under section 43(a), or a willful violation under section 43(c),''.

(c) DESTRUCTION OF ARTICLES.—Section 36 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1118) is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by striking ''or a violation under section 43(a),'' and inserting ''a violation under section 43(a), or a willful violation under section 43(c),''; and

(2) by inserting after ''in the case of a violation of section 43(a)'' the following: ''or a willful violation under section 43(c)''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and shall not apply to any civil action pending on such date of enactment.

SEC. 4. LIABILITY OF GOVERNMENTS FOR TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT AND DILUTION.

(a) CIVIL ACTIONS.—Section 32 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1114) is amended in the last undesignated paragraph in paragraph (1)—

(1) in the first sentence by inserting after ''includes'' the following: ''the United States, all agencies and instrumentalities thereof, and all individuals, firms, corporations, or other persons acting for the United States and with the authorization and consent of the United States, and''; and

(2) in the second sentence by striking ''Any'' and inserting ''The United States, all agencies and instrumentalities thereof, and all individuals, firms, corporations, other persons acting for the United States and with the authorization and consent of the United States, and any''.

(b) WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.—Section 40 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1122) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c);

(2) by striking ''SEC. 40. (a) Any State'' and inserting the following:

''SEC. 40. (a) WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY BY THE UNITED STATES.—The United States, all agencies and instrumentalities thereof, and all individuals, firms, corporations, other persons acting for the United States and with the authorization and consent of the United States, shall not be immune from suit in Federal or State court by any person, including any governmental or nongovernmental entity, for any violation under this Act.

''(b) WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY BY STATES.—Any State''; and

(3) in the first sentence of subsection (c), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking ''subsection (a) for a violation described in that subsection'' and inserting ''subsection (a) or (b) for a violation described therein''; and

(B) by inserting after ''other than'' the following: ''the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof, or any individual, firm, corporation, or other person acting for the United States and with authorization and consent of the United States, or''.

(c) DEFINITION.—Section 45 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1127) is amended by inserting between the 2 paragraphs relating to the definition of ''person'' the following:

''The term 'person' also includes the United States, any agency or instrumentality thereof, or any individual, firm, or corporation acting for the United States and with the authorization and consent of the United States. The United States, any agency or instrumentality thereof, and any individual, firm, or corporation acting for the United States and with the authorization and consent of the United States, shall be subject to the provisions of this Act in the same manner and to the same extent as any nongovernmental entity.''.

SEC. 5. CIVIL ACTIONS FOR TRADE DRESS INFRINGEMENT.

Section 43(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1125(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) In a civil action for trade dress infringement under this Act for trade dress not

registered on the principal register, the person who asserts trade dress protection has the burden of proving that the matter sought to be protected is not functional.''.

SEC. 6. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) ASSIGNMENT OF MARKS.—Section 10 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1060) is amended—

(1) by striking ''subsequent purchase'' in the second to last sentence and inserting ''assignment'';

(2) in the first sentence by striking ''mark,'' and inserting ''mark.''; and

(3) in the third sentence by striking the second period at the end.

(b) ADDITIONAL CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The text and title of the Trademark Act of 1946 are amended by striking ''trade-marks'' each place it appears and inserting ''trademarks''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S. 1259.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in support of S. 1259, the Trademark Amendments Act of 1999, and urge the House to adopt the measure.

This bill is nearly identical to H.R. 1565, the Trademark Amendments Act of 1999, which the House Committee on the Judiciary favorably reported on May 26 of this year.

This legislation makes significant and necessary improvements in the trademark law.

The Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property and the Committee on the Judiciary support S. 1259 in a bipartisan manner. I urge its adoption today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1259, the Senate trademark bill that is substantially similar to the bill reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary earlier this year, H.R. 1565.

This legislation is a necessary follow-up to the Federal Trademark Dilution Act of 1995, which was enacted last Congress and which gave a Federal cause of action to holders of famous trademarks for dilution.

The bill before us today is necessary to clear up certain issues in the interpretation of the dilution act which the Federal courts have grappled with since its enactment.

In particular, S. 1259 would provide holders of famous marks with a right to oppose or seek cancellation of a mark that would cause dilution as provided in the dilution act.

The legislation enacted in the 105th Congress authorizes injunctive relief after the harm has occurred, while the legislation before us today will allow the right to oppose or seek cancellation of a mark hopefully before harm has occurred.

While we today take up the Senate bill, it is substantially the same as the House bill on which a hearing and committee markup occurred earlier this year.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 1259.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1259.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATENT FEE INTEGRITY AND INNOVATION PROTECTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1258) to authorize funds for the payment of salaries and expenses of the Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1258

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Patent Fee Integrity and Innovation Protection Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be made available for the payment of salaries and necessary expenses of the Patent and Trademark Office in fiscal year 2000, $116,000,000 from fees collected in fiscal year 1999 and such fees as are collected in fiscal year 2000 pursuant to title 35, United States Code, and the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.), except that the Commissioner is not authorized to charge and collect fees to cover the accrued indirect personnel costs associated with post-retirement health and life insurance of officers and employees of the Patent and Trademark Office other than those charged and collected pursuant to title 35, United States Code, and the Trademark Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on October 1, 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

□ 1500

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration and to insert extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in support of S. 1258, the Patent Fee Integrity and Innovation Protection Act, and urge the House to adopt the measure.

This bill is identical to H.R. 1225, the Patent and Trademark Office Reauthorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, which the House Committee on the Judiciary favorably reported on June 9. This legislation is premised on the same policy goal as last year's version, namely, to prevent the diversion of revenue generated by special surcharges from the Patent and Trademark Office. The point of S. 1258 is straightforward and necessary, to allow the agency to keep all the revenue it raises in user fees to benefit American inventors and trademark holders. The Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property and the Committee on the Judiciary support S. 1258 in a bipartisan manner, and I urge its adoption today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minority, I am happy to rise in support of S. 1258, a bill to reauthorize the Patent and Trademark Office.

S. 1258, like H.R. 1225, reflects bipartisan opposition to surcharges on patent applications and support for fees that will fully fund the PTO and its obligations to its retirees. The bill explicitly authorizes the use of carryover funds to pay for the expense of the Employees Health Benefits and Life Insurance Funds.

The Patent and Trademark Office is 100 percent funded through application and user fees which all too often in the past have been diverted to other agencies and programs to the detriment of the efficient function of our patent and trademark systems. S. 1258, like Public Law 105–358 from the last Congress, reflects our resolve that this practice be firmly a matter of past history.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Not unlike S. 1260 regarding the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the gentleman from California has also worked very closely with us on this bill and the previous bill and concurs in its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1258.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATORY RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 258 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1074.

□ 1503

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1074) to provide Governmentwide accounting of regulatory costs and benefits, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) is unavoidably detained and will be here shortly and asked me to proceed.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1074, the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor. Once again, the Congress is taking the lead in enhancing the accountability of the Federal Government to the American people.

The Regulatory Right-to-Know Act is a bipartisan bill that will allow us to better understand the impact on our economy of Federal regulations and bureaucratic red tape. It requires the Office of Management and Budget to submit an annual accounting report that estimates the costs and benefits of Federal regulatory programs.

The importance and timeliness of this legislation cannot be understated. Recent studies estimate the compliance costs of Federal regulations at more than $700 billion annually. Unfortunately, these costs amount to a hidden tax passed on to hardworking Americans in the form of higher prices, reduced wages, stunted economic growth and decreased technological innovation.

Just think, if we could lower the cost of Federal regulations by just one-seventh of that amount, $100 billion per year, it would have the effect of a $1 trillion tax cut for the American people over 10 years. That is $200 billion more than the tax cut we fought so hard to pass just last week.

But to lower the costs, we have to know the costs. The Regulatory Right-to-Know Act will provide this valuable information, helping regulators make better, more accountable decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that all regulation is bad, but we ought to know the true cost of these actions so that we can judge how useful they really are.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1074 to begin this important review.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 1074, the so-called Regulatory Right-to-Know Act of 1999. This legislation would require the Office of Management and Budget to prepare an extensive annual report on the aggregate costs and benefits of Federal regulations, by agency, by agency program and by program component.

For the past 2 years, Congress has enacted appropriations riders that require OMB to tabulate the costs and benefits of major Federal regulations. Some observers have found this annual cost-benefit report to be helpful. They argue that it shows the health, environmental and other benefits of Federal regulations and how those benefits far outweigh their costs.

For example, the 1998 Report to Congress on the Costs and Benefits of Federal Regulations concluded that those benefits far exceeded the costs by anywhere from $30 billion to $3.3 trillion. Well, that is a good report supporting the benefits of these regulations and how they outweigh the costs of the regulations. That is what we want to know.

But other observers have questioned the utility of these annual reports. According to the OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, aggregating costs and benefits of regulations are, they say, of little value to policymakers because they offer little guidance on how to improve the efficiency, effectiveness or soundness of the existing body of regulations. Why? Why would that be the case? They say, because the information available includes enormous data gaps, accurate data is sparse and agreed-upon methods for estimating costs and benefits are lacking.

Furthermore, critics like Professor Lisa Heinzerling of the Georgetown University Law Center say that the difficulty in quantifying benefits is likely to cause skewed results. Comparing aggregate, quantifiable costs, such as the dollar cost to comply with regulations, is easier to do than to quantify the really basically unquantifiable benefits, such as lives saved or a cleaner and healthier environment, and so to compare the two may mislead the public about the net benefits of regulation.

Well, whatever the merits of the current annual report that is being prepared by OMB, this bill is seriously flawed. First of all, this bill does not codify the idea that we will have annual reports. Instead, it dramatically expands these requirements in ways that will substantially increase the burdens on OMB, raise the costs to the taxpayers, and produce little significant new information.

In short, if H.R. 1074 were itself subject to a cost-benefit analysis, it would flunk.

One of the major problems in this bill is its scope. Currently, OMB prepares an annual analysis of the costs and benefits of ''major'' regulations with an annual economic impact of over $100 million. This makes some sense. There are relatively few major regulations. Out of the 5,000 regulations issued in the Federal Register each year, only about 50 have major economic effects. The limitation to major regulations allows OMB to focus its analysis on the most important and costly regulations.

Moreover, agencies that promulgate these major regulations have to prepare cost-benefit regulations as part of the rulemaking process, so this gives OMB a database to draw from.

But this bill, H.R. 1074, is not limited to major regulations. It requires a cost-benefit analysis of all 5,000 regulations issued each year. According to this bill, the report must include, quote, an estimate of the total annual costs and benefits of Federal regulatory programs, including rules and paperwork; one, in the aggregate; two, by agency, agency program, and program component; and, three, by major rule. This would therefore require agencies to perform cost-benefit analysis for all rules in order to provide OMB with the information it needs to compile the aggregate report.

This simply does not make sense. OMB testified that this bill would require OMB and the agencies to compile detailed data that they do not now have, and undertake analyses that they do not now conduct, using scarce staff and contract resources. That is because there is no such information available for these 5,000 nonmajor rules.

The administration says that the increased burden that this would place on the agencies would crowd out other priorities and would add little value. We have heard similar comments from unions, consumer groups and environmental organizations. Groups opposed to H.R. 1074 include the AFL–CIO, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Public Citizen, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club and dozens of other national and local public interest groups.

Before the committee markup in May, we reviewed the Federal Register to see what types of rules would be subject to this new cost-benefit analysis. One example was a temporary rule issued by the Coast Guard governing the operation of a drawbridge near

Hackberry, Louisiana. This regulation was completely noncontroversial. In fact, it was actually requested by the State in order for the State transportation department to make some necessary repairs. Yet under H.R. 1074, OMB now needs to conduct an analysis of the economic costs and benefits of this regulation, including its direct and indirect effects on economic growth, prices, wages, small business and productivity.

There are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of rules issued each year that fall into this category. Is this how we want to spend the taxpayers' dollars?

Not only would this bill be wasteful, it would provide an incomplete picture of the costs and benefits of government programs by omitting corporate welfare from the report of aggregate costs and benefits to the taxpayers. According to an investigation by ''Time'' magazine, the Federal Government gives out $125 billion a year in corporate welfare. It seems to me that it is only logical that any OMB report should include all costs and benefits to the economy, including the costs to the taxpayers and benefits to businesses from corporate welfare.

Later today, several of our colleagues will introduce an amendment to address these concerns. The Hoeffel-Kucinich-Visclosky Taxpayer Protection and Corporate Welfare Disclosure Amendment would require OMB to report on the costs and benefits of corporate welfare.

□ 1515

It would also limit the amount of money that could be spent on these analyses to $1 million, double what the CBO estimated for the annual cost to implement the bill, while we are giving twice as much as CBO says this bill is going to cost, because I do not think their cost estimate is going to be correct.

And there ought to be some ceiling on the amount of money that hard-working taxpayers are going to pay to do this analysis that may not even be of any value. We ought not to be spending certainly more than $1 million on this project which seems to be the personal agenda of some of those who are pushing the legislation. While this amendment does not address all my concerns with H.R. 1074, it will go a long way towards protecting the taxpayer by limiting the cost of the bill and giving a more accurate picture of the costs and benefits of government programs.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge at the appropriate time that Members support the amendment. The Hoeffel-Kucinich-Visclosky Taxpayer Protection and Corporate Welfare disclosure amendment is a commonsense amendment that would at least improve a deeply flawed bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, no one in this room would buy a house without hiring an inspector to look it over carefully to make sure it was liveable; no one would buy a new car without looking at the warranty and taking it out for a spin to make sure that it runs; none of us would buy a new suit of clothes without having it professionally tailored and then trying it on first to see if it fits, yet we expect the American people to spend $700 billion a year to comply with thousands of Federal regulations without knowing whether those regulations do what they are supposed to do.

I think we owe the American people an explanation. H.R. 1074 will help us give them one. It will help us answer the questions about whether all these regulations are worth what we are paying for them and whether society enjoys a net benefit. This bill will improve our regulatory system by putting timely, reliable information on the costs and benefits of regulations in the hands of policymakers and legislators. At the same time, it leaves in place all existing rules and it maintains the integrity of the existing rulemaking process.

Mr. Chairman, the American people deserve to know what they are getting for $700 billion a year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wish to rise in support of H.R. 1074. The public has a right to know. What this issue really boils down to is what is good for democracy, and what is always good for democracy is information. What this legislation seeks to achieve is to give the public information.

Now through our regulatory framework in our Executive Branch of government all of our laws in this country are implemented, executed by our Executive Branch of government. We here in Congress often pass overly vague laws, and it is up to the regulators, the Executive Branch of government as defined in the Constitution, to put the teeth in those laws, to execute those laws, to define the regulations.

But what we are finding in this Federal Government which has become very vast and very large with so many different regulations, so many different agencies often promulgating the same regulations on the same topic and the same issue, that we have so much duplication, we have so many regulations that are passed onto our people which really take the full force of law, which do not take into account any chance of looking at whether the costs exceed the benefits, whether there is a better way of imposing the regulation or whether it duplicates other existing regulations within the Federal Government.

What this bill seeks to do is to have OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, conduct a review every year, something well within their means, something the Congressional Budget Office says is very minimal on a cost basis. What the OMB will do under this law is give us a report analyzing the costs and the benefits of proposed regulations. It will look at whether or not regulations duplicate each other.

We analyzed this last week, and we looked at so many different areas where regulations are so duplicative that people, family farmers, factory workers, small businessmen and women in this country are facing regulations that tear them in different directions. We have two different regulatory agencies pursuing wet lands conservation laws. One regulatory agency told a farmer in California, Dave Peckham, ''Go ahead and farm your field, put a vineyard in there. Make sure you put your vineyard around this wetland,'' and then another agency came and said, ''You're violating the law. We're going to conduct fines and impose penalties on your business.''

We have so much waste and duplication in our regulatory agencies in this government that the public has a right to know what is being duplicated, where is this taking place. The public also has a right to know about the costs and the benefits of the regulations being placed upon our people. And what this really comes down to is simply a good government act. This is good government.

The U.S. Government imposes a hidden tax on our public today. Last week, we voted for a tax relief package. We imposed taxes, income taxes, excise taxes, inheritance taxes, capital gains taxes, death taxes on our people in an overt way. We see the tax, it comes out of our paycheck, we send in our 1040. But there are other taxes that our public pays today, there are other taxes that citizens of this country pay, and that is a hidden tax, the cost of regulations.

It is estimated by Thomas Hopkins of the University of Rochester, the Rochester Institute of Technology, that hidden tax of regulations costs our economy, our people, our small businesses every year in excess of $700 billion. A $700 billion tax is being imposed upon the people of this country, and we are not even looking into whether or not these taxes exceed the costs, whether the benefits of these taxes exceed the costs, whether or not they are being duplicative or not. All this is a good government measure to say: Let us look at what we are doing as a Federal Government, let us look at the regulations we are promulgating.

This does not change one regulation, this does not affect any law from being implemented. This gives the public the right to know the truth. This gives the public the information that they need so they can follow the law.

All we are saying is, ''Let's have the Office of Management and Budget review these regulations, let's have the Office of Management and Budget weigh the costs and the benefits of these regulations, let's have the Office

of Management and Budget tell us whether they are overly duplicative or not,'' and I would like to echo what my colleague from Illinois said about the bill and its supporters:

Mr. Chairman, this is a bipartisan bill. This bill is being supported by the National Governors' Association, the National Conference of State Legislators, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties and the International City and County Management Association. The bill is also supported by Americans for Tax Reform, the Center For The Study of American Business, Citizens for a Sound Economy, the Seniors Coalition and the Sixties Plus Coalition.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

It is very peculiar to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) say we have OMB to do this analysis so we can find out the cost benefit of regulations. Well, OMB already does that, and the gentleman said the OMB said it costs $700 billion a year to comply with regulations.

That is not accurate. OMB said, after doing their analysis, that it costs $230 billion not $700 billion; and that is the costs. But the benefits for regulations OMB said ranged, because we cannot know precisely how to quantify it, but we know there are certain enormous benefits that come from regulations to protect the environment, to protect public health and safety; they say the benefits of a $230 billion cost is anywhere from $260 billion in benefits to $3.5 trillion.

Now the gentleman wants OMB to do a report, but he ought to be accurate in telling the Members what OMB is already saying on this very subject. Let me tell my colleagues what some others are saying about this bill.

The United Auto Workers say the UAW submits that this bill would only serve to further delay the promulgation of public health and safety protections by mandating wasteful analysis and diverting limited agency resources.

The United Steelworkers say that they oppose this bill because it would lengthen and complicate the already cumbersome regulatory process of agencies such as OSHA which address issues affecting worker safety and health.

The Consumers Union opposes this bill, and they say that the substitution of different words or details does not obviate the need this bill would create for the Executive Branch to expend the very substantial resources in an attempt to quantify what they may well find is unquantifiable and most certainly would be meaningless in an aggregate form.

Now do we want to take taxpayers' hard-earned money and waste it, because that is what this bill would do. It would have OMB spend, I believe, without a limit, millions of dollars on an analysis on non-major regulations. We are not talking about major regulations, but regulations that are nonmajor, often noncontroversial, usually noncontroversial, regulations that everyone supports, and then have to go through a lot of paperwork. Well, maybe it is a win for those who have their own agenda to say that if maybe they are lucky, OMB came out with a report showing that the costs out-did the benefits. They can say, well, there is a wasteful regulation, but even if they can never come up with a way of showing that some of these regulations are not effective, they could just busy all the people in the government doing these reports that serve no useful purpose.

Let us subject this bill to a cost-benefit analysis. We do not know what the full costs will be of this bill to make OMB go through all these regulations and review. But we do know that the costs are going to be extraordinary and the benefits are going to be minuscule. We ought not to enact legislation that does not serve a cost-benefit purpose, we certainly ought not to have regulations that do not have benefits outweighing the costs. And I think that the way to make sure that we have regulations that are effective and cost effective is to do our job as congressional custodians through oversight and not just simply pass laws that can do a great deal of harm.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of our time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) for his management.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) assumed the chair.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United states were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

□ 1530

REGULATORY RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT OF 1999

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) has 21½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are bringing this bill, the Regulatory Right-To-Know Act of 1999, which is, as my colleague said, a bipartisan bill to promote the public's right to know the cost benefits and impacts of Federal regulations. This bill is the product of work done by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) over the last several years, and it builds on provisions that were included in the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for 1997, 1998, and 1999. There is also a companion bill in the Senate, S. 59, also designed to establish a permanent and strengthened regulatory accounting system.

Now, my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) says this bill would put onerous new requirements on the bureaucracies and the agencies that write regulations. If only there was that sentiment and concern about the small businesses, the farmers, the people who are working to earn a living outside of government about the onerous costs of Federal regulations, because estimates are that they do, indeed, amount to $700 billion a year. These are private estimates which have measured the cost of these.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1074 is a good government requirement that the Office of Management and Budget would actually make sure that the regulatory impact analyses are done on major rules and that they aggregate these into an annual accounting statement and an associated report. The accounting statement would provide the estimates of the costs and benefits for Federal regulatory programs in the aggregate; not one-by-one as each rule comes through the process, but by agency, so that we can compare where are these costs coming from; which agencies have the greater burden; which agencies provide the greater benefits for us in these social programs, as well as by program within each agency, and by program component.

The information would be provided for the same 7-year time series as the budget of the United States: the current year, 2 preceding years, and the 4 following years.

The associated report would analyze the impacts of Federal rules and paperwork on various sectors; for example, what is the cumulative impact on several different agencies on small businesses or on farmers, and it would also do it by functional areas; what is the impact on public health. That is where I think we will see the greatest analysis of the potential benefits of Federal regulations. Where are our regulatory programs having an impact on the environment, giving us a cleaner environment; where are they having an impact on creating greater health for the public; where are they having an impact on greater safety.

The essential question that I think this analysis and the final report will help us to answer is how do we get the

biggest bang for our buck, for all of the billions of dollars of regulatory costs that we impose upon this country in order to pursue those social goals of a cleaner environment, a healthier workplace, and a healthier lifestyle for all Americans.

One of the things we have noticed in our subcommittee time and time again is that there are many times in which we have overlapping regulations, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) spoke of several of those, in which we have duplications, in which we have potential inconsistencies among Federal regulatory programs. The report will offer recommendations to reform those inefficient programs so that we can do a better job. Once again, how do we get the biggest bang for the buck out of all of the costs imposed in Federal regulations.

Currently, there is no report that analyzes these cumulative impacts of Federal regulations. I believe from the bottom of my heart that Americans have a right to know what are those costs, what are those benefits, and what are the impacts they have on various sectors and various functional areas.

Current estimates, as we talked about earlier, are, indeed, in the private sector, could be as much as $750 billion, which would be, by the way, a 25 percent increase from 10 years ago. Nobody quite knows because the Regulatory Right-to-Know bill has not been enacted; and, therefore, there is no cumulative accounting for the costs of regulations. By the way, if that estimate is correct, that ends up being a little less than $7,000, about $6,900 for every family in America, a lot more than the taxes that they pay directly to the Federal Government.

Now, the bill requires OMB to issue guidelines, to standardize agency estimates of costs and benefits and the format for the annual accounting statement. The bill also requires the Office of Management and Budget to quantify the net benefits for each alternative considered, as well as the net costs, so that we can determine whether the agencies are doing their job in maximizing the benefits to the environment, health and safety, and minimizing the costs to the American public.

I think this bill will help the public understand how and why major decisions that are made by the executive branch agencies are made, and it will disclose if there are agencies that have indeed chosen the most effective and least costly approach.

To ensure a balanced and fair estimate in these areas, the bill requires that this annual report be publicized in a draft form and be submitted to with two or more experts for the opportunity of peer review, so that we get outside estimates, outside expertise looking at those questions on the costs and the benefits of regulations. Finally, it requires that the report be published annually, so that everybody, every citizen can have access to that information.

One of the things that we have also done is we require OMB to compile some new and improved information about regulatory programs, but we also believe that the bill will not impose any significant undue burden on OMB, since much of the needed regulation is either already available or already to be provided to OMB under the President's executive order on regulatory review.

Now, since 1981, when President Reagan issued his historic executive order, the Federal agencies have been required to perform a cost-benefit analysis of major rules, which constitutes the bulk of the Federal regulatory cost and benefits. Also, OMB can use any other sources of information, including private regulatory accounting studies and government studies done by the agencies.

The bill, as reported by the Committee on Government Reform, made many changes to lessen the burden on OMB and to address the administration's concern, including a phase-in of some of these key requirements. The result is that the CBO has estimated the cost of this bill to the taxpayer is less than $500,000, less than $500,000 each year. To me and my way of thinking, that is a tremendous benefit when one can spend a little less than $500,000 and potentially save billions of dollars for the American public on unnecessary, duplicative regulations.

There is also a very small sum of money to tell us where can we get the biggest bang for the buck in terms of improving the health and safety of the American worker, in terms of getting the biggest bang for the buck in cleaning up the environment, in terms of getting the biggest bang for the buck in allowing Americans to live a healthier life. I think the cost of this rule, as demonstrated by the CBO estimate, certainly meets any type of cost-benefit analysis that we might want to impose on it.

This bipartisan bill has been endorsed by many organizations; and my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) started to mention several of the major public organizations, representatives of cities and towns and State governments, as well as the National Governors Association; but it has also been endorsed by the Alliance USA; the American Farm Bureau Federation; the Americans for Tax Reform; the Associated Builders and Contractors and the Business Roundtable; the Center for the Study of American Business; the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America which, by the way, is key voting this bill; the Chemical Manufacturers Association; The Citizens for a Sound Economy, which is also key voting this legislation; the National Association of Manufacturers, which is also key voting the legislation; the National Associations of Towns and Townships; the National Federation of Independent Businesses; the Seniors Coalition; 60 Plus Association; and the Small Business Survival Community; which is also key voting this piece of legislation.

Now, unfortunately, some of the complaints about this bill, some of those raised in fact in the minority views of the committee report, end up misunderstanding the bill and therefore lead to incorrect or misleading assertions about what is required in the legislation. For example, it incorrectly states that it would require a cost-benefit analysis for every major and minor rule. That is simply not in the legislation.

What the bill does require is that major rules that are currently subject to the executive order have a regulatory impact analysis, but there are no new regulatory impact analyses, no new rule-by-rule cost-benefit analyses, and no new rule-by-rule impact analyses. Simply, what this bill does is require OMB to enforce the executive orders and then aggregate the data by various sectors.

One of the things that we must do in focusing on this is also ask ourselves, will this have an impact on slowing down issuing of regulations. The bill does not change any standard of law; and it cannot, frankly, slow down any rulemaking, because the analyses are required to be done after the fact and in the aggregate. This is a look back to say what are the regulatory programs that were put in place in the past year and what are the costs, so that we can now look and see whether we have the best overall regulatory proposals.

I hope today's debate recognizes both the bipartisan nature and the narrow intent of H.R. 1074 to provide useful information. The public, it does have a right to know where its regulatory agencies are performing and how they are doing; and it will provide useful information to decisionmakers, both in Congress and in the executive branch, about the costs, the relative benefits, the impact of various Federal programs, so that we can do a better job of legislating in those areas, and the executive branch can do a better job of regulating in those areas.

In May and April, at the subcommittee and full committee markups, opponents of the bill tried to add some amendments to cripple the legislation or to undermine the public's ability to actually receive the information about these regulatory programs. There are some amendments on the floor today that would do that. I think it is critical that we move forward to actually ensure that the public does have a right to know about its regulatory process, and I would urge my colleagues to oppose any weakening amendments, any amendments that would gut the bill, any amendments that would be, in fact, undermining the essential goals of this legislation. I believe the public has a right to an open and accountable government. OMB's accounting statement and a report

that this legislation will require, will provide important tools to help Americans participate more fully in government decision-making, and to assist in making smarter regulatory decisions for the future.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the gentleman from Indiana is absolutely incorrect when he tells us that his bill would apply to just the major rules, because the text of his bill provides that there would be all the rules and paperwork in the aggregate, by agency, agency program and program component, and by major rule. If he wanted it by ''major rule'' alone, he could have said that.

Further, on the bill it says, ''analysis of the impacts of Federal rules and paperwork on Federal, State,'' so on and so forth. It does not say ''major,'' it says ''impacts of Federal rules.'' The consequence of that would be, I believe, to waste an enormous amount of money.

There is an argument to do a cost-benefit analysis, as has been required in the appropriations riders, on the major rules. But when we get into these minor rules, we are talking about things like noncontroversial requests to have a regulation of a drawbridge near Hackberry, Louisiana, that everybody supported, and then one would have to go through all the paperwork to do an analysis on a noncontroversial rule.

On May 14, the Veterans' Administration issued a rule to adjust the level of education assistance available to veterans as required by the Benefits Act for Veterans of 1998. This rule was strictly ministerial, since the adjustment was required by statute. That rule would have to be subject to an extensive analysis with a lot of paperwork, with even peer reviewers to look at OMB's analysis after the fact.

On July 23, the Department of the Treasury issued a rule to allow the U.S. Mint to use mechanical means rather than melting to destroy mutilated coins. Well, we would have to have that rule reviewed over again to try to quantify the costs and the benefits of taking these mutilated coins and melting them down as opposed to using some other way to destroy them.

On July 23, the Food and Drug Administration amended its animal drug regulations to reflect the approval of a new drug to treat infections in dogs. Well, why should that have to go through a long, extensive review of the costs and benefits?

Now, it is not just the costs and benefits of that regulation, in and of itself; but it is costs and benefits to the economy, to wages, to productivity and growth. So we are, in effect, mandating an enormous amount of burden, a lot of busywork, wasting taxpayers' dollars to comply with this legislation that is so overly broad in the way it has been drafted.

Now, there may be groups that support it because they were misinformed, as are the Members being misinformed today about the legislation. They may think it was only the major rules, but in fact, it goes far beyond that.

Mr. Chairman, could I just inquire as to the amount of time on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) has 13 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) has 10 minutes remaining.

□ 1545

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, my concern about H.R. 1074 is that it would give us an incomplete picture. The proponents of this bill, of the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act, are asking for a cost-benefit analysis of Federal regulations, arguing that the public and Congress have a right to know the cost of the regulations that are promulgated by the bureaucracy in response to the statutes that we pass here in Congress.

Frankly, it is a fair request. It is a rational request. I understand why they want to know that. They say it may cost $700 million a year. They cite private estimates that may or may not be true. It could be far, far less than that, as government studies have indicated. However, we do have some reason to want to know the cost of government regulation.

But the bill before us would give an incomplete picture. There is no question that government regulations cost money. They cost businesses money to comply. That is obvious on the face. In return, we hope we get certain benefits: a safer workplace, a more competitive business environment, better consumer protections, cleaner environmental sites, cleaner air, cleaner water. There is certainly a benefit intended when we pass a bill that is turned into a regulation that in turn regulates business.

But if we are really interested in finding out the impact on businesses of Federal action, we must not only do a cost-benefit analysis of regulations, but we must include in that a cost-benefit analysis of the corporate welfare received by many of those businesses.

''Corporate welfare'' is a term bandied about a lot. It can mean a number of different things. It is outright government spending subsidies to certain businesses that give them a direct benefit from the taxpayer. Corporate welfare includes tax preferences, tax breaks, loan guarantees, and loan preferences.

Corporate welfare includes the use of government assets below market value. Grazing on government lands, mining on government lands, logging on government land at rates below fair market value, all of that comprises corporate welfare.

If we are serious about analyzing the cost of government action on American business, and if we really want to give the American people the full picture, we have to ask for the full picture. If we are going to ask the Office of Management and Budget to do an analysis of the cost and benefit of Federal regulations, we have to include in that analysis the costs and benefits of corporate welfare that have been estimated by Time Magazine at $125 billion a year.

I will have more to say about the corporate welfare aspect of this debate when I offer an amendment on that subject in a few minutes. I rise now simply to urge the House to understand the full picture and to ask for the full picture.

What do the proponents of the bill have to hide? If we want to know the impact on business of Federal actions through regulations, let us include in that study the impact on business of the benefits given through corporate welfare.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

As I mentioned, the gentleman is the originator of this legislation, and much credit goes to him for his diligent work in this area over the last several years.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have worked with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH), the gentleman from California (Mr. CONDIT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), and a broad bipartisan group of cosponsors on the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act of 1999.

The bill was introduced with 17 Democrats and 14 Republicans as cosponsors. The bill has been improved in committee to address some of the concerns of the Office of Management and Budget, and based on two amendments by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) to add new information requirements and to ensure a balanced and peer review.

One of the amendments of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) requires an analysis of the impacts of programs and program components on public health, public safety, the environment, consumer protection, equal opportunity, and other public policy goals.

Moreover, the definition of both benefits and costs include quantifiable and nonquantifiable effects, including social, health, safety, environmental, and economic effects. I think Members can see that we have gone the extra mile to ensure that this legislation encompasses a fair analysis and is not weighted just toward regulatory costs.

I should also note that the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act of 1999 changes no regulatory standard and will not slow down the development of

any regulation. Moreover, the Congressional Budget Office has scored this bill in its lowest category as costing under $500,000 per year.

The Regulatory Right-to-Know Act is a basic step towards a smarter partnership in regulatory programs. It is an important tool to understand the magnitude and impact of Federal regulatory programs. The act will empower all Americans, including State and local officials, with new information and opportunities to help them participate more fully and improve our government. More useful information and public input will help regulators make better, more accountable decisions and promote greater confidence in the quality of Federal policy and regulatory decisions.

Better decisions and updated regulatory programs will enhance innovation, improve the quality of our environment, secure our economic future, and give a better quality of life to every American.

Mr. Chairman, while good management and accountability matter, there are a number of reasons that this act is the right step towards enhanced quality and accountability in regulatory programs. Over the past 4 years, this Congress has changed the direction of the Federal Government from the endless burden of more taxes and spending to the new fiscal discipline of balance and accountability.

For the past decade, America's business ingenuity accounts for a surge in quality and productivity. The result of this surge is an American economy which is the unparalleled envy of the world. Millions of Americans in private businesses have brought incredible improvements to our quality of life, health care, and education.

Through the new emphasis on flexibility and innovation, State and local officials have led the way to safer, cleaner, and more prosperous places to live. Given this power and responsibility, we in Congress must be the allies of state and local government, American business and families, through responsible management of the Nation's regulatory programs to ensure quality in necessary regulation and freedom from unwise regulation.

The drive for quality, the same basic drive toward the free market and State and local innovation, must be the drive for Federal regulatory programs as we enter the next millennium.

This may take time. We have already reviewed two accounting reports from the Office of Management and Budget. Many parties commented on drafts of these documents and have pointed out the need for substantial improvement. I expect the real impact from this information will be a few years from now, when the information base is built up further.

The concept of flexibility and improvement for the accounting statement itself is built into the legislation. I agree with the Office of Management and Budget, that the current information is not sufficiently detailed to make management decisions. That is a few years down the road. We should not, however, accept a path where ignorance is bliss. We also agree with the Office of Management and Budget in its last accounting statement report when it said, ''This report presents new information on both the total costs and benefits of regulations and the costs and benefits of major individual regulations. We hope to continue this important dialogue to improve our knowledge about the effects of regulation on the public, the economy, and American society.''

In closing, this bill will provide vital information to Congress and the executive branch so they may fulfill their obligation to ensure wise expenditure of limited national economic resources and improve our regulatory system. Let us not forget that a tax or a consumer dollar spent on a wasteful program is a dollar that cannot be spent on teachers, police officers, or health care.

If we are serious about openness, the public's right to know, accountability, and fulfilling our responsibilities as managers, we will enact this important piece of legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Clinton administration, which would have to enforce this proposal, has written that they oppose it. They say, ''The increased burden that this would place on the agencies would crowd out other priorities and would add little value in many cases. That is because cost-benefit analysis can be very expensive and time-consuming.''

The Environmental Defense Fund, which opposes this legislation, said that, ''The bill ignores the serious practical and methodological limitations that characterize cost-benefit analysis. In doing so, it compels agencies to waste considerable taxpayers' resources developing new information that is worse than useless.''

The Environmental Coalition of Mississippi said, ''This legislation would impose burdens on Federal agencies, undermining their ability to protect consumers' civil rights, public health, safety, and the environment.''

The Natural Resources Defense Council said, ''We strongly believe this legislation would create needless bureaucracy and divert scarce agency resources away from the efforts to carry out and enforce vital public health and environmental safeguards.''

Of course, I mentioned in my opening comments all the other environmental, public health, public interest groups that oppose this legislation. The main reason that I would urge Members to oppose it is that it is not what it has been represented to be. It is not a review of the major regulations. It covers all regulations. It wastes taxpayers' dollars in doing so.

To me, to waste taxpayers' dollars in the name of trying to save taxpayers' money is a fraud on the American people. This legislation is well-intended but poorly drafted, and for that reason, I would hope that when we get to final passage of the legislation, Members would vote against it.

For a proposed regulation to be promulgated by an agency, it has to be reviewed and subject to comments from anybody affected. After that, it goes to the Office of Management and Budget, where they are required by law to review it and to do a cost-benefit analysis on it before it is considered one that will be put into final form. After that, once the regulation becomes legally binding, existing riders on appropriations say that if it is major, we ought to review it for cost-benefit to see whether we are getting the benefits for the costs.

This bill goes beyond all of that and requires that small, non-controversial regulations be subject to this wasteful exercise for no value after we have got all that paperwork that will be generated by the legislation. So I would hope that Members would oppose the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1074. Before coming to Congress, I spent 8 years as a Member of the Omaha Nebraska City Council. This gave me an opportunity to observe firsthand the impact of Federal regulations on our cities.

Many of the regulations may not cost the Federal Government much, but the cost to the States and the localities can often be great. Washington regulators need to appreciate how much of a financial burden their rules are on other forms of government. They might even be encouraged to find more cost-effective ways of accomplishing their goals.

This is why this legislation is so necessary. Let me tell the Members, just to build a road within the city of Omaha, some firsthand experience. About 30 to 40 percent of the time and talent to get that road built is spent in trying to comply with Federal rules and regulations. It is very costly. The irony here is that some of those Federal regulations that we must comply with at the local level to try and build that road demand cost-benefit analysis.

I would say what is good for the goose is good for the gander. Perhaps some of those rules and regulations are not necessary, and we could streamline and create efficiencies and cost savings at the local level.

Information on the costs and the benefits of the Federal regulatory programs has been available since 1997. The existing legislation before us today strengthens the existing requirements and makes them permanent law.

From the City Council service, I can appreciate why all the major organizations representing State and local

elected officials support the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act. As a sponsor of H.R. 1074, I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting it, and oppose the Hoeffel amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have had these kinds of debates in the past on so-called regulatory reform proposals, and what we usually get in the course of these debates are a lot of anecdotes. They are the kinds of anecdotes that get all of us very angry. It usually involves some well-meaning citizen who is the victim of some terrible regulation, or an overzealous agency.

□ 1600

After we hear these gut-wrenching stories, we are asked to conclude that the regulatory system is broken and needs to be reformed. The only problem with these stories is that they are just that, stories. After the debate, we go back and research some of these anecdotes, as we have done in the past, and they may include a kernel of truth, but the facts and conclusions end up being wrong.

For example, in the 104th Congress, we were told about the Safe Drinking Water Act requiring the City of Columbus to test its drinking water for pesticide used only to grow pineapples. That, of course, is ridiculous. Everyone knows one does not grow pineapples in Columbus, Ohio. But when we looked into that story, which was told on the House floor, it turned out that the pesticide DBCP is considered a probable human carcinogen, and it was widely used on over 40 crops until it was banned in 1979. Since then, it was found in the groundwater in 24 States, and 19 States have reported levels above the Federal standard.

I remember also hearing from the gentleman from Indiana about OSHA killing the tooth fairy by requiring extracted baby teeth be disposed of as hazardous waste rather than allowing the parents to take the teeth home. Well, that sounds ridiculous. But when we checked it out, it turned out there was a regulation issued by the Bush administration that required dental workers to take precautions when handling extracted teeth because they were contaminated with blood. But a gloved dentist was allowed to put the tooth in a clean container and give the tooth to the parents for the tooth fairy.

There are other examples. But now, during the debate on this bill, we heard a new anecdote. Last Thursday, when we were debating the rule for this bill, and I believe that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) repeated this, we heard the story in the debate today of Dave Pechan who got caught in a turf fight over wetlands regulations between the National Resources Conservation Service and the Army Corps of Engineers.

According to our colleague, the Conservation Service gave Mr. Pechan approval to convert his land into a vineyard, but then the Army Corps of Engineers told them he will be subjected to civil and criminal penalties if he continues to work his land. He is now in limbo while the Corps conducts its own wetlands evaluation of his property. That is a quote from our colleague.

Well, we called the Army Corps of Engineers on Friday. What we found out is that, while the Corps disagreed with the Conservation Service's wetlands determination, it deferred to their decision. The Corps sent a letter to Mr. Pechan in December of 1997 informing him that their investigation was effectively closed. So Mr. Pechan is not being subjected to civil or criminal penalties, and he is not in limbo.

Mr. Chairman, we may disagree on the role of the Federal Government or the need for Federal regulations to protect health, safety, and the environment; but we ought to keep the debate on the facts.

The facts are this bill is not as has been represented, only dealing with major regulations. It applies to all regulations. The facts are this bill will cost a lot of money. We have heard cited the CBO's estimate of $500,000, but I believe it is going to be more. We will see, if it is only $500,000, whether the other side will agree to an amendment that will say, okay, no more than a million dollars can be spent on this enterprise.

I would like to submit for the RECORD, and I am going to with this statement, comparisons of other anecdotes and facts that we found for the various cases that have been raised on the House floor. Let us not let these anecdotes, which make all of us angry if we thought they were true, be used to get us to make policy changes in our law that will, as some of the groups that are opposed to this legislation indicated, provide for excessive waste of taxpayers' dollars, to develop a needless bureaucracy, divert scarce agency resources away from the efforts to carry out and enforce vital public health and environmental safeguards.

I would urge opposition to this legislation.

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, if love and communication are the seeds of a good marriage, then open discussions are a good thing. It is this same principle that highlights the importance of the Regulatory Right-To-Know Act and why it must be approved. The more we know about the burdens of Federal regulations imposed on American families, the better our decisions will be.

This bill gives policymakers, lawmakers, regulators, and the public a valuable tool for evaluating the benefits and burdens that new regulations impose. Either way, it provides an honest and open accounting of our votes.

This effort is bipartisan, and it is built on the principles of openness and accountability. The public has the right to know its government has considered every factor when it imposes new regulations on Americans. To do anything less would be irresponsible.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Regulatory Right-To-Know Act.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to, rather than go into anecdotes, go into facts and talk about some of the arrangements that the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) has been talking about.

First, I would like to talk about the score of the bill. The Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, said that this would cost less than $500,000 per year for this score of the bill. That is after they read the legislation, and I will get to that in 1 second.

But to put this in perspective, Federal agencies will spend an estimated $17.9 billion per year to write and enforce regulations in fiscal year 1999. That is one-tenth of 1 percent of total spending on Federal regulatory programs.

Even if we assume for the sake of argument that the CBO's estimate is off by a factor of 10, H.R. 1074 would still cost less than 1 percent of total agency spending on regulations. It will not strain agencies' budgets.

But going on to the point that this would cause a cost-benefit analysis on rule by rule by rule, the bill specifically states that OMB is given the discretion to bundle rules into aggregate components, to take a look at component rule categories.

So this will not make OMB go down the road of doing 5,000 separate rule by rule by rule cost-benefit analyses. This bill gives OMB the discretion to bundle rules in the aggregate by section, by related categories, and then conduct the aggregate cost-benefit analyses.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

This piece of legislation would require the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to report on the aggregate annual cost and benefit of regulations, regulatory programs, and program components. Unfortunately, bill would waste taxpayer dollars by compelling agencies to use their limited resources to annually analyze rules that are immaterial. The resulting information likely would not improve the efficiency, effectiveness, or soundness of the existing body of regulations.

The OMB traditionally has worked hard to annually report on the costs and benefits of approximately 50 major rules. This bill, as it stands, would require the OMB to report on the costs and benefits on over 5,000 rules issued each year. This would include thousands of administrative and routine rules that OMB currently does not review.

This bill also fails to disclose to the public the costs and benefits of billions of dollars of

corporate welfare doled out by the federal government to regulated corporations each year.

The burden imposed by this bill will fall on agencies and prevent them from using valuable funds for environmental and health programs. It will tie up agencies with new, unnecessary, bureaucratic red tape that will keep our agency workers writing reports instead of helping people.

Many citizen groups oppose this bill, because they see the danger in keeping our agencies overburdened with administrative requirements, rather than allowing them to make new rules, and enforce existing regulations. Some of the groups that oppose this bill include the Sierra Club, the League of Conservation Voters, the Defenders of Wildlife, the Environmental Defense Fund, the AFL–CIO, AFSCME, the United Steelworkers of America, the Consumers Union and the American Lung Association. Each of these diverse groups knows that administrative agencies are there to help them in their causes—saving the environment, protecting American workers' jobs, and preserving and improving our health—and do not want to see these agencies face additional hurdles when trying to fulfill their purpose.

These studies required under this bill are impractical and unworkable. Simply said, in many cases, agency workers will not be able to quantify, especially in a fiscal sense, what good a regulation can do. How can we put a price on preserving our beautiful national parks? How can we assess the benefit of clean air for our children? It is difficult to put monetary figures on these benefits, but they are ones that our taxpayers count on, and enjoy.

I ask all my colleagues to oppose this bill, avoid wasteful administrative costs, and keep our government focused on problem solving.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure, the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act of 1999, but to also express some concerns I have with the balance of this legislation. While I believe this bill is an important tool for the public to learn about the costs and benefits of federal regulations, I fear that it may prove extremely costly, in both time and resources, and could lead to delays in regulations designed to protect worker safety, human health, and the environment.

Everyone understands the impact of federal regulatory programs on our economy—they have helped Americans, with the help of American businesses and industry, to clean the air, protect wetlands, promote safe transportation, ensure healthy and abundant food supplies, improve workplace safety, and promote human health. However, each of these important steps forward comes with a cost. While many of those costs are justified, it is important that the federal government work closely with the public to develop regulations which can achieve these goals reasonably, quickly, and efficiently. H.R. 1074 may help empower Americans with new information to improve public participation and help regulators make better decisions.

For the past 2 years, I have been involved in a bi-partisan working group of Members of Congress to develop broad, consensus-based legislation in the area of environmental regulations. I remain committed to this because I believe all Americans share essentially the same goals. The environmentalists I know want to ensure that our economy continues to grow and that Americans continue to prosper financially. And there's not a CEO I know who doesn't cherish the time spent in the great outdoors enjoying fresh air and clean water. In short, we all want clean neighborhoods, and we all want good jobs.

Broadening the information available to the public will improve this situation. Causing delay in formulating regulations will not. Americans must work together toward success. I believe the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act may help increase participation in our federal government's rule-making process. We in Congress, therefore, must commit to providing the necessary support to ensure that the Executive branch can continue its work effectively and efficiently. H.R. 1074 must not be an excuse to drain scarce agency resources or undermine the health and safety of Americans and our precious environment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises today to express his support for H.R. 1074, the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act. This common sense legislation would require the Administration to submit to Congress a comprehensive annual accounting statement and report containing an estimate of the total annual costs and benefits of Federal regulatory programs.

The number of regulations issued by Federal agencies have greatly increased in recent times. These regulations can have huge financial repercussions on the private sector, state and local governments and the public with little or no oversight. This Member is pleased to be a cosponsor of H.R. 1074 which simply requires a reporting of the costs and benefits of regulations. For example, it is shocking to note that an estimate indicates that regulatory costs for 1999 will exceed $700 billion (or $7,000 for the average family)!

Mr. Chairman, in closing, this legislation will provide much needed accountability and will give the public access to information regarding the cumulative costs, benefits and impacts of Federal regulations. This Member urges his colleagues to support H.R. 1074.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1074 and support the Hoeffel-Kucinich amendment. H.R. 1074 would impose unduly burdensome analytical requirements and contain excessive provisions for consulting with State and local governments. The bill would waste huge sums of hard-earned consumers' income. The financial burden that would result would take scarce funds away from critical environmental protection and public health programs.

H.R. 1074 fails to include the costs and benefits of corporate welfare. One cannot determine the complete costs and benefits of regulations without also taking into account taxpayer-funded subsidies to the regulated corporations.

The administration opposes H.R. 1074, as do over 300 public interest organizations ranging from the AFL–CIO to the National Environmental Trust, United Auto Workers, U.S. Pirg, and the New Jersey environmental lobby in my home State. I can't remember the last time such a large and diverse range of interests united on an issue—imagine—the auto industry representatives and the environmentalists standing side by side!

The League of Conservation also is likely to score the vote on final passage as well as on the Hoeffel-Kucinich amendment.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Hoeffel-Kucinich and opposing final passage.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1074

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Regulatory Right-to-Know Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) promote the public right-to-know about the costs and benefits of Federal regulatory programs and rules;

(2) increase Government accountability; and

(3) improve the quality of Federal regulatory programs and rules.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the definitions under section 551 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to this Act.

(2) BENEFIT.—The term ''benefit'' means the reasonably identifiable significant favorable effects, quantifiable and nonquantifiable, including social, health, safety, environmental, and economic effects, that are expected to result from implementation of, or compliance with, a rule.

(3) COST.—The term ''cost'' means the reasonably identifiable significant adverse effects, quantifiable and nonquantifiable, including social, health, safety, environmental, and economic effects, that are expected to result from implementation of, or compliance with, a rule.

(4) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(5) MAJOR RULE.—The term ''major rule'' has the meaning that term has under section 804(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(6) NONMAJOR RULE.—The term ''nonmajor rule'' means any rule, as that term is defined in section 804(3) of title 5, United States Code, other than a major rule.

(7) PAPERWORK.—The term ''paperwork'' has the meaning given the term ''collection of information'' under section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

(8) PROGRAM COMPONENT.—The term ''program component'' means a set of related rules.

SEC. 4. ACCOUNTING STATEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 5, 2001, and on the first Monday in February of each year thereafter, the President, acting through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall prepare and submit to the Congress an accounting statement and associated report containing an estimate of the total annual costs and benefits of Federal regulatory programs, including rules and paperwork—

(1) in the aggregate;

(2) by agency, agency program, and program component; and

(3) by major rule.

(b) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—In addition to the information required under subsection (a), the President shall include in each accounting statement under subsection (a) the following information:

(1) An analysis of impacts of Federal rules and paperwork on Federal, State, local, and tribal government, the private sector, small business, wages, consumer prices, and economic

growth, as well as on public health, public safety, the environment, consumer protection, equal opportunity, and other public policy goals.

(2) An identification and analysis of overlaps, duplications, and potential inconsistencies among Federal regulatory programs.

(3) Recommendations to reform inefficient or ineffective regulatory programs or program components, including recommendations for addressing market failures that are not adequately addressed by existing regulatory programs or program components.

(c) NET BENEFITS AND COSTS.—To the extent feasible, the Director shall, in estimates contained in any submission under subsection (a), quantify the net benefits or net costs of—

(1) each program component covered by the submission;

(2) each major rule covered by the submission; and

(3) each option for which costs and benefits were included in any regulatory impact analysis issued for any major rule covered by the submission.

(d) SUMMARY OF REGULATORY ACTIVITY.—The Director shall include in each submission under subsection (a) a table stating the number of major rules and the number of nonmajor rules issued by each agency in the preceding fiscal year.

(e) YEARS COVERED BY ACCOUNTING STATEMENT.—Each accounting statement submitted under this section shall, at a minimum—

(1) cover expected costs and benefits for the fiscal year for which the statement is submitted and each of the 4 fiscal years following that fiscal year;

(2) cover previously expected costs and benefits for each of the 2 fiscal years preceding the fiscal year for which the statement is submitted, or the most recent revision of such costs and benefits; and

(3) with respect to each major rule, include the estimates of costs and benefits for each of the fiscal years referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) that were included in the regulatory impact analysis that was prepared for the major rule.

(f) DELAYED APPLICATION OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) APPLICATION AFTER FIRST STATEMENT.—The following requirements shall not apply to the first accounting statement submitted under this section:

(A) The requirement under subsection (a)(2) to include estimates with respect to program components.

(B) The requirement under subsection (b)(2).

(2) APPLICATION AFTER SECOND STATEMENT.—The requirement under subsection (b)(1) to include analyses of impacts on wages, consumer prices, and economic growth shall not apply to the first and second accounting statements submitted under this section.

SEC. 5. NOTICE AND COMMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Before submitting an accounting statement and the associated report to Congress under section 4, and before preparing final guidelines under section 6, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) provide public notice and an opportunity of at least 60 days for submission of comments on the statement and report or guidelines, respectively; and

(2) consult with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office on the statement and report or guidelines, respectively.

(b) APPENDIX.—After consideration of the comments, the Director shall include an appendix to the report or guidelines, respectively, addressing the public comments and peer review comments under section 7.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF PEER REVIEW COMMENTS.—To ensure openness, the Director shall make all final peer review comments available in their entirety to the public.

SEC. 6. GUIDELINES FROM THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Council of Economic Advisers, shall issue guidelines to agencies to standardize—

(1) most plausible measures of costs and benefits;

(2) the means of gathering information used to prepare accounting statements under this Act, including information required for impact analyses required under section 4(b)(1); and

(3) the format of information provided for accounting statements, including summary tables.

(b) REVIEW.—The Director shall review submissions from the agencies to ensure consistency with the guidelines under this section.

SEC. 7. PEER REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall arrange for 2 or more persons that have nationally recognized expertise in regulatory analysis and regulatory accounting and that are independent of and external to the Government, to provide peer review of each accounting statement and associated report under section 4 and the guidelines under section 6 before the statement, report, or guidelines are final.

(b) WRITTEN COMMENTS.—The peer review under this section shall provide written comments to the Director in a timely manner. The Director shall use the peer review comments in preparing the final statements, associated reports, and guidelines.

(c) FACA.—Peer review under this section shall not be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(d) BALANCE AND INDEPENDENCE.—The Director shall ensure that—

(1) the persons that provide peer review under subsection (a) are fairly balanced with respect to the points of view represented;

(2) no person that provides peer review under subsection (a) has a conflict of interest that is relevant to the functions to be performed in the review; and

(3) the comments provided by those persons—

(A) are not inappropriately influenced by any special interest; and

(B) are the result of independent judgment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. No amendment to that amendment shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Amendments printed in the RECORD may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENTS NO. 2, 3, AND 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCINTOSH

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer three amendments.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

Amendments No. 2, 3, and 4 offered By Mr. MCINTOSH:

Page 4, line 17, strike ''President'' and insert ''Director''.

Page 7, beginning at line 5, strike ''and economic growth'' and insert ''economic growth, public health, public safety, the environment, consumer protection, equal opportunity, and other public policy goals''.

At the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. . SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO CERTAIN FEDERAL BANKING AGENCIES AND MONETARY POLICY.

(a) TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY AND DUTIES OF DIRECTOR.—The head of each Federal banking agency (as that term is defined in section 3(z) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 181(z)) and the National Credit Union Administration, and not the Director, shall exercise all authority and carry out all duties otherwise vested under this Act in the Director with respect to that agency, other than the authority and duty to submit accounting statements and reports under section 4(a). The head of each such agency shall submit to the Director all estimates and other information required by this Act to be included in such statements and reports with respect to that agency.

(b) EXCLUSION OF MONETARY POLICY.—No provision of this Act shall apply to any matter relating to monetary policy that is proposed or promulgated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, let me describe these three technical amendments very briefly. We have discussed them with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) who unfortunately wanted to be here but was not able to be here when this bill was called up earlier today.

Amendment No. 2 strikes the word ''President'' and inserts the word ''Director'' which simply ensures the consistency in the use of terminology throughout the bill.

Amendment No. 3, inserting the words ''public health, public safety, the environment, consumer protection, equal opportunity, and other public policy goals,'' delays the effective date for some of the impact analyses which OMB is required to prepare under the bill. This amendment is being offered jointly by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and me or was to be offered jointly by us.

Amendment No. 4 responds to the concerns of the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman LEACH) and the Federal Reserve Board. The amendment's two provisions ensure that H.R. 1074 cannot mistakenly be construed as impinging on the independence of the Fed, or as interfering in any way with monetary policy set by the Open Market Committee.

I would submit that these amendments will perfect the bill and do not change any of the substance or policy of the bill.

As I understand it, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) has agreed to these, and there should not be any controversy to them.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to say that we have reviewed these amendments. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr.

KUCINICH), as the Ranking Democrat on the subcommittee, and our staff has looked them over, and we would support the en bloc amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HOEFFEL

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. HOEFFEL:

At the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. . INFORMATION REGARDING OFFSETTING SUBSIDIES.

In addition to the information required under section 4, the President shall include in each accounting statement under that section an analysis of the extent to which the costs imposed on incorporated entities by Federal regulatory programs are offset by subsidies given to those entities by the Federal Government, including subsidies in the form of grants, preferential loans, preferential tax treatment, federally funded research, or use of Federal facilities, assets, or public lands at less than market value. The analysis shall—

(1) identify such subsidies;

(2) analyze the costs and benefits of such subsidies; and

(3) be sufficiently specific to—

(A) account for the amounts of subsidies provided to the entities; and

(B) identify the entities that receive such subsidies.

SEC. . TAXPAYER PROTECTIONS.

(a) LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The aggregate amount expended by the Director and agencies each fiscal year to carry out this Act may not exceed $1,000,000.

(3) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any expenditure for any analysis or data generation that is required under any other law, regulation, or Executive Order and used to fulfill the requirements of this Act.

(b) SUNSET.—This Act shall have no force or effect after the expiration of the four-year-period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is designed to add to the Right-To-Know legislation in front of us a requirement that the Office of Management and Budget do a cost-benefit analysis of the corporate welfare benefits received by American companies when they do the cost-benefit analysis required by the bill on regulations written by the Federal Government.

The purpose for my amendment is to make sure that, when we give the public this information that the bill wants them to have, when we provide this right to know, not only to Congress, but to the American people, that we give them the full picture. The bill itself, as written, would not do that.

The proponents of the bill, I am sure in good faith, point out that the cost of Federal regulations is, in their estimation, high, and they want the public to know that. I understand that desire. But if we are going to go through this annual exercise of asking the Office of Management and Budget to conduct such a study of the impact of regulations on American businesses, let us make sure we know all the facts. We should have nothing to hide, Mr. Chairman.

If these businesses that are allegedly burdened with Federal regulations receive a Federal benefit through a tax advantage, a subsidy, a preference, let us have that on the table as well. If we want to find out the costs and benefit of Federal actions, let us include all these Federal actions, not just regulations, but the corporate welfare subsidies as well.

This amendment, the Hoeffel-Kucinich amendment is very much based upon the hard work done by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH). As a member of the committee, I want to compliment him for his work.

I want to compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member, for his work. I look forward to the debate here, to work with the distinguished members of the majority, to come to a legislative decision here that gives the public what we all want the public to have, the full picture.

□ 1615

My amendment would, first, include the cost of corporate welfare in the cost-benefit analysis that we are asking to be completed by the Office of Management and Budget. Secondly, the Hoeffel-Kucinich amendment would make sure that the cost of this annual study would be capped at $1 million.

Now, the CBO has estimated the cost of the underlying bill to be less than $500,0000 a year. So we have doubled that to put a cap of $1 million on the combined study to determine the cost of regulation and the cost of corporate welfare. That seems to me to be a rational but prudent cap to make sure that we do not have a cost overrun or a runaway study here that would cost more than any potential benefit to the public.

And, thirdly, my amendment would make sure that this entire bill will not become a perpetual drain on the Federal budget if it proves to be not as useful as the proponents hope by putting a 4-year sunset provision in the bill. If this bill is successful, we can always lift that sunset and keep these studies going on an annual basis, as long as we feel they are useful. But if these studies are not useful, then the 4-year sunset provision in my amendment would protect the taxpayers and make sure that this does not become a perpetual drain.

Mr. Chairman, we have defined corporate welfare as spending subsidies, tax preferences, below-market rate use of Federal assets, such as land for grazing or timbering or mining. These corporate welfare benefits have been estimated by Time Magazine to equal $125 billion a year. Every year, $125 billion, the equivalent, according to Time, of the paycheck for 2 weeks of every working American man and woman. That is a very high cost. And we would like to see what the benefit of that is, and we would like to have this $125 billion of estimated Federal benefit included in this study of Federal cost-benefit analysis.

Some who oppose this amendment say that it is designed to kill the bill. It is not. It is designed to make this bill whole, to make sure that we get the full picture. Without this amendment, the underlying bill does not give a full and complete picture of the impact of the Federal Government on American businesses and does not give a full picture of the benefit and cost of regulations or of corporate welfare.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Let me say in response to the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), about the Hoeffel-Kucinich-Waxman amendment, a couple of different points that I think are important for us to keep in mind.

First of all, the way the amendment is worded, ''burdens imposed on incorporated entities,'' it will sweep up into that group entities that I am not sure the gentleman had in mind when he was drafting the amendment but, nonetheless, would be included in the definition of incorporated entities. To the extent that public interest groups or not-for-profit groups are incorporated, they would also have the same analysis done on the benefits and subsidies that they receive in various Federal programs and would be required to disclose the amounts of those as a result of this report.

More fundamentally, this amendment is not related to the fundamental purpose of the bill in the sense that it opens up the entire bit of legislation to determine what type of benefits different entities in our society receive from government programs, specifically those that are incorporated in one of our various States. It is not limited to the offset on the amount of various regulations but is broad ranging.

And since every entity is affected by some legislation, it would essentially be a laundry list of all of that, subsidies as well as the effect on each of those individual players. That truly will bust the budget, if it is actually ever included in law and enacted, and, ultimately, does a great deal of damage to the core purpose of this bill by bogging it down in a direction that was not intended and, frankly, not beneficial in determining what are the impacts of Federal regulations on the private sector.

Now, I would have to say that the issue of corporate welfare is a longstanding and controversial issue which should be thoroughly debated by this House, but not in the context of a bill which we brought forward from this committee that is focusing on the regulatory burden since it goes much more, quite frankly, into spending and tax subsidies than it does to the regulatory impacts on those entities.

I would say that this Hoeffel-Waxman amendment ultimately ends up not being workable as an accounting amendment because it requires the government to do that by individual corporate entity. None of the analysis that we require currently in the bill is required by individual entity. It is, in its most detailed form, by individual rule, which has a broad application to many similar entities, but, in general, is in the aggregate of cross or different regulations and breaking down by business sectors and different functions.

So this would add a level of detail that, frankly, I am not sure anybody could come and say to us would in fact ever be workable if it were to be required.

Finally, the second part of the Waxman-Hoeffel amendment, the cap on a million dollar spending in order to require expensive new data collection and analysis are somewhat incompatible. This, I think, ends up being an amendment that is designed primarily to cripple the legislation, a gutting amendment, that would take away from the primary purpose of it; and I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hoeffel-Kucinich-Visclosky amendment, and this is called the Taxpayer Protection and Corporate Welfare Disclosure Amendment to H.R. 1074. Now, this amendment would protect the American taxpayer and streamline government by disclosing the cost and benefits of corporate welfare and placing common sense limits on the cost of this legislation to $1 million a year. It would also sunset the reporting requirements after 4 years, thus assuring that we do not continue to require this if it is not achieving its goals.

H.R. 1074 ignores the fact that each year the Federal Government provides billions of dollars in corporate welfare to regulated businesses. In fact, the conservative Cato Institute recently estimated that corporations receive over $75 billion annually from the Federal Government. Time Magazine puts this total at $125 billion. This amendment would require corporate welfare to be disclosed to the American public so that they can have a complete accounting of the costs and benefits imposed by the Federal Government.

For example, as currently worded, H.R. 1074 would require OMB to report on the cost to industry of clean air regulations promulgated under the Clean Air Act, but it would not include any of the $2 billion in Federal subsidies allocated to the coal industries through the Clean Coal Technology Program, which assists private companies in developing technologies which helps them comply with these regulations.

This amendment, on which I am pleased to have had the participation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), who has shown real leadership on this issue of challenging corporate welfare, this amendment would not only ensure that the public gets a more complete understanding of the actual cost of Federal regulations, it would also help the American public decide whether such subsidies to large profitable corporations are worthwhile.

As Ralph Nader recently testified at the House Committee on the Budget hearing, ''There is only one change that will counteract the entrenched interest which create, shield, and rationalize corporate welfare programs: an informed and mobilized citizenry.''

The amendment would also protect taxpayers by limiting the funds that could be spent on these analyses. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that implementing H.R. 1074 would cost less than $500,000 a year. According to the letter, this estimate ''assumes that the statement submitted under H.R. 1074 would be similar to those previously submitted by OMB, which have relied on existing information, such as the agency's analysis of new rules to estimate the aggregate costs and benefits of Federal regulations.''

Similar information also exists on corporate welfare, so we believe that doubling the estimate should provide plenty of funds for OMB to produce this report on both the costs and benefits of regulations and the costs of benefits of corporate welfare.

Finally, this amendment would sunset the bill after a reasonable time so Congress can evaluate if it makes sense to continue these analyses.

Mr. Chairman, this is a common sense amendment. It provides the American taxpayers with additional information about the costs and benefits of regulatory programs. It prevents us from spending unlimited amounts of money analyzing minor and noncontroversial regulations and does this without limiting cost-benefit analyses that are already required under other laws and executive orders.

It is an amendment that I would hope all budget conscious Members of Congress would support. Furthermore, I think that as this issue comes up in the future, we should be able to see a growing bipartisan support for measures which challenge corporate welfare. At a time when the American people are struggling to make ends meet, when many households are worried about Social Security, are worried about Medicare, we certainly should make sure that those who have the most benefits in this society also have to disclose to the American public just how much money is getting to them.

So I have been pleased to work with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) on the other side of the aisle in trying to craft the overall bill, though I am sorry we do not agree on the details; but I think this is one amendment that I hope we can find a way to come to some concurrence on.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, in drafting the amendment, does the gentleman know whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) or any of the other Members have considered the impact of identifying the individual corporation in terms of some of the protections of privacy under the Internal Revenue Code? Right now we have a fairly elaborate system in place where an individual taxpayer's information is not revealed when government analyzes different tax information.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if somebody is getting billions of dollars in subsidies from the Federal taxpayers, I personally do not believe they should be entitled to any commitment of privacy. The American people want to know where their money is going. However, I respect the import of the gentleman's question.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a couple of the points that the gentleman mentioned and also just mention that I would like to speak in favor of the Kucinich-Waxman-Hoeffel amendment. However, I am unable to speak in favor of this amendment because the two policies contained in this amendment, although in and of themselves are good policies, fine policies, but put together in one amendment they are actually self-defeating.

What I mean when I say that is this amendment is a contradiction because it will increase the cost of the study and then it will cap it. I understand that the gentleman has not certified whether the CBO has scored the cost of a new corporate welfare study, but not knowing the cost of a new corporate welfare study and then throwing on top a million dollar cap is self-defeating.

The amendment provides a convenient excuse for OMB to refuse to perform the analysis due to costs. Even if a study would normally not go over $1 million, as OMB has said, absent a corporate welfare study, the increased requirement of a corporate welfare analysis would provide an even stronger incentive for OMB to argue that it is impossible to remain within these caps.

Mr. Chairman, one additional point that I think is very worthwhile noting, as I was just reading the gentleman's amendment, and I would like to mention that I would love to work with the gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from California, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania on ridding corporate welfare from the Federal Government because I, too, believe we should not be subsidizing these types of business arrangements; but in reading the definitions contained in the amendment, it says ''incorporated entities.'' Well, incorporated entities could mean hundreds of thousands of small businesses, such as lawyers, doctors, dentists, and even municipalities.

So I think the way the amendment is drafted it is drafted in such a way that

it will give us precisely what the gentleman from California feared, and that was requiring OMB to do so many analyses that it will prevent them from doing their other priority work. It will require OMB to go down not just to the big corporate giants that are getting the advanced technology grants and the other corporate welfare grants that we, as a team, want to get rid of, but going to the dentists, going to the municipalities, going to the doctors.

The definition of incorporated entities is too vague, which gives OMB a chance to say this will cost too much, this will exceed $1 million. So by combining the laudatory goal of going after corporate welfare with the $1 million cap, the gentleman is essentially killing the bill.

□ 1630

They are essentially rendering this bill absolutely unworkable by saying OMB will not be able to do this, it is going to cost too much and, therefore, will have no cost-benefit analysis at all.

If the gentleman would be willing to work on a separate piece of legislation going after the issue of corporate welfare aside from this legislation, I think we could get a wonderful bipartisan team together and really advance this bill and clean up the definition of ''incorporated entities.''

If that would be the case, I think we would have a winner here. But, sadly, this amendment is nothing short of killing the bill. A vote for this amendment is a vote against the Right-to-Know Act. It is a vote against cost-benefit analysis.

So I urge a ''no'' vote on this and a ''yes'' vote on final passage.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, let me first say that the information we are seeking is surely in the computers of every agency that exists in the Federal Government.

We are really asking OMB to collect information, not to create an entirely new procedure here. So the cost of the corporate welfare study is surely within half a million dollars.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) what is the definition of ''incorporated entity'' and has he taken into consideration that incorporated entities could very well mean a dentist's office, a doctor's office, a municipality, a law firm, something like that?

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, an incorporated entity is just that, entities incorporated under Federal law.

The reality is that no matter who is included in that, again, the benefits, the tax breaks, the special subsidies, if they are going to an incorporated entity, that information is available to the Federal Government.

We have never asked anyone to collect it before. That is what this amendment would do. I tell the gentleman that I do have a corporate welfare commission bill that I hope he will cosponsor with me.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the problem that I see with this bill is that incorporated entities and requiring the OMB to study incorporated entities could go down the road of going in to seeing whether anything the Federal Government does benefits something as small as a doctor's office or a dentist's office could be considered corporate welfare.

We all know that the intent of this is to allow us to be better empowered to stop big, multimillion-dollar grants to very large corporations. But it is my fear that this amendment is not written that way.

On top of it, we do not know how much this is going to cost. And I know the gentleman is concerned about costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RYAN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, let me explore with the gentleman that point that he raised.

The gentleman thinks that the cost burden of preparing the analysis on corporate welfare would exceed the million-dollar total amount that we would limit for this whole exercise of the evaluations.

Now, we have a CBO estimate on the amount of the analysis cost for the regulatory side, and they say it is $500,000.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, a figure that the gentleman disputes.

Mr. WAXMAN. I do dispute it. But suppose we said, for that side of the ledger, we will go to a million dollars and then we would say for the analysis on the corporate welfare side we will not put a limit on it. Would that bring the gentleman to the point of supporting this amendment?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman were to remove the cap altogether, I personally would not have a problem. I would have to refer to my colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee.

But if the million-dollar cap were removed, I think that would go quite a ways farther in ensuring something like this. But I do think the definition ''incorporated entities'' does have to be cleaned up.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, on exactly that point, I think the amendment, frankly it needs to have hearings if we are going to think about it as serious legislation.

I heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) say he thought incorporated entities were those incorporated under Federal law. I have a suspicion he meant also under State law. Because there is only a handful of corporations incorporated under Federal law, whereas the vast bulk of private-sector corporate entities are incorporated under State laws.

That is a question we will have to explore and answer. And to identify each of those entities that receives a subsidy has some very important privacy concerns.

So I would be reluctant to concede that we could change the cost side and not address those serious problems on the first part of this amendment.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think what we have here is the basis for a working relationship for another vehicle to do some hearings in our committee to work on this issue together.

But at this time, with an amendment that is written in a very sketchy way that has so many open-ended definitions that does cap the ability of OMB to do this where this corporate welfare analysis is not scored by CBO, so we just do not have enough knowledge to know whether this falls within the cap or outside the cap. I think it is unworkable at this time.

I would like to add that this amendment is key voted as a ''no'' vote by the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

I think though, however, we have something we can work with. Hopefully, we can work together after passage of the final passage. I hope we defeat this amendment. But I would like to urge my colleagues that maybe we could get a relationship and work together on this in the committee. We have to tighten up the definition and do something that is good for our country.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I strongly support this amendment. The amendment has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY). It is called the Taxpayer Protection and Corporate Welfare Disclosure amendment.

I am honored that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) would call it the Waxman amendment, but it is not officially the Waxman amendment. I have not offered it. But I support it.

This amendment does two important things. First, it protects taxpayers. As written, this bill would require OMB to prepare a cost-benefit analysis of every regulation no matter how small or ministerial.

This makes no sense. We do not need analysis for the sake of analysis. We should target our analysis to those major or controversial rules that are in genuine dispute.

My concern is that the cost is going to run out of control. That is why this amendment would place a cap on the amount of taxpayer funds that can be spent on that analysis of $1 million, which is twice what CBO says should be spent on this bill.

Now, it is interesting how the other side has done a quick pivot. They said, oh, this bill is not going to cost much money. It is only $500,000, and it is well worth it. But then when we have challenged that figure and said, all right, we will accept double the amount of CBO, but we think it is going to cost more, let us at least be sure that we limit it, they come around and say, oh, no, no, no. We cannot limit it because it may cost more.

Well, one of my colleagues said, what is good for the goose is good for the gander. Either it is going to cost $500,000 or under a million or it is going to cost more. And if it is going to cost more, I think it is going to be wasteful.

I tried to pursue a minute ago with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) the idea that maybe we put the cap of a million dollars simply on the regulatory analysis and not on the corporate welfare side. But then the response was back that he did not want any cap at all.

Well, I want a cap for one reason. I want to protect the taxpayers from having their money wasted on analysis for no purpose.

This amendment is important to do now in this bill. We were told, let us work out another piece of legislation. Let us develop a relationship. We will talk about it in committee. We will talk about it after the bill passes.

Well, the leadership of our committee, which is controlled by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH), have not given us a hearing on this. Mr. MCINTOSH said, oh, we cannot do this. We have not had a hearing. They are not willing to call a hearing on this idea of corporate welfare. We have had no hearings on the issue.

We were told when we had the mandates bill, we said, well, if you are going to mandate and require a separate vote in the House before there is a mandate, let us do that when it comes to protection of the environment. We were told, well, that is something that should be in another piece of legislation.

This amendment belongs in this bill. It would add balance to the bill. The bill as written requires analysis of the costs of Federal programs to regulated entities. The amendment would require OMB to also look at the benefits of Federal programs to corporations through various types of what we would call corporate welfare.

Each year the Federal Government gives out billions in subsidies to successful businesses in the form of preferential tax treatment, subsidized loans, grants, and the use of Federal land, assets and facilities at below-market costs.

Many might think that a Congress that has worked so hard to take people off welfare might also try to force successful corporations off welfare as well. But just the opposite is true.

Let us understand what is going on here. Last week this House, on a partisan vote, passed H.R. 2488. I consider it an irresponsible tax bill that does nothing to ensure the long-term solvency of Medicare and Social Security.

What it does do is disproportionately provide its tax benefits to the wealthy, to corporations, to businesses, not to ordinary people who pay taxes.

This tax bill was passed largely on party lines. It contains almost a hundred billion dollars in new direct tax breaks to businesses.

Now, many might want to keep this information secret about these tax breaks. But I think the public has a right to know who we are giving our money to.

The Congressional Research Service has determined that there is not a comprehensive list of subsidized industries. We do not know where all the Federal tax breaks are going to businesses. We do not know where all the grants and the other indirect subsidies are going.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WAXMAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, we know if the Hoeffel-Kucinich-Visclosky amendment were adopted it would cure this problem by requiring each year the Office of Management and Budget to identify Federal subsidies and disclose the costs and benefits of these subsidies.

Mr. Chairman, if the intent of this bill is to provide more information to the American people about the relationship between regulated entities and the Federal Government, this amendment will very much help accomplish that goal. There is no reason the American people should not be informed about how their tax dollars are being used to subsidize corporations.

I have heard this argument, what if the person or entity getting a subsidy is an individual business, therefore, you are going to presumably invade their privacy or make it too difficult to understand where the money by way of corporate subsidies actually goes?

Well, that is a sham. These corporate entities can be stated in the aggregate. They are topics. It is not a doctor's office. It is how much doctors get. It is not a subsidy to one corporation. It can be corporations in a particular enterprise. And in that way we will know how much of a benefit is being placed on these corporations when we ask them to clean up the environment and protect public health, when we ask them to come in and make sure their drugs are safe and effective and to get approved by the FDA.

We also ought to know, on the other hand, whether we give them subsidies that help them deal with that burden, as we do so often to corporations that take advantage of special tax breaks and special grants and special preferential treatments in the use of Federal assets.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 258, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) will be postponed.

Mr. MCINTOSH. 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. RYAN of Wisconsin) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, 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. 1074) to provide Governmentwide accounting of regulatory costs and benefits, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1801

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin) at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

REGULATORY RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 258 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1074.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1074) to provide Governmentwide accounting of regulatory costs and benefits, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, a demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman

from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HOEFFEL

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) on which further proceedings were postponed, and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 217, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

AYES—192

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Fattah
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Traficant
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—217

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clement
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cramer
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Fowler
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kelly
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sandlin
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Blagojevich
Cannon
Chenoweth
Coburn
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Dixon
Ehrlich
Farr
Fossella
Ganske
Gordon
Granger
Hunter
Johnson, E. B.
Martinez
McCollum
McDermott
Murtha
Oberstar
Peterson (PA)
Pryce (OH)
Taylor (NC)

□ 1825

Mr. BOYD changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. ESHOO changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 335, I was unable to get here to vote due to inclement weather in the metro New York City area. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, 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. 1074) to provide Governmentwide accounting of regulatory costs and benefits, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 258, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 254, noes 157, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

AYES—254

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling

Goss
Graham
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Manzullo
McCarthy (MO)
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—157

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilbray
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jones (OH)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Phelps
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—22

Blagojevich
Chenoweth
Coburn
Crane
Cubin
Dixon
Ehrlich
Farr
Fossella
Ganske
Gordon
Granger
Hunter
Johnson, E. B.
Martinez
McCollum
McDermott
Murtha
Oberstar
Peterson (PA)
Pryce (OH)
Taylor (NC)

□ 1843

Mr. STUPAK changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 336, I was unable to get to vote due to inclement weather in the metro New York City area. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes''.

Stated against:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall numbers 335 and 336, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no'' on each rollcall vote.

□ 1845

REPORT ON PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS IN BOSNIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106–104)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 7 of Public Law 105–174, the 1998 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act, I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on progress made toward achieving benchmarks for a sustainable peace process.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 23, 1999.*

REPORTS ON NATIONAL TRAFFIC AND MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY ACT OF 1966, HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT AND MOTOR VEHICLE INFORMATION AND COST SAVINGS ACT OF 1972—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1996 calendar year reports as prepared by the Department of Transportation on activities under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, the Highway Safety Act, and the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act of 1972, as amended.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 26, 1999.*

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2587, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–263) on the resolution (H. Res. 260) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2587) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2605, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–264) on the resolution (H. Res. 261) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2605) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

FAIRNESS FOR VETERANS

(Mr. FILNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, colleagues I rise today in support of the action taken earlier today by Vice President AL GORE on behalf of our Nation's veterans. The Vice President has announced that the administration will seek an additional $1 billion fully paid for to ensure our Nation can continue to provide quality and timely health care for our veterans.

America's veterans and many Members of Congress have been speaking out loudly in the past months for an increase in the veterans budget for fiscal year 2000. I am pleased and proud that the administration has heard our call.

The Vice President's action is a vital step toward keeping the promise that was made to our veterans when they

joined the Armed Forces and made their promise to serve their country. We will begin to meet the long-term care needs of our aging veterans. We will begin to lower the waiting times for our medical appointments that veterans have to endure now.

Mr. Speaker, after years of flat line budgets, this action is sorely needed. I salute this move taken by the Vice President this morning.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

HARD TIMES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I spoke on this House floor about the crisis facing farmers and ranchers. This evening, I continue my efforts to inform my colleagues about the seriousness of the issues and the need to act now.

Last week, I introduced with some of my colleagues legislation that takes an important step to help producers make it through this period of extremely low prices. I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2568, the Market Loss Assistance Act of 1999. This straightforward bill provides producers an immediate shot in the arm. Under this bill, producers would receive an additional payment equal to 75 percent of their current farm payment. While this is only one part of a solution to help producers, it is an important part, and it provides immediate assistance. We need to assure our farmers that relief is on its way. Let us begin the debate on disaster assistance now.

Part of the problem is the loss of exports. In 1996, agricultural exports hit a record of $59.9 billion, and since then, agricultural exports have fallen substantially. This year, exports are predicted to be $49 billion for a loss of over 18 percent since 1996, just 3 years ago.

Not surprisingly, as exports have fallen, so has net farm income. Since 1996, net farm income has fallen to $45 billion, a decline of 15 percent. That $45 billion net farm income now stands at the same level as a decade ago. Does anyone think the cost of fertilizer, land payments, equipment, and other farm inputs have remained the same price for the last decade? Of course not.

In the world of agricultural export promotion we have lost the battle on behalf of farmers, and if the current trend continues, we may soon lose the war.

This chart paints a very clear picture on where the United States is on its commitment to helping American farmers and ranchers compete around the world. About $8.45 billion is spent each year on agricultural subsidies. Of this, the United States represents $122 million or roughly only 1.4 percent.

We repeatedly tell our farmers and ranchers to produce for the world and compete for world markets. When your principle export competitor is the European community, the battle for market share under these conditions does not take long. In 1996, the EU spent 69 times more than we spent for export assistance. We cannot let this go on.

Out of this pie, 83.5 percent of the export assistance programs are spent by the European community. Ours are 2.5 percent.

When I first arrived in Congress, the Department of Agriculture indicated that we could not use export promotion funding because prices were too high and that shipping our U.S. farm products overseas might make them even more expensive. Now I am told we cannot use export funds because it would drive the prices even lower; a story I find particularly hard to believe in light of tight storage situation and low farm prices already well under the loan rate.

If the bitter medicine of low prices must be taken, I would recommend we aggressively work through this period and move U.S. agricultural products. Our farmers are locked in a battle competing for international markets. We cannot continue to abandon them. We must use our export programs forcefully, and we must act now.

Mr. Speaker, farmers are willing to compete in the global marketplace, but they cannot compete with foreign treasuries. I urge all my colleagues to join in the fight for the American farmer. We need short term disaster assistance; and for the long run, we need agricultural exports.

PROTECT OUR GREAT LAKES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, last October you and our colleagues gave unanimous consent to my House Resolution which called on the President and the other Body to act to prevent the sale or diversion of Great Lakes water to foreign countries, businesses, corporations, and individuals. The House of Representatives, speaking with one voice, asked that procedures be established to guarantee that any sale or diversion be fully negotiated and approved by representatives of the United States Government and the Government of Canada in consultation with effective States and provinces.

I want to remind our colleagues of that House action, Mr. Speaker, because there is another threat to the Great Lakes, one posed by drilling for gas and oil in and under the waters of this great natural resource.

Mr. Speaker, we are not being alarmists. Water diversion and drilling for gas and oil are real threats to one of the world's most valuable resources.

Consider, Mr. Speaker, these facts. As I list each item, I want you to think about each of these facts in terms of potential impact on our Great Lakes.

Seventy percent of the Earth's surface is covered by water; 97.5 percent of that water is sea water. Only 2.5 percent of the surface water is fresh water. The Great Lakes contains 6 quadrillion gallons of fresh water, one-fifth of the Earth's fresh water resources.

The Great Lakes are home to 40 million people. One-quarter of Canada's population lives in the Great Lakes basin.

The World Bank predicts that by about the year 2025 more than 3 billion people in 52 countries will suffer water shortages for drinking or sanitation. More than 300 cities in China are currently experiencing water shortages, and more than 100 are deemed to be in condition of acute water scarcity. The global demand for water is doubling every 21 years.

Citizens of the United States and Canada use and consume more than 100 gallons per day per person. Eighty percent of the fresh water used goes to agricultural production.

I thank the Buffalo News for many of those facts, Mr. Speaker. I present them as random facts because like pieces of a puzzle they must be analyzed and arranged to see their importance.

The World Bank has studied this puzzle, and I call your attention to a quote from a World Bank report which appeared in the Buffalo News in a March 1999 story. The World Bank report predicted wars of the next century will be fought over fresh water.

So are we really being alarmists? I believe not.

A company in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, just one company, was given a permit last year to take up the 2.6 million gallons of water per day for 5 years from Lake Superior. I was joined by members of the Ontario parliament and the Canadian New Democratic Party in bringing public attention to this permit which was revoked by the Ontario government, but all fresh water will increasingly be eyed as a potential commodity.

A Vancouver-based company, Global Water Corporation, has an agreement with an Alaskan community of Sitka to take fresh water from a lake and ship it by tanker to China. The deal allows Global to take up to 5 billion gallons a year for 30 years. Global envisions 445 tankers per year carrying fresh water to Asia.

Now we have spoken of just two companies. We know the market is there. We can easily see the overhead is minimal, the market is expanding and the potential number of speculators and potential shippers is unlimited.

Let me say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that although I have mentioned China twice in my remarks, I am not attempting to invoke it as threat to our own security. China is merely a customer in need of fresh water now. The

entire world will be eying our natural resource.

As of today, the issue of sale and diversion of Great Lakes water and fresh water throughout this country remains unsolved. Following the House vote on my resolution, the U.S. and Canada have asked the International Joint Commission to study the issue on water diversion along the entire border from Alaska to the St. Lawrence River to Maine. Their preliminary report on diversion should be ready in August.

A final report on our joint water resources should be completed early next year. Until all questions on the sale or diversion of fresh water are answered, I have introduced legislation which would place a moratorium on any sale or diversion of fresh water in this country until we have these questions answered.

In the meantime, there is another threat to the Great Lakes as it is the policy of my home State of Michigan to allow drilling for gas and oil underneath the Great Lakes. Canada allows gas rigs drilling directly into Lake Ontario now. Proponents of oil drilling in the Great Lakes say the risk is minimal, small, tiny. I say tiny is too big. A gallon of oil spilled in Lake Superior would take 999 years to flow out, to be cleared by natural flow. Lake Michigan, 99 years; Lake Huron, 60 years.

Fresh water is a precious, scarce resource that needs our protection from exploitation of oil and gas companies and by sale and diversion of water.

□ 1900

IN THE SPIRIT OF THE ADA, WE MUST PASS H.R. 1180

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago today, President Bush signed the Americans with Disabilities Act into law. Since my election to the House later that same year and as a Minnesota State Senator from 1981 to 1990, I have worked hard to help people with disabilities live up to their full potential. That is why I, like many Members of this Chamber, strongly support the Americans with Disabilities Act, and we celebrate its enactment. But, Mr. Speaker, much more work needs to be done.

In signing the ADA, President Bush noted the law is designed ''to ensure that people with disabilities are given the basic guarantees for which they have worked so long and so hard: independence, freedom of choice, control of their lives, the opportunity to blend fully and equally into the rich mosaic of the American mainstream.''

As we celebrate the anniversary of this historic legislation, we reflect on all that has been achieved for people with disabilities. We must also, however, address where we have failed to empower people with disabilities.

In 1990, President Bush, in signing that historic act, reminded us that many of our fellow citizens with disabilities are unemployed. They want to work, and they can work. This is a tremendous pool of people who will bring to jobs diversity, loyalty, low turnover rate, and only one request: the chance to prove themselves.

Mr. Speaker, despite the remarkably low unemployment rate in America today, people with disabilities are still asking for this chance to prove themselves in the workplace. A recent Harris poll found that unemployment among people with disabilities is between 70 and 75 percent. Think of that: 70 to 75 percent, or three-quarters of people with disabilities are unemployed in America today. Historically, fewer than 1 percent of people with disabilities leave the SSI and SSDI rolls following successful rehabilitation. Individuals with disabilities have insufficient access to and choice of services they need to become employed. Most SSI and SSDI beneficiaries are never even offered rehabilitation services.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the ADA sought to improve this situation. But the ADA did not remove all the barriers within the current Federal programs that prohibit people with disabilities from working. It is time to eliminate work disincentives for people with disabilities. Eliminating work disincentives for people with disabilities is not just humane public policy, it is sound fiscal policy. It is not just the right thing to do, it is also the cost-effective thing to do.

President Bush knew that discouraging people with disabilities from working, from earning a regular paycheck, paying taxes and moving off public assistance actually results in reduced Federal revenues. He noted, and I am quoting again: ''When you add together the Federal, State, local and private funds, it costs almost $200 billion annually to support Americans with disabilities. In effect, to keep them dependent.'' And that was in 1990, Mr. Speaker. We certainly spend more than that today to keep people with disabilities dependent on the system.

Like everyone else, people with disabilities have to make decisions based on financial reality. Should they consider returning to work, or even making it through vocational rehabilitation, the risk of losing vital Federal health benefits often becomes too threatening to future financial stability. As a result, Mr. Speaker, they are compelled not to work.

Given the sorry state of present law, that is generally a reasonable and a rational decision for people with disabilities. The National Council on Disabilities said it best in its report to the 105th Congress on removing barriers to work when it wrote: ''Social Security programs can be transformed from a lifelong entitlement into an investment in employment potential for thousands of individuals.'' Transforming these Federal programs to springboards into the work force is a goal of legislation that I cosponsored in the House with the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) and many others on both sides of the aisle, the Work Incentives Improvement Act, or H.R. 1180. This critical legislation has been passed by the Committee on Commerce and a similar bill has been approved by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, preventing people from working runs counter to the American spirit, one that thrives on individual achievements and the larger contributions to society that result. We must not rest until we pass the Work Incentives Improvement Act. People with disabilities deserve the opportunity to fulfill their dreams. Let us give them the chance to prove themselves now.

RECOGNIZE THE KASHMIRI PANDITS AS A MINORITY GROUP UNDER INDIAN LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, although the world welcomes the apparent withdrawal this month of Pakistani forces from India's side of the line of control in Kashmir, we are continually reminded of the dangerous situation that still exists in that mountainous region.

Last Wednesday's New York Times reported that 20 Hindus were killed in 3 incidents before dawn last Tuesday in what the newspaper suggested could be a stepped-up campaign of hit-and-run tactics by Muslim insurgents in remote areas of the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir. I am sad to have to report that these kinds of attacks are nothing new, Mr. Speaker.

The worst of these attacks in the village of Lihota left 15 dead. Last week's violence was the fourth mass killing in Kashmir in just 3 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, this spring, when Islamic militants had been infiltrating India's territory with the support of, and active collaboration with, Pakistan, the world took notice. The fact that India and Pakistan are both nuclear powers stirred up fears of a wider war. When it became apparent even to Pakistan's ruler that their gambit in Kashmir was both a military and a propaganda disaster, the Pakistani Government reverted to its traditional ploy by trying to internationalize the conflict by bringing in the United States as a mediator, an effort that our administration has wisely resisted.

However, Mr. Speaker, the prospect of an India-Pakistan war obscures the ongoing violence that has destroyed the life of this entire region. While people of all faiths have suffered, the Hindu community of Kashmir has been particularly severe. The Pandits have suffered as individuals, singled out for violence, and as a community, forced to leave their ancestral homes and way of life, turned into refugees in their own country.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the ongoing unique suffering of the Kashmiri Pandits, I am urging the Indian government to recognize the Kashmir Pandit community as a minority under Indian law to provide additional benefits and protection. While Hindus are the majority religion in India as whole, they are a minority, and indeed, a persecuted minority in Jammu and Kashmir.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the chairman of the National Minority Commission has proposed that Hindu minorities in various Indian states be officially classified as minorities. The chairman's recommendation is pending before the government. Although such a designation would usually require an amendment to be passed by the parliament, the Lok Sabha, the lower House of the Indian Parliament, there may be occasions where the commission can unilaterally act.

While the details of such an action are obviously an internal matter for India's government, I soon will be circulating a letter to India's Prime Minister Vajpayee, which I hope my colleagues in Congress will join me in signing, urging that the appropriate steps be taken to provide the Pandits with the minority designation.

Mr. Speaker, the militants, with Pakistan's backing, have transformed a peaceful, secular state in India, one which happens to have a predominantly Muslim population, into a killing field. The militants make no secret of their desire to drive the Pandits out of Kashmir and do not think twice about killing as many of them as possible. And under such a severe, violent threat to their very existence, I believe that the designation of minority status is an urgent priority and respectfully urge the Indian Government to make this designation.

While I understand the enormity of the challenge, I urge Prime Minister Vajpayee and his government to create an environment in which the Pandit community can return to their homeland in the Kashmir Valley in the future. I also urge that the government of India raise the ongoing genocide of the Kashmiri Pandit community in bilateral talks with Pakistan.

I have the highest regard for Prime Minister Vajpayee, both personally and in his capacity as the elected leader of the world's largest democracy. I know he also grieves over the victimization of the Kashmiri Pandit community, and I hope to work closely with the Indian Government with the support of the Kashmiri-American community in resolving this humanitarian crisis.

SECURITY AT OUR NATIONAL LABS—WE MUST ALL BE CONCERNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week I came to the floor to talk about Chinese espionage, something that seems to be missing in media coverage. A couple of weeks ago, an interview on The O'Reilly Factor caught my attention. Bill O'Reilly spoke with Lieutenant Colonel Edward McCallum, the director of Security and Safeguards for the Department of Energy. After 9 years serving in this position, Colonel McCallum has been placed on administrative leave and his job has been threatened.

Mr. Speaker, Colonel McCallum has a long and distinguished military career. The colonel is an individual who takes his job as a defender of our Nation and our constitutional rights seriously. Colonel McCallum has dedicated his life to protecting the citizens and the critical national security interests of America; and now, he is being punished because he came forward with facts surrounding espionage at our research and weapons laboratories.

Mr. Speaker, when President Clinton appointed Hazel O'Leary Energy Secretary, a dangerously casual attitude invaded the Department of Energy. Colonel McCallum has said that as security was relaxed and even cut, he and members of his staff repeatedly contacted Secretary O'Leary's office urging her to take measures to protect our sensitive technology. Unfortunately, their efforts were ignored. This destructive management style began with Secretary O'Leary, but similar efforts to urge Secretary Bill Richardson to protect the security of our weapons laboratories has been stonewalled.

Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough to think that our national security has been compromised. Now the same government that fails to recognize the gravity of stolen national security secrets is penalizing individuals like Colonel McCallum who fought and continued fighting for the safety and protection of our Nation. This is outrageous and completely unacceptable. It was Colonel McCallum's responsibility as the director of Security and Safeguards to make the Department aware of how to better protect U.S. technology; and yet, when he and Members of his staff tried to bring attention to the issue and make changes, nobody listened, or worse, chose to ignore his warnings.

This begs the question: What else could have been stolen and who else could have gained access to this information? What new information is now available to other nations that threaten each and every citizen, and why are we not more concerned?

Mr. Speaker, the safety and protection of our national security is an issue of critical national importance. We must commend, not penalize, men and women like Colonel McCallum whose dedication and commitment to this country is so strong that they would risk losing their jobs and their livelihood to protect America.

We know this administration is responsible for compromising our national security. At the very least, that is unforgivable. In administrations of greater accountability, these acts would have been labeled treasonous. Instead, they would like to quiet Colonel McCallum and bury this messy espionage issue.

This is an issue with serious consequences for each of us. When our national security is compromised, so too is the safety of each and every American. Unfortunately, this concern is lost on many Americans. The advances gained by other nations make all Americans more vulnerable. As such, we should all be concerned; we all must be concerned.

Mr. Speaker, last week I had the opportunity to appear on The O'Reilly Factor to talk about Chinese espionage and Colonel McCallum's quest for the truth. As Mr. O'Reilly and I discussed, something must be done for the colonel and the American people who rely on the government to protect and defend them and their way of life. Like all Americans, Colonel McCallum deserves protection. While the administration is threatening his job simply for telling the truth, they threaten security and safety of us all.

Mr. Speaker, it has become clear that the President and the administration are not committed to our national security, nor are they committed to the individuals who dedicate their lives to protecting it. Therefore, my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and I joined together to send a letter to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, asking the colonel to testify before the committee about this grave matter. With help from Fox News and Bill O'Reilly, we have aggressively followed and reported on this subject.

We can continue informing the American people how this administration has compromised our national security. Since my appearance last week, Mr. O'Reilly and I have heard from scores of average citizens from across our Nation. Each e-mail, letter or phone agreed on two basic points: first, to protect this country, we must act to address past occurrences of espionage while ensuring that it does not happen in the future; second, we must protect patriots like Colonel Ed McCallum who continues fighting to protect our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the citizens who contacted my office: the security of our Nation is precious.

□ 1915

IT'S TIME TO DECIDE OUR NATIONAL PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last week we saw the budget allocation for the Departments of Labor, Health and

Human Services, and Education cut by an additional $1 billion, making for a potential $12 billion shortfall in these programs. We saw that same Committee on Appropriations bring to the House floor the FY 2000 defense bill as a level $10 billion above the 1997 budget agreement cap for defense, and $5.7 billion above the Administration's request, a request that was already $1 billion greater than the FY 1999 allocation.

We saw the Republican majority approve a GOP tax bill, mainly for the very wealthy, which would reduce Federal revenues somewhere in the neighborhood of $800 billion over the next 10 years, and nearly $3 trillion in the following decade.

What is wrong with this picture? What is wrong is what is missing, funding for our children: for their education, their health and well-being; funding for our seniors: their security, their medicine, and their basic needs; funding for our communities: for their economic development and safety, the protection of open space, safe drinking water, clean air, and the recovery of polluted land.

In a time of unprecedented economic prosperity, I believe we have a unique opportunity to face the issues and solve the problems that have been holding individuals and communities back for decades. We have the resources, if managed carefully, to increase Federal grant assistance for higher education; rebuild our public schools; protect and preserve our national resources; attack poverty and homelessness; clean up contaminated urban sites; invest in environmental, medical, and other technologies; establish early childhood development programs for all our children, and ensure that the health of our children and our seniors is safeguarded for a generation. All we need is the political will to make these choices our national priorities.

In 1997, Congress approved one of the largest tax cuts in the history of our country. We do not need over $100 billion in new tax breaks for corporations and new favors for the wealthiest Americans when our schools and our communities and infrastructure need significant repair and modernization.

We do not need $4 billion to $5 billion worth of pork barrel projects in the defense bill, projects the Pentagon did not ask for and does not want, year after year after year, when that money could reduce classroom size in grades K through 3.

Do not tell me the money is not there. President Clinton presented a budget for the Pentagon that was $1 billion more than last year's level, increases that will continue annually over the next 6 years. The defense bill approved by the House last week is $5.7 billion more than even the President's request.

By contrast, according to the Children's Defense Fund, to provide health insurance for every uninsured child in the United States would cost $11 billion.

Do not tell me the money is not there. Last week the Republican majority said we can eliminate the estate tax for the 300 largest, wealthiest estates in America, but we cannot provide seniors with the prescription drug benefit. This Congress is deciding the Nation's future, the fate of its children, its seniors, its communities, its farms, without a serious debate on the critical needs and priorities of our Nation.

If the defense budget over the next 5 years includes just the increases requested by President Clinton and the GOP tax bill is implemented, then all other discretionary spending will have to be cut by nearly 40 percent. That is a 40 percent cut in education, in veterans programs, in Head Start, in disaster relief, in urban development, in immunizations for infants and toddlers.

The current budget caps are intolerable if we are to address the current needs of our communities. Is this Congress really prepared to implement a fiscal program that will require an additional 40 percent reduction in all non-defense programs? Does the majority really want this to be the anti-education, anti-children, anti-seniors, anti-veterans Congress, or is it trying to return us to the days of big deficits?

We can do better and we must do better. We are elected to do better. I firmly believe we can have a strong and modern defense second to none without the increases being suggested, but it will require a significant reordering of priorities within the Armed Forces. It will require greater accountability on the part of the Pentagon for the funds it receives. It will require our allies to pay their fair share for global defense. It will also demand restraint and responsibility on the part of all Members of Congress not to load up the defense budget with unneeded and unasked for weapons, equipment, and facilities.

I believe we should provide responsible tax relief to help the most vulnerable in our society become more productive and financially secure, to eliminate the major penalty, to modernize our schools, and enhance our ability to research and develop the technology machinery of the next century.

We have an historic opportunity to address longstanding needs and bring every American into a more prosperous future. I hope we will do that, and not squander this moment with irresponsible spending and reckless tax cuts like the one the Republican majority approved last week.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following material relating to the budget.

The material referred to is as follows:

SUMMARY: ''WHY A COLD WAR BUDGET WITHOUT A COLD WAR?''

Dr. Lawrence Korb, the former Assistant Secretary of Defense under Ronald Reagan, has outlined an alternative Pentagon budget that would reduce spending by more than 17% per year ($48 billion). Dr. Korb's study was sponsored by Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities (BLSP), a coalition of business people and military officials who are currently advocating a 15% reduction in the Pentagon budget. They believe this money can be reinvested in programs that build American communities, such as school modernization, class-size reductions, healthcare and other local and state programs. Dr. Korb calls the present Clinton Administration plan ''A Cold War Budget without a Cold War'' and argues for restructured spending that strengthens the U.S. military in a manner reflective of the drastically changed world order.

INVESTMENT

Dr. Korb's $75 billion annual modernization proposal (20% less than the present $94 billion investment budget) would replace aging equipment and increase our technological edge. Dr. Korb's plan would actually modernize U.S. forces ''more rapidly at a lower cost'' than the current investment strategy. The Pentagon could achieve this by buying less expensive weapons that would still be the most powerful in any battle, rather than building the next generation of unproven weapons at three times the price. ''Rushing new generations of weapons systems into production,'' Dr. Korb reports, ''is an antiquated Cold Ware practice that continues to cost taxpayers billions.''

NUCLEAR CAPABILITY

The Korb report calls the $30 billion spent annually on strategic nuclear forces a remnant of the former U.S./Soviet practice of mutual assured destruction. Dr. Korb urges the U.S. cut the number of strategic nuclear weapons from its present level of 7,500 to a number no greater than 1,000 a quantity large enough to destroy any possible targets but small enough to be maintained at $15 billion per year (half the present rate).

READINESS

Dr. Korb details a readiness package costing no more than $145 billion per year, $21 billion less than present spending ($166 billion). Dr. Korb's plan would maintain forces capable of winning a major theater war and conduct a significant peacekeeping mission, while maintaining a presence in the other key areas around the globe. Dr. Korb finds that the Pentagon currently overspends in force deployment. He maintains, for example, that stationing 100,000 U.S. troops in Europe is excessive and that 50,000 troops would constitute an effective presence in Europe (which can afford to do more to protect its own interests).

CONCLUSION

Dr. Korb's report stresses the importance of making a Pentagon budget responsive to the reality of the post Cold War world. No longer should the U.S. Government overspend to ensure security or compete in an arms race with the Soviet Union. As the only remaining superpower, it is time for us to adjust spending to reflect that place of privilege and responsibility. Dr. Korb's realistic budget proposals set an important standard for fiscal responsibility. Pentagon officials were immune to financial constraints during the Cold War era, and the recent reviews they have conducted have been, Dr. Korb tells us, ''nothing more than a rationalization for the existing force structure.'' Business Leaders believes that it is now time for the Pentagon to follow Dr. Korb's lead and become accountable for spending taxpayers' assets.

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1999]

BUSINESS GETS BIG BREAKS IN TAX BILLS

(By Dan Morgan)

After years of tight budgets and a Congress focused on cutting the deficit, business this

week cashed in on the new economic climate to win billions of dollars in breaks tucked into the tax bill that passed the House and another working its way through the Senate.

Capitalizing on the new era of government surpluses are multinational corporations, utility companies, railroads, oil and gas operators, timber companies, the steel industry and small business owners.

Along with the breaks for those behemoths, smaller provisions sprinkled through the bills will give tax relief to seaplane owners in Alaska, sawmills in Maine, barge lines in Mississippi and investor Warren Buffett. Other provisions assist Eskimo whaling captains on Alaska's North Slope and Carolina woodlot owners.

The House version contains almost $100 billion in direct tax breaks for business over the next decade—and dozens more provisions that will benefit various industries indirectly. The Senate Finance Committee reported out a different and less generous measure giving business about $50 billion in direct tax relief.

While special provisions in tax and budget bills are a staple of life in Washington, the difference this time is that, with a projected $3 trillion budget surplus over the next decade, the lawmakers enjoyed far more flexibility to gratify lobbyists' wishes.

''If you're a business lobbyist and couldn't get into this legislation, you better turn in your six-shooter,'' said a Democratic lobbyist. ''There was that much money around.''

The Republican tax plans, which would cut nearly $800 billion in taxes over the next 10 years, face a long and uncertain road, and are sure to be sharply scaled down before President Clinton will agree to sign them.

Still, the sections providing tax relief for corporations make clear that business intends to use its political muscle to claim its share of the surplus.

Republican leaders strongly defended the tax concessions, saying they are needed to strengthen the competitiveness of U.S. global business, help distressed industries such as steel and oil, and encourage mergers that make the economy more efficient. And they noted that the bulk of tax cuts in the bill go to benefit families.

But some critics—even within the GOP—said the largess to special interests repudiates the party's pledge to eliminate ''corporate welfare.''

''Republicans promised to change this kind of behavior,'' said Sen. John McCain (R–Ariz.), an opponent of ''pork barrel'' spending. ''But I think it's fairly obvious that hasn't been the case. Now we're going to see this big thick tax code on our desks, and the fine print will reveal another cornucopia for the special interests, and a chamber of horrors for the taxpayers.''

Tax concessions to the oil and gas industry, as well as nuclear utilities, have also drawn some early fire from environmental and consumer groups.

''At a time when we should be curbing smog and global warming, these bills are going to give billions of dollars in tax breaks to the companies responsible for these problems,'' said Anna Aurelio, staff scientist at U.S. Public Interest Research Group.

Budget analysts cited a single, sizable item to illustrate how the new budgetary climate has opened up possibilities for corporations.

Since the mid-1980s, multinational corporations have attempted to secure changes in the tax code that would allow them to allocate their worldwide interest deductions in such a way as to generate additional foreign tax credits—and thereby trim their tax bills. The U.S. Treasury has been largely supportive. But according to a lobbyist for a major international bank, ''Nobody thought it could get done because it would cost so much money.''

This year, both House and Senate bills include the tax relief. The House proposal would cost $34 billion in lost revenue to the government over the next 10 years, and the slightly more modest Senate version would cost $14 billion.

''For so many years Congress was totally focused on raising revenues,'' said Douglas P. Bates, chief lobbyist for the American Council of Life Insurance. ''These were really the first tax bills in a long time where the revenue offsets [the need to find money to make up for cuts elsewhere] weren't driving the issues.''

Bates experienced that first-hand. He spent much of the week dispatching a series of e-mail messages to the organization's 500 members, alerting them to beneficial provisions that were added to the bills as they moved through the Senate Finance Committee and the House.

When the dust settled, the full House and Senate committee had approved a series of provisions that had long been on the group's wish list, including deductibility for long-term care insurance and changes in rules governing corporate pension plans. ACLI officials said the changes should create new business for life insurance companies that manage corporate pension plans or offer long-term care coverage.

After years of trying, ACLI also scored a major victory when it got the House to support repeal of a tax provision that delays the ability of life insurance companies to file consolidated returns, or write off losses of newly acquired affiliates against their own profits. The 10-year savings to the industry from that provision alone would be $949 million, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation.

ACLI Chairman Carroll A. Campbell Jr., a former member of the House Ways and Means Committee, met with committee Chairman Bill Archer (R-Tex.) to press for the change, sources said.

The change is deemed crucial to a wave of insurance company mergers, including the recent one between Provident Insurance Co., of Chattanooga, in the home state of Sen. Fred D. Thompson (R), and UNUM Corp., of Portland, Maine. Thompson, a member of the Senate Finance Committee, persuaded committee Chairman William V. Roth Jr. (R-Del.) to add part of the House provision to his tax draft hours before it was brought before the committee.

ACLI also joined with a coalition of banks and securities firms to get both the full House and Senate Finance Committee to extend for five years a temporary tax deferral on income those industries earn abroad.

The companies, working under the umbrella of the Coalition of Service Industries, will save some $5 billion in taxes over 10 years as a result of the provision, according to congressional calculations.

As uncertain as the prospects for the across-the-board tax cuts for families are, the tax relief for business seems likely to create its own pressure on Clinton and Congress to agree on legislation. And with tens of millions of dollars in campaign contributions at stake, neither party can afford to ignore business's drive for extensive tax relief this year.

''Business doesn't want a repeat of last year when there was no tax bill, just a bunch of extenders [of provisions about to expire.] It would be nice if this wasn't just a political exercise. There's enough money that I think they can work this out,'' said John Porter, an Ernst & Young tax expert.

An example of the huge stakes is the more than $1 billion that the utility industry stands to save in taxes over the next 10 years if a House provision affecting utility mergers survives.

The provision, sponsored by Rep. Gerald ''Jerry'' Weller (R-Ill.) a Ways and Means Committee member, would excuse the payment of taxes on the fund that utilities set up to cover the costs of shutting down nuclear power plants.

Weller, who has three nuclear facilities in his district, said the tax provision is crucial to the restructuring underway in the utility industry as the nation moves to a deregulated electricity market. One immediate effect would be to hasten the merger of Decatur, Ill.-based Illinova Corp. and Dynegy Inc., a Houston natural gas company.

The issue, Weller said, was important to the entire Illinois delegation, including House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert (R), though he added he has not spoken to Hastert about the matter.

But some consumer groups are wary. ''The nuclear industry has already been getting a ratepayer-funded bailout in state electricity reorganization plans. Now they're going for federal tax breaks too,'' said U.S. Public Interest Research Group's Aurelio.

Several environmental groups this week said they were still studying provisions in both the House and Senate versions of the bill that would allow timber companies to write off the cost of replanting trees over seven years, rather than recovering those costs when they sold the trees.

''We see this as a huge win for the environment,'' said Michael Kelin of the American Forest and Paper Association, which lobbied Rep. Jennifer Dunn (R-Wash.) and other timber state members. ''This will lead to a greener America.''

THE BIG WINNERS

Big Business: Relaxation of pension and health plan regulations; bills also lift some ceilings on defined pension benefits.

Expanded availability of foreign tax credits, by allowing global allocation of interest deductions (both bills).

Small Business: Repeal or reduction of estate taxes (both bills).

House restores 80 percent deductibility of business meals.

Banks, securities firms: Bills extend ability to defer taxes on income earned abroad until money is returned home.

Railroads, barge lines: both bills repeal 4.3 cents per gallon tax on rail diesel and barge fuels.

Timber: House reduces capital gain on sale of trees. Both bills allow seven-year amortization of costs of replanting trees, lifting current cap.

Insurance: House bill would end five-year restriction against life insurance companies writing off losses of affiliates against profits. House and Senate allow deductibility of long-term care insurance.

Oil and Gas: House bill allows expensing of environmental remediation costs; expands net operating loss carryback to five years; extends suspension of income limits on percentage depletion allowance.

Utilities: In utility mergers, the House bill allows acquiring companies not to pay tax on funds previously set aside to cover future costs of decommissioning nuclear plants.

Steel: House allows manufacturers to use alternative minimum tax credit carryover to reduce 90 percent of AMT liability.

PRIORITIES

1. Amount of federal tax money allocated to the Pentagon this year: $276 billion.

Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4 Budget of the United States (FY 2000); 5, 6, 7, 8 Center for Defense Information (Washington, DC); 9 World Military and Social Expenditures by Ruth Leger Sivard; 10 National Center for Educational Statistics (Washington, DC); 11, 12, Children's Defense Fund (Washington, DC); 13 Budget of the United States (FY 2000); 14 Children's Defense Fund (Washington, DC); 15 Council for a Liveable World Education Fund (Washington, DC); 16 U.S. Conference of Mayors (Washington, DC); 17 Center for Defense Information (Washington, DC); 18 Justice Policy Institute (Washington, DC); 19, 20 Budget of the United States (FY 2000); 21, 22 ''A $75 set screw? Bad old days of Pentagon purchasing are back,'' Copley News Service, by Julia Malone, March 18, 1998; 23 Center for Defense Information (Washington, DC); 24 World Military and Social Expenditures by Ruth Leger Sivard; 25, 26 SIPRI (Stockholm); 27, 28 Center for Responsive Politics (Washington, DC); 29, 30 distributed anonymously over the Internet; 31 ''Military-Industrial Complex Revisited,'' by William Hartung, World Policy Institute, November, 1998; 32 $276 billion annual Pentagon budget ÷ 365 days per year ÷ 24 hours per day ÷ 60 minutes per hour 2 minutes = $1,050,200.

2. Amount allocated to education: $31 billion.

3. Amount allocated to the Environmental Protection Agency: $7 billion.

4. Amount allocated to Head Start: $5 billion.

5. Ratio of U.S. defense spending versus Iraqi defense spending: 276 to 1.

6. Ratio of Pentagon spending to combined defense spending of Russia, China, and all ''rogue'' nations: 2 to 1.

7. Ratio of defense spending by U.S. and allies to combined defense spending by those nations: 4 to 1.

8. Rank of U.S. military spending among all nations: 1.

9. Rank of U.S. education spending per student among all nations: 10.

10. Rank of math and science test scores by U.S. high school students among industrialized nations: 18.

11. Number of children without health insurance in U.S.: 11 million.

12. Number of children without health insurance in all other industrialized nations: 0.

13. Amount of President Clinton's proposed increase to the Pentagon budget next year: $12 billion.

14. Amount needed to provide health insurance for 11 million American kids who don't have it: $11 billion.

15. Amount of pork in the Pentagon budget—not requested by the Pentagon but inserted by Congress: $5 billion.

16. Amount needed to reduce kindergarten through third grade class size to 18 students: $4 billion.

17. Amount required to build 48 of 341 new F–22 fighters, designed to fight the collapsed Soviet Union: $9 billion.

18. Amount needed to provide proven anti-crime programs for all eligible kids in U.S.: $9 billion.

19. Percentage of U.S. discretionary budget—the part of the budget that Congress votes on—given to Pentagon: 48.

20. Percentage allocated to education: 8.

21. Amount paid by the Pentagon for one screw in 1998: $75.

22. Amount such a screw would cost in a hardware store: 50 cents.

23. Rank of U.S. nuclear arsenal among all nations: 1.

24. Rank of U.S. infant mortality rate among all nations: 13.

25. Percentage decrease in Russian defense budget since 1998: 74.

26. Percentage decrease in Pentagon budget since 1998: 21.

27. Amount of political contributions and lobbying in 1997 by tobacco industry: $44 million.

28. By the weapons industry: $58 million.

29. Cost of a New Attack Submarine, proposed to replace U.S. subs that are already the world's best: $2.1 billion.

30. Cost of one decent map of downtown Belgrade: priceless.

31. Percentage of Senators who have a facility in their district owned by defense contractor Lockheed Martin: 100.

32. Amount spent by Pentagon while you read this fact sheet (average reading time 2 minutes): $1 million.

[From the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, July 12, 1999]

MUCH OF THE PROJECTED NON-SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS IS A MIRAGE

VAST MAJORITY OF SURPLUS RESTS ON ASSUMPTIONS OF DEEP CUTS IN DOMESTIC PROGRAMS THAT ARE UNLIKELY TO OCCUR

(By Sam Elkin and Robert Greenstein)

Congressional Budget Office figures released July 1 indicate that the large majority of the budget surplus projected outside Social Security is essentially artificial because it depends on unrealistic assumptions that large, unspecified cuts will be made over the next 10 years in appropriated programs and that there will be no emergency expenditures over this period. When the more realistic assumption is made that total non-emergency expenditures for appropriated programs will neither be cut nor increased and will simply stay even with inflation—and that emergency expenditures will continue at their 1991–1998 average level—nearly 90 percent of the projected non-Social Security surplus disappears.[1]

The new CBO projections show that under current law, the federal government will begin running surpluses in the non-Social Security budget in fiscal year 2000 and run cumulative non-Social Security surpluses of $996 billion over the next 10 years. But these projections, like those OMB issued several days earlier assume that total expenditures for appropriated programs—which include the vast bulk of defense expenditures—will remain within the austere and politically unrealistic ''caps'' the 1997 budget law set on appropriated programs.[2]

To remain within the FY 2000 caps will entail cutting appropriated (i.e., discretionary) programs billions of dollars below the FY 1999 level. No one expects this to occur. Leaders of both parties have acknowledged that a number of appropriations bills cannot pass unless the amount of funding provided for the bills is at significantly higher levels than the current caps allow.

The caps for FY 2001 and 2002 are more unrealistic than the FY 2000 cap; the caps for those years are significantly lower than the FY 2000 cap when inflation is taken into account. Moreover, the CBO and OMB projections assume that for years after 2002, total expenditures for appropriated programs will remain at the level of the severe cap for FY 2002, adjusted only for inflation in years after FY 2002. This means that the surplus projections assume levels of expenditures for appropriated programs for fiscal years 2001 through 2009 that are lower, when inflation is taken into account, than the highly unrealistic FY 2000 cap that almost certainly will not be met.

Also of note, both parties have proposed significant increases in defense spending in coming years. Defense spending constitutes about half of overall expenditures for appropriated programs. In addition, legislation enacted last year requires increases in highway spending in coming years. These factors are further reasons why the caps are unlikely to be sustained.

CBO must base its budget projections on current law. The spending caps on appropriated programs are current law. CBO has acted properly in developing its projections. But policymakers who act as though the $1 trillion in non-Social Security surpluses projected over the next 10 years all represent new funds that can go for tax cuts of program expansions appear to misunderstand the meaning of the projections.

Because the CBO projections rest on the assumption that expenditures for appropriated programs will be held to the levels of the caps, these projections assume that over the next 10 years, these expenditures will be reduced $595 billion below current (i.e., FY 1999) levels of non-emergency discretionary spending, adjusted for inflation. (The $595 billion figure is found in a CBO table on this matter issued July 12.)

Since defense spending is widely expected to rise, all of these $595 billion in cuts would have to come from non-defense programs, primarily domestic programs. This would entail reducing overall expenditures for on-defense appropriated programs by 15 percent to 20 percent over the next 10 years, after adjusting for inflation. Since some areas of non-defense spending such as highways are slated to increase, other areas would need to be cut deeper than 15 percent to 20 percent. Achieving cuts of this magnitude in non-defense appropriated programs would be unprecedented.

Cutting federal expenditures results in lower levels of debt. CBO projects that the $595 billion in reductions in appropriated programs assumed in its baseline would generate $154 billion in additional savings over the next 10 years through lower interest payments on the debt. Consequently, the reductions in appropriated programs that the CBO projections assume result in total savings of $749 billion over the next 10 years.

These $749 billion in assumed savings account for 75 percent—or three-fourths—of the non-Social Security surplus projected over the next 10 years. Since most or all of these cuts are unlikely to materialize, a large majority of the surplus projected in the non-Social Security budget is essentially a mirage.

EMERGENCY SPENDING

Nor does this represent the full extent to which the DBO projections rest on assumptions that lead to an overstatement of the likely non-Social Security surplus. The CBO projections assume no emergency spending for the next 10 years. There will, of course, be emergencies over the next 10 years that result in government expenditures. There have been emergency expenditures outside the spending caps every year since the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 established the caps. Hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, and international emergencies will not magically disappear.

Over the 1990's, emergency funding has averaged $8 billion a year, excluding both emergency expenditures for Desert Storm in the early 1990s and the higher level of emergency spending in fiscal year 1999.[3] The most prudent assumption to make is that emergency expenditures will continue to average about $8 billion a year.

This means an additional $80 billion of the projected surplus over the next 10 years is not likely to materialize since it will be used for emergency expenditures. This $80 billion in expenditures will cause interest payments on the debt to be $24 billion higher than the levels the CBO projections assume.

[1] We use the average level of emergency spending in fiscal years 1991 through 1998, other than expenditures for Desert Storm. This also excludes the high level of emergency spending in fiscal year 1999. The term ''appropriated programs,'' as used here, means discretionary programs.

[2] Technically, OMB assumes expenditures for discretionary programs that exceed the caps, but it also assumes offsetting reductions in mandatory programs and tax increases.

[3] The $8 billion figure represents average funding for emergencies other than Desert Storm for fiscal years 1991 through 1998, as expressed in 1999 dollars.

ESTIMATE OF AVAILABLE SURPLUS LOWER THAN IN EARLIER CENTER ANALYSES

Based on Congressional Budget Office data, this analysis shows that when realistic assumptions are used, the non-Social Security surpluses total only about $112 billion over the next 10 years. Earlier Center versions of this analysis showed modestly larger available surpluses. The revisions in this analysis stem from two factors. First, on July 12, the Congressional Budget Office issued a table that raised CBO's estimate of the portion of the CBO surplus projection that results from the assumption that discretionary spending will be cut. CBO had earlier estimated that $584 billion of the projected surplus was attributable to assuming that non-emergency discretionary spending would be reduced below the FY 1999 level of non-emergency discretionary expenditures, adjusted for inflation. CBO now estimates that $595 billion of the surplus projection is due to this assumption. Second, an earlier Center analysis did not address the assumption in the CBO projections that there would be no emergency expenditures for the next 10 years. This revised Center analysis does address this matter.

CBO'S SURPLUS FORECAST: HOW MUCH IS REALLY AVAILABLE FOR TAX CUTS AND PROGRAM EXPANSIONS?

[In billion of dollars]

CBO projection of non-Social Security surplus over 10 years	$996
Amount needed to keep non-emergency spending for appropriated programs even with inflation	−595
Likely emergency expenditures (based on average annual emergency expenditures, FY 1991–1998)	−80
Social Security administrative costs (CBO counts as a Social Security expenditure, but Congress counts as a non-Social Security expenditure)	−31
Higher interest payments on debt due to higher levels of spending for appropriated programs than the CBO projections assume	−178
Remaining surplus available for other uses (if some of this is used for tax cuts or program expansions, interest payments will rise further above the CBO projection, requiring some of the $112 billion to be used for interest costs)	

CONGRESSIONAL AND CLINTON BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF SPENDING FOR APPROPRIATED PROGRAMS

The Congressional budget resolution approved earlier this year assumes a very large tax cut of $778 billion over 10 years. The resolution can accommodate a tax cut of this magnitude because it assumes that none of the surplus will go to placing spending for appropriated programs at a more realistic level. Moreover, the budget resolution assumes that additional cuts in appropriated programs of nearly $200 billion over 10 years will be instituted, on top of the already unrealistic reductions assumed in CBO's projections. (These additional reductions would come in years after 2002.) Under the budget resolution, overall expenditures for non-defense appropriated programs would be cut 29 percent between FY 1999 and FY 2009, after adjusting for inflation.

The Clinton budget would add back somewhere in the vicinity of $500 billion over 10 years for appropriated programs, or most of the $595 billion needed to keep non-emergency spending for appropriated programs even with inflation. The Clinton budget only uses $328 billion of the surplus, however, for this purpose. The remaining funds would be raised through a series of offsetting cuts in entitlement programs and tax increases, such as a cigarette tax increase. Many, if not most, of these offsets are given little chance of passage on Capitol Hill. If these offsets are not approved and no funds from the surplus are provided for appropriated programs beyond the $328 billion the Administration has proposed, appropriated programs would have to be cut approximately $270 billion over 10 years below current levels, adjusted for inflation. (To compute the exact amount appropriated programs would have to be reduced under this scenario requires data no yet available on the Administration's new budget plans.) In addition, the Administration's budget does not appear to reserve a portion of the surplus for the emergency expenditures that inevitably will occur.

Another $31 billion also must be subtracted from the project non-Social Security surplus; it is needed for the administrative costs of operating Social Security. As the Congressional Budget Office explains on page 6 of its new report, CBO counts these $31 billion in costs as a Social Security expenditures, but Congress treats them as part of the non-Social Security budget and counts them against the spending caps on discretionary programs. (The Congressional budget resolutions passed each year include these expenditures as non-Social Security expenditures that affect the size of the non-Social Security surplus. It is the budget resolution, not the CBO projections, that Congressional budget rules enforce.) Counting these costs as part of the non-Social Security budget reduces the non-Social Security surplus.

When this $135 billion—$80 billion for emergency expenditures, $24 billion for related interest payments on the debt, and $31 billion for Social Security administrative costs—is added to the $749 billion described above in expenditures for appropriated programs and related interest payments on the debt, a total of $884 billion—89 percent of the projected non-Social Security surplus—dries up. Only $112 billion remains. (See table on page 3.) In addition, non-Social Security surpluses of any size do not appear until 2006; the non-Social Security budget either continues to show deficits or is in balance (but without significant surpluses) until that time.

One other caution regarding the surplus projections should be noted. The economic and technical assumptions underlying the forecast could prove too rosy (or not rosy enough). CBO has repeatedly warned that a high degree of uncertainty attaches to budget projections made several years in advance. In a report issued earlier this year, CBO noted that if its projections for fiscal year 2004 prove to miss the mark by the average percentage amount that CBO projections made five years in advance have provided to be off over the past decade, its surplus forecast for 2004 will be off by $250 billion.[4] If economic growth is modestly slower than forecast or health care costs rise substantially faster than is currently projected, budget surplus could be substantially lower than those reflected in the CBO estimates.

HOW MUCH OF THE SURPLUS IS AVAILABLE FOR TAX CUTS, MEDICARE, AND SOCIAL SECURITY IF MORE REALISTIC ASSUMPTIONS ARE USED?

In summary, if more realistic assumptions are used—namely, that total non-emergency expenditures for discretionary programs will remain at the fiscal year 1999 level, adjusted for inflation and emergency spending will remain at its average level for the recent past—a very different picture emerges of how much in surplus funds is available for tax cuts, shoring up Medicare and Social Security, and other initiatives. Under this more plausible scenario, only about $112 billion remains available, and hardly any of it is available in the next five years.[5]

It may be noted that to assume, as we do here, that total non-emergency expenditures for appropriated programs will be no higher in future years that non-emergency expenditures for such programs in fiscal year 1999, adjusted for inflation, is to use a conservative assumption. It is a foregone conclusion that defense spending will rise faster than inflation. Hence, for overall non-emergency expenditures for appropriated programs to remain even with inflation, non-defense programs must be cut in real (i.e., inflation-adjusted) dollars. Yet spending for some non-defense program areas such as highways is already slated to rise. The House recently passed legislation to boost aviation spending as well. Thus, the assumption used here for expenditures for appropriated programs may be too low.

These findings have major implications for policymakers. For there to be sufficient surplus funds to finance the large tax cuts some policymakers advocate, Congress would have to make cuts of unprecedented depth in appropriated programs over the next 10 years—cuts substantially deeper than those policymakers are balking at passing this year.

TRENDS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING

Expenditures for appropriated (i.e., discretionary) programs are already low in historical terms as a percentage of GDP. There is serious question about how much further they can be expected to decline.

CBO projects that total discretionary spending will equal 6.5 percent of GDP in fiscal year 1999, the lowest level since at least 1962. (Published data on discretionary spending as a share of GDP only go back to 1962.)

Much of the decline in discretionary spending as a share of GDP has come in defense spending, which fell following the end of the Cold War. But non-defense discretionary pending also has contracted as a share of GDP. At 3.4 percent of GDP this year and last, non-defense discretionary spending is at as low or lower a share of GDP as in any year since 1962.

Under the new budget projections, discretionary spending would fall much further as a percentage of GDP. The new CBO projections assume discretionary spending will fall from 6.5 percent of GDP today to 5.0 percent in 2009, as much lower level than in any year in decades.

Dicretionary spending may be approaching its limits in terms of how much more it can fall as a share of GDP. That may be one of the lessons both of last year's highway bill and of last October's omnibus appropriations bill, which exceed the budget limits for discretionary spending and designated the overage as emergency spending.

While non-defense discretionary spending has fallen over the past several decades as a share of GDP, it has not declined in inflation-adjusted terms (although it has declined since 1980 if an adjustment reflecting the increase in the size of the U.S. population is made as well). If we have emerged from a period of deficits without expenditures for non-defense discretionary programs having declined in inflation-adjusted terms, there is little reason to believe the political system will exact deep cuts in this part of the budget when the outlook is sunny, surpluses have merged, and pent-up demands for various types of discretionary spending are coming to the fore (witness the aviation bill the House recently approved). This underscores the unrealistic nature of the assumptions of substantial reductions in discretionary program expenditures that underlie the projections of $1 trillion non-Social Security surpluses.

[4] In computing the average percentage amount by which CBO projections made five years in advance have proven to be off, CBO excluded the effects of legislation on deficits or surpluses. The $250 billion figure is based on the average percentage amount by which the budget projections missed the mark due solely to economic and technical factors. See CBO, *The Economic and Budget Outlook: Fiscal years 2000–2009*, January 1999, p. xxiii.

[5] There would be a small non-Social Security surplus in fiscal year 2002.

THE DISASTROUS STATE OF AGRICULTURE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BRYANT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here today. I do have the high honor of representing the Seventh District of Tennessee. Both that district and the State itself has a very strong and diverse economy.

Included as part of the base of that economy is agriculture, and as I would follow on the heels of my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), his statements, our agriculture in Tennessee and in this country is in a disastrous state, something that we ought to all be concerned with here in Congress. As we work to satisfy the number of issues that are out there that cover the board, we cannot forget about agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I have had several meetings in my district where I talked to different constituencies, and that is a consistent complaint that we hear; that while we are doing well in our industries, our manufacturing, our distribution across the State, the agricultural communities, not only the farmers and beef producers, the pork producers, but the communities in which they live, the banks, the equipment dealers, the stores, the retailers, are all suffering along with them.

I have been told that in effect what is happening in the agricultural communities is that they are being paid 1950s prices, but yet their expenses are 1999 expenses today. I would challenge any part of our economy to operate under those standards, that you are getting paid like you were in 1950, but your expenses are today's expenses. You cannot exist very long in that type of situation.

When we came to Congress in 1994, we did a lot of good things. One of the good things we did was try to turn our farmers loose to compete like everybody else; to lift up all the programs and restraints that they had and to let them compete in this world market, this global market that we are in.

One of the commitments we made to these farmers, in addition to lifting these restraints and saying, you are on your own, go out and do the best you can, one of the conditions we laid out was that we will help you with the estate tax.

Despite what the previous speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, said, this tax bill that we passed last week does wonderful things for our farmers. It does in fact help them with the estate tax. When the family farm can be passed along with less estate tax being paid, it is more likely that the heirs, the children of that farmer, will be able to keep that family farm.

I would suggest that this bill we passed last week, this tax reform, goes to more than just 300 of the richest Americans out there, it goes to our farm owners, our small businesses in our smaller communities.

Another thing that we did in that tax bill was help our farmers through self-insured insurance. When they buy their own insurance, they can deduct that total premium for that. This 10 percent across-the-board tax break, this applies to farmers, also.

One of the other requirements that we promised them back when we lifted the programs was that we would help them in our markets, help them stabilize their markets. When they raise all their crops, have the good years, when they win the battle over the droughts and too much rain and bugs and pests that come out to destroy their crops, they still have to sell those crops somewhere. We promised them we would help stabilize the markets.

I would simply ask my colleagues, every time that we have an opportunity to vote on these kinds of issues that pertain to boycots and embargoes against other countries, particularly as they deal with food and fiber, that we be careful there that we do not always do that at the blink of an eye.

Another commitment we made to our farmers was regulatory relief. We said we would make it easier for them to farm, and yet, we hear stories in committees that I sit in about the Environmental Protection Agency coming in and wanting to take away some of the chemicals that our farmers use to be able to be as successful as they are in producing basically the food for the world.

Now we are being told that maybe they cannot use some of these chemicals, or that some of their land may be a wetland and that it ought to be in a position where they cannot use it to farm. They pay taxes on it, they own it, but they cannot farm it.

I am simply saying that our farmers are the best stewards of the lands that we have. They have to be good stewards. They have to be environmentalists. They want to take care of the land because it is their source of living. There are not any better stewards of land out there than the farmers.

I would remind my colleagues that when we get into these kinds of issues, I would ask that we remember our farmers. We have to keep them in mind. A lot of people seem to think, and I say this jokingly, though, that the food starts in the grocery store, and that the fiber or clothing that we buy starts in the department stores. They do not think anything about what causes that to appear in the stores. They simply think it is there when they go buy something, and it will always be there. But we have to keep our farmers in mind as we deal with the panoply of legislation that we deal with.

I simply use my 5 minutes of time this afternoon to remind my colleagues of the importance of our agricultural communities.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND FEDERAL SPENDING PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about national priorities and Federal budget needs. It is now estimated that the budget surpluses over the next 10 years, not counting social security surpluses, will be a little under $1 trillion. Now everyone in Washington wants to figure out how to spend that $1 trillion.

Last week we saw the Republican plan for that money. Last week the House of Representatives passed a bill to use almost the entire surpluses, $792 billion of the projected $966 billion surpluses for the next 10 years, for a tax cut, a tax cut heavily slanted to the rich, a tax cut in which 1 percent of taxpayers will get 30 percent of the tax relief, and a tax cut that is back end loaded and will cost an additional $2 trillion in revenues in the second 10 years, just when the baby boomers will be retiring and necessitating huge new expenditures for social security and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, last week the House of Representatives also passed the defense appropriations bill, which will spend $266 billion for defense programs, $2.8 billion more than the administration requested. When combined with other military spending bills, the total defense spending will be $288 billion this year, about $8 billion more than the President's request and almost $10 billion more than the cap set by the 1997 Balanced Budget Act.

Thankfully, that bill did not include funding to purchase the Rolls Royce of the sky, the F–22 jet fighter. There is still a very real danger the funding for the F–22 will be restored in conference. That would be a huge mistake. For the price of each F–22 plane at $200 million per plane, it will be too expensive to risk in combat. For each F–22, you could repair 117 American schools, you could build 33 new elementary schools, or enroll 40,000 more children in Head Start. Is that not a better use of taxpayer funds?

However, when Congress cut the F–22, it did not use the funds for schools or children, it used the funds for more defense spending. Members of Congress cannot wait to bust the budget caps and spend millions more for defense, but we have not done the same for domestic social programs. We all know every penny we spend on the military will not be available to strengthen social security, build affordable housing, extend health care coverage to millions of Americans, or pay down the national debt, and yet we are still talking about devastating cuts to vital Federal programs, included social security.

The surplus we hear so much about is based on the assumption that most domestic programs will be cut far past the bone. Simply providing enough funding for non-defense discretionary

programs to keep pace with inflation would require an additional $590 billion over the next 10 years.

Factoring in an allowance for the average level of emergency appropriations would require another $100 billion. If these limited funds are spent instead on the Republican tax cut, it would mean an average 27 percent cut in all domestic programs by 2009.

Mr. Speaker, in 1981, President Reagan and the Republicans led us over the edge of a cliff. They thought we could have a large tax cut and increase defense spending. Sound familiar? The result was an increase in our national debt, the accumulated deficits since George Washington, from $800 billion in 1981, when Ronald Reagan took office, to $4.3 trillion in 1993 when Bill Clinton was sworn in.

□ 1930

In 1992, the deficit was $290 billion, with annual deficits of $500 billion projected for the mid-1990's. The Clinton deficit reduction plan of 1993, passed without a single Republican vote, began our climb out of the abyss. Now after 7 years of strong economic growth and careful management of government resources, including reduction of the Federal work force of 370,000, we have reached high ground.

We balanced budgets and projected surpluses, and this pains our Republican colleagues. They do not want either to pay down the national debt, as the President proposes, or to initiate long-postponed investments in our schools and day-care centers and our cities and our colleges, our Medicare, and Head Start.

We ought to invest this money, instead, in our people, in our schools, and our infrastructure in order to keep our economy growing. With the strong robust economy, we can meet the needs facing Social Security while we invest in other social programs to improve the lives of all Americans.

So the message is clear tonight. We cannot postpone any longer our long-postponed investments in schools and day-care centers and roads and bridges and railroads and Medicare and Head Start and housing. Now is the time to shift budget priorities to reflect future needs to help working families to have an educated work force, to build up our country's infrastructure so that we can keep economic growth at a high level that will generate the money to pay for it and that will pay for the money to pay for the Medicare and for Social Security as our baby boomers start to retire.

Let us not fritter this away on a tax cut for the rich and on unneeded defense spending on unneeded Rolls Royce programs.

TRIBUTE TO KOREAN WAR VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 46th anniversary of the end of the Korean War. So I think it is a fitting time to remember and pay tribute to all Americans who fought and died in that war.

Yesterday, I had the privilege of speaking at a Korean War Memorial Service in Fultondale, Alabama. There, the names of 672 Alabamans, who died or are missing in action in that war, names were called. It was a very emotional service. We had a 21-gun salute. Relatives placed flowers at the memorial.

I gave a speech, and the veterans at that memorial asked me to again give that speech tonight in tribute to their fallen comrades and to all of those who served in Korea, those who died, and the 8,000 who are still missing in action as a result of that war.

I will place in the RECORD the names of those 672 Alabamans who paid it all in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the Bible, God calls on his people, on his children to remember, to remember the wonderful works that he has done, to remember his miracles, to remember all that he has done for them.

When we read the Bible, we are sometimes frustrated that the children of Israel continually forgot the good things that God had done for them. We sometimes say why were they so unappreciative? Why did they forget? Why did they fail to remember?

But are we so different? Is not our treatment and our ignorance of the Korean War not a parallel? We forgot a whole war and the sacrifices made there. Why did we forget? Why were we so unappreciative for the 37,000 Americans who died there? Why do we not know a lot about that or the fact there are 8,000 missing to this day?

The Korean War was concluded, not with the enemy's surrender, but with a negotiated armistice that reestablished the existing borders between North and South Korea. It left an uneasy peace that exists even today.

With tens of thousands of young Americans brutally killed and a war occurring in such a remote and inhospitable land so far away with no victory to celebrate, the Korean War gave most Americans little to remember and much to forget.

For that reason, the Korean War is today called the ''Forgotten War,'' and it is often spoken of as the Forgotten War. However, there is much to remember about this war, much to remember about those who left farms and factories, high school classrooms and college campuses to defend our freedom.

From Alabama, there were four brothers, the Goodwin brothers. They all survived Korea. They came home with eight purple hearts. Mr. Goodwin, Bob Goodwin from Birmingham, was there yesterday to lay flowers at the memorial.

Today, we recall, and we remember. We are not here to cheer or to celebrate, but to reflect on the sacrifices that were made so long ago, to remember the living, those who survived and are not here today, and those who died and lie buried about us and those, as I said, 8,000 whose bodies were never recovered, who were never buried here in the United States.

World War II had followed World War I, the war to end all wars. The long struggle against Nazism and imperialism was over, and America, although victorious, was so weary of war. America and her people knew well the cost, the horror, and the sacrifice of war.

But that did not prevent 1½ million of America's finest patriots from leaving their homes or friends to serve. Halfway around the world they went or, as so aptly described in the Korean War Memorial, to ''a place they had never been and a people they had never met.''

As William Sessions, the father of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), said, ''They went not for conquest and not for gain, but only to protect the anguished and the innocent. They suffered greatly and by their heroism in a thousand forgotten battles they added a luster to the codes we hold most dear: duty, honor, country, fidelity, bravery, and integrity.''

These were citizen soldiers. But for the most part, they were not skilled in war. They were ordinary young men and women like our sons and daughters.

We should remember, too, the hardships our Korean War veterans endured: the deadly cold, the weeks and months spent crammed in foxholes and bunkers dug into rugged, harsh terrain. They faced an enemy of overwhelming numbers ready to torture and brutalize. They were locked in hand-to-hand combat at ''Heartbreak Ridge'' and ''Pork Chop Hill,'' confronted with the fastest fighter jets at ''Mig Alley.''

Today's military history records that our Korean veterans set a standard of courage that may be matched, but which will never be surpassed.

In summary, chiseled in silver on the Korean War Memorial are the words ''Freedom is not free.'' The men and women who served in Korea and the family and friends of those 37,000 who never returned and those thousands still missing have paid it all. They demonstrate the high and precious cost of freedom.

We should never forget that these patriots paid a price one by one when they were swept away by the treacherous tides of Inchon or died defending the perimeter of Pusan or froze to death by the hundreds at Chosan reservoir or in the long march back. Their families will never forget their sacrifice and neither should we.

Now on this hot sunny, summer day, Mr. Speaker, let me simply sum up by saying, today we know that those, that first resolute action by these veterans

stemmed the expansion of communism and, in so doing, helped change the course of history.

Now, we know it took four more decades to win the battle against communism. But having witnessed the collapse of the Berlin Wall and its aftermath, we know now that those who served in Korea laid the foundation for one of the greatest victories in the history of mankind, the free world triumph over communism.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the names of the Alabamians who died in the Korean War as follows:

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO DIED FROM HOSTILE ACTION (INCLUDING MISSING AND CAPTURED) [1]

[Listed by home State, county or hometown and thereunder alphabetically]

Name	Rank/Grade	Branch of service	Home of record, City/Town/County [2]	State
Abercrombie, Aaron R.	1LT	Air Force	Birmingham	Alabama
Adams, Aubrey G.	PVT	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Adams, Bernard B.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Adams, John R.	SFC	Army	Houston	Alabama
Adams, Robert E.	MSGT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Albright, Richard V.	PFC	Army	Lee	Alabama
Aldridge, Ellis L.	SFC	Army	Fayette	Alabama
Alexander, Howard E.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Alford, Ottis F.	CPL	Army	Morgan	Alabama
Allen, Alonzo	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Allen, James R.	PVT	Army	Madison	Alabama
Allums, Morris	SFC	Army	Walker	Alabama
Alverson, R. C.	SGT	Army	Madison	Alabama
Anderson, Lloyd G.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Andrews, Earnest M.	CPL	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Ange, Luther M.	PVT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Anthony, Stanley H.	PVT	Army	Chambers	Alabama
Arceneaux, Harry A.	SGT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Archer, B. R.	PFC	Army	St. Clair	Alabama
Arnold, Bloyce C.	SGT	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Arrington, Andrew B.	PFC	Army	Russell	Alabama
Atherton, Harold J.	PFC	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Atwood, Virgil M.	2LT	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Bailey, Charles	PVT	Army	Russell	Alabama
Bailey, James J.	PFC	Army	St. Clair	Alabama
Bailey, Raymond E.	CPL	Army	Fayette	Alabama
Bailey, Willard E.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Bain, Odom Carl	CPL	Marines	Town Creek	Alabama
Baker, Isaac E.	SFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Baker, Steward M., Jr.	2LT	Army	Covington	Alabama
Ball, James H.	PFC	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Barfield, David D.	PVT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Barker, William A.	SGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Barnes, Mack R.	SFC	Army	Henry	Alabama
Barnett, Robert A.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Barrier, James F.	PVT	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Bates, Elmore C.	SFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Bates, William A.	PFC	Marines	Vinemont	Alabama
Beams, Charles L.	CPL	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Beasley, John A.	PFC	Army	Marion	Alabama
Beason, Howard Eugene	CPL	Marines	Walnut Gorve	Alabama
Benefield, Denson H.	PVT	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Betts, Charles C., Sr.	SGT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Beveridge, Bruce, Jr.	2LT	Army	Baldwin	Alabama
Bill, Hubert L.	PVT	Army	Russell	Alabama
Birchfield, Edward	CPL	Army	Madison	Alabama
Bird, James P.	CPL	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Bishop, Travis A.	CPL	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Bishop, Wesley W., Jr.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Black, Paul Eugene	PFC	Marines	Centre	Alabama
Blanks, Willie F.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Blenkinsop, John R.	CPL	Army	Walker	Alabama
Bolton, George D.	PVT	Army	Pickens	Alabama
Booker, Robert L.	SFC	Army	Conecuh	Alabama
Boone, Boyce J.	1LT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Booth, Izea	PVT	Army	Elmore	Alabama
Bowen, Elzie R.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Bowers, Jefferson A.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Bowlin, Milas E.	PFC	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Bracknell, Arthur	CPL	Army	Bibb	Alabama
Braden, Robert D	PFC	Army	Coosa	Alabama
Brannon Wilmer	CPL	Army	Geneva	Alabama
Braswell, Carl W.	CPL	Marines	Childersburg	Alabama
Briers, Charlie	PFC	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Brim, Zephry	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Bringhurst, Robert	SGT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Brooks, Charles E.	PFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Brooks, John W. Jr.	PVT	Army	Jackson	Alabama
Brooks, Leotis	PFC	Army	Barbour	Alabama
Brooks, Lloyd K.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Brown, Buford, M	PFC	Army	Coffee	Alabama
Brown, Walter Jr.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Brown, William E.	1LT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Browning, Joseph D.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Browning, Perry H.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Brozell, Albert M.	CPL	Army	Elmore	Alabama
Bruce, Ralph T.	PVT	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Bryant, Vivian D.	SGT	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Burch, Louie F.	SGT	Army	Coffee	Alabama
Burgett, Alfred T.	CPL	Army	Franklin	Alabama
Burney, Ralston L.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Burt, John E.	SGT	Army	Bibb	Alabama
Bush, Billy J.	CPL	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Byrd, Ervin A.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Caldwell, Crayton Lowell	CPL	Marines	Wadley	Alabama
Calhoun, Harold	CPL	Army	Chambers	Alabama
Callaway, Vernon A.	PVT	Army	Bount	Alabama
Cameron, Floyd D.	PFC	Marines	Notasulga	Alabama
Campbell, Charlie A.	SFC	Army	Madison	Alabama
Caraway, Cody E.	PFC	Army	Russell	Alabama
Carroll, James R.	CPL	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Carter, Dudley	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Carter, Emmett J.	CPL	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Cash, James R.	SGT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Castle, William B.	SGT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Causey, Billy J.	PVT	Army	Elmore	Alabama
Cauthen, Winifred	PVT	Army	Dale	Alabama
Champion, Merrill A.	PFC	Army	Cleburne	Alabama
Chancery, Joseph D.	PFC	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Chancey, Howard Harrell	PFC	Marines	Ariton	Alabama
Chapman, Harold S.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO DIED FROM HOSTILE ACTION (INCLUDING MISSING AND CAPTURED) [1]—Continued

[Listed by home State, county or hometown and thereunder alphabetically]

Name	Rank/Grade	Branch of service	Home of record, City/Town/County [2]	State
Chappell, Billie F.	PFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Christian, Earl E.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Clark, Charles W.	CPL	Army	Lee	Alabama
Clark, O.C. Jr.	PVT	Army	Covington	Alabama
Clark, Odell	SGT	Army	Dale	Alabama
Clements, Louis C.	PVT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Clements, Terrell C.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Cleveland, Clifton	PFC	Army	Bibb	Alabama
Cleveland, Euclid, L.	CPL	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Cleveland, Ned J.	SFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Clyott, Cecil Harrison Jr.	1LT	Air Force	Talladega	Alabama
Coates, Roman W.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Cobb, William L.	CPL	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Cochran, Jack D.	PFC	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Cochran, L. G.	PFC	Army	Marion	Alabama
Cody, George G.	CAPT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Coffman, Emory Ronald	LCDR	Army	Elkmont	Alabama
Coker, Cecil A.	PFC	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Coker, Martin A.	CAPT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Cole, Phillip M.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Coleman, Herbert	SFC	Army	Hale	Alabama
Collier, Rogers	1LT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Collins, Harry P.	CPL	Army	Houston	Alabama
Cook, Thomas H.	PFC	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Cork, Thomas R.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Cornell, Paul D.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Cotney, Comer C.	PVT	Army	Tallapoosa	Alabama
Counts, George W.	SGT	Army	Colbert	Alabama
Cox, Arthur W.	SFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Cox, James A.	PFC	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Crabtree, Morgan L.	SGT	Army	Madison	Alabama
Craig, Willie	PFC	Army	Dallas	Alabama
Creel, William T.	CPL	Army	Randolph	Alabama
Crocker, George A.	PFC	Marines	Gadsen	Alabama
Crockett, Charles R.	CPL	Marines	Sheffield	Alabama
Crowder, Donald G.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Crumpton, Floyd T.	PVT	Army	Morgan	Alabama
Culpepper, Lonnie	SGT	Army	St. Clair	Alabama
Cummings, Charlie W.	PFC	Army	Randolph	Alabama
Cunningham, Augustu	PFC	Army	Dallas	Alabama
Cunningham, Luther	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Daniels, Judge	PVT	Army	Henry	Alabama
Dates, Little N.	PFC	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Daughtry, Charles E.	CPL	Army	Lee	Alabama
Davidson, Gerald E.	PFC	Army	Walker	Alabama
Davis, Arnold G., Sr.	SGT	Army	Shelby	Alabama
Davis, Billie Howard	PFC	Marines	Phoenixville	Alabama
Davis, Claude L.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Davis, Edgar E., Jr.	CPL	Army	Madison	Alabama
Davis, Madison L.	MSGT	Army	Pike	Alabama
Davis, Richard F.	SFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Davison, Leslie E.	CPL	Army	Baldwin	Alabama
Daw, Willie D.	PFC	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Dawson, Bobbie	PVT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
De, France, Charles	PFC	Army	St. Clair	Alabama
Deason, Charles L.	PFC	Army	Perry	Alabama
Deason, George, Jr.	CPL	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Deland, Edward E., Jr.	SFC	Army	Russell	Alabama
Denton, Robert	CPL	Army	Dale	Alabama
Dickinson, Percy E.	CPL	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Divine, Winfield	PFC	Army	Coffee	Alabama
Dix, Marvin	PVT	Army	Pike	Alabama
Dixon, Melvin L.	SGT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Doby, Alfonzo	SGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Donaldson, Tellis W.	MSGT	Army	Covington	Alabama
Donaldson, Weldon C.	PFC	Marines	Mobile	Alabama
Dooley, Johnnie K.	PVT	Army	Fayette	Alabama
Doss, Theodore R.	PFC	Army	Marengo	Alabama
Dowling, Robert V.	MSGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Doyle, Thomas J.	SGT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Dunn, Larry M.	PFC	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Dye, Robert L.	PVT	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Echols, Tommie L.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Ellis, Julius L.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Emmons, Clifford O.	CPL	Army	Choctan	Alabama
Enfinger, Edgar	SGT	Army	Houston	Alabama
Evans, Corbit	PFC	Army	Marion	Alabama
Evans, Owens B.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Everett, William L.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Fancher, Maxie	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Farmer, Rudolph	SFC	Army	Covington	Alabama
Fincher, Roy L.	PFC	Army	Randolph	Alabama
Fleming, Robert P.	SGT	Army	Calhoon	Alabama
Flowers, Horrie, Jr.	MSGT	Army	Pike	Alabama
Flowers, Odis B.	PFC	Army	Pike	Alabama
Floyd, Andrews J., Jr.	CPL	Army	Baldwin	Alabama
Foster, James H.	PVT	Army	Russell	Alabama
Foy, Sam	PFC	Army	Sumter	Alabama
Franklin, John, Jr.	PVT	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Frazier, Herbert W.	SGT	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Frazier, Vance	CPL	Marines	Easley	Alabama
Frazier, William H.	MAJ	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Freeman, John W.	CPL	Army	Shelby	Alabama
Fromhold, Joseph B.	PVT	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Fulks, Daniel W.	SGT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Fuqua, Fred	SFC	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Gaines, Obie M.	CPL	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Gamble, Gilbert	PVT	Army	Coffee	Alabama
Garner, James W.	PFC	Army	Shelby	Alabama
Garner, Max F.	PVT	Army	Dale	Alabama
Garrett, Herbert J.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Gates, Thomas V.	PVT	Army	Madison	Alabama
Gibby, Eddie	CPL	Army	Clarke	Alabama
Gigger, Quillie S.	PFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Gill, Gerald S.	PFC	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Gilland, J.W.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Gillespie, Champ G.	CPL	Army	Houston	Alabama
Gillespie, George D.	WO	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Glaze, Claude	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Glover, Joseph E., Jr.	SFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO DIED FROM HOSTILE ACTION (INCLUDING MISSING AND CAPTURED) [1]—Continued

[Listed by home State, county or hometown and thereunder alphabetically]

Name	Rank/Grade	Branch of service	Home of record, City/Town/County [2]	State
Glover, Thomas, Jr.	PFC	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Godwin, Robert E.	CPL	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Goode, John	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Goodson, Paul R.	SGT	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Gossett, John Louis	SSGT	Marines	Montgomery	Alabama
Graddy, William J.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Graham, Leonard F.	PFC	Army	Elmore	Alabama
Grant, Paul	PFC	Army	Lee	Alabama
Grantham, Lawrence	PVT	Army	Covington	Alabama
Gray, Leo H.	PFC	Army	Limestone	Alabama
Gray, Merrett G.	CPL	Army	Shelby	Alabama
Grayson, Roy A.	2LT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Green, John L.	SFC	Army	Cherokee	Alabama
Greene, Claud, Jr.	PFC	Army	Morgan	Alabama
Greenhill, Bruce J.	2LT	Marines	Montgomery	Alabama
Gregory, Joe B., Jr.	PVT	Army	Russell	Alabama
Griffis, Willie D.	PVT	Army	Limestone	Alabama
Grimes, Raymond	PFC	Army	Russell	Alabama
Gross, Robert Franklin	MSGT	Air Force	Montgomery	Alabama
Gunter, William Howard	SSGT	Marines	Browns	Alabama
Guthrie, Robert H.	SFC	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Hagwood, Eddie, Jr.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Hall, Hedrey D.	PFC	Army	Fayette	Alabama
Hall, Howard W.	SFC	Army	Clarke	Alabama
Hallford, W.T.	PFC	Army	Russell	Alabama
Hallmark, Thomas J.	PFC	Marines	Bessemer	Alabama
Hambright, Garnett	SGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Hammonds, Homer M.	PFC	Marines	Dawson	Alabama
Hampton, Leroy, Jr.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Hardeman, Julius F.	SGT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Hardin, George R.	CPL	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Hardwick, Richard L.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Hardy, Isac	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Hardy, James W.	PFC	Marines	Pell City	Alabama
Harless, Richard G.	SFC	Army	Madison	Alabama
Harper, Rayford H.	SGT	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Harris, James	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Harris, James A, Jr.	1LT	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Harris, Lewis A.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Harris, Richmond Gilbert	PFC	Marines	Foster	Alabama
Harris, Roosevelt	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Hart, Robert H.	PFC	Army	Conecoh	Alabama
Hataway, Roy	PVT	Army	Coffee	Alabama
Hatley, William H.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Hawkins, William M.	PFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Haynes, James L.	PFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Hays, Robert A.	PVT	Army	Lamar	Alabama
Hazwood, Clifford	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Heard, Booker T.	CPL	Army	Lee	Alabama
Heard, Delbert E.	SFC	Army	Madison	Alabama
Hearn, Edwin F.	PFC	Army	Russell	Alabama
Helms, Henry L.	PFC	Army	De Kalb	Alabama
Hendrix, Charles R.	PVT	Army	Monroe	Alabama
Hendrix, Thomas Calvin	SGT	Marines	Hartselle	Alabama
Henry, Fred S.	CPL	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Henry, Kenneth, Jr.	PFC	Army	Lawrence	Alabama
Herring, Eugene	PFC	Army	Dale	Alabama
Herrington, Robert	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Hicks, Luther	CPL	Army	Greene	Alabama
Higgins, George Carlton	PFC	Marines	Birmington	Alabama
Higgins, John S. Jr.	PFC	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Hill, Charles R. Jr.	CPL	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Hill, John A.C.	PFC	Army	Randolph	Alabama
Hobbs, Elven J.	CPL	Army	Conecoh	Alabama
Hoffman, Donald Edward	1LT	Air Force	Alexandria City	Alabama
Holder, Ray E.	SFC	Army	Geneva	Alabama
Holloway, Paul G.	PVT	Army	Franklin	Alabama
Holmes, Clyde Thadeus, Jr.	Capt	Marines	Birmington	Alabama
Holt, Zane Moses	Maj	Air Force	Livingston	Alabama
Hopper, James H.	PFC	Marines	Altoona	Alabama
Horne, Russel T.	SGT	Army	Hale	Alabama
Horne, Waymond Leon	PFC	Marines	Lanett	Alabama
Horton, Charles Thomas	CSS	Navy	Columbiana	Alabama
Howard, Cordell	SGT	Army	Tallaedega	Alabama
Howard, Frank R.	PVT	Army	Tallapoosa	Alabama
Howard, Oliver M.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Howze, Frank B.	Maj	Army	Perry	Alabama
Hoyt, Lester G.	PVT	Army	Montgomer	Alabama
Hughes, Lucious W.	PFC	Army	Houston	Alabama
Hughes, Morris E.	PFC	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Hulett, Ervin	SGT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Hunter, Joseph Jr.,	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Hunter, William Bryant	PFC	Marines	McDowell	Alabama
Hutchins, Johnnie R.	SGT	Army	Franklin	Alabama
Hyde, Daniel T.	SGT	Army	Franklin	Alabama
Ingle, Clarence B.	PFC	Army	De Kalb	Alabama
Jackson, Albert	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Jackson, Arthur	1LT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Jackson, Comer, Jr.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Jackson, David Jr.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Jackson, Irby L.	PVT	Army	De Kalb	Alabama
Jacobs, George L.	PVT	Army	Dallas	Alabama
James, Albert Jr.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
January, James	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Jarrell, Cleveland	PFC	Army	Elmore	Alabama
Jeter, James L.C.	PVT	Army	Covington	Alabama
Jeter, Robert M.	CPL	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Johnson, Fred S.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Johnson, Herbert D.	PFC	Army	Madison	Alabama
Johnson, Leroy	SGT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Johnson, Wesley	PVT	Army	Chambers	Alabama
Johnston, Jimmie Curtis	PFC	Marines	Margaret	Alabama
Jones, Baskil	PVT	Army	Crenshaw	Alabama
Jones, Bobby J.	PFC	Army	Walker	Alabama
Jones, Charles W.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Jones, Clarence G.	PFC	Army	Houston	Alabama
Jones, Joe D.	PFC	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Jones, Joseph	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Jones, Mack D.	SGT	Army	Winston	Alabama
Jones, Odis F.	PFC	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO DIED FROM HOSTILE ACTION (INCLUDING MISSING AND CAPTURED) [1]—Continued

[Listed by home State, county or hometown and thereunder alphabetically]

Name	Rank/Grade	Branch of service	Home of record, City/Town/County [2]	State
Jones, Thomas C.	CPL	Army	Fayette	Alabama
Jones, William H.	PFC	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Jones, William T.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Jordan, Barney H.	SGT	Army	Bullock	Alabama
Journey, Richard M.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Jumper, Joseph	PVT	Army	Russell	Alabama
Justice, James W.	PFC	Army	Geneva	Alabama
Justice, Marion W.	PFC	Army	Pike	Alabama
Keith, John W., Jr.	COL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Kilby, Thomas E III.	1LT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
King, Frank, Jr.	CPL	Army	Barbour	Alabama
King, Harvey	CPL	Army	Bullock	Alabama
King, Herbert	PFC	Army	Pike	Alabama
King, James Daniel	PFC	Marines	Ensley	Alabama
King, James Hubert	SN	Navy	Groushaw County	Alabama
King, William A.	PFC	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Kingsley, Willie L.	MSGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Kirby, Paul	PVT	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Kirkland, Oland H.	CPL	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Kirkpatrick, Leslie	1LT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Klug, Kenneth W.	PFC	Army	Baldwin	Alabama
Knudson, Jack L.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Kountz, Richard William	PVT	Marines	Mobile	Alabama
Lacey, Robert L.	MSGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Ladner, Hobert P.	CPL	Marines	Mobile	Alabama
Lane, Robert C.	PFC	Army	Walker	Alabama
Latham, Billy J.	PFC	Army	Walker	Alabama
Lathan, Climon N., Jr.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Lawson, John E.	PFC	Army	Geneva	Alabama
Lee, Isaac, Jr.	PFC	Army	Monroe	Alabama
Lee, William T.	CPL	Army	Marion	Alabama
Lige, Amos	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Lilly, Edmund B.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Little, Robert H.	CPL	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Livingston, Odyce Watson	2LT	Marines	Montgomery	Alabama
Lloyd, Carl Hubert	PFC	Marines	Monroeville	Alabama
Locklar, Vernon H.	SFC	Army	Pike	Alabama
Logan, William F.	PFC	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Loggins, Floyd B.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Long, John B.	2LT	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Lott, George W.	1LT	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Love, William Murdock	PFC	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Mack, Paul, Jr.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Madison, Garland E.	CAPT	Air Force	Gadsden	Alabama
Magouirk, Lawrence	PVT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Maltbie, Rubin R.	PVT	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Manley, William J.	SGT	Army	Randolph	Alabama
Marcus, O.C., Jr.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Marold, William E.	PFC	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Martin, Joel R.	CPL	Army	Conecuh	Alabama
Martin, William B.	PFC	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Mason, Jim H.	CPL	Army	Walker	Alabama
Matson, Arthur A., Jr.	SGT	Army	Walker	Alabama
Matthews, Glenn	PVT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Mauldin, Sydney R.	PFC	Army	Russell	Alabama
May, Levert	PFC	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Mayo, Joseph Haynes	CPL	Marines	York	Alabama
Mayo, Marvin	CPL	Army	Elmore	Alabama
Mays, John, Jr.	SGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
McAlphine, Johnny L.	PFC	Army	Blount	Alabama
McCall, Terry S.	CPL	Army	Escambia	Alabama
McCarty, Frank W.	CPL	Army	Pike	Alabama
McClure, John S.	SGT	Army	Colbert	Alabama
McCullers, Charles	PFC	Army	Elmore	Alabama
McCullough, James	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
McDaniel, Howard H.	PFC	Army	Pickens	Alabama
McGee, Dave	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
McGee, William R.	PFC	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
McGhee, Richard D.	CPL	Army	Morgan	Alabama
McIntyre, Clifton	CPL	Army	Mobile	Alabama
McLeod, William	PFC	Army	Dale	Alabama
McMillan Reveren	PVT	Army	Dallas	Alabama
McGamie, Kenneth Eugene	PFC	Marines	Huntsville	Alabama
Meadows, Vernon	PVT	Army	Coosa	Alabama
Mefford, Jake, Jr.	SPC	Army	Madison	Alabama
Melcher, Huey P.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Meyer, Harry, Jr.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Miles, Claud	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Miller, Augustus	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Miller, Cecil	PVT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Miller, Frank Edward, Jr.	CAPT	Air Force	Birmington	Alabama
Miller, Grady H.	CPL	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Miller, Joe R.	CPL	Army	Jackson	Alabama
Miller, Vernon Eugene	PFC	Marines	Horton	Alabama
Mills, Eugene O.	PFC	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Mills, Hilery W.	PFC	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Mitchell, Archie F.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Mitchell, Bobby A.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Mitchell, Grady Purden, Jr.	1LT	Marines	Selma	Alabama
Mitchell, William L.	PVT	Army	Madison	Alabama
Mixon, Herman L.	SGT	Army	Lamar	Alabama
Moore, David L.	PFC	Army	Washington	Alabama
Morphew, James E.	PFC	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Morris, Harry R.	PFC	Army	Houston	Alabama
Morris, Max A.	MAJ	Army	Blount	Alabama
Morris, Milton, Jr.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Morrow, Billy J.	PFC	Marines	Goodwater	Alabama
Morton, Ralph Frankline	FA	Navy	Alabama City	Alabama
Moseley, Samuel L.	SFC	Army	Cherokee	Alabama
Moss, Alonza	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Murphree, Calvin	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Nabors, Dixon H.	2LT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Nelson, James H.	PVT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Nelson, Jerome S.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Nelson, Paul R.	PFC	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Nelson, Richard P.	CPL	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Nevins, Guy Holder, III	1LT	Air Force	Montgomery	Alabama
Newell, Jersome E.	PFC	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Newton, Forster E., Jr.	CPL	Army	Houston	Alabama
Odom, Newman R.	SFC	Army	Walker	Alabama

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO DIED FROM HOSTILE ACTION (INCLUDING MISSING AND CAPTURED) [1]—Continued

[Listed by home State, county or hometown and thereunder alphabetically]

Name	Rank/Grade	Branch of service	Home of record, City/Town/County [2]	State
O'Hara, Cordell	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Olive, James G.	CPL	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Oliver, Jesse Harold	SGT	Army	Birmingham	Alabama
Oliver, Kenneth E.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Ousley, James A.	CPL	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Overstreet, James Douglas	SN	Navy	Montgomery	Alabama
Overton, Robert E.	SGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Pace, Charlie J.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Parker, Alfred P.	PFC	Army	Coosa	Alabama
Parker, Dixie S.	1LT	Army	Bibb	Alabama
Parker, F.D.	PVT	Army	Walker	Alabama
Parker, Olen	SSGT	Marines	Hartselle	Alabama
Parker, Oscar B.	PFC	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Parmer, William E.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Parrish, Willie P.	PVT	Army	Dale	Alabama
Partridge, Walter R.	SGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Pate, Billy C.	PFC	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Patrick, Willie	PFC	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Patterson, Clarence	PVT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Peak, Willie L.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Pearce, Thomas P. Jr.	2LT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Pearsall, Gilbert B.	1LT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Pendergrass, Leon B.	MSGT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Penland, Raymond D.	SFC	Army	Lee	Alabama
Perkins, Frank	SGT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Peterman, Paul	PVT	Army	Houston	Alabama
Pettit, Raymond C.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Phelps, Woodrow W.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Phillips, Billy M.	PFC	Army	Limestone	Alabama
Phillips, Hugh B.	PVT	Army	Jackson	Alabama
Phillips, Richard L.	PVT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Pickens, Freddie F.	SFC	Army	Lemar	Alabama
Pickett, James L.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Pickett, Robert Edward	PFC	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Piper, Ranson D. Jr.	CPL	Army	Elmore	Alabama
Pitts, Clyde T.	SGT	Marines	Gadsden	Alabama
Pitts, John W.	PFC	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Pogue, James F.	PFC	Army	Madison	Alabama
Polarie, Howard L.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Poole, Lovell	SGT	Army	Randolph	Alabama
Poore, Elvis J.	PFC	Army	Winston	Alabama
Porter, Alec W.	PFC	Army	Clay	Alabama
Posey, Noland D.	CPL	Army	Madison	Alabama
Potter, Morris L.	MAJ	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Pounds, Lester M. Jr.	PVT	Army	Bibb	Alabama
Powell, Buford B.	CPL	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Powell, James R.	PVT	Army	Walker	Alabama
Prentice, Robert H.	PVT	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Prestwood, Virgil W.	PFC	Army	Jackson	Alabama
Pritchett, Dixie C.	PVT	Army	Clarke	Alabama
Pugh, William A.	1LT	Air Force	Birmingham	Alabama
Raber, Rudolph	PFC	Army	Balwin	Alabama
Raines, Alford B.	SGT	Army	Dale	Alabama
Randall, Elgin V.	CPL	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Ratliff, Jerry		Army	Chilton	Alabama
Rawls, Charles W.	PVT	Army	Hale	Alabama
Ray, Alton G.	PFC	Marines	Courtland	Alabama
Raye, Leroy J.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Reaves, James W.	CAPT	Army	Lee	Alabama
Reed, Cecil	PFC	Army	Lamar	Alabama
Reese, Leon	SGT	Marines	Huntsville	Alabama
Reese, Willie	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Reid, Elbert Josephus Jr.	SSGT	Air Force	Birmingham	Alabama
Richard, Ralph Leslie	CPL	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Richard, N.L.	SGT	Army	Monroe	Alabama
Riddley, James R.	CPL	Army	Houston	Alabama
Rigdon, Edward W.	PFC	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Riner, Claude L. Jr.	PFC	Army	Colbert	Alabama
Rivers, Norman O.	SGT	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Rives, Joel Orlander	1LT	Air Force	Birmingham	Alabama
Roberson, Edward L.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Roberts, Jeff, Jr.	PVT	Army	Houston	Alabama
Robinson, James	SFC	Army	Hale	Alabama.
Robinson, Wilda E.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Rogato, Costanzo	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Rogers, Harvey W.	2LT	Army	St Clair	Alabama
Rogers, Willie L.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Root, Voorhees S., Jr.	SSGT	Air Force	Huntsville	Alabama
Roper, Hillard Marshall	MAJ	Air Force	Auburn	Alabama
Ross, James	PFC	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Ruddell, Adler Earl	AD3	Navy	Batesville	Alabama
Rushing, Harry Eugene	2LT	Air Force	Montgomery	Alabama
Rushing, Larry W.	PFC	Army	Lamar	Alabama
Salze, Floyd Wheeler	CAPT	Air Force	Birmingham	Alabama
Sanders, Wade C.	PVT	Army	Sumter	Alabama
Sanford, Barnie L.	MSGT	Army	Elmore	Alabama
Sanford, Isadore	PVT	Army	Fayette	Alabama
Sasser, Ralph	PFC	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Saunders, Harry J.	SFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Sawyer, Doil B.	PVT	Army	Geneva	Alabama
Schaufler, William	PFC	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Shackelford, Allen	PFC	Army	Sumter	Alabama
Shauf, William Jerome	PFC	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Shea, Andrew B.	CPL	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Shelton, Leslie Taylor, Jr.	1LT	Marines	Mobile	Alabama
Shy, Henry H.	PFC	Army	Geneva	Alabama
Silver, Clarence P.	PFC	Marines	Mobile	Alabama
Simmons, Glen D.	PFC	Army	Walker	Alabama
Simmons, Johnnie L.	PFC	Army	Bullock	Alabama
Simmons, Willie H.	PFC	Army	St Clair	Alabama
Skelton, John C.	CPL	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Slaten, Waymon	PFC	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Slatton, Hayden W.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Sloan, Carl T.	PVT	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Smalley, Alfred August	SGT	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Smith, Billy E.	PVT	Army	Chambers	Alabama
Smith, Charles	1LT	Army	Covington	Alabama
Smith, Grover C.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Smith, Harold L.	2LT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Smith, James H.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO DIED FROM HOSTILE ACTION (INCLUDING MISSING AND CAPTURED) [1]—Continued

[Listed by home State, county or hometown and thereunder alphabetically]

Name	Rank/Grade	Branch of service	Home of record, City/Town/County [2]	State
Smith, Moses	PVT	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Smith, Rufus A.	PFC	Army	Blount	Alabama
Smith, Travis	SFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Smith, Walter M.	PVT	Army	Tallapoosa	Alabama
Smith, William L.	SFC	Army	Baldwin	Alabama
Sormrude, Louis M.	1LT	Army	Geneva	Alabama
South, Ernest C.	PFC	Army	Covington	Alabama
Spain, Robert L.	PFC	Army	Pickens	Alabama
Speegle, Kelton	MSGT	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Spence, Grover C. Jr.	PFC	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Spivey, Bobby E.	CPL	Army	Madison	Alabama
Spragins, Robert E.	CAPT	Air Force	Huntsville	Alabama
Springer, Marvin R.	PVT	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Stagg, Thomas C.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Staggs, William C.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Stanford, James C.	PFC	Army	Wilcox	Alabama
Stanphill, Dock L.	PFC	Army	Franklin	Alabama
Steele, Auther R.	PVT	Marines	Birmingham	Alabama
Steele, Harold M.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Steele, John W.	SFC	Army	Bibb	Alabama
Steen, Gerald D.	CPL	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Stewart, David L.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Stewart, Edward F.	CPL	Army	Cullman	Alabama
Stewart, Gerald W.	PVT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Stewart, Huell J., Jr.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Stiefel, Ernest J.	PVT	Army	Marshall	Alabama
Stokes, John M.	2LT	Army	Coffee	Alabama
Story, Martin L.	PFC	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Strickland, Marvin	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Strickland, Pete	PFC	Army	Lee	Alabama
Stickland, Terrell	PFC	Army	Dale	Alabama
Stubblefield, Billy	SGT	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Sulser, James E.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Sumners, James E.	SGT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Sutton, Andrew M.	CPL	Army	Pickens	Alabama
Sweatt, Walter M.	PFC	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Tennille, James E.	PVT	Army	Barbour	Alabama
Terrell, William	CPL	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Tew, Bernard	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Third, Jack H.	PFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Thomas, Fred	PFC	Marines	Mobile	Alabama
Thomas, James, Jr.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Thomas, Johnny W.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Thomas, Joseph, Jr.	SGT	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Thomas, Mitchell C.	2LT	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Thomas, Roy L.	CPL	Army	Blount	Alabama
Thompson, James L.	2LT	Army	Cleburne	Alabama
Thornton, William B.	SGT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Thrasher, Billy L.	PFC	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Threat, Woodie B.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Thurman, Ruben, Jr.	CPL	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Tilley, Herbert L.	CPL	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Tindell, James, Jr.	PFC	Army	Houston	Alabama
Tolbert, Barney A.	PFC	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Trent, James O.	SFC	Army	Lauderdale	Alabama
Trimm, John Edward	HM3	Army	Birmingham	Alabama
Trione, James J.	PFC	Army	Baldwin	Alabama
Turner, Robert G.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Turner, Thomas J.	PVT	Army	Walker	Alabama
Tyner, John T.	PFC	Army	Fayette	Alabama
Vails, Maxwell W.	MAJ	Army	tuscaloosa	Alabama
Van Horn, Irving	SGT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Varner, Alvin L.	CPL	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Varner, Gene C.	PVT	Army	Coosa	Alabama
Vaughn, Jack Dennis	PFC	Marines	Wilmer	Alabama
Vickers, Ivey E.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Vickery, Charles J.	PVT	Army	Baldwin	Alabama
Wadsworth, William	2LT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Waid, Homer L.	PFC	Army	walker	Alabama
Walker, Walter L.	PVT	Army	Blount	Alabama
Wallace, Floyd	PVT	Army	Choctaw	Alabama
Wallace, Howard E.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Wallace, John W.	PVT	Army	Tuscaloosa	Alabama
Walthour, Charles P.	2LT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Walton, Bobby B.	PFC	Army	Clay	Alabama
Wance, Ralph R.	CAPT	Army	Madison	Alabama
Washington, Joseph	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Washington, Preston	SGT	Marines	Warrior	Alabama
Watford, Billy S.	CPL	Army	Houston	Alabama
Watson, John W.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Watson, Leonard	CPL	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Watson, William E.	PVT	Army	Wilcox	Alabama
Watts, Eddie	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Weaver, Carlos D.	PVT	Army	Escambia	Alabama
Webb, Jerald C.	PFC	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Weeks, Grady M.	SSGT	Air Force	Birmingham	Alabama
Weldon, Elbert	PFC	Army	Lee	Alabama
Weldon, Olebia B.	SFC	Army	Lee	Alabama
Wendling, George Vincent	MAJ	Air Force	Birmingham	Alabama
Wesson, Lee C.	CPL	Army	Walker	Alabama
Wester, Robert	CPL	Army	Cherokee	Alabama
Westry, James P.	PFC	Army	Wilcox	Alabama
Wheeler, John H.	PFC	Army	Fayette	Alabama
Whisenant, Nois L.	CPL	Army	Marshall	Alabama
White, James, S.	PFC	Army	Pike	Alabama
White, John H.	CPL	Army	Jackson	Alabama
Whitehead, Lee Jr.	CPL	Army	Geneva	Alabama
Wilbourn, Julian D.	PVT	Army	Jackson	Alabama
Wilks, Van L.	PVT	Army	DeKalb	Alabama
Williams, Basil A.	PFC	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Williams, Buck	CPL	Army	Jackson	Alabama
Williams, Herman	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Williams, James M.	PVT	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Williams, Jasper D.	PVT	Army	Washington	Alabama
Williams, John J.	PFC	Army	Houston	Alabama
Williams, John Jr.	PVT	Army	Walker	Alabama
Williams, Olen B.	MSGT	Army	Chilton	Alabama
Williams, Paul R.	PVT	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Williams, Roosevelt	PVT	Army	Lee	Alabama
Williams, Roosevelt	CPL	Army	Russell	Alabama

U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO DIED FROM HOSTILE ACTION (INCLUDING MISSING AND CAPTURED) [1]—Continued

[Listed by home State, county or hometown and thereunder alphabetically]

Name	Rank/Grade	Branch of service	Home of record, City/Town/County [2]	State
Willis, Charles A.	PFC	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Wills, Elbert F.	CPL	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Wilson, Clarence O.	CPL	Army	Walker	Alabama
Wilson, Garvin	SGT	Army	Baldwin	Alabama
Wilson, James E.	SFC	Army	Houston	Alabama
Wilson, Juan B.	CPL	Army	Mobile	Alabama
Wilson, Robert D.	PVT	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Winchester, William	PVT	Army	Lawrence	Alabama
Womack, Robert W.	PFC	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Wood, Bobby J.	CPL	Army	Blount	Alabama
Wood, Wallace Norman	Capt	Marines	Greenville	Alabama
Woods, Thomas B. Jr.	CPL	Army	Jefferson	Alabama
Woodson, Lewis B.	PFC	Army	Shelby	Alabama
Worrell, Leonard E.	PFC	Army	Conecuh	Alabama
Worth, Jack	CPL	Army	Montgomery	Alabama
Wright, Preston A.	PFC	Army	Talladega	Alabama
Wyatt, Wilmer T.	SGT	Army	Covington	Alabama
Yancy, Robert G.	PFC	Army	Calhoun	Alabama
Yaw, Billy G.	PFC	Army	Etowah	Alabama
Yelverton, V.S.	PVT	Army	Perry	Alabama
Young, David R.	PFC	Army	Cullman	Alabama
TOTAL—672				

[1] For persons who died while missing or captured, the date of casualty is the date died not the date declared missing or captured.
[2] Army lists country; Air Force, Navy and Marines List city or town or place.
Source: Korean conflict casualty file, 1950–1957 (machine-readable record), Record Secretary of Defense, record group 330.
For further information, please contact the Center's Reference Staff.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the text of my speech.

KOREAN WAR MEMORIAL SPEECH—FULTONDALE, ALABAMA, SUNDAY, JULY 25, 1999

Throughout the Bible, God calls on his Children to remember. To remember the wonderful works He has done, His miracles and the judgment He uttered (Psalms 105:5). We are told not only to remember the good days, but the difficult as well. ''Remember that you were a slave in Egypt,'' he reminded the children of Israel. Remember the days of old, and consider. Recall what the Lord your God did.

And when they forget to remember the hard lessons or the sweet blessings of the past, failure was not far away. When we read the Bible, we are sometimes frustrated seeing God's children repeating their mistakes time and time again. Being so unappreciative. Why did they forget? Why didn't they remember?

But are we so different? We forget a whole war and the sacrifices made. Is not America's treatment of the Korean War not parallel? Why did we forget? Why were we so unappreciative?

The Korean War concluded not with the enemy's surrender, but with the negotiated armistice that re-established the earlier boundary between North and South, leaving an uneasy peace that lingers today. With tens of thousands of young Americans brutally killed and in such a remote and inhospitable land so far away and with no victory to celebrate, the Korean War gave most Americans of that time little to remember and much to forget. That is why the Korean War is often spoken of as the forgotten war.

However, there is much to remember about this war and about those who left farms and factories, high school classrooms and college campuses to serve their country.

Today, we assemble together to remember. To recall and consider. We are not here to cheer or to celebrate but to reflect on the sacrifices of so many made so long ago. To remember the living, those who survived and are here today. Those who died and lie buried about us, and those whose bodies were never recovered to lie beneath the green, green grass of home.

World War II had followed World War I, the war to end all wars. The long struggle against Nazism and imperialism was over and America, although victorious, was so weary of war. America and her people knew well the cost, the horror and the sacrifice of war.

But in June 1950, one and a half million of America's finest patriots left their families, friends and homes to help defend freedom. Halfway around the world they went, or as so aptly inscribed on the Korean War Memorial, to ''a place they had never been and a people they had never met.'' These were citizen soldiers. For the most part not skilled in the art of war, but ordinary young men and women like our sons and daughters, who, when the time came, showed extraordinary courage.

We should remember, too, the terrible hardships our Korean War veterans endured. The deadly cold, the weeks and months spent crammed in foxholes and bunkers dug into an unbelievably rugged and harsh terrain. They faced an enemy of overwhelming numbers ready to torture and brutalize. They were locked in hand-to-hand combat on ''Heartbreak Ridge'' and ''Porkchop Hill'' and confronted the world's fastest fighter jets in ''Mig Alley.'' Today's military history records that our Korean veterans set a standard of courage that may be matched, but which will never be surpassed. Ordinary men and women who showed extraordinary courage.

Chiseled in silver on the Korean War memorial are the words ''Freedom is not free.'' The men and women who served in Korea and the family and friends of those 36,914 who never returned and those thousands of Americans who were lost in Korea and whose bodies to this day have never been found demonstrate the high and precious cost of freedom. We should never forget that these patriots paid the price one at a time when they were swept away in the treacherous tides of Inchon or died defending the perimeter of Puzan, or froze to death by the hundreds at Chosan reservoir or in the long march out. Their families will never forget their sacrifice and neither will we.

Now on this hot, sunny summer day 46 years after the July armistice, we have a new reason to remember those who left home and struggled to stop the spread of aggression, for we now know that it was these veterans who took the first resolute action to stem the expansion of communism, and in doing so helped change the course of history. Now we know it took four more decades to win the battle against communism, but having witnessed the collapse of the Berlin Wall and its aftermath we know that those who served in Korea laid the foundations for one of the greatest victories in the history of mankind: the free world triumph over communism.

As we leave this memorial, this observance, let us be reminded the Korean War is not a forgotten war. It is a war most worthy of remembrance. Let us, on behalf of all the free people of the world, remember the men and women who died not only in the Korean War, but in all our wars. Finally, let us give thanks to those men and women who have given their lives for our freedom, and give thanks to God for them and for those who stand guard over America today, defending and preserving our freedom.

PUTTING CHILDREN FIRST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this body to stop over-spending on defense and start spending on the needs of our children. We need to put children first.

Our military spending is still at Cold War levels. Each year, we allocate more than half of federal discretionary spending to military efforts. In contrast, for education, that figure is less than 9 percent. As a nation, we rank 1st in military spending but only 10th globally in spending for education. It should then come as no surprise, that in a recent international study of 21 industrialized nations the students of the United States ranked 19th in math and science performance.

This Congress voted to increase the Pentagon's budget by 112 billion dollars over the next six years. Incredibly, that is nearly the same amount of money needed to repair the nation's schools according to a report by the General Accounting Office.

Our schools are in dire need of assistance. many are crumbling, cracking, and splitting at the seams. That same GAO report informed us that 14 million pupils nationwide are being educated in unsatisfactory environments. These children are attending school in facilities that either need extensive structural repair or the replacement of one or more buildings. In my home state of Michigan, for example, more than 1 in 5 schools have at least one building in need of serious repair, and more than half of Michigan's schools have at least one serious environmental health problem.

We all accept the fact that learning environment affects the quality of the education our children receive. I ask you: ''How do we expect our children to learn, when we do not

give them the clean and safe places to do so?'' We need to get the asbestos out of the classrooms. We need to get children out of trailers and portable classrooms. We need to fix leaking roofs, repair plumbing facilities and ensure each student is studying under adequate light.

Ms. Lenora Starks, a constituent of mine, recently wrote to me. She was concerned that we weren't doing enough to help our public schools. ''We must ensure,'' she wrote, ''that our students have a proper learning environment. In too many schools, efforts to improve student achievement are hampered by inadequate and deteriorating facilities.''

Ms. Starks can see our priorities. She sees that this Congress has not been putting children first and is worried about what that means for our nation's future.

We need to put children first by increasing spending on Head Start. Rather than giving an excess of 17 billion unrequested dollars to the bloated Pentagon budget, we could fully fund Head Start for the next five years. And this funding is critical. Because of inadequate federal funding, Head Start is only able to serve 30 percent of eligible children. Lack of federal fund also causes most children to wait until the age of four to enter the program, when evidence supports earlier intervention is more effective.

Children are also adversely affected by a lack of financial commitment to low-income families and to impoverished neighborhoods. One example is the malignant neglect of the childcare crisis in this country. The 105th Congress only provided 182 million dollars this year to improve the quality of children care in this country. This fell far short of the estimated 7.5 billion dollars needed to provide safe and affordable child care for working families. Full-day child care costs up to 10,000 per year, yet half of America's families with young children earn less than 35,000 per year. Child care in low-income communities must be a priority if parents are going to be able to seize opportunities to provide for their children.

Regarding neighborhoods, support for Community Development Block Grants, which have a long history of providing economic aid to underserved areas, is declining. In the city of Detroit, CDBG funding has declined from 130.1 million to 51.3 million over the past 19 years. For fiscal year 2000, current proposals by this Congress would continue the downward trend. With one in five American children living in poverty, cuts to CDBGs undoubtedly affect their futures. Studies show that poor children are less likely to finish school, are at heightened risk of stunted growth and other health problems and contribute less to our economy as adults. We must restore the CDBGs to their original vitality and reverse the years of cutbacks if we really want to help the youngest victims of poverty.

Congress also misdirects spending by failing to support youth employment initiatives. While increasing the Pentagon's budget over the past two years, Congress has concurrently cut youth job training by 80 percent and federal support for summer jobs for young people. Young people must have avenues to pursue their dreams.

We need to reprioritize our allocation of funds in this nation. We need to put children first. This is not a choice, this is a must.

TITLE IX AND ROLE OF U.S. WOMEN'S NATIONAL SOCCER TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I raise my voice in praise of title IX and the U.S. Women's National Soccer Team.

There is no doubt in my mind that title IX has been successful in expanding opportunities for women in athletics. Before title IX, women represented only 1 percent of college athletes, and virtually no athletic scholarships went to women. Because of title IX, more than 100,000 women now participate in intercollegiate college sports.

The purpose of title IX is to provide the same opportunities for women in education as men. While we celebrate the great strides that women have made in competitive athletics, we should also recognize that title IX has made an impact and opened doors in other areas of education.

The U.S. Women's National Soccer Team, our 1999 Women's World Cup champions, they certainly made it clear that women can make a tremendous contribution to sports. These dedicated, determined, and accomplished young women make me proud to be associated with the cause of getting more girls and women involved with sports and fitness.

Title IX and the U.S. Women's National Soccer Team have changed the playing field for girls and women in athletics. But since title IX was passed in 1972, there has been a world of change in our expectations of what women can achieve.

Women like Mia Hamm and Michelle Akers on the soccer field, and Colonel Eileen Collins, who is commander of the shuttle flight Columbia, they have shown the skeptics that women can successfully participate in every walk of American life. They are all long-distance runners in the challenge and the struggle to raise the status of women in our society.

When I was growing up, most people thought that girls were not as interested in sports as boys. Consequently, girls were discouraged from participating in sports activities. Now research by the Women's Sports Foundation shows that, on the contrary, boys and girls between the ages of 6 and 9 are equally interested in sports participation. By the age of 14, however, girls drop out of sports participation at a rate six times greater than boys. Something must have happened.

Now, after the U.S. Women's Soccer Team has won the 1999 Women's World Cup, young girls have aspirational and inspiration role models that will no doubt increase their participation in sports. They are growing up and appreciating the sports skills of women, and they see images of themselves excelling in sports.

Young women who participate in sports are more likely to finish school, less likely to have an unwanted pregnancy. The availability of athletic scholarships has enabled more women to pursue a college education and has opened opportunities for women at dozens of colleges.

Let me just point out the health benefits of regular and rigorous physical exercise are extensive. Studies show that women who participate in sports actually lower their risk of breast cancer and are 92 percent less likely to be involved with drugs. There are also psychological benefits. Young women who play sports have a higher level of self-esteem, a lower incidence of depression, and a more positive body image.

I am sure that, all over America, young girls are achieving success on the athletic field and thinking about growing up to be soccer or basketball stars. Others are applying themselves to their studies, and they are dreaming about becoming scientists or engineers or even Members of Congress.

These young women can feel safe and secure in their dreams because title IX will be there to protect them from the barriers of discrimination.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the fiscal year 2000 budget. Adoption of the budget is the most important job that Congress performs. Like a sound business or well-run household, our budget establishes our priorities for the next year.

The news of our income for the next year looks amazingly good. The President's Office of Management and Budget is estimating a $99 billion surplus, including Social Security monies. However, without Social Security, we have a deficit. If we protect Social Security incomes, the surplus drops to $5 billion.

OMB's 10-year projection of $1 trillion surplus may be a dangerous phantom. There is a surplus only if we include Social Security funds. Without Social Security funds, we will have a deficit.

The available surplus is much smaller than what we think. When all of the figures are calculated in a responsible manner, our surplus is more like $112 billion, hardly enough to afford the almost $800 billion 10-year tax cut package that the Republicans are considering.

Two of this administration's enormous accomplishments are the substantial reduction of a deficit and a buoyant economy. In good economic times, a wise family makes certain that the essentials for a decent household is that the soundness of the physical foundations are in tact, a good roof, a good basement, sound plumbing and wiring, adequate nutrition, basic health care, excellent schools, a

healthy neighborhood, adequate infrastructure, transportation, clean air and clean water.

□ 1945

This is what we all want for our families. What a business aspires to have is a sound basis of operation, and that is what we want for our Nation.

Congress' work is to look at our income of hard-earned tax money and use this money to provide a decent and functioning Nation; a Nation which we all can be proud of, a Nation of well-educated people, well housed, well fed, healthy, with a decent regard for themselves and for each other and the common good. We must have serious priorities for the serious business of being a sound Nation.

Now, the majority cuts taxes for the rich and ignores problems that are screaming for attention. We must pay down our debts to lower our interest rates, but we must also respond to our housing problems. We have over 5.5 million households that are in substandard housing. In my district alone, the waiting list for housing assistance opened for 1 day in May of 1997, and 15,000 applicants stood in line for a waiting list running up to 5 years. In my county of Alameda, the wait list has been closed since 1991. Taking care of our housing stock should be one of our national priorities.

Over 43 million do not have health coverage. In California, among working families of employed single adults with children, 55 percent have no insurance. The number of uninsured children has increased by 25 percent during these amazing economic times. About 8 million Californians are not covered at all. Prescription drugs are being priced out of the reach of seniors, and I fully support the President's plan to address this need. Provision of essential prescriptions should be one of our national priorities.

There will be more students. Our classrooms are crowded. A record 52.7 million children are enrolled in elementary and secondary schools, and this number will climb to 54.3 million by 2008. We do not train our teachers sufficiently, and we do not pay our teachers sufficiently. We do not have enough teachers. We do not have enough counselors. We do not have enough school buildings, and much of what we have is aging and must be rehabilitated. Most of our schools are not connected to the Internet. The Republican tax bill is silent on these issues and all of these needs. These educational needs must be one of our national priorities for attention.

Almost 70 percent of this tax freedom bill, as it is called, goes to reduce taxes of the wealthiest 10 percent of the people, with incomes over $204,000 a year. Only 9 percent of this bill goes toward reducing the taxes of about 70 percent of our people.

There is hunger in our cities and there is hunger in many of our rural areas. The Washington Post reported that our military personnel and their families depend upon second and third jobs, food stamps, and cast-away furniture in order to feed and house their families. Eliminating hunger should be a national priority. Providing adequate wages for working people should be a national priority.

This is our chance to do what is right. This is our chance. Our rivers can be cleaned, our air can be improved. This is our chance to take care of the physical conditions of our environs; a program to continue our Superfund and brown fields cleanup, reforestation, and preservation of endangered species.

We have important and essential work to do together to recognize that the priorities of our country should be putting people first. It should ensure that we make our country strong, physically, socially and economically.

ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to also talk about where we go on the budget and also where we have been on this budget.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans were elected as a majority back in 1995. For almost every year before that, for the previous 40 years, the Democrat majority in this House used every cent of the Social Security surplus and spent it on other government programs. When Republicans came in, in 1995, we came in with the enthusiasm to try to make government more efficient. We said, look, there has to be a balanced budget, and so we started cutting back on spending.

We actually had a rescission bill. We started our session in January of 1995; but already, because we operate on a fiscal year, we had gone through the first one quarter of the budget year. But, still, with three-quarters left, we decided to cut down on the spending authorized for the rest of that year. We were successful, and we held the line on increased spending.

The following year, with a great deal of effort and dedication, but also controversy, we did the same thing, because we were dedicated to the proposition that we should have a balanced budget and that Congress should live under the same logical, practical rules that every family has to live under, and that is that we had to try to pay down our debt and try to live within our means.

We took a great deal of criticism that year and through the next election and were charged with accusations such as ''Republicans are taking food out of the mouths of children,'' and ''they are radical,'' and ''they are taking the security out of Social Security,'' and ''they are reducing spending at the sacrifice of America and the sacrifice of our economy.'' Of course, that did not happen, and we were successful in reaching a balanced budget.

Now, I think everybody agrees, the President included, that a balanced budget is reasonable. The question and the challenge is do we continue down the road we have had for so many years, the last 45 years, of moving for a bigger, more expensive, more intrusive Federal Government, really on the road to socialism; or do we set some priorities and do we say what is reasonable for taxpayers to pay in terms of the money they earn?

Right now the average taxpayer in the United States pays about 40 cents out of every dollar they earn in taxes to local, State and Federal Government. If we include the regulations that we impose on business, then it gets up to about 50 cents. So the first question is, how big should government be in terms of what earnings and income is? I say it is at its largest. Our taxes today are larger than they have ever been in the history of this country except for World War II.

Now, should we pay down the debt or reduce taxes with some of the surpluses that are projected? In the budget we passed this year, we took what many of us have been preaching for the last several years, and that is to say that we were not going to use any of the Social Security surplus for any other government spending, and we came up with this idea of a lockbox.

The lockbox is simply using every penny of the surplus coming into Social Security and using that money to pay down the debt held by the public. So it does not solve the Social Security problem, but at least it does not spend it for other government programs.

Now, the challenge is, as we look at approximately a trillion dollars coming in over the next 10 years in income taxes, and another definition for surpluses in income taxes is somebody that is being overtaxed, how much of that money should go towards paying down the debt; how much of that money should be used for expanded government spending; and how much of that money should go into tax relief, or giving back to the American people? Or a better way to say that is let the American people keep a few more dollars of what they have earned.

This tax reduction bill we passed the other day does both; it is a demand on paying down the debt as well as a tax cut for every American.

We have defined our goal of reducing the debt in terms of how much the debt service costs in this country. Alan Greenspan told our Committee on the Budget that a good way to measure the imposition of how big the debt is in this country is to measure the debt service cost. That is how much interest we pay out. That is $360 billion a year. We need to bring that down. That interest rate is now tied to whether or not we have across-the-board tax reductions. So we set back the across-the-board tax reduction for any year that we do not reduce the interest cost.

So I think it is correct, and I hope most of us agree, that we save Social Security and Medicare, but we also work at paying down the debt and we let the American people keep a few more dollars of what they have earned. They already work 4 months and 11 days during the year for taxes. That is enough.

OPPOSITION TO H.R. 2398

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to voice my strong opposition to H.R. 2398, a bill that would have disastrous consequences for the economy of my district, Las Vegas, Nevada.

H.R. 2398, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, is an example of the worst type of Federal Government meddling in local matters and senseless overregulation. I believe this is an issue of importance to Members of Congress and local governments across the country.

Here is the situation in a nutshell: the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors' Authority needs to expand its convention center to accommodate the growing needs of major trade shows and conventions. This type of business is the lifeblood of the economy of my district, and hundreds of thousands of jobs depend on it. I know, because I worked in the tourism business for many, many years before coming here, and I served as a business consultant trying to meet the needs of the convention industry in my hometown. I know firsthand how critically important it is for Las Vegas to expand its convention center, and I know how important these facilities are to dozens of other communities around the Nation.

Just 3 weeks ago, the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors' Authority was ready to issue revenue bonds exempt from Federal taxes. As my colleagues know, local government entities routinely issue tax exempt bonds to meet their building needs. The bond measure would allow my hometown convention center to add enough floor space to meet the needs of the convention business and maintain our reputation as one of the finest convention venues in the world into the 21st century.

The bond measure was the result of responsible local government planning for the future, to maintain a strong economy for the benefit of the 1.3 million residents of southern Nevada.

Then something shocking and outrageous happened, and it happened right here in this House. From 2,500 miles away, one of my district's most important economic development projects was torpedoed, but only temporarily, I hope. At the last minute the convention authority was forced to postpone its sale of bonds after H.R. 2398 was introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) on June 30.

The remarks of the gentleman from Texas in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicate Houston, his hometown, cannot compete with Las Vegas as a convention destination. He targeted Las Vegas with legislation designed to stop the expansion of the new convention center.

H.R. 2398 bears the obscure and seemingly harmless title of The Private Activity Bond Clarification Act of 1999. In reality, this measure would drop a bomb on the proposed Las Vegas convention center expansion and on every other public building project in the United States that uses similar tax exempt financing.

The Las Vegas convention center expansion project is a model of prudent use of public monies and sound planning. The bonds were to be repaid through hotel room tax revenues, exactly the revenues that would grow because there would be more convention space, attracting more visitors to southern Nevada.

With a Federal tax exemption, the cost of the convention center bonds would be low and the convention center will be able to accommodate conventions that otherwise would be turned away. The financing through tax exempt bonds meets every State and Federal rule and regulation.

But now, out of the blue, comes H.R. 2398. This bill seeks to kill the Federal tax exemption by changing the IRS codes, even though the current IRS codes set clear qualifications for projects in order to be tax exempt. And I might add that this project in Las Vegas meets all of these current qualifications.

H.R. 2398 is simply a solution in search of a problem. It sets out to fix something that ain't broke, and in the process H.R. 2398 could do a whole lot of damage throughout the United States. H.R. 2398 could drive up the costs of convention centers and arenas around the country by banning tax exempt bonds for those projects. It promotes the absurd concept that the Federal Government should tax local governments.

□ 2000

For no good reason, H.R. 2398 gobbles up local dollars by forcing local entities such as the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority to borrow money at higher interest rates because they would no longer qualify for Federal tax-exempt status. This amounts to an unfunded mandate and an onerous burden on our cities and our towns. I say we should be encouraging the economic boost that convention centers bring to a community, not discouraging them.

H.R. 2398 is totally out of step with the times. I know the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) must be aware that we are in an era of streamlining the IRS, not expanding it. We are in an era of reducing government intrusion on State and local matters, not meddling in them. We are in an era that recognizes the value of public-private partnerships to stimulate economic growth. And we are certainly in an era when we are all trying to lower the tax burdens, not raise them. H.R. 2398 is on the wrong side of all of these issues and we must reject it for the economic health of our local communities. The defeat of H.R. 2398 will also defeat Federal Government meddling in local affairs and defeat overregulation and it will be a victory for common sense.

WHITHER THE SURPLUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERWOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we have a surplus now. It is the first time since 1969 that we have had a surplus. We have this for two reasons: Number one, Congress has finally slowed down the rate of growth in government. Very important concept. We are questioning bureaucrats on how they spend our money. But, number two, and most importantly, we have a surplus because the American people have worked their tails off in the last several years and they have put in 50 and 60 hours a week and the revenues to our coffers have increased tremendously.

So now we have a big debate, a good debate going on, what to do with this surplus. I believe that there are three essential things that we should do, and that was what the debate last week was, on tax reduction.

Number one, what we should do with this surplus is pay our Social Security debts. Protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare. The President of the United States in January stood right where you are, Mr. Speaker, and said, ''Let's protect 62 percent of the Social Security surplus.'' But the Republican Party said, ''No, Mr. President, we want to protect 100 percent of the Social Security surplus and not just protect it on paper but put it in a lockbox so that it cannot be used for roads and bridges and pay raises and new entitlement programs but that money will be there for your mom and your dad's retirement.''

And so, Mr. Speaker, this bill puts aside 100 percent of the Social Security surplus to the tune of $1.9 trillion, protecting and preserving Social Security and Medicare.

Number two, this bill pays down the debt. For 40 years, because of irresponsible congressional spending, we have accumulated a $5.4 trillion debt. This bill takes the first serious step of paying down approximately $2 trillion of that debt by having a trigger device. The trigger device says that if you want to get a tax reduction, you have to pay down the debt. And unless the debt is paid down, then the tax reduction portion is not triggered. It is the first time that has ever been done by the House.

The third thing, of course, that the bill does is it provides the American people with $792 billion of their money

back for their overpayment in government. I am so sick and tired of people in Washington talking about how much the tax reduction is going to cost us. Guess what? It does not cost us anything because it is not our money, Mr. Speaker. It belongs to the American people.

If you go in Wal-Mart and you buy a pair of flip-flops for $2.50 and you give the cashier $5, they do not keep your money. It is your money. But if you have a Washington bureaucrat cashier, you will never see your change. They will give you more shoes, more flip-flops, they will even charge you. Before you know it the $2.50 purchase becomes a $6 and $7 purchase. That is how ridiculous things are in this town, Mr. Speaker. It is the American people's money and we need to give it back to them.

This comes in the form of a 10 percent tax reduction across the board, capital gains tax reduction, estate tax relief, relief for small businesses and farmers. The President of the United States, stickler for truth as he always has been, will come in and say, ''Oh, you're taking money away from seniors, from children, from the environment, from education.'' Well, if you are a Republican and you cross the street, the American President right now is going to accuse you of hurting seniors and children and the environment and education. It does not matter. He is a broken record. It is a formula that works for him, class warfare and scaremongering. But we are sick and tired of it.

It is interesting that liberal Senator BOB KERREY said that when you are talking about a $3 trillion surplus, an $800 billion tax reduction program is not reckless or irresponsible. That is from a well thought of, but liberal, Democratic Senator. He is saying, ''What's the big deal?''

What is the big deal, Mr. Speaker? We are talking about the size of a tax cut. We are not talking about whether to have one or not. The President has already agreed to one. Most of the liberals in Congress have agreed to one. We are only talking about the size of it.

Mr. Speaker, this tax package that was voted on the other day, again three-pronged, protects and preserves Social Security to the tune of $1.9 trillion through a lockbox, and protects 100 percent of it; number two, pays down the debt $2 trillion; and, number three, and finally and only after the others have been protected, it gives tax relief. Therefore, it is a good, responsible bill. I urge my colleagues to support it.

ON TITLE IX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, tonight we celebrate 27 years of title IX, a piece of legislation that was cosponsored by our dear friend the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) whom we come tonight to congratulate, along with Congresswoman Edith Green.

I have worked, Mr. Speaker, tonight with the cochair of the Women's Caucus, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), together women and men of the House, to recognize these two remarkable women and their achievements and their bringing about title IX, which began some 27 years ago.

These congresswomen planted a seed of opportunity for women that has blossomed into one of the greatest triumphs of our time. The successes of basketball superstar Nikki McCray; swimming sensation Penny Heyns; golf maestro Sherri Stein; the Williams sisters tennis phenomenon; ice hockey superstar Cammi Granat; the unstoppable softball shortstop Dot Richardson; World Cup soccer champions Mia Hamm, Brianna Scurry and Michelle Ackers; and Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins, the first woman to command a NASA shuttle mission which just took off on Friday. We are proud of all of them, Mr. Speaker, and we attribute their successes to title IX.

The impressive accomplishments of these women, and many more who have excelled both on and off the playing field, are not solely because of title IX. We know it takes drive, aggression, determination, competitiveness, sacrifice, true grit and a lifetime's dedication to hard work. These women are tough and they deserve to soar in their areas of expertise as they have done. But the passage of title IX, Mr. Speaker, opened a door that had been locked shut for countless decades and for countless generations of women who wanted to be challenged and pushed to new limits through athletic competition. Title IX allowed young women and girls to follow in the footsteps of tennis wonder Billie Jean King, track superstar Wilma Rudolph, and other pioneering female athletes.

It was the arduous and innovative work of the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and Edith Green 27 years ago, which we celebrated last Friday, July 23, that brought the Educational Amendments Act, which included title IX, to the desk of President Nixon. The gentlewoman from Hawaii, who is here tonight to help us celebrate her and to commend her, was both shrewd and precise in making sure that the inclusion of a few simple words would provide such a tremendous opportunity for women to develop latent athletic talents.

Specifically, the statute states, ''No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.''

The progress we have made over the past 27 years is awesome, Mr. Speaker. When President Nixon signed this bill, about 31,000 women were involved in college sports. Today, that number has more than tripled. Spending on athletic scholarships for women has also grown from less than $100,000 to almost $200 million. In 1971, there was an average of 2.1 women's teams at colleges, and now that number is at a record 7.7 per school. The participation level in high school was dismal, as well. In 1971, the athletic participation of all girls in the United States was just under 300,000. Today, that number has climbed to over 2.2 million. Finally, 40 percent of athletes at Division I schools in 1997–1998 were women, a 5 percent increase from 1996–1997. Women also received 40 percent of athletic scholarship budgets, a 14 percent rise from the previous year.

Since the enactment of title IX, we have also witnessed a significant surge in women's educational achievements. In 1994, women received 38 percent of medical degrees and 43 percent of law degrees, compared with 9 and 7 percent respectively in 1972. In 1994, women also earned 44 percent of all doctoral degrees, which is a noticeable increase from the 25 percent in 1977.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps most exciting of all, title IX has benefited millions of women, men and families who enjoy watching and playing sports. Over 40 million viewers tuned in to the final match of the Women's World Cup. That number was not only greater than any televised game for U.S. men's soccer but it also eclipsed the three-game viewing total for this year's NHL Stanley Cup. What the women's U.S. soccer team illustrated with their victory is just how far we have come as a Nation in providing opportunities for women to test their limits, excel in sports and fulfill their dreams in many more areas than women of our generation could ever fathom.

Tonight, I salute our dear friend the Honorable PATSY MINK and the Honorable Edith Green for paving the way for women to succeed in our educational institutions. And I give my most heartfelt congratulations to all of our athletic and academic achievers, who are the women of title IX.

BACKGROUND LEADING TO PASSAGE OF HISTORIC TITLE IX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for this honor that they are bestowing on me this evening and I want to especially thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for taking the initiative in convening this series of comments that will be made on title IX tonight.

Today, we are witnessing the results of the formation of a concept which was incorporated in the education amendments of 1972 in a small title referred to as title IX. It is important, I

think, for this generation of young women in particular that are coming forward and experiencing opportunities which were not available two generations ago to understand what prompted the inclusion of this language in the education amendments.

In my own experience, I went to college, I fully expected to be accepted in medical school, but upon applying to at least a dozen or more institutions in those days, in the 1950s, the reply that I received was, ''I'm sorry, but we do not take women into our medical school.'' And that was that. It was a blatant refusal to accept the notion that women could be equal in this society.

Prior to that, I had ventured into the Midwest. I enrolled at the University of Nebraska, thinking that some of my friends, male friends, were in medical school there and perhaps by being there I could have a better opportunity to be accepted. And so I enrolled for a brief period at the University of Nebraska.

Upon arriving there on campus, I found that I had been placed in a segregated rooming house with other minority women members of that college community. I was appalled at this practice, which I thought had been rescinded by laws previously. But I found myself in the midst of a tremendous turmoil on campus, which I must say I created, and within a short period of time the Board of Regents of that university eliminated that segregation and henceforth all people were treated equally and could be housed in the dormitories.

□ 2015

It was a series of these sorts of discrimination, even going back to Hawaii after I finished law school, which I went to as a second choice. I found that there were all sorts of vestiges of discrimination. I could not get a job. I always taught my colleagues currently in various places that if they had but given me a job, I would not be here on the floor of this Congress tormenting them with liberal legislation. So that is the penalty they pay today for ignoring my request for a simple job.

But coming to the Congress, I must tell you that the one person who really inspired me to get active in this field was my daughter who applied to go to Stanford University after finishing high school and was rejected because the percentage of women that had been accepted in the freshman class had been exceeded. So even in her generation, she was enduring this type of discrimination merely because she was female.

So coming to the Congress, being on the Education and Labor Committee chaired by Adam Clayton Powell, from the moment I sat in my chair as a freshman member down in the lower tier, he began hearings on discrimination and textbooks, and we hauled in all the textbooks to show that women were really being discarded. We hauled in the Department of Education because they were issuing films on vocational education which showed women as nurses, teachers, social workers, but not of the engaging occupations like scientists or a doctor or an engineer or anything of that kind.

So as we moved into the field of education finally with the enactment of Public Law 8910 which was the first Federal aid to education to elementary and secondary schools, we wanted to make sure that with the Federal Government getting into funding educational programs that women, girls, would have an equal opportunity, and that was all we were trying to say. We were in the poverty program. And Job Corps centers were being opened all over the country, but none for the girls, so we fought to open up women's Job Corps centers, and I went down to West Virginia to dedicate the first center.

So there were many, many people that were involved in this. Edith Green was the chairperson of the Higher Education Committee. She convened hearings in June of 1970. We celebrate the year 1972 because that was the enactment, but all of this was occurring from the moment I arrived here in 1965. I have had two generations of service in this Congress. I came here in 1965, and I left in 1976 to try to get to the other body, but they did not want or were not ready for me quite at that point.

But we had a number of hearings, and Edith was always up front chairing that committee. She called this hearing in June of 1970, wanted to amend the Civil Rights Act to add the protections for women in that legislation which was not yet established.

This was all going on at the same time that all the women in the country were getting excited about the ERA. Remember the Equal Rights Amendment? So you have to put this in the context of where this Nation was at this time and all of the foment that was going on in terms of our communities and here in the Congress. And so we tried to get a civil rights bill, but the Justice Department intervened and said, no, we cannot support an amendment of the Civil Rights Act; why do you not put this measure in the education bill? And really that is the genesis of title IX. It was not a surrender, but it was a concession to the Department of Justice at that time that insisted we do this.

So finally, when the education amendments came up in November of 1971, we were able to argue all of this.

In the final comment, I must say that the tribute really and the sustenance of this legislation has to go to my daughter because on the floor when there was an attempt made to water down this legislation, I was on the floor helping to get it through. But at the moment, the critical moment of just a minute or so before the vote, I was called off the floor because my daughter had gotten into a accident, and so I rushed off to Ithaca to see how she was. And in leaving the floor, the amendment which was a devastating amendment passed by one vote, 212 to 211, and so the next week the Speaker of the House, Carl Albert, took the floor, asked for a revote, and we captured the situation.

So she called me the other night and said, ''If you're going to talk about title IX, you must mention my role in it and how your commitment to me almost caused a catastrophe.'' But the House of Representatives reacted and restored common sense and dignity to the debate, and so title IX lived on forever with no one ever being able to challenge it ever again.

So that is the story of title IX.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Congresswomen PATSY MINK and Edith Green who authored Title IX. Because of their vision, we all witnessed the extraordinary accomplishments of many remarkable women over the years, including the Women's World Cup Champions and Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins.

All of America and much of the world was captivated by the grace and athleticism of the U.S. Women's Soccer team. All of us—men and women alike—were thrilled by their performances and marveled at what they were able to accomplish. America was on the edge of its seat during the final game.

And, just last week, Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins became the first woman to command a NASA space shuttle. Once again, we had evidence of what women can achieve if they are given the tools and opportunities.

It was a thrill for me to join the First Lady, members of Congress including Congresswoman MINK and the World Champion Women's Soccer Team aboard Air Force Two last Monday night to witness the Space Shuttle ''near'' launch commanded by Colonel Collins. It was quite a celebration of the successes of women. I wish the entire crew a successful mission and a safe return home.

Tonight, we pay tribute not just to Congresswomen MINK and Green, but to all the other women in this country who have excelled at sports or the arts, at science and in business.

Congresswomen PATSY MINK and Edith Green made a real difference in the lives of girls and women, and in the communities in which they live. Without their efforts, there would likely be no World Cup championship women's soccer team today or female NASA shuttle commanders. Those two extraordinary women, through their vision and courage, gave American women the tools to succeed.

Representatives MINK and Green were the guiding spirits behind Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972—the landmark legislation that bans sex discrimination in schools in both academics and athletics. Title IX states, ''No person in the U.S. shall, on the basis of sex be excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving federal aid.''

Before Title IX, many schools saw no problem in refusing to admit women or having strict limits. But since Title IX, we have seen significant increases in women's educational achievements: In 1994, women received 38 percent of medical degrees, compared with 9 percent in 1972; In 1994, women earned 43

percent of law degrees, compared with 7 percent in 1972; In 1994, 44 percent of all doctoral degrees to U.S. citizens went to women, up from 25 percent in 1977.

Title IX governs the overall equity of treatment and opportunity in athletics while giving schools the flexibility to choose sports based on student body interest, geographic influence, a given school's budget restraints, and gender ratio. The focus is on the necessity for women to have opportunities equal to men on the whole, not on an individual basis.

Here are just a few statistics that illustrate the impact this groundbreaking legislation has had: In 1971, about 31,000 women were involved in college sports and today that number has more than tripled; From 1971 to 1998, spending on athletic scholarships for women has grown from less than $100,000 to almost $200 million; In 1971, there was an average of 2.1 women's teams at colleges and now that number is at a record 7.7 per school; In 1971, the athletic participation of all girls in this country was 294,015. Today, this number has climbed to over 2.2 million; Forty percent of athletes at Division I schools in 1997–98 were women—a 5 percent increase from 1996–97; During the same year, women received 40 percent of athletic scholarship budgets—a 14 percent rise from the previous year.

In closing, let me thank, on behalf of all Americans, Congresswomen PATSY MINK and Edith Green and all the girls and women who inspire and lead us each and every day.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my women colleagues to commemorate Title IX's successes and achievements. First, I would like to commend my colleague and friend, Congresswoman PATSY MINK, as well as former Oregon Congresswoman Edith Green who authored and initiated Title IX over 20 years ago. Their contributions in support of equal opportunity for women have been invaluable.

Signed into law in 1972, Title IX is the landmark civil rights law that banned sex discrimination in schools in both academics and athletics. While the law applied to all education programs in schools receiving federal aid, it has become best known for expanding athletic opportunities for women.

Since Title IX's passage, women's participation in intercollegiate sports has skyrocketed: When Title IX was first passed, there were 31,000 women participating in intercollegiate athletics. Today, that number is over 120,000—a four-fold increase.

A recent survey showed that the number of women's collegiate teams have risen from 5.6 teams per school in 1977 to 7.5 in 1996.

Simply put, Title IX has been a smashing success for women's collegiate sports, which were virtually non-existent in the early 1970's.

But critics still like to lambaste Title IX, alleging that it's decimated men's sports or gone too far.

Let's put these tired old myths about Title IX to rest:

Myth #1: Title IX enforces quotas against men.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Title IX forbids quotas. It simply prohibits sex discrimination in federally funded education programs. That means female students must have equal opportunities to participate in education programs, including athletics. Utilizing a three-prong test, schools can show they comply with Title IX by fulfilling one of three requirements, offering schools flexibility and ample room for Title IX compliance.

Myth #2: Title IX will cause the elimination of men's collegiate sports.

Title IX does not require schools to cut men's sports. Nor has Title IX ever forced a school to eliminate a men's sports program to meet compliance. Many schools have decided to cut teams in men's minor sports, such as gymnastics and wrestling, for a combination of reasons, including budget constraints, changes in student interest, alumni support, liability or risk of injury. Let's not forget that football and basketball budgets consume a whopping 69% of the average Division I–A school's men's athletic operating budget. Perhaps Title IX critics should point their finger at poor fiscal management or excessive support for one sport—not at Title IX—for the decline in men's sports.

Myth #3: Title IX has gone too far.

Despite Title IX's successes, we still have a long way to go. The fact is that women's athletics continue to lag behind men's programs. Compared to men, female athletes have only 38% of scholarships. From 1992–1997, men's athletic budgets, in Division 1–A alone, increased by 139%. In contrast, women's budget increased during this time period by 89%. From fewer scholarships, to inferior athletic equipment and facilities, the playing field for female athletes is far from level. We need Title IX now more than ever.

Finally, the latest myth about Title IX is this: Title IX cannot be credited for the country's stunning success in women's soccer, because we produced the finest soccer players through independent youth leagues, outside the scope of Title IX. Let me quote a recent article in the latest edition of the conservative magazine The Weekly Standard: ''Title IX could not possibly have had anything to do with the team's success . . . seven of this year's eleven starters . . . all joined the U.S. national squad as teenagers in the 1980s—Title IX's 'dark ages' ''.

Where do Title IX critics think these women played while they were college-age? They played at universities with top-notch college soccer teams. It is the heralded successes of the University of North Carolina's women's soccer team, the University of Tennessee's women's basketball team, and other Division I–A teams and their recruitment of top female high school athletes that has been a driving force in promoting athletic programs at the high school level, both public and private. In fact, in high school, the number of female athletes has jumped from 294,000 in 1971 to 2.4 million in 1995. Indeed, Title IX has sent the message to our young women that they have far more opportunities to compete at the college level and to qualify for college scholarships than any prior generation.

In closing, Title IX has helped put women's sports on the map, including swimming, gymnastics, softball, lacrosse, field hockey, track and field, basketball and soccer. But perhaps Title IX's most important triumph is that it tells our girls that they can be and do whatever they want—and that includes excelling in sports and academics.

TITLE IX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening, and I had other comments prepared, but I do not want to be repetitious. I am kind of going to go from the cuff and say I have been blessed to be able to stand on the floor this evening with my colleague who put into practice title IX. And I say, Put into practice, because she was the one along with her colleague, Edith Green, that moved to have this legislation come to the floor, and I just want to take a moment to say: Congresswoman PATSY MINK, thank you so very much.

I have been blessed on another occasion to have worked in the campaign of Congressman Lewis Stokes back in 1968, and to stand here as his successor is another great opportunity.

So it is nice to see history in movement.

I stand here, and I would have gone through some of the statistics that my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) went through in her presentation, but I am going to skip that. But I want to congratulate you, Congresswoman MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for this evening's activity. I will move on to say in the last Olympics held in Atlanta, female athletes gave an outstanding and noteworthy performance. The last Olympics featured the first appearance of the women's softball team. The women's basketball Olympic dream team took the gold medal. The introduction of the WNBA was just 2 years ago, and I am proud to say that women in the city of Cleveland are always out in support of the Rockers. Of the 44 gold medals won by the U.S., 19 were given to women, including 5 team efforts.

In 1997, which marked the 25th anniversary of title IX, the women's addition of the National Directory of College Athletics asked people to give the most significant people or events which have effected women's inter-collegiate athletics since 1972. Of all the things presented, title IX was the one event in history that affected intercollegiate athletics.

I was proud to be able to be here in these United States when, in 1999, not only did the Duke men go to the final four, the Duke women went to the final four. That was significant for us to be able to say that.

I am almost out of time, only to say it is wonderful to turn on my television and see women athletes marketing sports products and setting the example for younger women. It is important for young women to build esteem and self-confidence, and I am pleased to say that my son, an athlete, is even proud of the women athletes that go to his school, and that is significant.

I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

I want to deviate just a little bit too from what I had prepared to say. I am

just so appreciative hearing the history and the context and the genesis and the activity that gave rise to title IX and to tell you I did not know of the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) wanting to go into medicine. But I have been reporting about her esteemed career at the University of Chicago Law School, and she says sometimes I elevated her to be first in the class, but I was told she was in the top 10 of her class. So if she had wanted to go to medicine, she would have been a great doctor, but we are very pleased that she is a great Congresswoman, a person of commitment and substance, and not only did she do something great in the 1970s in authoring title IX, but she continues to fight for equality of education for all people. And so we want to thank her for what she has done, but we want to thank her for what she is and what she represents to the future not only for women, but for men as well because she set the kind of example of what equality means.

Not only is she making people pay for their error and not letting her get into medicine, but she is opening opportunities not only for, obviously we see what happened with Earleen Collins, the first woman commander of NASA Space; just think of the opportunity that she does for people. Well, you have helped make that possible, and we celebrate the Women's World Cup champion. Just think if we did not have a title IX, that would not have been possible for all of these college women to come together with such confidence, such skill, and such poise to represent the United States at such a way.

So I want to thank you and thank our former colleague, Edith Green, who had the courage to follow you or be with you as you made history in the 1970s for all women and for all America.

Mr. Speaker. Equality. Its something that we have strived toward for years. The question is whether we will ever really reach equality.

Tonight we are honoring our colleagues, Congresswomen PATSY MINK and Former Congresswoman Edith Green who authored and initiated Title IX: the Women's World Cup champions; and Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins, the first woman to command a NASA space shuttle.

Mr. Speaker. All of these women must be commended for their leadership in providing equity for women and men in our educational institutions. They and especially Congresswoman MINK continue to fight for equality in education.

Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 is the landmark legislation that bans sex discrimination in federally assisted education programs or activities—in other words, women can not be discriminated against in academics or athletics.

Title IX grew out of the women's civil rights movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s.

During that time, Congress began to focus attention on systemic educational barriers to women and girls.

And because of this legislation, women have come a long way.

For American colleges and universities, women now constitute majorities in college enrollment and completion, and are the majority of recipients of bachelor's and master's degrees.

The proportion of women graduating from college today is now equal to that of men.

By 2006, women are projected to earn 55% of all bachelor's degrees.

In 1994, women earned 34% of all U.S. medical degrees, compared with 9% in 1972.

In 1994, women earned 43% of law degrees, compared with 7% in 1972.

In 1994, 44% of all doctoral degrees to U.S. citizens went to women, up from 25% in 1977.

There are more female faculty members now than in 1972, with women constituting 37.9% of faculty members at two-year public colleges, and 19.5% at private four-year colleges and universities.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that we are celebrating the success of Title IX is that on July 10, 1999, the Women's World Cup Soccer victory reminded us about how important it is to have the protections for women that we now have.

But this victory was about more than the game and the win. It was about female athletes, sports, and equality.

In 1971, about 31,000 women were involved in college sports and today that number has more than tripled.

From 1971 to 1998, spending on athletic scholarships for women has grown from less than $100,000 to almost $200 million.

In 1971, the athletic participation of all girls in this country was 294,015. Today, this number has climbed to over 2.2 million!

These statistics are overwhelming. We must keep on fighting this battle.

Equality. We must remember that this is what we want to achieve. We're on our way. This victory simply reminded us of that.

I want to thank Congresswomen MILLENDER-MCDONALD and CAROLYN MALONEY for bringing this important occasion to the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating how far women have come in both academics and athletics, and congratulate our colleague PATSY MINK for her leadership and vision.

THE SURPLUS; WHO IS IT FOR?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, over the next several weeks what this great country of ours is going to hear is an important debate. And that is what to do with the money generated by millions of American taxpayers who get up to work every single morning, some of whom work two jobs, the husband and the wife work as well. So, you have a husband and wife working two or three jobs a week, sometimes working 6 or 7 days to put food on the table, to pay the mortgage or to pay the rent, to make that car payment, to put away for your child's education, college, law school or med school.

Whatever hopes and dreams you have for your family, you are getting up every single day to fulfill your dream. And at the end of the week, when that paycheck comes, a big chunk of that comes right here to Washington. And the American people have been working so hard in the last several years sustaining economic growth that we really have not seen in recent times and generating a surplus here in Washington.

Now there are those here in Washington who think it is all their money. And there are those who want to spend every single dime on their favorite projects or programs. And then there are those who feel that, you know what our job here is to represent and do what is right for the American people, for those taxpayers who generated this surplus. And when we do things like address adequately Social Security and Medicare and education and protecting the environment and strengthening our national defense, then we can believe that those things are right. Then we decide, well, what is left?

Right now Washington is projecting a $3 trillion surplus. Now for whatever those assumptions are worth, the bottom line here is there is money that is going to be left on the table.

☐ 2030

It is important for the American people and the people back home where I am from in Staten Island and Brooklyn to understand the core principles that are going to really drive this debate.

There are those of us who believe in personal freedom more for the American people, and there are those who say we need more government control. There are those who want lower taxes, because we believe in the American spirit that when we reduce taxes and allow hard-working people to keep more of what they earn, it drives economic growth, it creates more jobs, and we reinforce what we all tell and what we all believe in, and that is that in this great country, one can follow their dreams if given the chance. On the other side are those who want higher taxes.

There are those of us on this side who want limited government because we believe when government gets too large it infringes on our freedoms and liberties, and there are those on the other side who feel that government is just not big enough.

Then there are those who want economic growth as opposed to those who want bureaucratic growth, who feel that the decisions made in our communities across this great country are not good enough, but if we grow our bureaucracies here in Washington to have faceless and nameless bureaucrats make decisions for ourselves, our families and our communities and our schools, our police departments, that somehow, that is a better approach to government.

Finally, there are those who believe in the creation of more jobs in the private sector that has driven this engine to generate this surplus, and then there are those who believe we need a little bit more redtape to stifle innovation, to hurt small businesses, to add

unnecessary rules and regulations that actually reduces the number of jobs it could create.

Mr. Speaker, over the next several weeks there are going to be those who say everything imaginable to allow the American people or force the American people to take their eye off the ball. I believe in the American people, the common sense that they will prevail in the end, and not only that, but that we will place our faith in their wisdom and judgment to know that when there is too much money left here in Washington, too many people want to spend it. I say when we take care of Social Security, Medicare, strengthen our national defense and protect our environment and improve education, what is left over we send back home to the people who earned it, to strengthen freedom, to strengthen liberty, and continue our path to prosperity, not only for families that I represent so proudly and humbly in Staten Island and Brooklyn, but all across this great country. I suspect that when we have this debate, the American people will understand who is right.

TITLE IX AND ITS EFFECTS FOR OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERWOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to honor the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) for her good works on Title IX and everything else she does here for women and children and families and all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, last Monday night I had the chance to see in person the effects of Title IX firsthand. And let me tell my colleagues, I was impressed. Last Monday night, a number of my colleagues and I flew to Florida with the U.S. Women's National Soccer Team and with the First Lady to watch the space shuttle launch. While we were there, we met with female astronauts and we met with other women involved with the space program.

Of course, I do not have to describe the American women's soccer team to anyone that is listening here tonight or anybody in this Chamber. I cannot imagine that there is an American who has not heard of their skill, their power, and their success and does not hold them in awe.

These women, these young women are the products of Title IX. They are the perfect example of the importance of Title IX. They are an example for every female player on every women's sport team in the Nation. But less well known are the benefits of Title IX for women like the women astronauts that I met.

Title IX says that no person shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded or discriminated against under any educational program or activity receiving Federal aid. So it is not just sports. Before Title IX, most institutions of higher education, as the gentlewoman from Hawaii told us, refused to admit women or have strict quotas on the number of women admitted. Since Title IX, however, there have been significant increases in women's educational achievements, particularly in what were traditionally all-male fields like science, engineering, math, and technology.

So while we were gathered there the other night to celebrate the very real achievements of women on and off the playing field due to Title IX, we must also be aware of how much there is left to do. According to the National Science Foundation, the low participation of women in math, science, and engineering is a true and serious national problem. Too many girls lose interest in science and math during elementary and middle school and refuse to take, or fail to take advantage of these courses that they will need to prepare themselves for technical and science degrees, and technical and science high-paid careers. Too few women earn college degrees in science, engineering, math, and technology. Even though women make up slightly more than 50 percent of our population, they are less than 30 percent of America's scientists.

My colleagues may be asking me, so what? Is that some national problem? Well, the answer is absolutely yes, this is a big problem. A big problem for employers, a big problem for women as future wage-earners, and a huge problem for our Nation as we compete in the global marketplace. Quite clearly, there is no way for America to have a technically competent work force if the majority of students, females, do not prepare themselves and study for science, math, and technology careers.

That is why I have introduced a bill to help school districts encourage girls to pursue these technical careers. My bill is formally entitled, Getting Our Girls Ready for the 21st Century Act, but it is known as ''Go, Girl.'' Go, Girl will encourage a bold new work force of energized young women in science, math, engineering, and technology. Go, Girl funds programs in elementary and high school to encourage girls to study and pursue careers in those fields.

Today, women are big winners on the soccer field, and that is with the help of Title IX. Now we need to get Title IX and Go, Girl into the classroom to make more girls and their future employers winners by preparing girls for careers in science, math, engineering, and technology.

Mr. Speaker, Title IX says, no person shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded or discriminated against under any educational program or activity receiving Federal aid. Our job now is to encourage all girls and young women to take advantage of Title IX opportunities and like the American soccer women and the women astronauts, become all that they can be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAYNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THANKS TO TITLE IX, WOMEN CONTINUE TO MAKE HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking and applauding our cochair, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and our covice-chair, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for putting together this Special Order and all of my other women colleagues for joining us this evening.

I want to join also in thanking the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and former Congresswoman Edith Green for their foresight in championing and protecting the rights of women and young girls against gender discrimination within the educational system of this country, particularly in athletics; and I want to also thank all the other Members of Congress who have continued to fight to end discrimination of all kinds in this Nation.

Title IX was important legislation, and its impact is immeasurable. Its very intent was the impetus for ensuring that today's sheroes would become role models for the young girls of today and those yet to be born. Access to equal opportunities in education has made it possible for all of us to be here as representatives in Congress. Thanks to those like the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) who came before me, when I was fortunate to have been accepted into medical school, unfortunately, we were still less than 5 percent of our class. Now, women at George Washington University School of Medicine, my alma mater, make up more than 50 percent of any incoming class.

In the past few weeks we have also had outstanding examples of what Title IX has done for women in the United States since its implementation. As many have said, on Friday, Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins made NASA and U.S. history as the first woman to command a space shuttle; and of course, we are all still basking in the success as well in the recent victory of the women's soccer team this month at the World Cup, which indicates what significant progress continues to be made each and every day.

More women are enrolled in college and universities than ever and are pursuing postgraduate and professional degrees, a key factor in the swell of women-owned businesses across this country today. One of the most obvious benefits of Title IX is the impact it has had on women's participation in intercollegiate athletics, and our young

women are determined to make their mark in the sport arena.

In my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, educational and athletic equity has long been practiced, and we have produced a multitude of successful players in various sports, as well as in other fields. One of our long-standing track and field success stories in the Virgin Islands is Flora Hyacinth who is one of 24 Virgin Islanders participating in the Pan American games in Winnipeg this week, and we wish her well. Ms. Hyacinth also set a world record in 1986 for the triple jump while attending the University of Alabama, and just last year won the long jump gold in the Venezuela games. She and Ameerah Bello, another winning track and field athlete from the Virgin Islands, are both qualifying members of the Virgin Islands Olympic team.

Also making her mark in women's track and field is 16-year-old Rodneysha Pitts, who recently ranked among the top 10 U.S. high school students while attending school in Indiana briefly last year.

At the college level, Vania Blake, a volleyball player from the Virgin Islands at North Carolina A&T, was named Athlete of the Year and MVP of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference for her school; and, Felicia James, the MVP of the All Star basketball games at Grambling State University in Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we have all had many shining examples of young women who have been able to succeed in their respective areas because of the freedom and opportunity Title IX provides. One only need attend a WNBA game here in the District or in any city to truly realize the impact that women's sports has had on up and coming female athletes nationwide; and it is here that we can also be proud of the precedence that Title IX has set, for without it, entities such as the WNBA would not have been possible.

While we still have a long way to go in ensuring equality across the board for women and all Americans, we can look onward with pride as young women like Venus and Serena Williams dominate the world of tennis and cheer on all of the women who are charting a bright future in women's sports.

I look forward to the day, Mr. Speaker, when there will be a women's soccer league, baseball league, and any other league that we choose to break ground in. The sky is the limit for our young women in sports, in business, in politics, and now in space. I am proud to be here this evening with Congresswoman MEEK and my other colleagues and to be able to work with them, to continue to open doors for women and for all Americans.

APPLAUDING THE AUTHORS OF TITLE IX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think that we have all benefited from the historical perspective that has been given to us this evening. It is certainly my honor to be able to associate with the remarks of my women colleagues to honor my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Even more exciting for, I hope, all of us who have had the pleasure of being on the floor, was to see her energy in recounting this historical recollection of the challenges and the battle, if you will, of what she had to overcome to bring us to this point. I particularly enjoyed the gentlewoman's emphasizing that she was a woman and a mother. When it came to her daughter, her daughter was first, but she did and made all of these sacrifices because she wanted to see young women who were coming up behind her to have the opportunities that she might not have had.

So I want to join my colleagues, and I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for her vision and leadership, along with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), for giving us this opportunity to come and honor the existence of Title IX, the landmark legislation that bans gender discrimination in school academics and athletics, and to applaud the authors of this legislation.

□ 2045

I might say to my good friend and colleague, the vote did not count, but the vision, the words, and fight that she puts in place were really what counted. We thank her for that. Might I say to former Congresswoman Edith Green, our appreciation as well. Their leadership ushered in a new era of appreciation for women in sports in academia.

The Speaker has been listening patiently. As many of us proudly like to talk about our children and home towns, let me say that I am from Houston, Texas. I want to share a personal moment of pride, or two personal moments of pride; one, when the WNBA Comets won their first championship, I had the pleasure of being in the arena.

Mr. Speaker, I am not embarrassed to say as a slightly older woman than 21 years old, I cried, I cried, because for the first time I saw women in a competitive sport, with the excitement, the energy, but also to see the community, men and women, cheering for women sportspersons, not because it was basketball, which seems to have taken the world by storm, but because women were engaged in a competitive sport, and we all were cheering.

Might I say that I have a young daughter, a young woman for who I had the pleasure of being a mother on the sidelines, watching her play basketball and engaging my husband and my younger son in what she was doing wrong and what she was doing right. How many of us had that experience 20, 30 years ago, when I relished the opportunity to participate in sports in my high school and in college, and Mr. Speaker, I simply was not asked to participate. Yet, I have the opportunity to sit along the sidelines and applaud my young daughter, and watch my young son engage in debate and cheering his sister along.

I stand to congratulate the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and Ms. Edith Green for what they have made and what the future holds. I also congratulate the Women's World Cup team champions. Their historic win a few weeks ago over China was watched all over the world, and certainly serves as a testament to the importance of Title IX.

Might I apologize to my constituents who invited me to be a guest speaker, and unfortunately, there was a television in the room, and I asked everyone to stop, stop the program so I could see the final minutes of the World Cup, and watch the women bring it to a close and slap 5, and I congratulate them as well, many of whom are from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. No, I am not from North Carolina, but my daughter attends that school, and the soccer women made me aware of that when we visited with them, and joined them in traveling to NASA last Monday to see off and to offer words of congratulations to Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins, the first woman to pilot the space shuttle. She is flying above us now.

I might congratulate her because I think the charge of Title IX helped to propel women all over the country and the world to do great things. We saw her go off in space last Friday, but I was with my colleagues, both colleagues who were here on the floor, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) to travel down to Florida to see her off.

Let me quickly finish by saying each of these accomplishments, Mr. Speaker, have served to remind us that only 27 years ago there was no Title IX, and women were still second-class citizens. We have come a long way from those days when only men were expected to be legislators, excel in sports, and fly in space.

This is truly a great day for women in America and all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, let me say one thing, it is vital that we do not pit the value of women's sports against the needs of men's sports. I want to say today, tonight, this evening that what the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) did and Congresswoman Green, both of them in the United States Congress, was a great thing. Let us not turn it into a wrong thing or a bad thing by pitting those two needy efforts against each other.

I simply want to say, Mr. Speaker, as I come to a close, there is much that we need to do. I will cite the number of women that got medical degrees, and 43 percent of law degrees and doctoral degrees, 44 percent. All of this I think is

generated by the energy and enthusiasm when women get into a competitive mood.

But we have a long way to go, Mr. Speaker. In fact, we need more women CEOs. We need to address the question of pay equity, more engineers and scientists. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we have yet to elect the first woman president of the United States of America.

So I am grateful to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and former Congresswoman Green, as authors of this energetic legislation. They dreamed and we believed and we accomplished. Today we honor them for their work, and our commitment and challenge, Mr. Speaker, is that we go forth to do better, to do great things, and to create equality for men and women in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the Women's Caucus in honor of title IX, the landmark legislation that bans gender discrimination in school academics and athletics. I also wish to applaud the authors of this legislation, Representative Patsy Mink and former Congresswoman Edith Green. Their leadership ushered in a new era of appreciation for women in sports and in academia.

I also stand to congratulate the Women's World Cup Team champions. Their historic win a few weeks ago over China was watched all over the world and certainly serves as a testament to the importance of title IX.

Finally, I would like to offer words of congratulations to Air Force Colonel Eileen Collins, the first woman to pilot the Space Shuttle.

Each of these accomplishments serve to remind us that only 27 years ago, there was no title IX and women were still second class citizens. We have come a long way from the days when only men were expected to be legislators, excel in sports and fly into space. This is truly a great day for women in America and all over the world. It is vital that we do not pit the value of women's sports against the needs of men's collegiate sports.

Since title IX passed, we have seen that there have been significant increases in women's educational achievements. In 1994, women received 38 percent of medical degrees, 43 percent of the law degrees, and 44 percent of all doctoral degrees. In 1972, the numbers for professional degrees were in the single digits (9 percent for medicine and 7 percent for law).

In athletics, we have also seen more opportunities for women in intercollegiate sports. Institutions now must ensure that there is adequate athletic financial assistance, accommodation of athletic interests and abilities of women, and that the opportunities and treatments afforded to sports participants must be equivalent.

Some other program components include providing access to equipment and supplies, opportunity to receive academic tutoring, medical and training facilities and services, adequate support services and publicity. These benefits are some of the ways institutions ensure that sport participants receive equivalent treatment.

We know that title IX has had an important impact on women's sports. We have seen the success of the Women's National Basketball Association and the Women's Soccer Team as evidence that access to these programs in college is crucial to professional development.

I am proud to stand here today to applaud this important legislation and these women who have blazed the trail of achievement for other women. These athletes will inspire a new generation of girls to engage in sports. CEO's, pay equity, and, yes, we have yet to elect this Nation's first women President.

I am grateful to serve in Congress with Representative PATSY MINK, one of the authors of this legislation. She must have only dreamed that we would be here today in honor of the great accomplishments of women due to her work. Today, we honor your work and the work of other women who have fought hard to give more opportunities to women.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TAX RELIEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, the discussion about tax relief has been brought to this body tonight in very eloquent terms. What I would like to do is to talk to one of my colleagues, one in particular, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI), who is headed this way, to discuss the practical side of tax relief.

As I go about my district, and I have seen the discussions brought about, both the pros and cons, I am perplexed by the fact that people are saying we do not need tax relief.

I want to state at the front of this that there are three reasons that I can see for tax relief that is needed at any time, and especially at this time.

One is to support the economy. We have surpluses now that have never been so great. They were not obvious in that the projections 5 years ago, even 3 years ago, were that we were going to have deficits, a continuation of deficits. But we have surpluses now.

The economy is growing from a lot of different sources. There is a lot of money in the stock market. It is over 11,000 now, which is unheard of. When I came in 1992, I think it was right below 3,000. So it is a factor that we need to support the economy so that it does not go down, so that we can keep the surpluses. Tax relief is one way of doing that.

Secondly, we must shrink the government. We are doing a good job. It is not simple. We are doing it over a lot of objections. We are doing it through elections after elections, when people are saying, from the other side, you do not care about this, you are mean-spirited, you are this or that. But we have started bringing the cost of government down.

There is one sure way we can do that. That is to stop the blood supply or stop the money from coming in. Tax relief will provide that, and it will also help and give freedom to the people who work.

We have too many people who were finding their families in disarray. They are not spending enough time at the breakfast table, the dinner table, the supper table. That is because they are having to work two jobs. They keep talking about let us bring costs down, but our inflation is under control.

We have a lot of different factors that are being mentioned, but the big problem is that we are just taxing people to death.

This particular tax relief package includes something called estate taxes. That is something that I hope, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) gets here that we can talk about in more detail. But we have to support the economy, keep the surpluses in place, shrink the government,

stop spending so that we will have smaller government, less bureaucracy. It will be less burdensome to the individuals, and give freedom to the people who work so they can have choices for their families, because we must build the families back.

The excuses that we have seen in the past have been, well, let us wait until we balance the budget. That seems safe for those people who want to keep taxes at a high rate. That seems safe because the deficit was projected for years and years and years. I think in 1998 the deficit was projected at $377 billion, and we came in, or maybe these are not the accurate figures, but we came in at like something like $72 billion for a surplus, a swing from a deficit to a surplus.

So it was safe for people to say, we won't have the taxes, those people who believe taxes are the way for government to operate. They were saying that is fine, let us just keep it there. Let us keep the taxes there until we can eliminate the deficit. Well, we have a balanced budget, we have eliminated the deficit, and we are progressing in that way. We need to keep it.

Also we heard that social security was a factor, we must protect social security and Medicare. That has been mentioned time and time again. At one point the administration proposed that we put 62 percent aside on social security. We have said, no, before we do anything, before we have tax relief, we have more spending, we are going to put 100 percent of the social security aside.

That comes from years and years of using social security for the wrong reasons. Not one year has one dime been set aside to protect social security until we have passed the lockbox, not one year. The trust fund has been used for all kinds of things. It has been used to finance the Vietnam War, to finance spending programs, to finance the government getting bigger. It has brought about more and more deficit, more and more debt, and greater and greater government, and less and less control of our lives. But we have taken care of that with the lockbox. We are taking care of social security and Medicare.

Now we are told, let us wait until the debt is paid off. Here comes another excuse, another delay for these people who want taxes. Now what we have done in this bill that is coming up is we have plugged the tax reductions into whether the debt is coming down. So if the interest on the debt is not reduced in certain years, then the reductions in the income tax or the 10 percent across-the-board tax will be delayed 1 year.

So then we are faced with the fact that we are going to benefit from our keeping the debt down because the interest will be lower, and from that point, if we spend too much, we will suffer from it, so we are going to have a good and a bad consequence.

I just think what we have as the problem and the thing that is perplexing, as I have stated, and I see that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) is here. But what I am saying, some people, when they hear the word ''taxes,'' they say, yes, that means I am going to get something. Some people, when they hear ''taxes,'' they say no, I am not in favor of this because somebody is going to take something away from me and take my incentive for working.

What I would like to discuss in this time we have here with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) is the pros and cons of it. We happen to have appeared before this body one other time, when we discussed another issue, and we had a friendly discussion. People called my office and said, why are you so friendly with somebody on the other side? He got the same kinds of calls.

I would just like to propose to the gentleman that maybe he could make an opening statement, and we can just start talking in front of the American people. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI).

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. First of all, I want to congratulate my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, because what it should establish to the American people is that a Republican and a Democrat can come to the House floor and engage in debate and talk about the real issues that we are involved in, and not the partisan or political issues that so often we get involved in in our debates on the floor.

So I really welcome this opportunity to share this hour with the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY), and what we want to do is not necessarily talk about a particular tax bill, whether it be the House version of the tax bill, the Senate version, or the President's version. I think what we really want to talk about with the American people is sort of representing the average American sitting there in the living room, trying to come to some conclusion as to what their government should be doing right now in regard to fiscal policy and tax cuts that will have great ramifications on their family, on their community, and on the future of not only this country, but indeed, the world.

The proposition that I would argue tonight, if we were going to put it in debaters' terms, would be, resolved that the Congress of the United States take no action this year in regard to affecting the revenues as represented by the Tax Code adjustments, as suggested by either the House, the Senate, or the President.

That proposition that I would argue is based on several things.

First and foremost, anyone in economics today agrees that although we can project out what the income will be 10 years from now, 20 years from now, or 30 years from now, and sound very intelligent about it and very informed, and I am sure the gentleman from Arkansas or I could give that argument, but the fact of the matter is that there is a common parlance term for that, and I will just give the initials, it is BS.

The fact of the matter is, we have a hard time in our system, and with this complex economy of the United States and of the world, to even project out what is going to happen 3 months or 6 months from now. If anyone doubts me, listening to this, if we knew what was going to happen 3 months from now, we would all immediately run down to the markets, whether it would be the stock market or the bond market, buy options, and retire 3 months from now, if we knew where it was going, because clearly it is going to be reflected in those markets.

□ 2100

The market is a day-to-day operation. It really is an intelligent operation as a free market. It indicates what people's, in varying degrees, their analysis has made them come to a conclusion. There are winners. There are losers. Some people buy thinking a stock is going to go up. In fact, it goes down; and they lose. Some people sell when they think the stock is going to go down; and in fact, the stock goes up.

That is what a free market is. That is how markets exist. To my knowledge, there is no one that I know that can tell me even what is going to happen tomorrow on these markets, no less 3 months from now, 6 months from now, and clearly not 5, 10, and 15 years from now.

It almost appears to me to be the height of conceit that anyone at any office, elected or otherwise, or in any position in this country that would have the audacity to make these projections.

Now, why is that important? Well, when we pass tax laws, they are not easily reversed, particularly if we pass a tax law and reduce taxes and therefore reduce revenues.

We have seen over the course of the history of the last 20 years, only four major tax packages enacted in law. This will be our fifth. So the earliest life turn is about 4 years, 5 years.

In 1981, we saw a tremendous tax reversal and where, in the Reagan administration, the concept of Reaganomics, supply-side economics, said that basically we can hold what we committed when we ran for office. When Mr. Reagan ran for office, he said, ''I will balance the budget. I will increase expenditures for military and defense. And I will cut taxes.'' So he cut taxes, balanced the budget, and spent more for defense.

Now I argued at that time to myself, I did not see how one could do that. I did not see how one could cut revenues on the one hand, spend more money for the defense on the other hand, and balance the budget.

Well, Mr. Reagan was right in two instances. The two instances were an act of this body can, in fact, cut taxes, and they did in 1981, almost $900 billion.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, was that with the help of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI)?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, Mr. Speaker. Fortunately, I was not here. But our predecessors were here. I have to say that that tax cut probably was not passed only by the Republican majority, because, as the gentleman from Arkansas knows, in the House, as a Representative, there are a lot of people pressing us for tax cuts. So it becomes a very popular political thing to do. Oh, let us get on the bandwagon.

As a matter of fact, some of my friends that talk about that occasion call it the Christmas tree. Everybody had something to add on and give a gift to somebody back home or some industry or some group of people they were interested in.

Anyway, what they did is they made this tremendous commitment to cut taxes and then, and I think rightly so, although I was not in favor of it at the time, I will quite frankly tell my colleagues that they did make an increase in the expenditures for defense. It was sizable; over the course of that decade, probably a trillion dollars for defense.

Now, looking back with the hindsight and the ability to see what happened in 1989 and 1991, the Wall falling and the destruction of the Soviet Union as we knew it for 50 years of our lives, we could say, well, that was the expenditure, a greater defense expenditure to win the ''Third World War'' without fighting it. Because, in fact, we forced in a poker game, if you will, the Soviet Union to try and match the American capacity to spend for defense.

They were great accomplishments. Fine. We brought the Soviet Union to dissolve into new states. Hopefully, over a period of time becoming more democratic and making the world more stable. We had a military that was fully equipped to handle the needs and protect the interest of America and, indeed, the free world; and it was accomplished.

But in that price, it did not only cost us that trillion dollars for defense expenditures, it cost us an increase from 1980, when Mr. Reagan became President, of a debt of the United States, not a deficit, a debt of $800 billion to, at the end of his administration, it was about $3.5 trillion. It was a $2.7 trillion increase in the debt of the United States in that period of time.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, is the gentleman from Pennsylvania attributing that to the fact that there was tax relief given?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, clearly, we cut revenues, and we spent more money, and we ended up in debt. What we did is we financed America, as opposed to financing it by revenues and tax revenues, we financed it by going into debt. I mean one can justify that. And we probably can do that in the future to some extent. But the question is how far do we want to go into debt long-term in the United States, and who does it benefit, that debt, and who does it really hurt? I think we should talk about that debate.

But let me set, if I can, the standard. So we went through this, that administration, and then we came into the Bush administration. Just prior to the Bush administration, the second tax bill was passed. In a way, I did not support that tax bill in the House, but I voted for it finally when it came out of conference, and I did it really for a simple reason.

It was Bill Bradley who was the United States Senator at the time, and his argument was, I thought truthfully correct, that we should try and make our tax policy reflective of the free market, to free up decision making by corporations and individuals of where they make their investments and where they put their money, not based on tax avoidance that is a policy set by the legislators of tax policy, but that supply and demand of capital and funds be freed up to operate in the marketplace.

That is one of the reasons we did away with the difference between capital gains and earnings. They were taxed at the same rate. That was the first time that occurred probably in 50 or 70 years in tax policy in the country. It was good policy.

Our problem is the Christmas tree in 1986 when we brought the levels of tax rates down, even Mr. Reagan had advised to come down no lower than 35 percent on the top bracket, no, the Christmas tree makers in the House and the Senate were not happy. They brought it down to 28 percent and 14 percent on the low side.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Pennsylvania hit this thing twice. The Reagan tax relief bill brought supposedly 19 to 20 million jobs into the economy that did not exist before. Is it possible that the fact that the spending kept going up is the reason why we had the deficit and not the tax relief? In other words, is it true, is it not a possibility that the tax relief actually played toward reducing the debt by employing more people, increasing the number of taxpayers, and bringing in more revenues in that fashion?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, that argument applies to the present day. There is not any doubt in any mind, we are at $5.5 trillion, if we want to become greater spenders, I think the economic theory indicates that we can spend ourselves into higher revenues and greater job creation. It is just we are going to end up with a much higher debt. That is really the issue I am much interested in. Where do we want to stop, or what do we want to do with this accumulated debt?

See, in my mind, I can certainly justify debt in fighting a war. I would not care, if America were in world war, if we have to double or triple the debt; and, oftentimes, that is when debt did occur that way.

Mr. DICKEY. Even taking Social Security surpluses or Social Security income?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Absolutely.

Mr. DICKEY. Okay.

Mr. KANJORSKI. If we want to have to go to war to defend this country, we have a win-lose situation. If we lose, we do not have a Constitution, we do not have Social Security, we do not have America.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I can go along with that.

Mr. KANJORSKI. So that type of risk of that nature, that justifies almost any fiscal policy.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, before we really get into some of these other things, it is clearly a situation where the gentleman from Pennsylvania believes that we ought to keep the taxes where they are, we ought to have more control in the Federal Government. I want less taxes and less control in the Federal Government. Is that not a fair statement?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, not quite, but close, Mr. Speaker. Close. Here is what I want.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to characterize what he thinks I want and what he wants and see if we can get the differences set out.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Arkansas wants to try and give back to the American people what he may perceive as excess funds coming from them. I think that the gentleman somewhat has lost faith in the political system, both the Congress and the Presidency, or even the enlightenment of the American people; that if this money, all the surplus money practically that will come in or is projected to come in over 10 years, if it is not returned, it will be improperly spent.

I think I look at it as two things. I think it is the first time in my lifetime that we have an opportunity of reversing this tremendous trend of increasing the national debt of the United States, and, in fact, we can start paying it off. I think that is fiscally responsible and that is the fiscal conservatives' position.

Now, that is not to say that, at some point, we should not examine a tax cut because, certainly, if we knew the excesses of revenues were so great that we could pay the debt off in a couple of years, that would be great. But we all know that $5.5 trillion is not going to be paid off in a couple of years. Even the President's most optimistic view is that he could retire the public debt of $3.6 trillion in 15 years. But that again is assuming all these assumptions work out.

I have been around the House long enough to know, every time I hear my friends on either side of the aisle, including my fellow colleagues on this side of the aisle, when they start making an argument based on all of these assumptions, seldom do these assumptions work out. I would like to err on the side of conservativism, fiscal responsibility.

I think two things, too, on the side of the gentleman from Arkansas. Last

year, I voted against what I thought was an irresponsible resolution, although proposed by a very good friend of mine, and I really like the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT). The gentleman from Oklahoma said, let us pass the resolution to do away with the income tax code by the year 2001.

I checked the other day. That was in June of 1998. Some 219 of my fellow Republican colleagues voted yes, and about 208 of my Democratic colleagues voted no, and it passed.

The whole theory, if we go back to that argument that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) and those proponents made that day was that this gigantic out-of-control tax code has got to be finally shot and put to rest, given a decent burial. The only way to do that is pass a resolution that, on a certain date and a certain time, it is dead. It is repealed.

Some of us argued that is awfully nice to say that, but if we do not have something to replace it, it is really injurious to the decision makers and business and in our communities and in our families of what are their obligations going to be 3 and 5 years from now.

The whole purpose of passing a tax statute rather than year to year is to give people the benefit to project their needs and how they can respond to the obligations that they may have from the government.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, what I see in this body, and I have only been here 7 years, is that we do not do a whole lot until the end of the day, we do not do a whole lot until the end of the week, and we do not do a whole lot until the end of the term.

Now, I am defending my vote to say that we are going to terminate the tax code at a certain date because that is how we operate. We are not going to operate without a deadline, and we probably will not do it until 6 months or a year until that deadline comes up.

Now, of course, it did not pass. The law did not pass the Senate. It had not been signed into law, so those people listening do not have to worry about it. But I am just saying those of us who are so concerned with the spending and the fact that, if we let up at all, we are going to continue to spend, and the Internal Revenue Code and Internal Revenue Service is one way that we spend.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, let me try and respond to the gentleman from Arkansas. I think two problems are at fault there, two fundamental errors. One, why do we want to get rid of the tax code? Because it is so lengthy, so complicated. Most Americans are so fed up with the time they have to expend preparing their taxes and business people preparing taxes and the expense of preparing taxes that they wanted to simplify it. Yet, just the other day when we voted the tax cut, we added 560 new pages to the tax code. We made it far more complicated. That will spurn about, oh, another 10,000 pages of IRS regulations to implement our changes in the law. Why did we do that if we were serious about changing it?

Mr. DICKEY. Because we are trying to stimulate the economy, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I could agree with that.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, what we have is we have a structure called the IRS, which is horrible. It favors the rich. It favors the people who have got enough lobbying strength to make exceptions. The poor working stiff is out here, who does not have the shelters, has to pay a lot more than the rich people.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Arkansas agrees with that. But then if we look at the tax code we just passed, two-thirds of the benefits go to the upper 9 percent, and a third of the benefits go to the richest 1 percent of our population. So that certainly is not taking care of the 91 percent that only got a third of the tax benefits.

□ 2115

But let me give the second problem.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not agree with what the gentleman just said, by the way, but go ahead.

Mr. KANJORSKI. By passing the tax code right now, and by taking this supposed, assumed, money that may come in, the gentleman has now limited the funds that would be necessary to make intelligent new tax policy. Because if we want to make a simplified tax policy, we will not be able to project what revenues will come in from that tax policy for several years. Now, if we had a surplus, we could take that risk at that time.

Further, we know that Medicare and Social Security do need adjustment, do need support. Why should we not take this surplus and make sure that Social Security and Medicare are secure 25, 30, 40, 50 years from now?

Mr. DICKEY. What does the lockbox do? The lockbox theory says we will not touch the money from Social Security and Medicare. We are going to protect it.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Matter of fact, let me talk about the lockbox.

Mr. DICKEY. Did the gentleman vote for the bill?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No.

Mr. DICKEY. So what the gentleman said was let us keep Social Security available for spending like we have had before?

I do not want to be argumentative about it, but that is the way the gentleman's vote could be interpreted; is that not correct? Is that not a fair interpretation?

Mr. KANJORSKI. What we are doing now is taking all of the surplus from Social Security, but it is a little amount, from beyond Social Security, and we are actually doling it out by reducing taxes over assumptions that cannot be correct over 10 years.

Mr. DICKEY. Reducing what taxes, now, income taxes or FICA, Social Security?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Corporate taxes. All kinds of taxes. Not Social Security.

Mr. DICKEY. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Those people who want to tax, those people who say on August 7 of 1993, or whenever it was, voted for the largest tax increase that this Nation has ever had, also want to keep Social Security available for spending. Is that a fair corollary; or is that a corollary with the gentleman?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No. And I appreciate that the gentleman could have heard that assertion made sufficiently long enough by some people that are trying to sell a political agenda, but it is really not correct.

Mr. DICKEY. Those two things exist with the gentleman, do they not?

Mr. KANJORSKI. There were two fundamental things that happened. In the Reaganomics of the 1981 tax cut and the 1986 tax cut, we never got to balance the budget. The Presidents, both Reagan and Bush, never sent to the Congress a balanced budget.

Mr. DICKEY. I understand that.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Every year it was out of balance. So they just recognized the right to live in deficits.

Mr. DICKEY. They spent more.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Spent more than was coming in; therefore, we were building up the debt in the United States.

Now, there were two heroic acts, two heroic acts, one performed by a Republican president and one performed by a Democratic president. And I may not have ever said this to the gentleman before, but I was here in 1991, and I remember when President George Bush met with the leadership of the House and the Senate and tried to get our fiscal House in order in 1991; and they brought back a proposal that I voted against and which did not carry in this House, a budget proposal.

They brought it back a second time. I voted against it, and it failed in this House. And then they called a group and said what is it going to take to pass a budget? And I quite frankly said we are going to start cutting this deficit and, therefore, the debt of the United States.

Mr. DICKEY. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Does the gentleman think we can cut deficits better by cutting spending or increasing taxes? What is the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Cut deficits?

Mr. DICKEY. Does the gentleman think we can cut deficits better by increasing taxes or by cutting spending? Which is better, if the gentleman has to make a choice between the two?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Well, it depends where the taxes are going to come from and what amount they are and who we are taking it from.

Mr. DICKEY. Well, was it better that we increased taxes back under George Bush or cut spending? Which was the better circumstance?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Very clearly, because we were already in deficit, how

could we not increase taxes? And we were already cutting spending. That was the beginning.

Mr. DICKEY. Spending was going up every year. Spending went up every year.

Mr. KANJORSKI. That is absolutely true. The budget of the United States has gone up every year. The population of the United States has grown every year. And every year from now until America becomes less than 50 states or has a decrease in population as a result of a catastrophe our government will grow. We will always have more Americans year to year.

This whole argument of people saying, oh, they are spending more this year than they did last year. Of course we are, because this year we have 8 million more Americans.

Mr. DICKEY. I just happened to think, and of course I wanted to get into this discussion, and I wanted someone who might be watching and listening to us to see if there is a difference. Those things that the gentleman is talking about, the historical things, what I think is that if we stop spending, we do a better job of cutting the deficit than by increasing taxes.

I think if we increase taxes, we are decreasing the chances of reducing the deficit. That is from a businessman's standpoint. I am a businessman. I have had to meet payroll, I have had to borrow money, I have had to pay interest, I have had to control inventory, I have had to pay insurance premiums and pay taxes. I have had to balance all of that and then across the counter still please the customer. And from that standpoint I am saying this, that I believe that cutting spending is 10 times better than increasing taxes if the goal is to cut the deficit.

Mr. KANJORSKI. My answer to that is, depending on what spending we are going to cut and depending on whose taxes and why we are going to increase them.

I will give the gentleman an example. Today, people that have lived in this country with the existing market that has doubled or tripled their net worth in the last 6 years, even though they pay 1 percent more in taxes than they did 6 years ago, I doubt there is anyone who would trade their net worth in today, if they are in the upper 5 percent income bracket in this country. They will certainly not do that.

Mr. DICKEY. If they are in the stock market, I agree.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Not only the stock market. Compare it to salaries. I heard Senator HARKIN talk today about the last 20 years. If we took executive salaries, CEO salaries in the United States and the minimum wage, and we tracked them to give the minimum wage increase the same percentage as the corporate executive increase was, the minimum wage today would be $40 an hour.

And, obviously, I am not saying that is bad. That is a business decision. That is the people who own the stock and control these corporations, and these are people that help create great wealth in this country. So I am not opposed to that.

But let me go back to spending. If the gentleman makes the argument that all spending is the same spending, I do not agree with him, and that all spending costs money and could drive us into debt, I do not agree. There is intelligent spending and stupid spending, quite frankly. Intelligent spending, and I will give the gentleman an example, the GI Bill of Rights. When that was instituted by this Congress in 1945, it was a novel new idea that all these young American men and women that were going to be returning from all over the world into the private sector were going to be upskilled and uptrained and educated. It cost a great deal of money in the first 4 and 5 years of the GI Bill of Rights. But where is America today as a result of that expenditure? That trained, educated, skilled work force developed the computer, developed space industry.

Mr. DICKEY. Just for the sake of time, there is actually plenty of things that we agree on that spending is perfect for, like the highways and the judicial system and the military. My gosh, the gentleman and I will not argue about that. But what I am saying is just cutting spending. I am not talking about which spending we cut. If we reduce cost, and I think this administration has done that, if we reduce cost in certain ways, we reduce the number of employees and those things, that has a greater impact.

Mr. KANJORSKI. And we have.

Mr. DICKEY. Let me finish. That has a greater impact than increasing taxes. Now, the same thing, if we cut spending and reduce taxes, then we have a double benefit.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Absolutely. There is no question about that.

Mr. DICKEY. Does the gentleman have confidence that we can continue to cut spending? Has the gentleman felt the pain of our cutting spending in this House?

Mr. KANJORSKI. What I guess I am arguing is a simple proposition: the gentleman is an average American family, and the gentleman is making $400 a week and the gentleman has debt of $10,000, credit card debt, auto debt, whatever, and suddenly the gentleman's employer asks him to work 50 percent more hours a week, instead of 40 hours a week can the gentleman work 60 hours a week and be paid the same amount or double time. The gentleman has an opportunity to make $200 a week or $400 a week more than the gentleman ever had.

Now, the gentleman does not know how long that is going to last, but right now the gentleman can say, gee, it is going to last for a month or so because my employer really needs this work done because he has sales to meet. Now, the gentleman meets around the kitchen table or the dining table on Sunday with the family and the gentleman says, I think I am going to have 20 weeks of this 50 percent more time, so, therefore, I am going to make either $200 more a week for 20 weeks, which is $4,000 or $400 more a week for 20 weeks, which is $8,000. We are going to have $4,000 or $8,000 more to spend in this family in the next 10 weeks.

Now, who in their right mind would say, okay, Daddy, let us go on an around-the-world vacation? No, an intelligent mother and father would say, oh no, we are going to take some of that money and pay down our credit cards, or pay off the car, or take some of it and put it in the bank for education for the kids' future.

There is no real difference here. What we are arguing about or differing on is we are just like that family. For the last 40 years, 30 years, since 1969, we have been increasing our debt every year, and particularly in the last, oh, about the last 20 years, since 1980 it has been exponential in its explosion. Now, I can justify why we did it, but now we are in prosperous times. Our unemployment rate is 4.2 percent. Most people cannot even believe it could get down to that level but certainly cannot see it falling much below that.

Mr. DICKEY. So the gentleman is saying we should spend more now?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, I am saying we should start paying off that debt.

Mr. DICKEY. Are we not doing that?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No.

Mr. DICKEY. Of course we are. Fifty-one billion dollars was paid off on the national debt, we are talking about non-Social Security debt, in 1998, and $122 billion is projected for this year.

Mr. KANJORSKI. That is right.

Mr. DICKEY. Now, we are 7 months in it, and the gentleman may say, well, the projections will not work. The gentleman probably did not believe in 1998 that we would be paying off $51 billion in the national debt.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I absolutely believed it.

Mr. DICKEY. So interest rates are going down. This tax package, that I voted for and the gentleman voted against, says that we will not have the tax decreases unless the interest on the national debt goes down every year.

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, no.

Mr. DICKEY. Every year. It will extend it one more year for 10 years.

Mr. KANJORSKI. It is really a false claim. If the interest rate jumps up to 10 percent from the 5.6 percent it is at now, that immediate next year——

Mr. DICKEY. Not interest rates, the interest payments.

Mr. KANJORSKI. The interest payments.

Mr. DICKEY. The interest payments on the national debt, if they do not go down, the tax reductions do not take place. Does that take care of the debt problem?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, because the gentleman is talking about interest, not the size of the debt. The interest payments are depending on what the

interest rate of that year is. I can grow the debt and have lower interest rates.

Mr. DICKEY. But does not the lack of dollars that the gentleman pays in interest free up more dollars for paying the national debt off?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, not unless the gentleman has the money to pay the debt off. Right now we are not going to have that. We are, quote, taking $1 trillion over the next 10 years, if all assumptions are right, that would have gone to the debt. And instead of letting it go to the debt, we are sending it back to the American people. But that means that an interest rate on the Federal debt, assume it is 6 percent because that is where it is about, that means $60 billion every year more will have to be paid ad infinitum until that is reduced.

Mr. DICKEY. It is $358 billion that is projected for next year in interest on the debt, just to get a figure.

Mr. KANJORSKI. What I am saying is, why can the gentleman not join me and say, look, we are working extra time, our economy is as prosperous as it can be, let us form a policy to get rid of this debt while we can? We cannot pay the debt off when the economy is in recession or depression. If we do not pay it off when we are in prosperity, where is the fiscal hope of ever paying it off?

Mr. DICKEY. Here is the answer to the question. In 1961, President Kennedy had a reduction in the capital gains taxes and tax revenues went up. In 1996, we had a reduction in capital gains, tax revenues went up.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Absolutely.

Mr. DICKEY. It does not necessarily always happen. The gentleman and I have discussed this before.

□ 2130

But it is a possibility that the tax reductions are going to increase the amount of revenue.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Absolutely. I tell you right now, if you reduce the capital gains tax in 1999, you will have more revenue in 2000. Why? Because everybody that has had their stock go up 100 percent or 200 percent in the last 4 years, they are not going to be stupid. They are going to sell and pay less taxes than they would this year and take a benefit, so you are going to get that up-front tax revenue.

Mr. DICKEY. I want to talk about one other thing. Let us talk about the estate tax now. In this provision, and I know you agree with some of these things, but in this provision of estate taxes in the bill that we just passed, it provides that there is going to be reduction of the estate tax over a period of time to zero.

Now, I want to see if you agree with this. After someone pays the Federal income tax and after they pay capital gains tax if they had capital gains, after they pay tax on savings on their dividends and after they pay excise taxes, fuel taxes, income taxes and State taxes and then sales taxes and all other taxes that I have not named and someone is left with something after all of that, is it good that we tax that that has been accumulated or saved from all of that effort at the rate of 37 to 55 percent at someone's death?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No and yes. Like all things, there are not simple answers. I wish there were.

Mr. DICKEY. Are you in favor of reducing the estate tax?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I think the estate tax certainly should be adjusted for small businesspeople, for farmers and for people that are in net worths of even a couple of million dollars.

But let me ask you this. Assume that an individual has a net worth of $100 billion and assume that person has a life expectancy of 45 years, and if there is no estate or income tax, what do you think that person's accumulation of wealth will be and the next generation of that wealth in perpetuity?

What am I suggesting? If you apply that formula to just Bill Gates, and I hate to cite Mr. Gates because he has made a great contribution to America, but I am sure he is already thinking that because he has indicated that he does not want to keep that in a family. But if you did apply it, probably by his 75th or 80th birthday, he will have a net worth value, at just growth of 10 percent a year, of $2 trillion.

Mr. DICKEY. What is your question?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Without an estate tax, that growth will constantly compound ad infinitum. So that if you carried that to the extreme, you get to the Benjamin Franklin example, that all the money in the world would be owned by one person.

Mr. DICKEY. That person has to die for this thing to work. For this estate tax to apply, Bill Gates has to pass on.

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, no, no. Because his children are not going to have an estate tax.

Mr. DICKEY. We do not know about the children.

Mr. KANJORSKI. My argument is, I do not know how they would do, but I think that is open to a very strong argument.

Mr. DICKEY. What you are saying is you just want to stop the accumulation of wealth no matter how hard you work, nor how much talent you have or how much you contributed to the society?

Mr. KANJORSKI. It all depends. If we want economic kings or czars in the world.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not think that is going to happen. Let me give you an example.

A young man, younger than I am, younger than we are, came to this city and told the story of what it was like in a small town in my district where he owns a bank, he owns three banks, his family does, a car dealership and some timberlands. When his grandmother dies, he is going to have to borrow money and pay $20,000 a month to pay the death taxes that are going to be on her estate. Now, when his dad dies, her son, it is going to be more than that, because hers will come into his and then it comes down.

Now, here is what will happen to them. This may be something where you are in favor of. They will have to sell. They cannot expand, first of all. If they cannot meet the debt payment, they are going to have to sell off their interest. Is that what you say is the benefit of the estate taxes? Or are we stifling growth, reinvestment and further employment by doing this and forcing these people to pay $20,000 a month to the Federal Government for 10 years?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I understand what you are saying. That is a very tough event, but I would say there are probably 5 or 6 million Americans listening to us, all of which would not mind inheriting three banks, an auto dealership and timberland and most Americans do not have that when they pass on. They generally pass a mortgage on the house and debt on.

Mr. DICKEY. But they are going to have to buy it back from the government.

Mr. KANJORSKI. If we intelligently debate this as we are doing tonight, there is a solution to that problem. Part of the problem of estate taxes, which I agree with, we should find a way of taking artificial inflation out of an inheritance tax. There is no reason to penalize someone who has owned a piece of property for 40 or 50 years and a portion of its present value is represented by inflation and not real growth.

Mr. DICKEY. You are talking about indexing now?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Sure. We can index that. Secondly, we can certainly raise the exemption a great deal so that the hundreds of thousands of Americans that have become millionaires in the last 6 years under the Clinton administration do not lose what they have earned over those years. I can understand that. We want to encourage people to contribute and to make wealth, but what we do not want to do, it seems to me, and I would like to argue this point, I think we have to find a mechanism that one great man can come along in a family and then for the next 200 years of his survivors, contributing nothing, can end up being the wealthiest people in the world. I do not think we want to do that.

I heard another figure today that impressed me and why we have to think about this. It is not pressing today that we think about it, but as Americans, to have public policy. The wealth of three Americans, three of our wealthiest Americans today, are greater than 600 million people living in the world today. Three people have the accumulated wealth of 600 million.

Mr. DICKEY. I have seen that.

Mr. KANJORSKI. How is this country going to imbue its free market system and its democratic government around the world if people think there is no way that we have equality? That

is not to say we should confiscate this wealth.

Mr. DICKEY. I think where you and I differ on this——

Mr. KANJORSKI. You and I are lawyers. You know the rule against perpetuities. What is the rule against perpetuity?

Mr. DICKEY. You cannot keep passing it on from generation to generation to generation.

Mr. KANJORSKI. You are claiming by inheritance to do away with the rule on perpetuity in families. If you cannot do it in a trust estate.

Mr. DICKEY. You can do it with intent, though. You can bypass the rule against perpetuities. You can exempt it from applying. It can happen. But vesting is what is so very important in that. I am sure this does not mean anything to anybody.

Mr. KANJORSKI. We know that Benjamin Franklin put an accumulation, I do not know whether it was $100—

Mr. DICKEY. Excuse me. We are talking about two different things. I think I am listening to you from the standpoint of what you want to do is just share the wealth.

Mr. KANJORSKI. No.

Mr. DICKEY. What I want to do is try to protect the economy. The estate tax is harming the economy.

The estate tax is harming the economy. Do you agree with that?

Mr. KANJORSKI. The estate tax?

Mr. DICKEY. The death taxes are harming the economy. In my situation, this family knows what is needed for those three banks in small town Arkansas. They know what the dealerships can do and what they cannot do. If they have to sell to someone, say, from Omaha, Nebraska, who comes in there, we will not have the same productivity. We will not have the same progress.

Mr. KANJORSKI. All the adjustment necessary can be made there and should be made there after an extended debate, that we think about why we have inheritance tax policy affecting the very largest accumulation of wealth down to the very minor accumulation of wealth. Certainly I agree with you.

Mr. DICKEY. We agree on that. Lead me into this other area. We are using the death tax to share the wealth. How does that help our country?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, we are not. I certainly do not want to use the death tax to share the wealth. What I am disturbed about is those people who without some way of either encouraging them to be philanthropic with their assets or taxing them, we go on in perpetuity accumulating wealth like a vacuum cleaner.

Mr. DICKEY. What happens, though, in the estate plans, and you and I have seen them, where to avoid estate taxes, all of these things go into charitable trusts or charitable institutions so that there is no tax.

Mr. KANJORSKI. And that is very serving to the economy, to have this type of philanthropic activity.

Mr. DICKEY. You say it is serving the economy?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Sure.

Mr. DICKEY. It is hurting our ability to pay off the national debt.

Mr. KANJORSKI. No.

Mr. DICKEY. So taxes are not needed to pay off the national debt? What we are doing with the death tax, we are driving those assets into tax-exempt entities.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Let me ask you a question. Would you agree that the economy of 1999 is probably the best economy that you have ever lived in in your lifetime?

Mr. DICKEY. I think historically it is, do you not?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I agree.

Mr. DICKEY. I claim credit for it.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Would you join me in the wish that we could perpetuate this economy as many more months or years as possible because it is increasing wealth for everyone in our system?

Mr. DICKEY. Yes, sir. I think to do that we need to reduce taxes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. That is where we differ. I want to get to that point. Right now we are at the top level of our production of commodities, of materials. We are at about 90 to 92 percent of absolute capacity to produce. That is about the highest level we have been in in our lifetimes. There is not much productive capacity left in our economy.

Mr. DICKEY. That is what they have been saying for the last 2 years.

Mr. KANJORSKI. We are down to 4.2 percent and right now if you go to some employers or some workshops, you find the level of performance of employees has fallen because we are tapping the very minimally trained people in our force, which is very healthy, but sometimes services and activities fall as a result of that because we are getting people in the workforce that never worked before. That means we are at maximum capacity of production and we are at maximum employment. Now, what a tax cut does—

Mr. DICKEY. Wait a minute. There is an exception to that. That is, our tax in relationship to the gross domestic product is the highest that it has been since 1946. It is 20.1 percent. Does that relate to your discussion?

Mr. KANJORSKI. No, it is always going to do that as long as we keep running deficits, as we have run deficits. Next year if the deficit does not go down and it goes up, you are going to need more interest for the debt. It will keep going up. Every $100 billion, you are going to need $6 billion more, every year ad infinitum.

Let me give you an example what we are all worried about. I join guys like Alan Greenspan. I cannot say he favors or believes in everything I believe, but we do agree on one point. He says this is not the time to cut taxes. This is the time to pay off the debt.

Mr. DICKEY. When is the time to cut taxes from your standpoint?

Mr. KANJORSKI. From my standpoint clearly not until we reduce the increase in debt back to the Reagan years. I would like to go to zero.

Mr. DICKEY. How can you go to zero faster by taxing?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Because that money is a revenue in and it buys bonds.

Mr. DICKEY. But you just got through saying it is perfectly reasonable to expect that by reducing the taxes we will increase revenues.

Mr. KANJORSKI. No. Artificially for a year in capital gain, you will get more capital gains revenue in because it will exacerbate the market.

Mr. DICKEY. I see what you are saying. I did not understand your position. I disagree with it.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Your problem is and what Mr. Greenspan argued to us the other day in his appearance on the Humphrey-Hawkins report, is that at some point when this economy starts turning down, you are going to have to provide a mechanism to encourage it to return from recession to recovery. That is when you cut taxes. So we may have to go into deficit spending when that happens. But why would you spend and put more money out for consumption when we cannot create any more product and we do not have any more people to employ?

So what we are all worried about is through this type of fiscal policy, you are going to have more money chasing the same amount of goods and the same amount of people that are available and start to exacerbate inflation. We have a tremendous impact on fiscal policy in the policy of taxation. But we have an independent body downtown called the Federal Reserve, and they control the monetary policy of this country.

Basically Mr. Greenspan says that if you shove more money out there to buy more goods and there are not those more goods, the price of those goods are going to go up and the cost of that labor that is limited is going to go up, you are going to cause inflation and we are going to have to raise the interest rate to counter, with monetary policy, that inflation. Let us look at what that does.

Mr. DICKEY. That stops the tax decreases from going into effect if that happens. We have got the mechanism to control that.

Mr. KANJORSKI. The mechanism on taxes, first of all, only apply to the change of the rate on personal income tax, not to the estate tax, not to any of the others. They are set. Once they are passed they are set. But also every time the Federal Reserve would increase interest rates by 1 percent, it costs the American government $55 to $60 billion. Every 1 percent. To see interest rates go up to 8 or 9 percent, as has happened many times in your lifetime and mine, if that were to occur—

Mr. DICKEY. Not with balanced budgets though, I do not think.

Mr. KANJORSKI. We have not lived in too many balanced budgets.

Mr. DICKEY. That is what I am saying. 1969 was the last balanced budget.

Mr. KANJORSKI. If we enact this tax code, most of us, and I think when I say most of us, most of the economists agree, we will be out of a balanced budget in a very short period of time.

□ 2145

Mr. DICKEY. Okay, let me ask my colleague this; let me change the subject a second.

Marriage tax penalties; we right now are encouraging people not to live together if they love each other but not to get married. We are also, in this code, encouraging school bond construction by being more favorable on the taxes in that area.

Does the gentleman agree that tax reductions should solve other problems like trying to encourage people to get married and also by bond construction for schools and so that the local authorities can build more schools?

Mr. KANJORSKI. I just spent 6 days a week ago traveling across America with the President, and I went to Hazard, Kentucky; I went to the delta of Mississippi; I went to East St. Louis in Illinois; I went to the Indian tribes of South Dakota; the hispanic community of Phoenix, Arizona; and to Watts in Los Angeles. And I went there trying to find out what policy the government could pursue to help these people, and I came away with a lot of observations.

One observation is regardless of how many people tell us that this economy has helped all people, it has not. This economy has been very helpful to the upper 5, 10, 15, 20 percent of the American population. We are part of that population.

Mr. DICKEY. Of course that employment now, unemployment is at an all-time low for an all-time period of time.

Now I do not understand what the gentleman is saying now.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Well, to some of those people, they are living in poverty level even though they are working poor. They are working poor.

Mr. DICKEY. Well, we are doing that to the military. I know we are doing that to the military.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Yes.

Mr. DICKEY. The military is existing on housing and food stamps in some instances.

Mr. KANJORSKI. The Indian tribes of South Dakota, 75 percent unemployment. The unemployment rate in the delta of Mississippi was twice the national rate. But the explanation given by a lot of the officials, I think, I believe is the education level in the State of Missouri is 50 out of 50 States. And they said that is what we need before we can get people hired.

Mr. DICKEY. Did the gentleman say Missouri or Mississippi?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mississippi.

Mr. DICKEY. Okay.

Mr. KANJORSKI. In order to attract new businesses in there they need a trained work force and an up-scale work force, and we have got to have the capacity to do that.

What I came away realizing is, one, all people are not benefiting from this prosperity; two, there are distressed areas in this country that need help; and, three, where we agree:

We can use, sometimes, tax policy to encourage where money goes, and I would much rather see capital investment in the private market made in these distressed markets where the government has anything to do with the decision-making and is not part of it.

Let us utilize the great magic of the free market. It is a tremendous tool.

Mr. DICKEY. Well, cannot we do that? I mean does the gentleman agree that tax credits and tax incentives are helpful?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Absolutely, if they are proper. But they are not proper if we have favorite special interest groups that come down here.

Mr. DICKEY. Well, what about education savings accounts where one can put in not $500 but $2,000 a year?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Absolutely. If we can afford to do that properly, there is no question, and I think that type, I think that is where it is going, to the right place.

Mr. DICKEY. Well, that is what is in this bill.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Sure, we know there are those little segments in the bill. But our problem is look at what we reduce, the corporate tax rate, the individual tax rate at the highest level to 1 percent. Let us look at what we did to the special interest groups. But we do not want to argue this bill.

Look, we are never, as we know.

Mr. DICKEY. The gentleman is right about that. That is correct, that is correct.

Mr. KANJORSKI. As we know, no two Members in this House will ever agree 100 percent with what is in a spending bill or what is in a tax bill. This is the House that comes to order with compromise, and we have to accept things we do not disagree with.

Mr. DICKEY. There are a lot of people in my district who I talk to and who support me, are saying the things that the gentleman us saying, not in the depth that the gentleman is saying, but they are saying not now, maybe later.

I do find that the people who say, give the economy the augment like we want it or a little bit more fervent than the people who say we just do not feel right about it.

But that is why I am listening to what the gentleman is saying.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I think our risk is I do not know how low the unemployment rate could go, but it is as low now it has ever been in my lifetime. I always used to think 5 percent was full employment. As a matter of fact, I think Humphrey Hawkins said 6 percent is full employment, matter of Federal statute. Well, 1.8 percent under that.

I always felt that I never expected us to have what I think is a Clinton recovery of 1993 built on the Bush sensible tax increase of 1991.

Mr. DICKEY. Now, wait a minute. The gentleman thinks both of those tax increases have brought us low inflation, lowest unemployment, low interest rates and higher productivity.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Yes.

I am going to join the gentleman some day in sponsoring a statue to George Bush because he did have, he gave up his Presidency to do the right thing.

Mr. DICKEY. Why does the gentleman think he gave up his presidency?

Mr. KANJORSKI. Well, he knew that he made the promise no new taxes.

Mr. DICKEY. Because American people do not like tax increases.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Look, we started out this discussion knowing. I do not know of a Member of Congress who likes to vote to increase taxes. They will always vote to cut them. It is not hard to get numbers to cut. I do not think any American likes to pay taxes unless they think it is absolutely necessary or could be used for a good purpose.

I think the gentleman is hearing out there from his constituents, the same thing that I am hearing. We do not want wasteful spending, and I agree with that. But we want measured, intelligent spending, and we want to pay down the debt.

Mr. DICKEY. Let me tell my colleagues this:

I have enjoyed discussing this with my colleague who has not smiled a whole lot. I have been trying to smile over here, but it has not been coming across. We must continue this sometime. Thank you so much.

Mr. KANJORSKI. I think it helps us all.

NO FAVORED NATION TRADE AGREEMENT FOR CHINA UNTIL CERTAIN PROMISES ARE KEPT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERWOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago last month, China's Communist dictatorship sent its tanks and armored carriers crashing through the pro-democracy protest in Tiananmen Square in Beijing. Hundreds of innocent protesters were crushed to death, hundreds more were mowed down by machine gun fire, hundreds more were arrested and executed. The men and women who gave their lives for freedom in Tiananmen Square in Beijing and those who are still languishing in Chinese prisons are in many ways the heirs to the legacy of our Founding Fathers. In the days leading up to their slaughter, they quoted Jefferson not Mao. Their source of inspiration was not Mao's Little Red Book, but our Statue of Liberty.

We all witnessed the lone man blocking those oncoming tanks. For that individual at that time, freedom and democracy were ideals that were absolutely worth dying for.

Tonight we stand here in remembrance of that man who stood in front of the tank and the countless other Chinese people who chose Thomas Jefferson over Mao Tse-Tung. We stand here in consolation with their bereaved mothers and fathers who still cannot find their daughters and sons, whether they disappeared in Tiananmen Square or whether they disappeared in Tibet. But most of all, we stand in defiance to those who would continue to sacrifice the freedom and democracy for the Chinese people on the alter of free trade.

Wei Jingshang, a democracy activist that spent nearly two decades in Chinese prison for his political beliefs once told me that American corporate executives, not Chinese spies, not Mao Tse-Tung, not the thugs who run the slave labor camps, but that American corporate executives are the vanguard of the Chinese Communist Party revolution in the United States. He is right. There is no issue before Congress that has lobbied more heavily than giving the People's Republic of China continued trading privileges, and while virtually every Nation, other Nation in the world retains Washington lobbyists to do their bidding, China relies on the business community to do its heavy lifting in this city.

Every year, when we debate most favored nation status for China, every year when we debate this issue, American CEO's stream into Ronald Reagan Airport seeking special favors for the world's worst abuser of human rights. They are helped by former government officials, high-ranking American former government officials that know how the machinery of our government operates including former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, former U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills, and former U.S. Commerce Secretary Mickey Cantor.

For those who do not agree with my assessment, I recommend you contact the editors of Fortune Magazine who, this fall, are sponsoring a 3-day business trip to Shanghai. This trip including dinner with President Jiang Zemin and a luncheon with Henry Kissinger will outline and thank these American business corporations, these American corporate executives, for their work in China. After the conclusion of their gala in Shanghai, many of these corporate CEO's plan the next day, October 1 of this year, to go to Beijing and celebrate with Communist party leadership the 50th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China, the 50th anniversary of the victory of communism in China.

Just think about that. American corporate leaders, some of the wealthiest, most successful, most well-paid corporate leaders in the United States will travel to Beijing and stand and sit at Tiananmen Square with leaders of the Communist Party revolution celebrating 50 years of communist rule in China and celebrating frankly, maybe implicitly, but frankly celebrating the deaths of those hundreds and hundreds, maybe thousands of demonstrators for democracy that were following Thomas Jefferson, not Mao Tse-Tung.

But much of the equipment on display as they sit in Beijing and watch this parade in Tiananmen Square, that much of the equipment on display on October 1 of this year they know has been financed by China's enormous bilateral trade surplus and incorporated stolen U.S. technology. Apparently, that is of little concern to America's most prosperous and well-paid CEOs.

After all, these CEOs and their Wall Street allies do not seem to care much if the shelves at the Lorain, Ohio, K-mart are lined with goods manufactured by Chinese prison labor. Their lawyers in Washington do not care much if Chinese workers are imprisoned for trying to form unions. And these well-paid CEO's do not seem to care much that some of these companies that they contract with in China are paying Chinese workers 12 cents an hour, those that are being paid at all, not to mention those that are in Chinese slave labor camps and working for these American companies.

But it should bother all of us that after 10 years, that 10 years after the slaughter at Tiananmen Square, American citizens, some of our wealthiest corporate leaders that benefit from living in a free and open society, will be actively celebrating communism in China and, at the same time, actively celebrating the demise of democracy in China, the harsh realities at the ongoing genocide in Tibet, the continued arrest and torture of democracy activists, the proliferation of nuclear technology in North Korea, the forced abortions conducted by Chinese Communist leaders, the persecution of Christians and Buddhists and all religions in China; none of this seems much to matter to the leaders of our corporate community in this country.

To this I say the most effective way to toughen our relationship with China is to deny it special trading privileges. Every year, many of us have prodded the Republican leadership in this body to force China to improve its behavior before giving it preferential trade status. China buys, we buy from China approximately $75 billion worth of goods from that country every year.

China buys from us about $12 billion worth of goods. We sell more to Belgium with 1/120 of the population of China, we sell more to Belgium in a year than we sell to China. We have a $65 billion trade deficit. We sell $75 billion, we buy $75 billion worth of goods from them. They buy $12 billion worth of goods from us. These trade benefits give Chinese Communist dictators the billions of dollars. Last year, it was nearly 60 billion, the billions of dollars and the commercial technology needed to modernize the People's Liberation Army.

Yet each year, many of the same Members of Congress who are the loudest in their criticism of the Clinton administration's China policy vote to give Beijing preferential trade status. Mark my words. After the vote on Tuesday on MFN, after this Congress will again support the morally bankrupt position of the Clinton administration and the Republican leaders in Congress, many of those Members on the other side of the aisle after voting to give preferential trade status to China will be yelling and screaming about the President's wrong position admittedly, but wrong position on his whole China policy.

Yet when it comes time to step up to the plate tomorrow and vote on most favored nation status, I hope they would come over and join those of us on both sides of the aisle that realize how corrupt this whole process is.

Mr. Speaker, what we need to do before granting China special trade privileges is condition their behavior on something other than a whole series of broken promises. I am weary of continued Chinese Communist promises that they will behave, that they will play fair, that they will stop the human rights abuses, that they will stop the forced abortions, that they will stop the child labor, that they will stop the slave labor.

□ 2200

I would like to quote his mentor, Soviet leader Lenin when he said: ''Promises are like pie crust, they are made to be broken.''

Mr. Speaker, I asked the administration, I asked the Republican leadership in this body, I asked the American business community, so strongly supportive of MFN for China and so strongly supportive of World Trade Organization entry for China immediately, I asked them to step back and let us see if China can behave for 1 year, just only 1 year. We should demand to see if China can stop its human rights abuses for only 1 year. We should demand to see if China can stop using slave labor for only 1 year. We should demand to see if China can stop child labor if only for 1 year, and we should demand that China stop threatening Taiwan before receiving another dollar from U.S. consumers, for only 1 year. We must not give China special trading privileges until we see proof that its Communist rulers are capable of abiding by the rule of law. That is all we ask, Mr. Speaker.

Let us wait a year. Let us not give China Most Favored Nation status. Let us not give China these trading privileges until they can prove to the American people and to their workers and to their citizens and their country that only for 1 year they can act like most of the rest of the world that is integrated into this world economy and the World Trade Organization and throughout the world economy. Just ask for 1

year, if China could behave itself, if China could join the League of Nations, to join the community of nations and act like the rest of us, who treat workers decently, who do not engage in human rights violations the way that China does.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) from the neighboring county, Cuyahoga County, who has been an active participant and leader in this fight against Most Favored Nation status for China.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is a pleasure to serve with the gentleman in this Congress and to call him neighbor.

These economic issues which the gentleman speaks of are issues which affect both of our constituencies, constituencies which in many cases share the same economic concern, the same jobs, the same factories, the same concerns about their family survival. I think it is fair at this moment to ask, why are we renewing Most Favored Nation trading status to China when our trade deficit is so large that it is costing jobs in the United States?

Why would we continue to allow Chinese exports to flood the American market when American exports to China are puny in comparison? Why does this Congress vote on bills to make trade free when, by far, the most important part of the economy does not even involve foreign trade at all, but domestic product and consumption?

A great disservice is done to the American people when so much time and effort is spent by the Congress making trade free for the corporations because it is at the expense of American residents, American workers, and American consumers.

Now, contrary to what one might think by listening to those who support MFN for China, a global free trade agreement, international trade is a drag on the American economy. Most Favored Nation status or ''normal trade relations,'' as it is being called today, means that the U.S. gives to China the same exact trade status that it would give to a tiny country or ally. But MFN with China costs more jobs than it creates. Moreover, foreign trade is such a small part of the economy, that to make policy on the basis of what promotes foreign trade is to make the tail wag the dog.

Now, how many of my colleagues know that U.S. exports to foreign countries in 1998 accounted for only 11 percent of the gross domestic product? Imports account for slightly more than that. What that means is that 76 percent of the gross domestic product is made in the United States and consumed in the United States.

To make our economy healthy, we have to promote the health of the domestic economy. We have to promote higher wages and a monetary policy that promotes full employment. But MFN for China undermines the domestic economy. By far, the largest component in our trade with China is imports. By 1998 we imported $71 billion of goods from China. That was $57 billion more than the exports we sent to China.

The U.S. pays China $6, Mr. Speaker, for every $1 it earns in exports to China. Trade with China puts a drag on the U.S. economy, and that leads to lower employment and lower wages for Americans. Indeed, American exports to China represent only a tiny fraction of all American exports to the rest of the world, about 3.6 percent. But imports from China represent a much larger proportion of everything America imports from the world, around 13 percent. Imports from China do about 4 times more harm to the U.S. economy than exports to China do good for the U.S. economy.

Furthermore, America imports more from China than any other single country. We consume about one-third of their exports. That should give the U.S. powerful leverage over China. That is because China would know that when the U.S. demands more democracy in China, more respect for human rights, better environmental protections, that the biggest customers continued business rise in achieving those goals. Is that what the U.S. does? No.

The policy of this administration and the Congress has been to give up the economic leverage the U.S. has. The imbalance is so obvious we should ask the obvious question: If MFN for China by far benefits China at the expense of the United States of America, why are we giving MFN to China at all? Because large multinational global corporations lobby for it. Those corporations are seeking to promote their own business and profits. They see China as a good place to do business.

When multinational corporations talk, many in Congress listen. When they talk about MFN for China, they are lobbying for the Chinese Government. The Chinese have not given up their leverage, and they use access to the Chinese market to influence the corporations to lobby the Congress for MFN for China, and here we are.

Soon Congress will debate on this floor disallowing Most Favored Nation trade status for China. Giving the status is bad for the U.S. economy. It is bad for American workers. It is bad for American consumers. But it is good for Chinese manufacturers and a handful of U.S.-based multinational corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I will be here when that debate comes to the floor to urge my colleagues to vote for the American economy and not for essential interests. Our steel, our automotive, our aerospace industries which form the pillars of our strategic industrial base are being threatened by this avalanche of imports from China. How are we going to protect the America of the future if we do not take a stand and demand once and for all that this country insists on having a strong trading policy which protects American jobs and protects the American economy?

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for this opportunity to address the Congress, and it is an honor to work with him on this issue, to work with such fine representatives as the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) and others who are so dedicated to protecting the future of the American economy. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) very much for his leadership on this issue and recognize that several other Members will be joining us, and I thank my colleagues for their involvement.

On one point that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) said that is especially noteworthy is that the rules we set for China are the same rules, if we give them Most Favored Nation status, as it unfortunately is always the case, the same rules we set for a tiny country. They are also the same rules we set for free countries, and if we look at what makes China so attractive to western investors, the subsidies given by the government, the slave labor that the Chinese use, the child labor that the Chinese use, their ban on the right to freely associate, that workers can bargain collectively, their restriction of movement of workers so that workers are unhappy and cannot move somewhere else; all of these features that are attractive for American western investment in China is what should disqualify them from Most Favored Nation status.

The fact is, when China pays 12 cents an hour to workers, when they do not follow any environmental rules, when they do not treat their workers well, when they do all of the kinds of things that violate international labor standards, they are not competitive with the rest of the world; no one can compete when workers are treated that way. That is one reason that steel workers in the United States are at a disadvantage and auto workers and all the people that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and I represent in northeast Ohio and so many others in this institution represent, when the Chinese do not play by the same rules as everyone else, whether it is slave labor or child labor or 12 cents an hour wages, not to mention forced abortions and religious persecution and all kinds of human rights violations, when they do not play by those rules, clearly, there is no reason we should give them trade advantages so that they can continue to take advantage of other countries around the world.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, if I may make this point for a moment, and I know we have other colleagues waiting to speak here, and I certainly want to yield to them, but the point that arises

here is that China has an industrial policy, and its industrial policy is providing China with a kind of national cohesion, so that they can have sustained economic growth.

Now, a lesser concern of China is political freedom. Think about that. Think about what that means. So as multinational global corporations make China a place to do business, China cares less about political freedom, they flood the United States with all of these imports, creating this huge deficit, so we are exporting jobs from a free Nation to a nation that does not have a democracy, and they are sending back imports here, displacing jobs of people who work in a democracy, thereby helping to create a condition where we are actually paying for the destruction of our own democracy. They are targeting what are our central industries in this country: electronics, machinery, petrochemicals, automobile manufacturing, steel, aerospace, construction. So I say to the gentleman his point is well taken.

We have a joint concern here when it comes to looking at what this trade policy does. But we have two points here, and one is that the United States trade policy is wrong, but we need an industrial policy which will help to focus a trade policy which is fair; and right now, it is unfair and Most Favored Nation status for China would compound the unfairness. I yield back, and I am grateful for this chance to join my colleagues.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield to Congress's foremost leader on this issue, who has a greater understanding of U.S.-China policy than any other Member of this body, and who has led the charge against Most Favored Nation status in large part because of her belief in fair play and human rights, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for calling this Special Order tonight. I am pleased to join my colleagues, the gentlemen from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and others I know who want to participate to talk about the issue of Normal Trade Relations with China, formerly known as Most Favored Nation status with China.

□ 2215

I guess I will start off with that point. The name has been changed, and not to protect the innocent.

This policy, our U.S.-China policy has had more names. It has been called constructive engagement, strategic partnership, and now, most recently, principled purposeful engagement with our eyes wide open. Can Members imagine, that is what the administration calls its policy towards China.

It has to remove all doubt that our eyes are wide open on this policy, lest someone think that we must be turning a blind eye to what China is doing in terms of trade, proliferation, and human rights, because indeed, only by turning a blind eye could one formulate this purposeful, so-called principled engagement with eyes wide open, because the policy has been a complete failure.

There are three areas of concern, as my colleagues have pointed out: Human rights, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction by China, and the trade issue.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) very eloquently opened his remarks by talking about the young man before the tank. He talked about the young people who echoed the words of our Founding Fathers. Many of those, indeed, hundreds of them, are still in prison for speaking out freely for democratic reform 10 years ago, at the time of the Tiananmen Square massacre. Thousands of people are in prison in China for practicing their religion. Hundreds of thousands are in reform through labor camps for reeducation by the Chinese.

Mr. Speaker, just this past week over 10,000 people were arrested by the Chinese for practicing Falun Gong, their belief system, and whether we agree with it or not, it is not up to us to decide on someone else's religion or their spirituality, but it is inappropriate, it is wrong, and we as a country should be speaking out when any country detains 10,000 people for wanting to freely associate and believe in something.

I will go into that a little more if I have time, but having touched on the human rights issue, and I will talk about the proliferation issue in a moment, I want to talk now about the trade issue.

What has distinguished this coalition that we have to oppose MFN for China, or now called normal trade relations with China, again a name change, is the fact that each year the President must request a special waiver in order for China to get whatever we want to call this special trade treatment that it receives. It is special for them because they do not have a market economy, and therefore, the President must request a special waiver.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has a resolution to deny the waiver, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes. Let me tell them why. Just on the basis of trade alone, how can we think about giving China normal trade relations when China does not give us any such thing?

We have heard the statistics that in 1998, the trade deficit was about $58 billion with China. It is higher this year. Over $1 billion a week, over $1 billion a week, is lost because of China's unfair trade practices.

I wanted to call to my colleagues' attention, when the business community comes around, and indeed they do, to tell us how trade with China has grown, I want to show my colleagues just how it has grown. It has not grown so much in terms of exports to China. In fact, our exports to China are practically stagnating, the increase is so minuscule. However, on the imports from China, the increase is so staggering as to to be overwhelming, as be beyond explanation.

When we started this debate around the time of Tiananmen Square, the trade deficit for that year was going to be $6 billion. For this year, it will be over $67 billion. What is missing in this picture? Who are the mad geniuses who have said that if we give MFN to China year in and year out, our trade will increase? Yes, indeed, it has, our imports from China, not our exports to China.

Our exports to China are important. As I said earlier, this is an odd coalition that we have going here, people who have not agreed on other points. By and large, I represent a city built on trade. I have voted for fast track under President Bush and NAFTA under President Clinton and the rest. But something is very wrong about a policy that allows a country to do this. Let me read what is considered to be normal by those advocates for the Chinese regime.

They think it is normal, and do Members think it is normal, when the U.S. trade deficit is surging every year, again, as I said, over $67 billion in 1999, is it normal that China continues to maintain barriers to U.S. goods and services entering the Chinese market, including high tariffs, pervasive non-tariff barriers and non-transparent barriers, non-transparent trade rules and regulations, restrictions on trading and distribution rights, restrictive government procurement practices, and restrictions on investment?

I enumerate those because every possible way that we could gain something in trading with China is restricted to us.

Is it normal that China continues to pirate U.S. intellectual property to the tune of about $2.5 billion in lost sales in 1998? That is not from me, that is from the International Intellectual Property Alliance. And China continues to utilize forced labor for production of exports to the United States, in violation of U.S. law.

Is it normal that China demands technology transfer? And therein lies the biggest danger to our own economy's future. China demands a technology transfer. That is our intellectual property, too, our know-how. That is what we tell the American worker is our economic competitive advantage in the international markets. Yet, China is demanding that that technology be transferred to China.

So if we want to sell products in China, we must produce them there, okay? So that is production transfer. That is one thing. But technology transfer says, and besides, you have to give us all of your designs on what you are making. Now we are your major competitor for our own market. You can produce in China, but that, Mr. Chairman, will have to be to export to another country. We are saving the

Chinese market for the Chinese manufacturers.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say, to compare this trade relationship, which is unfair in every respect, let us see what the trade deficit would be in a free marketplace, but do not restrict U.S. products going into China having high barriers, and then say that this is going to lead to human rights in China, it is going to lead to all these good things, when it is not even leading to a decent balance of payments for the United States.

I just wanted to point out to my colleague another point. That is, all of this hoop-de-doo about all of the trade with China, just let us talk about the exports, again. China has 1.2 billion people. Now, many, many of them are poor, and I always support assistance for basic human needs for poor people in China. So this is not about the Chinese people, it is about the Chinese regime.

The Chinese regime, which controls many of the industries in China, to China we export 2.8 percent of our exports. Now, look over here. Belgium has 10 million people, 10 million people. We export 3.3 percent of our exports to Belgium. It is 3.3 to Belgium, 10 million people, and 2.8 to China, 1.2 billion people.

Let us look at Taiwan. They have 20 million people. We export 4.1 percent of our exports to Taiwan. Get it? It is not about free trade, it is about barriers to products made in America going into China.

Opponents, those who oppose our efforts tomorrow will say that we want to isolate China, and to vote for the Rohrabacher amendment is to isolate China. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, those who say that, and some of them in the highest places in our government, do a grave disservice to the issue by trying to caricaturize it that way.

We certainly do not want to isolate China. Especially we do not want to isolate the Chinese people. The answer to every problem practically in our relationship with China is that the situation would be better if China were more democratic, if the people of China were able to choose their form of government, their form of worship, their form of assembly, their freedom of speech.

The issue of Taiwan certainly would be better if China were more democratic. The issue of doing business in China would be better if China had rule of law. The issue of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to rogue states I think would be improved, too. On that point I will close my remarks.

The administration and others who rationalize their support for a purposeful principled engagement with our eyes wide open will tell us that China is helping us on some very strategic issues worldwide. For instance, they will say that China is helping to stabilize South Asia. Oh, really? China is not trying to stabilize South Asia, China has mobilized Pakistan. Without the cooperation of the Chinese, the Pakistanis would not have the missile and other dangerous technologies that they have, and they continue to assist them, the Pakistanis. There is absolutely no question about that.

So that has added to the instability in South Asia. Every time they agreed to stop doing it, they said they did not do it, they would stop doing it, would not do it anymore, and continued to do it. That started in the Bush years and continued in the Clinton years.

Now we have them saying, those who support this policy, saying they are helping us with North Korea, to stop their missile development program. Either they are not trying very hard or they have failed to intercede, or they are not very effective. But in any case, North Korea is proceeding apace with its missile program, and not only that, they are selling to Pakistan technologies that they have received from China.

So this is not about how they are helping us in North Korea. If they were helping in North Korea, it would be in their own interest, anyway. We do not have to bribe them by ignoring their human rights abuses in order for them to do what is right as far as North Korea is concerned, if they are a responsible so-called strategic partner.

They still continue to make the Persian Gulf area a very dangerous neighborhood. We all know that we have a national interest in the Persian Gulf because of oil. We went to war because of that. Our young people are still in the Persian Gulf. When they are, they are looking right at missile technology, C–801 and C–802, sold to the Iranians by the Chinese, and other dangerous technology as well.

So I think that our policy with any country should be to make the trade fairer, to make the people freer, and to make the world safer. On all three of these scores this policy has failed.

So what we are asking our colleagues to do is, we know most-favored-nation status, so-called normal trade relations, is not going to be revoked. The President would never allow that to happen. But what we can do tomorrow is to send a message to Beijing that the people in prison have not been forgotten, that we are not stupid when it comes to our own trade relationships. Even though the exporting elites run the show around here, there are some people who can add.

Then, in terms of proliferation, our national security is at stake, and that we know what they are saying is not true, and they can blame it on whomever they want, but their government is either responsible for the proliferation, or else they are not capable of signing an agreement about proliferation. But somehow or other, they must be responsible or unaccountable, but they cannot be both at one time.

That is why I was so pleased that my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) extended the invitation to speak about this issue a little more at length that we will have on the floor tomorrow. Let us remove all doubt, this is not about isolating China, it is about pro engagement with the people of China; that we do not accept the premise that increased trade will lead to more personal freedoms, more democratic freedoms in China. For 10 years they have been singing that song, and it has not worked. And in any event we do not subscribe to a principle of trickle-down liberty, anyway.

What we want is a brilliant future with China economically, politically, diplomatically, culturally, in every way. That can only happen when China treats its people with the respect that they deserve, and then we will have an engagement that is sustainable of our national values, sustainable of our own economy, and sustainable of international security.

Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentlewoman from California. As she has pointed out in the past, other years leading up to the vote on what was called before MFN, most-favored-nation status, the Chinese have done a few nice things. They might help us a little bit on foreign policy.

□ 2230

They might release some prisoners, some political prisoners. But this year, interestingly, as time has approached for the most favored nation status, the Chinese Communists are so arrogantly confident that they are going to win this vote in this Congress, that they have not released any prisoners. They have actually arrested at least 10,000 religious people simply practicing their religion. They put more people in camps. They have gone the opposite direction.

That is why it is so important, as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) says, that our colleagues send messages to the Chinese Communists that we do not like what they are doing.

Now, we know that we are not going to win this vote tomorrow. But if we lose this vote overwhelmingly, we know we are not going to get most favored nation status put aside, but we know if we lose overwhelmingly, it simply says to the Chinese, keep doing what you are doing because nobody in this country cares. That is why it is so important.

One more point the gentlewoman from California made is she suggested so much of this whole policy with China is shrouded in myths. The gentlewoman had mentioned that the Chinese Government supposedly is helping us stabilize South Asia, and that is clearly a myth that she exploded. The gentlewoman has said that the opponents accuse us of wanting to isolate China from us and from the rest of the world. That clearly is not true.

Another myth is that the Chinese have been there to help us in North

Korea in a very destabilizing or unstable situation. The gentlewoman exploded that myth.

The other myth that we hear over and over, and I have heard the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) talk about so many times, is how, if we engage with China, that democracy will come to that country, the more business development, the more economic interaction, the more trade between the two countries, that China will become a freer country.

Yet, when we look at the last 10 years since Tiananmen Square, when we look at everything from the trade deficits to the forced abortions to the selling of weapons to Pakistan, nuclear ring technology to Pakistan, to smuggling AK–47s into the harbor in the city of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), to all the kinds of persecution of religious minorities, to what they have done in Tibet, all of those things beg that question, are things getting better? Is China getting more democratic because we are engaging with them?

There is clearly no evidence that China has gotten more democratic as we engage with them. In fact, what we really are doing is strengthening the People's Liberation Army and strengthening the Communist party leaders in China.

Why are we so naive when we look at history with Nazi Germany as they grew and got more developed and economically better off and got to be a stronger wealthier country. They used that economic power and that technology and that wealth to kill more Jews, to kill more gypsies, to declare war on more countries, to engage in the kind of militarist kind of expansionism that they were so well known for.

The same issue goes on with the Chinese. Just simply looking at it in the simplest way, why should the Chinese change the way they do things when they get most favored nation station and they get these economic benefits from the United States? That is what the Chinese Communist leaders, they like the system this way. Clearly, they have benefited from this system. The PLA, the People's Liberation Army, they benefit from the system this way. They do not want democracy. The American corporate leaders, the investors in the major corporations, they benefit from Chinese policy this way.

So the people that are really running this policy, the U.S. corporate executives, the People's Liberation Army, and the Chinese Communist leaders, they like the system the way it is. They do not want democracy. The People's Liberation Army does not want democracy.

The corporate leaders in the United States that invest in China do not want labor unions to form in China. They do not want free movement of workers at their choice, moving around at the workers' choice. They do not want the kind of things that we believe in this country and the American values that we hold so dearly.

So why should more prosperity for the leaders in China, the top government officials, the top leaders and the generals and the colonels in the People's Liberation Army and the U.S. company executives, why should more money there make them want democracy more? They like the system the way it works.

I think the proof of that is, as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and I have talked many times, is if one looks back in February of 1989, the U.S. State Department issues a report every year about human rights around the world. If one looks, I was leafing through this report, it is a pretty long report, it is country by country. It is called the Country Reports on Human Rights. The State Department uses language talking about Serbia and Kosovo, the treatment of the Kosovars by the Serbs, by the Yugoslav government.

They also, if we flip a few pages forward, and we look at the language we describe, the Chinese Government's treatment of Tibetans, and the language is almost identical paragraph by paragraph.

We declared and bombed Serbia because of their treatment of Kosovo and their treatment of people in Kosovo, yet we give trade advantages to China when they are treating their Tibetan minorities almost exactly the same way.

What kind of coherent government policy is that when we bomb one country and we give trade advantages to another for almost the exact same behavior as interpreted by our government. This is not some whacko group. This is the U.S. Government State Department saying we are treating people, and that the Serbs treat people in Kosovo the same way that Beijing government treats people in Tibet. It is morally bankrupt and absolutely incredible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, picking up on what the gentleman from Ohio said, he reminded me that we were willing to raise an Army to redress human rights violations in Yugoslavia, and now we will not, they do not want us to raise a tariff to protect human rights in China, and indeed criticize us for raising our voices against China.

The fact is that the policy has failed. They have to blame it on someone, so they say we keep bringing this up so we are demonizing China. No, we are not. In the words of Harry Truman, ''I am not giving them hell. I am just describing it, and it seems like hell.'' We are not demonizing them. We are just telling it the way it is. If that sounds bad, that is not our fault. That is what is going on there.

I did want to call to the attention of our colleagues the letter from the Department of Social Development and World Peace of the U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops, which was sent to all Members asking for them to vote against the special waiver and in favor of the resolution of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) tomorrow.

I also wanted to call to the attention of our colleagues just in terms of expression of religion that the Falung Gong, imagine any other country in the world, if 10,000 people were arrested in the week, what the clamor would be on the floor of Congress and what the White House would be saying about our values and the rest of that, but it is practically ignored. Because money speaks so loudly, it is so deafening that people cannot hear these cries.

But we want the government in Beijing, we want them to get the message that this action has been noticed, that these people will not be forgotten. Many of the messages that we are receiving are that the Falung Gong members had no food, no drink, no medical attention for 5 days. They are in a very difficult situation.

I received this letter from my district, the Bay area Chinese newspaper today in the San Francisco Bay area reported that China has arrested 1,200 party officials and is forcing them to read the guidelines of the party and to abandon the Falung Gong practice. They are sending them to these reeducation schools, all of them in the same place, to reindoctrinate them.

So it is they who are so cowardly because they are so frightened. The regime is so frightened because they have no legitimacy. Their power springs from the barrel of a gun, and that is where it is.

So the peaceful evolution that the gentleman from Ohio described of economic reform leading to political reform can only happen, and sometimes does happen, if it is allowed to happen. But if it is perceived as an evil, as it is in China, and it is prevented from happening, then the consequences to those who want to speak out more democratically will obviously be repressed, as they have been a couple of hundred of pro-democracy people wanting to form other democratic parties in China have been arrested at the same time as this Falung Gong arrests have been taking place.

So the situation that the gentleman from Ohio describes in the country report of the State Department, China, Yugoslavia, Tibet, Kosovo is so similar. Now I do not want anybody declaring war on anybody. I mean, violence to me should be obsolete.

But the fact is, if we are going to have any respect for our moral authority, any respect for our values, we have to have some level of consistency and at least on how we speak out and how we use our leverage, our incredible over $60 billion leverage this year to promote democratic themes which will benefit, not only the people of China, but the people of the world.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if we think about what the gentlewoman

from California just said, the message that this country and the NATO forces sent to Slobodan Milosevic was, do not do what you are doing in Kosovo. No ethnic cleansing, no waging war against your people, no throwing people into prison, no violence, no more of that kind of activity.

The message that we are sending to Chinese Communist leaders for what they do to the Tibetans and what they do in slave labor camps is, it is okay. We do not care. In fact, we might even reward it by giving you trade advantages and letting you into the World of Nations.

I ask the gentlewoman from California to tell us, she in the past has been so involved in this issue for her entire 13 years as a Member of this body, I think it is so important to send a message to our colleagues. But the gentlewoman has recounted in other years, prior to the vote, the Chinese Government has released a few prisoners here and there. This year, it is the exact opposite. I ask the gentlewoman from California to recount that if she would to our colleagues who need to understand how important it is to send that message that the Chinese Communist party behavior is absolutely unacceptable.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for reminding me of his other question that he expressed earlier.

The leverage that we have in this debate, and that is why we bring it up every year, is that of course we are always hopeful that, as people open their eyes, they will open them up further and see that the policy is not working.

But one of the benefits of bringing it to the floor has always been that, when most favored nation status was in doubt, when Democrats, before we had a Democratic President, were voting against most favored nation status for China, and when it was in doubt, each year, the Chinese Government would release prisoners leading up to the time of the debate.

Chinese prisoners have said to us that their conditions improved markedly at a time when they thought the most favored nation status was in doubt. The very minute that MFN was delinked and then the vote became less, shall we say, of a message to Beijing and the Clinton administration, then the Chinese knew that they could proceed with impunity, and they no longer have to make any concessions to anyone, because they have known what Members of Congress have told me in this body. It does not matter what China does, we will never support sanctions on China. How can that be? But it is.

So that is what is lost in all of this is the prospect for a change in policy, always improve the conditions for the prisoners, lead to the release of some prisoners.

But that idea that MFN or NTR, whatever my colleagues want to call it, is in doubt, that is gone. So the Chinese now say to the moderates among them, we do not have to do anything. And they do not. That is the tragedy.

I used to say of President Bush, he never missed an opportunity to miss an opportunity to send a message to the Chinese about what our policy should be and what our values were in terms of human rights, in terms of our own economy, and in terms of our interest in national security. President Clinton has followed that path, although we were hopeful that he might not. So that is what is lost on this.

If I may say if, God willing it will not happen, but if this body ever entertains the notion of permanent MFN for China, we would be surrendering all leverage in terms of trade, proliferation, and human rights. Indeed, the biggest tool that the trade representative has in the negotiations on the World Trade Organization is permanent MFN. Certainly that should never happen until the situation is very changed in China.

But all of these notions about trade, increasing this, this, and this will only happen if the regime will allow it. What is happening, instead, is that the regime is emboldened and enriched by a $60 billion per year in the trade surplus. I might say, in the Clinton years alone, over $300 billion of surplus by the end of this year to the Chinese regime. There must be a better way. There must be a better way.

But we are squandering all of our leverage in order to meet the lobbying efforts of the exporting elites in whose interest it is.

I went back and got this book because it is a resource book from the Chamber of Commerce. What is interesting to me is they talk about all the good things that will spring from normal trade relations with China.

□ 2245

They have been singing this tune for 10 years that I know of at least, and it is all will, will, will, will. It is not about have or is benefiting U.S. So they have been squandering our leverage on the come, on what they hope will come sometime down the road in this great mirage, without a great deal to show for it in the present.

Here is the book, and it says, on page after page, will trade with China, will build a brighter future for America, will power the future of America's high-tech industry, will drive America's automobile industry, will help raise U.S. exports, will help beef up American exports. And it goes on and on like that, and I keep thinking when is it ever going to occur to them that they have been singing this song too long. What fascinates me even more is that people buy it. But I guess hope springs eternal.

In any event, let us give this policy a chance that says, of course we want to have engagement with China, but with our eyes open, truly, and not some new name that will change tomorrow on a policy that has not been successful and has been bipartisan in its failure.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What is so ironic during this process is that China wants to be a member of the World Trade Organization, to be accepted in the community of nations permanently. Yet during this last 3 or 4 or 5 years that they have been wooing the United States and other countries into admission or accession into the WTO, look at their behavior, everything from the nuclear ring technology to Pakistan, to slave labor, to child labor, to the closing of the markets, to the forced abortions, to the persecution of Christians, and the human rights violations. That is their behavior when they have been wooing us, when they want admission into this organization, when they want WTO accession. Once they are in, and I hope they are never in the World Trade Organization, then we will have no leverage with them.

That is another debate for another day, but that is so important to understand, that their behavior has been so outrageous and so outside the mainstream of world values and world opinions and world behavior that it is just remarkable that this body wants to include them in any of these organizations.

Ms. PELOSI. If the gentleman will yield on that point. I just want to add this further point, and that is that the trade representative herself has said if a country does not want to comply with the World Trade Organization regulations, there is really not much we can do about it.

And China has really received the message from the world that nobody is going to step up to the plate, because the too-big-to-fail doctrine is in effect. All the countries want their piece of the trade. Of course they are buying. China is buying from them; they are selling to us. They take the money they make on our trade, go buy stuff in other countries, win their political support in all the other world bodies, diminishing anything we could possibly do in a multilateral body in terms of human rights or other issues.

So the World Trade Organization only will work if the members coming in are of good faith. An economy as big as China's coming into the WTO, which refuses to play by the rules, if that country refuses to play by the rules, can wreck the WTO and wreck some of the western democratic economies as well, and that is really serious.

But we are in this immediate gratification stage for certain businesses in America. There is nothing long term about values, our economy or international security.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentlewoman from California, and I simply want to close with an exhortation to our Members to vote in support of the Rohrabacher resolution tomorrow which will deny Most Favored Nation status to China.

The importance of a ''yes'' vote tomorrow in support of the Rohrabacher resolution is to send a message to the Chinese that the kind of behavior from

persecution of people practicing their religion, to closing of their markets, to human rights violations, to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the only way to get the message that this body is unhappy and does not tolerate that kind of behavior is a ''yes'' vote tomorrow on the Rohrabacher resolution.

CHINA AND MFN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERWOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for half the time until midnight.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks we have just heard concerning the vote that will be coming up tomorrow on Most Favored Nation status, or as it is now referred to, normal trade relations, with the Communist government of China.

Let me just say for the record that this is a bipartisan effort. As we can see tonight, some people on the other side of the aisle have been very active; some people on my side of the aisle have been very active.

Perhaps one of the greatest disappointments I have had with this administration is that during President Bush's term in office I was very disappointed in his policies toward Communist China and, in fact, after Tiananmen Square was bitterly disappointed in how we took that and the positions we were taking in response to the massacre of democracy advocates in Tiananmen Square.

When George Bush lost the election in 1992 to president elect Clinton, I thought to myself, well, at least here is someone that I will be able to work with on the issue of human rights. Unfortunately, I had bought in to President Clinton's posturing on human rights. And I might add, unfortunately, all of us who have been active in the human rights arena have been disappointed with this administration. I personally feel that this administration has been the most anti-human rights administration in my lifetime, and it certainly has undermined the tough stands made by President Reagan and President Jimmy Carter, and has even superceded George Bush in the area of human rights.

For example, in China, this President has decoupled trade negotiations with China in relationship to anything to do with human rights. The administration no longer has that as part of its negotiating position. This President personally decided to make that decoupling. Had a Republican president done that, I imagine people would remember it a great deal more because there would have been a much greater fracas caused by that.

But tomorrow we will again address this issue that has been one that has gone on every year since my election to Congress, and tomorrow the House will debate legislation that has been introduced. However, it will be my legislation that will be debated. And that, of course, makes me feel a bit humble. I remember the time when I came into this body 10 years ago when I could not have dreamed of having a piece of my legislation being the focal point of a major day's work of the United States Congress. But I have introduced legislation that will disapprove of the extension of so-called normal trade relations with Communist China, which was previously known as Most Favored Nation status.

For the past 10 years, since the massacre of the democracy advocates at Tiananmen Square, and by the way, let us remember that the folks over in Beijing, the same people who have been in charge, the same gang that has been in charge, those people still deny that there was ever a massacre at Tiananmen Square of democracy advocates. But since then, the Congress has undertaken this debate every year, but there has been little change in the repression that is taking place in China.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) outlined that these are the very same arguments that we will hear tomorrow by the advocates of normal trade relations with Communist China. These are the very same arguments that have been offered year after year after year after year.

My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), asked earlier on in his remarks what must happen for these people who come to this floor and suggest that there will be progress made on the human rights front; that there will be a liberalization; that there will be a change in their belligerency; that there will be positive steps taken and recognizable steps taken if we just engage them in this trade policy, what more does China have to do? How much longer will it be before these folks who advocate these positions with all of their heart and with all of their sincerity, how much longer will it take, how much more must China do before they admit they are wrong? They are dead wrong, and it is clear to everyone that they are wrong.

I personally could not come and advocate those policies, that I believed perhaps were right, if they had continued over a 10-year period to go in exactly the opposite direction than what my predictions were. I, in fact, would suggest that if tomorrow a revolt broke out in Tibet and that nuclear weapons were dropped by the Communist Chinese Government on Tibet, annihilating hundreds of thousands, if not millions of Tibetans, we would still hear from these folks on the floor of the House of Representatives that if we just continue to engage them in this trade policy, that the policies followed by the government in Beijing are bound to liberalize and that the government in Beijing will become more civilized by their association with us.

I believe that they could murder every last christian in China, they could murder every last Tibetan, they could commit genocide against every Muslim out in the far reaches of China, who they are also murdering, they could take every one of the 70 million member group, who are nothing more than a movement of people who believe in meditation and believe in exercise, as is consistent with Chinese tradition, they could murder every one of those people and we would still have on the floor of this House people advocating that we continue on with the same policy year after year after year after year.

Well, something is wrong. Something is wrong, and it does not take a rocket scientist to know that something is wrong. It certainly might take a rocket scientist, however, to know exactly how much damage has been done to us that we have discovered in the last year. Because in this last year we have found out that since the last vote on Most Favored Nation status with China the Communist government in Beijing has managed to get their hands on, through theft and other methods, of our most deadly weapons secrets. They now have the ability to produce miniaturized nuclear weapons. They have the ability to produce these weapons of mass destruction.

And our own companies are overseas telling them and teaching them how to upgrade their missile capacity and their missile capability so that they can more accurately target American cities with these weapons of mass destruction.

Now, it is the theory of those who advocate most-favored-nation status that the world will be a safer place if we have this trade with China. But as we can see, that not only is the world not a safer place as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has pointed out, Communist China is the source of this deadly weapons technology to Korea, to Iran, to other Third World rogue nations, but not only that, not only is the world not a safer place, the United States is not a safer place because of this. Our own country now faces the prospect of our companies who have gone over there to liberalize China and make them more pleasant, make them more consistent with the civilized values of the western world, our own companies have gone over there and they have been corrupted themselves to the point that they have armed our worst potential enemy with weapons that could incinerate tens of millions if not hundreds of millions of American citizens.

There is something wrong with this policy. There is something dreadfully wrong. What more needs to be done before people will come on the floor of this House and will admit that that policy does not work? Year after year after year the same arguments, yet the empirical evidence suggests that they are going in the wrong direction. Making matters worse, as China has gone in the wrong direction, as China has kept up its roadblocks to the importation of American goods, kept up its

high tariffs, used the surplus that it is generating by its tariffs on our goods and taking advantage of the low tariffs in exporting their goods to the United States, taking the tens of billions of dollars that they have earned and while they are using that money to modernize their weapons, to aim it at the United States, we have an administration that insists on calling Communist China, again the world's worst human rights abuser, is being called our strategic partner.

If we do not change our policy towards the world's worst human rights abuser, Americans will pay a woeful price. It will not be just the Tibetans who will be slaughtered but it will be the American people, not just losing their jobs as we have shown in this testimony before us this evening, we have shown how our ability to compete with China and the slave labor prices in China and the slave labor wages in China, our ability has been cut down as we export technology to that country. Yes, we are paying an economic price. The Tibetans are paying a price with their lives as are the Muslims in that country, as are the dissidents in that country. But if we keep up this policy, the American people will pay a woeful price for this irrational, immoral and greed-driven policy that is putting us in grave jeopardy to a country that is controlled by gangsters and despots.

The time, Mr. Speaker, has long since passed when the United States should reexamine these fundamental policies toward the Communist dictatorship that rules the mainland of China. Our commercial policies as well as our diplomatic and military policies have for the past decade worked against the interests of our people and has not, as we had hoped, increased the level of freedom enjoyed by the Chinese people. In fact, after some initial progress, China has gone in the opposite direction, as I have just described, especially since the end of the Reagan administration and the tragic national reversal that took place in Tiananmen Square.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) defines insanity as doing more of the same and expecting to get different results. Here I have been describing it tonight. The same policies are being advocated over and over again, but yet these folks ask us to believe that this time around, there are going to be different results. I do not believe there will be different results if we continue this policy with Communist China. I believe our country will just be in more jeopardy and that in the end we will reach a threshold in our economic relationship with China where it causes great economic damage to our country as well as the national security damage, which is already becoming evident. It is at the least unreasonable, perhaps, and what we are talking about at the least is irrational optimism for these people to continue advocating this position.

I think that it is up to us to advocate what we believe in, and I certainly respect people with different opinions. But the American people should pay close attention to the debate that is going on here tomorrow. We must understand that since this debate started 10 years ago, the genocide has continued in Tibet, the Chinese democracy movement was wiped out, and there has been an increasing belligerence of the guys who run— the bully boys, I say, of Beijing—toward the United States, towards Taiwan, towards the Philippines.

Now, big business falsely claims that China will be liberalizing through this commercial engagement. As I have said, there is no evidence of that. The evidence goes exactly the opposite direction. China, as we heard from the gentlewoman from California, is exporting its weapons technology to various rogue nations.

Let me just add, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, I was shocked to find out that Communist China is aiding the North Koreans in their, quote, space efforts, in their space program. North Korea has a space program? Give me a break. North Korea has a space program? Here we are shipping North Korea hundreds of millions of dollars of foreign aid, our biggest recipient in Asia, and they are spending their money on a space program in which Communist China is taking the technology that they stole from us, or was given to them by our own aerospace firms, illegally, I might add, and they are building these rockets in the name of a space program.

How many people who read this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or listen tonight on C-SPAN believe that North Korea is really developing these rockets to launch civilian satellites but are not, which we know that probably is the case, that the North Koreans, with the Chinese help, are developing missiles in order to intimidate Japan and intimidate the democratic peoples in the Pacific, and unfortunately also to intimidate the United States because many of these rockets in North Korea and in China, thanks to our own companies, like Hughes and Loral, are now more capable of being more accurate in their targeting of American cities.

What we have in our China policy is a catastrophe, a catastrophe for the United States of America in the making. We see this with the money that the Communist Chinese have left over, and as the gentlewoman from California said, what type of normal trade relationship is it when they have barriers to our goods and high tariffs to our goods and we let them ship all of their goods into our country with very little tariff? With the surplus that they have from that, they are in Panama, they are in North Korea, they are modernizing their weapons, they are creating havoc throughout the world and they are putting the world in a position where we could have a catastrophe in which millions of lives are lost and we could face a catastrophe where the United States is put in grave danger. It is in grave danger today. We must change that policy for a number of reasons.

Let us go in now to what this means, what the policy is that we are talking about. Why is normal trade relations being proposed, then? Why do we have large financial interests who are pushing for that? If you examine what the trade is, what we have been talking about tonight, not only do we not have free trade, and the proponents will say, ''Well, we're free traders.'' My Republican colleagues will say, ''We're free traders.''

Well, I am sorry that that is not free trade. We are not talking about free trade. There is no such thing as free trade when on one side of the trading partnership you have a country which permits in all of the goods imported from the other country at 3 percent tariffs and with very few restrictions and the other country, Communist China, putting barriers up and controlling who gets to come over and who gets to buy and sell in their market. You have got a controlled economy here and controlled trade on this side and relatively free and open trade over here. That is not a free trade equation. A free trade equation is when you have free trade on both sides. No, this is an equation that is a one-way free trade, one-way controlled trade equation. When you do it that way, you leave the outcome, the results, not to a free expression of the market between the countries but instead you leave it up to some gangsters who run a tyrannical regime in Beijing, you leave it to them as to what will be the results of that trade, because you have permitted them to manipulate it while leaving it somewhat open on our side.

This is not about free trade. No, it is about managed trade on the side of the Communist Chinese regime so that they can get the $70 billion surplus and they can channel money and power in China to their clique. We are actually strengthening the dictatorship in Communist China by going along with this nonsense that they talk about of free trade, because it is not free trade.

I personally believe in free trade. I would advocate it. It is called free trade between free people. If you do not have free trade between free people, it is a non sequitur, it does not exist, for a one-way free trade is not a free trade equation.

□ 2310

But then why are these companies here? If you take a look even to that degree of what we supposedly export to China, once you take a look at what those exports are, you know we have several think tanks in this town that have done studies of this, and I believe it was the Heritage Foundation that did the most extensive study and reported that there is almost no trade going on with China in which American products are manufactured here and sold to the people over there. That is not what is going on.

Now you are going to have a lot of people come to this floor tomorrow who will be saying, oh, we have got to take advantage of the China market, we need its jobs for the people of the United States, and we have got to make sure that we do not let other people sell their products there when we should be selling American products.

I hope people listen to those arguments because that argument is totally fallacious. What the facts are behind that argument is enough to curl your hair. What is being sold to China are not American products that are being produced in the United States and sold to the Chinese consumers. What is being sold there that makes this trade surplus on the part of the Chinese even worse is what we are selling to them are factories and technology, and we are building their industrial infrastructure so that, as my colleagues know, on our side of the equation what we are selling them is the long-term process and the long-term technology they will need to destroy us economically and militarily and in every other way. We are giving the Communist Chinese tens of billions of dollars, and in our side of the equation our people are making money not on selling commercial items to the Chinese and building their standard of living. We are selling them factories.

I come from a very heavy aerospace area, and we sell airplanes to Communist China. But what the companies do not want you to know and do not want to focus on is that the Chinese are insisting if we buy your airplanes, you got to help set up airplane building factories in our country, and over the past 10 years we have set up almost an entire infrastructure in Communist China so that they can come back and put our aerospace workers out of work.

Oh, that is only the first layer of this cake. The second layer is: What else is there in this? What are we talking about here when these businessmen go over there and are setting up those factories? The reason they must have normal trade relations or most favored nation status, as we used to call it, is so that they will be eligible for taxpayer subsidies. Now is this free trade?

Now I heard the word ''subsidy'' mentioned here. I thought that I am a protectionist, that Rohrabacher and his gang are protectionists, and the other people are free traders. But where does subsidy come into the free trade equation? No, they have to have most favored nation status or normal trade relation status tomorrow, passed tomorrow, so that when a factory owner in the United States wants to close his factory, he will then be eligible if he wants to relocate it in Communist China to take advantage of slave wages over there, no unions, no freedom, no environmental controls. When he wants to do that and put our people out of work, he might need to get a loan. He might need to get a loan. Otherwise he would have to risk his own capital; and, my gosh, when you are doing that in a Communist country, that is a pretty bad risk.

Now, if you give him most favored nation status or normal trade relations, he can get a guarantee through the Export-Import Bank or any number of financial institutions that can traced right back to the American taxpayers' pocket, and they will guarantee the loan or they will subsidize the interest rate. We are subsidizing and we are encouraging American businessmen to go to Communist China and build the industrial infrastructure to put our people out of work. That is what we are voting on tomorrow.

Now we will be told that, no, we are voting on whether or not we are going to engage China or whether we are going to be able to trade with China. No, no. Let us ask. Everyone who hears that argument tomorrow, ask yourselves if this does not pass, will Americans be free too sell their goods in China? Of course they will. Americans will be able to sell their goods in China just as if they will be able to do it today.

Unfortunately, the Chinese have those roadblocks, but the difference will be if an American industrialist wants to set up a plant in China, he is going to have to do so on his own risk. He is going to have to do so using his own money rather than the taxpayers' money. That is the difference. That is what we are voting on tomorrow.

No wonder why these powerful interest groups want us to vote for most favored nation status, not normal trade relations. Of course they want to have the taxpayers pick it up, because they do not want to risk their money putting their money into a dictatorship.

You know, I will tell you something about the American people. If it was not for the American people, there would not be any freedom on this planet. To the degree there is freedom anywhere on this planet and stability anywhere on this planet it is because guys like who went out to save Private Ryan went out and did it, because the American people believe in freedom and democracy and justice, believe in the type of honest and fair government, believe in democracy, believe in what Thomas Jefferson said, believe that rights belong to everyone.

To the degree that we have gone all over the world and we have stood firm for those principles is to the degree freedom has succeeded around the world, and the American people, the American working people, deserve to have somebody watching out for their interests. They do not deserve to have some industrialist who says, oh boy, I can be here in the United States and make my money, and that is all because of the protection of these decent hard-working American people; but I am going to take that for granted, and I am going to go over there to Communist China, and I am going to invest over there because they know over in Communist China without some kind of guarantee their government is so corrupt and so tyrannical, this can be taken away from them, and it is only because of the decency and honor of the American people that we do not have that kind of oppression and instability here in our own country.

But who are they hurting when they invest over there? And it is a slap in the face, they are investing over there, and they are using tax dollars from our own working people to guarantee those investments. Something is dreadfully wrong; something is dreadfully wrong.

Now I do not deny that there are a lot of people who probably think that they are telling the story as they honestly believe it, and I am sure they must believe it. But how much longer can it go on and keep going in the opposite direction?

We have a situation today where this, and this just happened the last 2 weeks. As my colleagues know, we have been told things are getting better in China, and now all of a sudden tens of thousands of people who are just members of sort of a quasi-religious movement that they exercise in the parks. I have seen them. And it is a yoga-type of exercise. It is with Buddhism and Taoism put together, and these people and this movement, they have now been targeted, targeted by the Communist Chinese Party, and they are being arrested by the thousands.

Now remember this. We have had people lobbying, lobbying this Congress for this upcoming vote tomorrow, telling us that we should vote for this because it is going to help the Christians, and the Chinese Communists have said one thing. They have said one thing. Anybody can worship God in Communist China as long as you register with the state, sort of like the Nazis said to the Jews. You just have to register. Trust us, you will be okay. And now we have that same regime who Billy Graham and these others have told us we must, as my colleagues know, not deny them this trade status because it will hurt Christians, and all Christians have to do is register.

We have had our own religious leaders over there encouraging them to register, to register with the government. On my, my, my. The history in Communist China, you have seen this happen time and again where you have people who are being coaxed out into the open, and then it will followed by repression.

□ 2320

Anybody who suggests to a Christian in China or a Muslim in the far-off reaches of China to register with the government is doing a great disservice to our country and a great disservice to those people and a great disservice to the cause of human rights. Our country has to be the champion of human rights and believe in those fundamental values, or we are nothing. Those people themselves, their lives are on the line, and in terms of human rights, we have to have a standard of

human rights where people can worship God without having to register and tell the government what faith they are.

What has happened now? That argument has been underscored, underscored by this attack on what we call the Falung Gong, which is this movement that is under attack, because even a religious movement based on something that is entirely Chinese in culture is being attacked and brutalized in the worst possible way.

Mr. Speaker, there is a real comparison about the days that we live in, and for those people who read history, I think it is time that we should read history about the time of what happened in Asia back in the 1920s. There was another country back in the 1920s who thought, like China, that they were racially superior to all of the others. We had a country back in the 1920s in Asia who thought that they had the right to dominate all of Asia, this huge hunk of Asia; and they felt that they had the will to rule, and they were going to create a prosperity sphere, and everything would be out of one capital and unfortunately at that time it was Tokyo.

The Japanese back in the 1920s had the same policies that we now have in Beijing. They had this image that they had history on their side and they had a right to dominate the planet. And the United States had people who wanted to trade with them. In fact, we traded. We sold them scrap metal, just like Lorel and Hughes traded them secrets for how to build their rockets.

We had lots of commerce with the Nazis. We had industrialists telling us a lot of the same things about the Nazis, the same thing about the Japanese militarists. In the 1920s and the 1930s we let it go. And the Japanese knew one thing: there was only one country in their way, and it was the United States of America. They knew that, and the Communist Chinese clique that runs that country in Beijing knows that the United States of America is all that stands between them and dominating that region, and some day, mark my words, we will see a Chinese Communist move on central Asia and Kazakhstan and that area.

We will see a move toward the north in Siberia and Manchuria. We will see a move to try to dominate the Pacific Basin. We already see that where they are trying to take these islands away from the Philippines, the Spratly Islands, and we will see a move into Southeast Asia. If we just give the Communist Chinese the idea that they can do anything and we will still give them this trade status, they can do anything and we will still call them our strategic partners, we are inviting the very worst elements in China to stay in power and to brutally maintain their control and to move forward with their plans, because we are a bunch of pansies and we are saps, that we will not even protect the interests of our own people.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is time to change that policy before it is too late. We ended up in a war with Japan. We can prevent that with China. We must support the democratic elements in China, and we must not treat China as a democratic country; and we must make our alliances with the people rather than the clique that runs that country. It is up to us. We can make history. We do not have to relive the 1920s and 1930s again.

But if we just blithely ignore reality, if we blithely ignore our country being treated in an unequal way and just ignore the fact that they are modernizing their military at our expense and that we come groveling to them with this unfair trading relationship that gives them all of the advantage and puts our own American people at a disadvantage, because who is representing their interests, the Communists that run China will not respect us. They will loathe us, they will treat us like the weak links we are, and we will pay a price. Unfortunately, we are already close to that.

So tomorrow I would hope that people pay close attention to the debate, and it will be a spirited debate; and it will determine again the policies of the United States of America, because this is still a democratic country where the rule of law and the will of the people will prevail. It is just that we have to get the people active and involved in these issues.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. GRANGER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of official business.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. EHRLICH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of the birth of his son, Drew Robert.

Mrs. CHENOWETH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NADLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, for 5 minutes, July 27.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KOLBE, for 5 minutes, July 27.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRYANT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BACHUS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 27, 1999, at 9 a.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3217. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hazelnuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Establishment of Final Free and Restricted Percentages for the 1998–99 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV99–982–1 FIR] received June 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3218. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Olives Grown in California; Modification to Handler Membership on the California Olive Committee [Docket No. FV99–932–2 FIR] received June 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3219. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting notification that a transaction involving U.S. exports to a private company in the

energy sector in Russia is now ready to proceed; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

3220. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement regarding a transaction involving a U.S. export to Bulgaria; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

3221. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Summary of Expenditures of Rebates from the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Surcharge Escrow Account for Calendar Year 1998,'' pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2120e(d)(2)(E)(ii)(II); to the Committee on Commerce.

3222. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 99–0B, which relates to the Department of the Army's proposed enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability of defense article(s) previously sold to Greece, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b)(5); to the Committee on International Relations.

3223. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Greece for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 99–17), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

3224. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Maryland Regulatory Program [MD–043–FOR] received July 1, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3225. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change to Delegated State Audit Functions (RIN: 1010–AC51) received July 1, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3226. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Federal Housing and Enterprise Oversight, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Debt Collection (RIN: 2550–AA07) received June 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3227. A letter from the Attorney for National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, LeBoeuf, Lamb, Greene and MacRae, L.L.P., transmitting the 1998 annual report of independent auditors who have audited the records of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, pursuant to Public Law 88–376, section 14(b) (78 Stat. 323); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3228. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of the fiscal year 2000 Captial Investment and Leasing Program of the General Services Administration's Public Buildings Service, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3229. A letter from the Commissioner, General Services Administration, transmitting notification of the status of the National Laboratory Center and the Fire Investigation Research and Education facility proposed for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3230. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Annual Report of the Metals Initiative; to the Committee on Science.

3231. A letter from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a report on the actuarial status of the railroad retirement system, including any recommendations for financing changes, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 321f–1; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

3232. A letter from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the 1999 annual report on the financial status of the railroad unemployment insurance system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 369; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on July 22, 1999 the following report were filed on July 23, 1999]

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 850. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to affirm the rights of United States persons to use and sell encryption and to relax export controls on encryption; with amendment (Rept. 106–117 pt. 4). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GOSS. Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. H.R. 850. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to affirm the rights of United States persons to use and sell encryption and to relax export controls on encryption; with an amendment (Rept. 106–117 Pt. 5). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PACKARD: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2605. A bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–253). referred to the Committee of the whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CALLAHAN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2606. A bill making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 200, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on July 26, 1999]

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 468. A bill to establish the Saint Helena Island National Scenic Area; with an amendment (Rept. 106–255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 695. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to convey an administrative site in San Juan County, New Mexico, to San Juan College; with an amendment (Rept. 106–256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 841. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain works, facilities, and titles of the Gila Project, and designated lands within or adjacent to the Gila Project, to the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 862. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to implement the provisions of the Agreement conveying title to a Distribution System from the United States to the Clear Creek Community Services District (Rept. 106–258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 992. A bill to convey the Sly Park Dam and Reservoir to the El Dorado Irrigation District, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1019. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey lands and interests comprising the Carlsbad Irrigation Project to the Carlsbad Irrigation District, New Mexico (Rept. 106–260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2079. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain National Forest System lands in the State of South Dakota (Rept. 106–261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 57. Resolution disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China; adversely (Rept. 106–262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 260. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2587) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–263). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 261. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2605) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–264). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 2607. A bill to promote the development of the commercial space transportation industry, to authorize appropriations for the Office of the Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation, to authorize appropriations for the Office of Space Commercialization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 2608. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to clarify the definition of ''major drug-transit country'' under the international narcotics control program; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 2609. A bill to promote product development and testing in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA:

H.R. 2610. A bill to provide an affirmative defense in a civil action brought with respect to a Federal requirement which is potentially in conflict with another Federal requirement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 2611. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from income the salary of certain teachers who teach in high-poverty schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRAFICANT (for himself and Mr. VISCLOSKY):

H.R. 2612. A bill to expand United States exports of goods and services by requiring the development of objective criteria to achieve market access in foreign countries, to provide the President with reciprocal trade authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

164. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 175 memorializing Congress to enact the same mandated benefits as contained in Act 98 of 1998 in all Federal insurance programs and all federally regulated, self-funded health insurance programs governed by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

165. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 24 memorializing Congress to adopt legislation mandating that all products containing a steroid ingredient, including over-the-counter products and prescription drugs, be externally labeled as containing a ''steroid'' ingredient by the manufacturer and include inside the packaging an insert of information; to the Committee on Commerce.

166. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 192 memorializing the President and Congress to support legislation authorizing states to restrict the amount of solid waste being imported from other states and creating a rational solid waste management strategy that is equitable among states and environmentally sound; to the Committee on Commerce.

167. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 25 memorializing the President and the Congress to take whatever steps necessary to initiate talks with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the People's Republic of China, Russia and Vietnam for the purpose of obtaining the release of Americans being held against their will; to the Committee on International Relations.

168. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Oregon, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 10 memorializing Congress and the President to use all appropriate legal, diplomatic and economic means to obtain the full cooperation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and other nations in resolving the issue of American soldiers and pilots missing from the Korean War; to the Committee on International Relations.

169. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 memorializing Congress to appropriate for distribution to the counties in the State of Nevada the amount of money necessary to correct the underpayments to those counties pursuant to the Act for the previous fiscal years; to the Committee on Resources.

170. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 123 memorializing the President and Congress to make the $1 billion of Federal moneys already earmarked for abandoned mine land reclamation available to states to clean up and make safe abandoned mine lands; to the Committee on Resources.

171. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1 memorializing Congress to authorize the United States Air Force to withdraw the public land located within the Nellis Air Force Range indefinitely; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Commerce, and Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 82: Mr. COYNE, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 119: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 121: Mr. DICKEY and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 135: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 140: Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 354: Mrs. MYRICK and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 405: Mr. HOEFFEL and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 488: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 583: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 614: Mr. TOOMEY.

H.R. 628: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 664: Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 797: Mr. ROGERS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. REYES, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. LEE, and Mr. FLETCHER.

H.R. 798: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 809: Mr. COBURN and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1055: Mr. WAMP, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 1080: Mr. KLINK and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1095: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 1102: Mr. Nadler, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 111: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1168: Ms. LEE, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 1193: Mr. WEINER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. FLETCHER.

H.R. 1248: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 1272: Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1290: Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. LARGENT.

H.R. 1333: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1344: Mr. COMBEST and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 1355: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 1358: Mr. PICKERING and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 1413: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1446: Mr. GORDON and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 1485: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 1624: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. WEINER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1879: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. WU, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1814: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1818: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1837: Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KIND, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1841: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 1870: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 1907: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri and Mr. HILL of Montana.

H.R. 1932: Mr. PICKETT and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1993: Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 2000: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2121: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2202: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2221: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 2235: Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 2245: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 2265: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2303: Mr. CAMBELL.

H.R. 2319: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2339: Mr. MOORE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 2341: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WISE, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WELLER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GOODE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 2346: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 2389: Mr. HILL of Montana and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2418: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 2452: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 2454: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 2483: Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 2498: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 2534: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2543: Mr. REGULA.

H.R. 2548: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 2555: Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 2563: Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 2565: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 2567: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. STARK, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2571: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 2584: Mr. ROGAN.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. CRANE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GOODLING, Ms. LEE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. FORD.

H. Con. Res. 159: Ms. LEE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CRANE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. NEY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. FORD.

H. Res. 172: Mr. METCALF and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII:

39. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Utah Sheriff's Association, relative to USA Resolution 99–1 petitioning against the expansion of the authority, jurisdiction, and scope of federal powers and law enforcement; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2587

OFFERED BY: MR. BILBRAY

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 65, insert after line 24 the following:

BANNING POSSESSION OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS BY MINORS

SEC. 167. (a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any individual under 18 years of age to possess any cigarette or other tobacco product in the District of Columbia.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) POSSESSION IN COURSE OF EMPLOYMENT.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to an individual making a delivery of cigarettes or tobacco products in pursuance of employment.

(2) PARTICIPATION IN LAW ENFORCEMENT OPERATION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to an individual possessing products in the course of a valid, supervised law enforcement operation.

(c) PENALTIES.—Any individual who violates subsection (a) shall be subject to the following penalties:

(1) For any violation, the individual may be required to perform community service or attend a tobacco cessation program.

(2) Upon the first violation, the individual shall be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed $50.

(3) Upon the second and each subsequent violation, the individual shall be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed $100.

(4) Upon the third and each subsequent violation, the individual may have his or her driving privileges in the District of Columbia suspended for a period of 90 consecutive days.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply during fiscal year 2000 and each succeeding fiscal year.

H.R. 2587

OFFERED BY: MS. NORTON

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 54, strike lines 19 through 25 (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly).

H.R. 2605

OFFERED BY: MR. COOK

Page 15, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 15, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $30,000,000)''.

Page 15, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 17, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $4,000,000)''.

Page 17, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 18, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,442,000)''.

Page 18, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 18, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,750,000)''.

Page 20, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 21, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $2,000,000)''

H.R. 2605

OFFERED BY: MR. POMBO

AMENDMENT NO.: Amend Title I to:

Cut $150,000 from ''General Investigations'' designated for the Stockton Metropolitan Area and place that amount into ''General Construction'' for purposes of reimbursing the Stockton Metropolitan Area Flood Control Project, as authorized under Sec. 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–303).

H.R. 2605

OFFERED BY: MR. VISCLOSKY

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 5, line 25, strike the comma and all that follows through page 6, line 23, and insert a period.

H.R. 2606

OFFERED BY: MR. MOAKLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for programs at the United States Army School of the Americas located at Fort Benning, Georgia.

H.R. 2606

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

SEC. ____. Of the funds appropriated in title II of this Act under the heading ''ASSISTANCE FOR THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION'', not more than $172,000,000 shall be available for the Government of the Russian Federation.

H.R. 2606

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in title II of this Act under the heading ''ASSISTANCE FOR THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION'' may be used to carry out programs contained in the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative.

H.R. 2606

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 4: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

SEC. ____. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in title II of this Act under the heading ''ASSISTANCE FOR THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION'' may be used to carry out programs contained in the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative.

(b) Of the funds appropriated in title II of this Act under the heading ''ASSISTANCE FOR THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION'', not more than $172,000,000 shall be available for the Government of the Russian Federation.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 26, 1999 No. 106

Senate

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Dear Father, focus our attention on You, on our calling to be leaders, and on the people around us. Meet our inner needs so that we can meet the needs of others. Replenish our own energies so that we can give ourselves unreservedly to the challenges of this new week. Give us gusto to confront the problems and to work on applying Your solutions. Replace our fears with vibrant faith. Most important of all, give us a clear assurance of Your guidance that we will have the courage of our convictions.

Bless the women and men of this Senate with a personal experience of Your grace, an infusion of Your spirit of wisdom, and a vision of Your will in all that must be decided this week. In the name of our Lord and Savior. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JON KYL, a Senator from the State of Arizona, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the Chair.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, the Senate will immediately begin debate on the resolution to reinstate rule XVI. By a previous order, there will be 6 hours of debate on the resolution with one amendment in order regarding scope in conference.

As a reminder, a cloture motion on the motion to proceed to the House-passed juvenile justice bill was filed also on Thursday. That vote, then, will take place in a series of stacked votes this afternoon at 5:30, along with the rule XVI resolution and the amendment regarding scope in conference.

Further, it is the intention of the majority leader to begin debate on the Interior appropriations bill, and the reconciliation legislation will also come up this week, probably on Wednesday. Of course, under the rules, 20 hours of debate is permitted, and I am sure there will be a number of amendments, so we will have to begin on that promptly sometime early Wednesday morning.

Senators should be prepared to vote throughout each day and into the evenings, although we probably will not go late into the evening today other than the three stacked votes. But on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday late evenings should be anticipated in order to get this important work done.

RULE XVI

This is a day I have been waiting for because we have needed for some time now to reinstate rule XVI which would make a point of order in order against legislation on an appropriations bill.

More and more, the Senate has been abusing that process, making it very difficult to move the appropriations bills through the Senate, even though there is a lot of work done on both sides of the aisle by the leadership. For an example, last Thursday we would not have completed the State-Justice-Commerce appropriations bill had it not been for the dedicated efforts of Senator REID in his position as whip on the Democratic side, working with the chairman of the committee and the ranking member of the committee to get that legislation through. This is a responsible thing to do; the Senate will run better and we will still have the opportunity to offer amendments on legislative issues. So I hope, when the day is over, we will have reinstated rule XVI, and we will all be better off because of it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

RESTORATION OF THE ENFORCEMENT OF RULE XVI

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 160, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 160) to restore enforcement of rule XVI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time on the resolution shall be limited to 6 hours.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have been designated by the Democratic leader to control the time on this resolution that is now before the Senate.

I feel a certain affinity toward rule XVI because it was my point of order that was appealed and overruled. In short, what this meant is that we were here on an appropriations bill. It had been standard procedure in the Senate for decades and decades and decades that when an appropriations bill came before this body, we did not offer legislative matters on that appropriations bill; it should be for the 13 subcommittees to deal with the money of this country and not append extraneous materials, extraneous legislative matters to an appropriations bill.

However, that is what happened on such a matter, a supplemental appropriations bill. The junior Senator from Texas offered an amendment dealing with the Endangered Species Act. I raised a point of order. The Chair

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

upheld my point of order and that was appealed, a vote taken in the Senate which overruled that decision, and it changed the precedence of this body.

It has caused legislating on appropriations bills as standard operating procedure in this body since then. For more than 4 years, that is what has taken place.

There is going to be a vote taken later on rule XVI. The minority is going to vote against it. We recognize that we will be overruled by virtue of the fact that we are in the minority. We are protesting basically because of what has gone on in the Senate these past several years. The fact is that we are not able to offer amendments to bills coming through this body. In short, the Senate has been treated similar to the House of Representatives. For those of us who served in the House, there is not much difference anymore between the House and the Senate. When a bill comes to this Chamber, there is, in effect, an order placed on that bill just as in the House saying how many amendments you can offer, how long you can debate each amendment, and in effect how the bill is going to be treated.

That is very much unlike the Senate. In decades past, when a bill came before this body, debate took place on amendments that were offered relative to that piece of legislation. That is not the way it is now.

The reason that is important is that we Democrats believe we need—the country needs—to debate campaign finance reform. In the State of Nevada, a small State populationwise, my opponent and I spent over $20 million last year in the election. It is hard to believe. The State of Nevada had less than 2 million people in it. But my opponent, Congressman Ensign from the State of Nevada, and I spent over $20 million.

How could that be done? It was done because in the so-called hard money counts in our campaign we spent about $4.5 million each, and in State party money we spent over $6 million each. That does not take into consideration the independent expenditures that took place for me and against me. That is not the way campaigns should be, I don't believe. In the small State of Nevada, I repeat, over $20 million, probably closer to $25 million, $26 million was spent when you add in the independent expenditures about which I have talked.

That is an issue we should debate in this body. Maybe I am wrong. Maybe the American public, the people from individual States, want all that money spent. I doubt it. I think we should have a debate as to whether soft money, that is, corporate money, should be used for State parties and spend all this money on negative ads. I don't think so.

There should be a time, I believe, that we are able to debate education. The State of Nevada leads the Nation in high school dropouts. We are not proud of that, but that is a fact. I think we should be able to debate issues relating to that issue.

Senator BINGAMAN and I have legislation that would create within the Department of Education a dropout czar so that we could debate whether or not we should have in the Department of Education a person whose sole job it would be to work on curbing dropouts. Three thousand children drop out of high school every day in the United States. Over 500,000 kids drop out of high school every year in America. That is not the way it should be. Education is an issue we have not debated nearly enough in this body.

There are other issues we need to talk about: child care, minimum wage, the environment. There are so many issues we have not had the ability to talk about. That is what this debate is about.

I see my friend from the State of New York is here. I am managing this bill. I do not want to take a lot of time because I am sure there will be time later today to speak about issues. But the point is, rule XVI is being debated today as a result of a ruling of the Chair that was appealed. It was my point of order to the Chair that brought about this situation in which we now find ourselves. The point we in the minority want to make is that we should have full debate on issues, all issues. There should not be any arms or legs tied. We should be able to speak as we want on issues. We have not been able to do that.

I ask my friend from New York, how much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Might I have, say, 15 minutes?

Mr. REID. The Senator from New York is happily yielded 15 minutes.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, it is a special pleasure to rise on this important subject on this fateful day in the aftermath of the Senator from Nevada, whose vigilance, if I may say, as minority whip, led him to see a clear violation of rule XVI, the rule against legislation on appropriations bills, and so he made the point of order. In a casual way, having to do with the seeming inconsequence of the measure that had been proposed, the Senate overruled that point of order, and a century and more of fixed senatorial practice crashed and burned and has been burning all around us ever since.

There is a larger context, I suggest, in which to consider this matter. I am now in my last term in the Senate. I have been here almost a quarter of a century. I am frequently asked what has changed in the Senate in my time here. Without hesitation, the one thing I say is the procedures by which we work.

When I arrived, there was a recognizable symmetry and balance to the distribution of responsibilities, duties, and powers in the body. We had evolved over the 19th century a two-layer pattern of committees—committees being very special and distinct to our Government.

We are one of the few governments in the world that has them. The House of Commons has none. Recently they have been appointing committees of inquiry but no legislative committees of any kind. All authority rests with the Prime Minister. On those used-to-be celebrated occasions when the Chancellor of Exchequer at No. 11 Downing Street would come out, and he would hold up a briefcase called the budget, that, sir, was, in fact, the budget. There was not going to be a chance of change in the government's proposal. It has been that way for more than two centuries.

It is not the government that the founders put in place. They put in place a government of checks and balances of the assumption of opposed interests, of the resolution by debate, and by the recognition that there were, in fact, opposed interests. We were not all happily subject to the Queen, under her rule—or his if it were a King—and a harmony in the realm. Our founders thought no such thing. They did not depend on virtue. They depended on self-interest and being equally opposed in a mode of negotiation to resolve matters.

We had a series of authorizing committees, and they had jurisdiction over principal areas of government service. There were four—well, the principal committees were Foreign Relations, Finance, Armed Services, and then Interior, Commerce, Labor and Public Welfare, as it then was, Environment and Public Works, having previously been just Public Works.

Their jurisdictions changed. New issues came along. Public Works became Environment. Public Works, under the tutelage of Senator Muskie of Maine, brought the issue of the environment to our body. They would make laws which more often than not required expenditure. That expenditure would be provided by the Appropriations Committee in terms of the laws that had been passed by the authorizing committees. There was a parallel.

The Finance Committee, in the earliest years, from 1816 I believe, was principally concerned with raising the revenue of the Federal Government. In the early years, up until the beginning of this century, those were tariffs. That is why the tariff legislation, the ''tariff of abominations,'' things similar to that are so prominent in American 19th century history.

We moved to the income tax as our principal source of revenue. Tariffs are still not insignificant. In the Finance Committee, of which I am a member—for a period I was the chairman; now ranking member—we looked after the revenues of the Federal Government. Then Social Security came along; it was a tax. Whether it ought to have been a tax, sir, is an issue you could debate.

But 54, 55 years ago, at a garden party here in Washington, Frances Perkins, the Secretary of Labor who was responsible for developing a Social Security plan—a Justice of the Supreme Court kindly asked her about her work, and she said she had this great plan, but she was very concerned because the great Justices always said it was unconstitutional, whatever the New Deal was then going through that period. The Justice asked her to tell him more. She did, and he leaned down and whispered: The taxing power, my dear; all you need is the taxing power.

So in that famous photograph of President Roosevelt signing the Social Security Act, the person to his right is the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, a gentleman from North Carolina named Robert Doughton—little noted in history but enormous in his impact.

So the Finance Committee has taken over these other areas as well. Still our basic task is to raise revenue that the Appropriations Committee will spend in accordance with the laws passed by the authorizing committees. A workable system—rational, understandable, comprehensible and functioning.

Then in 1974 came the Budget Act and the creation of the Congressional Budget Office, the creation of the budget resolution. In part, this was a reaction to events in the Nixon administration—political and contemporary. But just as important, if I may be allowed a certain excursion into political science, if that is the term, it is a pattern that one observes in governments the world over, and you can see in ours. It was with the proposition, sir, that organizations in conflict become like one another.

A German sociologist at the end of the 19th century noted that even Persians finally determined it was better to have Greeks fight Greeks. And you can trace these patterns of imitation and competition through our own government.

Item. In 1904, or thereabouts, Theodore Roosevelt built the West Wing for the White House. He now had an office, the President had an office with a desk, and he could ask reporters in to tell them about things. Suddenly an office that had not been that eminent, certainly not compared to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, took on a quality previously unnoticed.

Right away the House built the Cannon Office Building named for their Speaker, Joe Cannon. We built what is now the Russell Building. Franklin Roosevelt built the East Wing of the White House. They built Longworth; we built Dirksen. In the meantime, the Supreme Court, which had worked happily down the hall for a century and a half—or, well, from the time we moved in to the new quarters in 1859, I believe—they came up from the basement and lived happily down there, and they said: Why don't we have a building? And they produced a building which eventually was across the park here. This pattern goes on and on.

Presidents travel abroad now. We travel abroad. There are more judges in the executive branch than there are in the judicial branch, and the like.

In 1921, Warren Harding created the Bureau of the Budget. Suddenly there was a consolidation of Presidential authority. Departments used to send their budgets to the Congress on their own. The President would know about them, of course, but there was no unified Presidential executive budget. That made for a real shift of authority toward the President.

It took almost half a century, but then we got our Bureau of the Budget in the Congressional Budget Office, and we started having our budget. This suddenly intrudes on the authority of the authorizing committees. Each year they would be given a notice of how much money they could spend, which was to be tolerable, of course, but it was somebody else telling them what previously they decided on their own. In this context, there was a centralization of authority in the Senate which did not serve it well.

Then came the decision to overturn rule XVI. Our government became incomprehensible. I cannot think of the number of hours I have stood on this floor, sometimes there at the desk for the chairman of the Finance Committee or ranking member, sometimes back here, looking at the final product of some massive, mysterious, impenetrable conference that went on somewhere in this building, downtown, elsewhere, that would bring to our desks at the end of the Congress 1,500-page bills that did everything, combined the appropriations with the legislation, with this, with that, with nobody knowing its contents. Not one Member of this body could attest to having read the bill, probably no one person. Obviously, some persons had read some parts, but that is not a democratic procedure. That is not a wise procedure.

It came about through a combination of the Budget Committee and this breaking away of a long, established unrestraint on ourselves that there are 13 appropriation bills, each must pass, and, therefore, if somehow you could get a measure on an appropriations bill, it would become law, even if it might not make it through the authorizing committees.

Well, yes, but what law? Whose law? Who knew? Those committees haven't been up there, the Foreign Affairs Committee, Armed Services Committee, for two centuries without acquiring some experience in their matters; and here, sir, we are heading for the same thing because the rule was overturned. Appropriations bills don't get passed any longer. Now it is we have 2 weeks left in July and August, really, because of the recess.

Mr. President, if my time has expired, may I ask for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. REID. I yield the Senator another 5 minutes.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. We are heading for this situation. There is even talk that the tax bills, which we will bring to the floor tomorrow or Wednesday, need not be resolved in this period of time. They can lay over until September. Well, that means they will lay over until the last day of the Congress, the last moment of the session. In the meantime, we can expect over half the appropriation bills to have passed.

I wonder if I might address a question to my friend from Nevada, if I might interrupt. How many appropriation bills have passed this year? Would he happen to know? No reason to know.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from New York, surprisingly, in spite of the legislating on appropriation bills, we have passed, I think, seven appropriation bills at this stage, give or take a bill or two. But, for example, we were able, on Thursday, to pass Commerce-State-Justice, which had hundreds of amendments filed. It was only through the cooperation of the membership.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. We begin to come to our senses; that has brought us to this point. We passed seven. I don't think we will pass 13. I think our tax legislation has every prospect of being an abomination. The Senate cannot pass legislation which it has never read and does not understand. That is what has been the consequence of this new situation.

In addition to which, the distinguished minority leader is proposing an amendment to the fine initiative of the majority leader that says: No more writing legislation in conference committees. That is against all of our rules, too, but has crept into our practices. Again, the authorizing committees are gradually being marginalized and have no role. Power is centralized.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I surely will.

Mr. REID. The Senator has graphically illustrated what happened under our present situation. Last fall, being more specific, that huge document we were asked to vote upon, we all came from our individual States, because we had been out of session, while a few people negotiated this bill for all of us.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Right.

Mr. REID. It was well over 1,000 pages, and it was something that you or I didn't read or anyone else read, isn't that true?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I stood here and said: I haven't read it. I know no one who has read it.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from New York, the same thing is happening now. The mere fact that the Senate has passed an appropriations bill doesn't mean it is going to become law because we have to go to conference with the House. If we are fortunate enough to come up with a bill, it goes down to the President. He has said he is going to veto most of these appropriations bills. So that means we will be right back

where we started last year, isn't that the case? We will have a bill written in conference that you or I, or even the members of the appropriations subcommittees, have never seen; is that fair?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. That is exactly so, sir. I can say to you, for example, that Senator ROTH, our distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, and I have jointly been sending letters regularly to the Appropriations Committee saying: You have Social Security Act or tax matters in this appropriations measure you are dealing with; surely, you don't want to do that. We don't get answers somehow.

Mr. REID. But under our present rules, I say to my friend, that is not only the rule, it is being done.

The minority leader has offered an amendment to this change we are discussing today regarding rule XXVIII, so that when you go to conference, the conferees could only work on the bills they have, the one from the House and the one from the Senate, and have to work on matters that are before them. They can't go outside that scope and start talking about wild horses in Nevada or they can't start talking about the wheat crop in North Dakota, if it is not in the conference report.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. If it is not in the conference report.

I will close, sir, by simply saying this is a subject that is said to be arcane, to be incomprehensible, to be something on the margin. The Constitution of the United States is a bit arcane. It was not something immediately obvious to everyone, what its principles were. But they were powerful, and they have persisted. So, indeed, have the rules of the Senate, developed in the early 19th century, and then later, starting in 1868, with regard to germaneness and the like. Language very similar to our Rule XVI dates to 1884. We have here the question of whether we are going to be able to govern ourselves in the future. If we should fail in that regard, what else, sir, will there be said of us when the history of the decline of the American Congress is written?

I thank the Chair for its courtesy in allowing me to extend my time. I thank my friend, the minority whip, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I think the statement made by the Senator from New York and the wisdom that he imparted to us is something we should all listen to.

Some have said: Well, we have to treat the Senate like the House of Representatives. We really can't debate measures.

I say to my friend from New York, and anyone else within the sound of my voice, we used to debate matters and let the cards fall where they did. A good example of that was the Budget Deficit Reduction Act of 1993. As Senators will recall, we had all kinds of statements of doom regarding that. The chairman of the House Budget Committee said: This plan will not work. If it does work, then I will have to become a Democrat.

Well, it has worked. We have now a budget surplus. But my friend from the House has not become a Democrat.

My friend, the chairman of the Finance Committee, said: It will flatten the economy. That has not been the case.

My friend, the senior Senator from Texas, said: I want to predict here tonight that if we adopt this bill, the American economy is going to get weaker, not stronger. The deficit 4 years from today will be higher than it is today, not lower. When all is said and done, people will pay more taxes. The economy will create fewer jobs. The government will spend more money, and the American people will be worse off.

Every statement made by my friend from Texas was absolutely wrong. The fact is that we had that bill. We had a debate. Without a single vote from my friends on the other side of the aisle, we passed that bill, with the Vice President breaking the tie. The deficit did not rise. In fact, it went away.

The economy got stronger, not weaker. More jobs were created; in fact, almost 20 million new jobs have been created since that legislation was passed.

The point I am trying to make is that we can debate issues, debate them in their entirety. We should do more of that. That is what this is all about.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Will my friend yield for a comment?

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I was chairman of the Finance Committee in 1993 when that deficit reduction act passed. It was a risk. We risked that what we understood of markets and of the economy was right. We could have been wrong. But it was not a casual affair. Day after day and evening after evening in the Finance Committee we debated it. We voted on it. It came to the floor, admittedly under a time limit from the Budget Act, but it was adequate to the purpose.

We legislated, and it was done in the open. The consequences are here to see. The $500 billion deficit reduction package contained in the 1993 reconciliation bill has been re-estimated by the Office of Management and Budget as having saved a total of $1.2 trillion. We had a $290 billion deficit that year. The 10-year projection was $3 trillion, and more, of cumulative deficits. Now we are dealing with a $3 trillion surplus. But that is because the process worked—and in the open. The oldest principle of our Government is openness and responsibility. We have been abandoning both, and the consequences show.

Mr. REID. I say also to my friend, he will remember when we had the debate about uninsured people who had no health care—who needed health care but had no insurance. That was a debate that came early in the Clinton administration, and we had a full and complete debate on that issue. It was debated at great length.

At that time, we had 38 million people with no health insurance. Now we have 43 million people with no health insurance. But the fact is, when you are in the majority, you have to take chances, as did the former chairman of the Finance Committee, the senior Senator from New York. You have to take chances. Health care was a good debate for the country. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I much agree.

Mr. REID. So I hope this debate will allow the majority to give us more opportunities to debate issues. It doesn't hurt to talk at length about issues. It is good for the country to talk about issues. It is good for the body politic. But we should legislate the way the Founding Fathers determined we should, and not have 1,500 bills that are prepared by 8 or 9 people when we have 535 Members of Congress. We have less than two handfuls of people that came up with that bill, and that is wrong. I think we need to change rule XVI, of course. We are going to protest and probably vote against that. But we also need to change rule XXVIII while we are doing it. If we do that, we will have a much more open and better legislative body. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Well said, sir.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in morning business and that the time I consume be counted against the time on the resolution.

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

THE NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE ACT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, this morning I noticed in the Washington Times newspaper that President Clinton has signed the bill we authored here in the Senate, the National Missile Defense Act. This is very important legislation which the Senate passed after a lot of debate. The House and the Senate then reconciled differences between the House-passed measure and the Senate bill and sent the bill to the President.

The President made a statement in connection with his signing the bill which raises some questions that I thought should be addressed by a comment this morning. After talking about the fact that he is signing the bill to address the growing danger that rogue nations may develop and field long-range missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction against the United States and our allies, he then has this to say in his message. He is referring to the fact that authorization and appropriations measures will

be a part of the process in terms of when and how and to what extent the funding is available for national missile defense.

This interpretation, which is confirmed by the legislative record taken as a whole, is also required to avoid a possible impairment of my constitutional authorities.

The President is suggesting that the bill doesn't mean what it says. I think that has to be brought to the attention of the Senate. The bill is very clear. It provides that it is the policy of the United States, upon enactment of this law, to deploy a national missile defense system as soon as technologically possible. That is unequivocal. It does not say ''but if.'' It is a change in policy of our Government. It has passed both Houses by a large majority, and now the President has signed the statute.

It seems to me the President is trying to reinterpret the bill to justify changing his position on this issue. He signed the bill; he didn't veto it. This is not a veto message. He could have vetoed the bill, if he disagreed with the terms, and given Congress an opportunity to review that veto message and override the veto or sustain it, as the Congress' will dictates.

I point this out to suggest that it is clear we have changed our policy, irrespective of the President's qualms about the new policy, and we now are committed as a nation to deploy a national missile defense system. We will do so in the orderly course of authorization and appropriation bills that we pass, as required. We have an annual appropriations bill funding all of the activities of the Department of Defense. But it is clear that one of those activities will be the continued research, development, and deployment of a national missile defense system.

I think it is very timely to point this out because the Prime Minister of Russia is coming to the United States. There will be talks this week with the President.

I am hopeful, and I urge the President to be honest with the Russian leadership about the need to modify the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty because the first part of that treaty says that neither signatory will deploy a missile defense system to protect the territory of its nation. But we have just changed the law of the United States to say that is our intention. We are committed to deploying a missile defense system that will protect the territory of the United States.

So, insofar as that is inconsistent with the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, the treaty needs to be changed, and our President should say that to the Prime Minister of Russia unequivocally—not we ''may'' change our mind when it comes time to authorize a deployment or to fund a deployment.

The decision has been made to deploy a system, and when technology permits us to deploy an effective missile defense system under the terms of this act, we are going to do it irrespective of the provisions of that treaty. So we must change the treaty. And we want to assure the Russians that we are not targeting them. We are not trying to create a new era of tension or competition or to make this a more dangerous relationship—just the opposite; we want to be aboveboard, candid, and honest with the Russians.

That is what I hope the President will do as a spokesman for our country.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the statement by the President at his signing of the National Missile Defense Act be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE HOUSE BRIEFING ROOM,
OFFICE OF THE PRESS SECRETARY,
The White House, July 23, 1999.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have signed into law H.R. 4, the ''National Missile Defense Act of 1999.'' My Administration is committed to addressing the growing danger that rogue nations may develop and field long-range missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction against the United States and our allies.

Section 2 of this Act states that it is the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as technologically possible an effective National Missile Defense (NMD) system with funding subject to the annual authorization of appropriations and the annual appropriation of funds for NMD. By specifying that any NMD deployment must be subject to the authorization and appropriations process, the legislation makes clear that no decision on deployment has been made. This interpretation, which is confirmed by the legislative record taken as a whole, is also required to avoid any possible impairment of my constitutional authorities.

Section 3 of that Act states that it is the policy of the United States to seek continued negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces. Thus, section 3 puts the Congress on record as continuing to support negotiated reductions in strategic nuclear arms, reaffirming my Administration's position that our missile defense policy must take into account our arms control and nuclear nonproliferation objectives.

Next year, we will, for the first time, determine whether to deploy a limited National Missile Defense, when we review the results of flight tests and other developmental efforts, consider cost estimates, and evaluate the threat. Any NMD system we deploy must be operationally effective, cost-effective, and enhance our security. In making our determination, we will also review progress in achieving our arms control objectives, including negotiating any amendments to the ABM Treaty that may be required to accommodate a possible NMD deployment.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, further, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this morning's report contained in the Washington Times written by Bill Gertz describing the issue and the President's actions also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times, July 26, 1999]

CLINTON SIGNS BILL FOR MISSILE DEFENSE—SAYS HE'S NOT REQUIRED TO DEPLOY IT

By Bill Gertz

President Clinton has signed into law a bill that says U.S. policy is to deploy a nationwide defense against long-range missiles as soon as the technology is available.

The president signed the legislation Friday but issued a statement saying the law does not obligate him to deploy the national missile defense, remarks that will likely upset congressional Republicans in favor of deployment.

The National Missile Defense (NMD) Act states that it is U.S. policy to deploy ''as soon as technologically possible'' a system of interceptors, radar and communications gear that can shoot down an incoming long-range missile.

Mr. Clinton said the law on deployment is subject to funding by annual authorization and appropriations for national missile defense.

''By specifying that any [national missile defense] deployment must be subject to the authorization and appropriations process, the legislation makes clear that no decision on deployment has been made,'' Mr. Clinton said.

''This interpretation, which is confirmed by the legislative record taken as a whole, is also required to avoid any possible impairment of my constitutional authorities.''

Mr. Clinton said the legislation also calls for continuing to seek negotiations with Russia on reducing nuclear forces, ''reaffirming my administration's position that our missile defense policy must take into account our arms control and nuclear nonproliferation objectives.''

The president remains opposed to deploying a missile defense because it will upset arms reductions and negotiations with Moscow. Mr. Clinton has said the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty is the ''cornerstone'' of strategic relations with Russia and must be preserved.

The administration announced earlier this year that it would begin talks—not negotiations—with Moscow on changing the ABM treaty to allow deployment.

The issue is expected to come up this week in talks between senior U.S. officials and visiting Russian Prime Minister Sergei Stepashin.

Mr. Stepashin will also discuss beginning a new round of arms reduction talks even though Russia's Duma has failed for several years to ratify the START II strategic arms pact.

The U.S. Senate, which ratified START II in 1996, conditioned its approval on Russian ratification of the treaty and prohibited the United States from cutting its nuclear forces to START II levels until Russia's parliament approves the treaty.

Many Republicans in Congress have said the ABM treaty is outdated and fails to take into account emerging long-range missile threats from China, North Korea and other nations.

A special congressional commission on missile threats stated in a report last year that long-range missile threats to the United States could emerge with little or no warning. The commission, headed by former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, boosted efforts by missile defense proponents and led to bipartisan support for the Missile Defense Act signed by Mr. Clinton.

Mr. Clinton said in his statement that a decision on whether to deploy a limited national missile defense will be made next year based on flight tests and other developmental efforts, cost estimates and an evaluation of the threat.

''Any NMD system we deploy must be operationally effective, cost-effective, and enhance our security,'' Mr. Clinton said. ''In making our determination, we will also review progress in achieving our arms control objectives including negotiating any amendments to the ABM treaty that may be required to accommodate a possible NMD deployment.''

Mr. Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin agreed during a meeting in Germany last month to hold talks this fall on possible changes in the ABM treaty.

White House National Security Adviser Samuel R. Berger told reporters at the time that the administration would make no decision on deploying missile defenses until June 2000. Mr. Berger also indicated that ABM treaty changes might be needed to accommodate a missile defense ''if we were to deploy one.''

Russia has opposed any changes at the ABM treaty, which states that neither side will build missile defenses that cover their entire national territory.

Russia has a limited, single missile defense site set up around Moscow. The United States has no defense against long-range missiles.

A senior White House official has said that the funding and authorization language of the Missile Defense Act is a loophole that allows that president to avoid having to deploy a national missile defense.

However, Sen. Thad Cochran, Mississippi Republican and chief sponsor of the legislation, has said the legislation is unambiguous.

Mr. Cochran said the administration should be honest about the need for ABM treaty changes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield the floor.

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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RESTORATION OF THE ENFORCEMENT OF RULE XVI—Continued

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are here today talking about the change in rule XVI. We are also talking about the minority leader's effort to change rule XXVIII.

The minority today wants to talk about how we are being treated like the House of Representatives. In fact, if the majority were consistent and they were going to vote without any question to change rule XVI, they would also vote to change rule XXVIII, which in effect says you can't go outside the scope of the conference as the conference committees have done, especially in the appropriations field.

I am happy to see my friend from North Dakota here, the chairman of the Democratic Policy Committee, who is in effect the educational arm for the minority.

Is the Senator ready to proceed?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the vote that has been called on this issue, I assume, is a vote that will come to the Senate because some are inconvenienced or upset by amendments that have been offered by those on the Democratic side of the aisle. These amendments have dealt with a range of issues we think are very important: Education, health care, agriculture—a whole series of issues we think need to be addressed. Because we have not been able to address them on authorization bills, we have offered amendments on appropriations bills.

As the Presiding Officer and my colleagues know, the precedent stemming back from a vote some while ago in the Senate allows us to do that. That might be inconvenient for the majority because it allows us, then, on an appropriations bill, to offer an amendment and have a debate on the Patients' Bill of Rights, for example. Or it may allow for us to have a debate on the agriculture disaster relief bill. They may not want to do that, but they cannot deny the members of the Democratic minority in the Senate the right to amend an appropriations bill. So the proposal is to change the rules back to where they used to be in order to prevent amendments of the type I have just described from being offered to the appropriations bills.

I thought it would be useful today to just go through a list of bills that describe the way the Senate has been operating in recent years and describe why many of us have felt it necessary to try to add legislation to appropriations bills. Let me just go through a list going back to 1997 and 1998.

The Family Friendly Workplace Act, S. 4. This bill, as it was described on the floor of the Senate, sought to give employees more flexibility with their work hours. Senator PATTY MURRAY sought to propose an amendment to give employees 24 hours a year of current family medical leave so they could take time off to go to school conferences and other things. But cloture was filed so that amendments could be offered. The purpose of the majority was to say: We want to debate S. 4. It is our bill. We want to debate it and we do not want the inconvenience of having amendments that we believe are not appropriate or germane to the bill. So what we want to do is put the bill on the floor and file cloture and prevent the Democrats from offering amendments.

On the Education Savings Act for public and private schools, they had the same approach: Bring the bill out here, file cloture and say: We want to debate this bill. It is our agenda. But we do not want you to be able to offer the amendments you want to offer.

The Federal Vacancies Reform Act, the same thing; Child Custody Protection Act, same thing. If we go through a list of these, we see what has happened is the majority leader has set himself up, it seems to me, as a kind of House Rules Committee in the Senate, saying I am going to bring a bill to the floor, and I am going to fill the legislative tree, as they call it, and create a mechanism by which no one else can move. It is a legislative straitjacket. No one else will be able to offer amendments.

Then the majority leader has said to us, on occasion: All right, I have a bill. I have filled the tree, come to me with your amendments, and if I approve and think we ought to debate them, I will allow you to debate them; if I don't, I will not.

That is not the way the Senate works. The Senate is a very inconvenient place and not a very effective or efficient place in the way it disposes of legislation. But that happens to be the way George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and Ben Franklin and Mason and Madison anticipated this place should work.

Remember the description about the Senate being the saucer that cools the coffee? They did not intend the Senate to work the way the House works, to have a Rules Committee to mandate that only certain amendments will be allowed, and then there will only be a certain amount of debate allowed, and it will all go very efficiently. That is not the way they intended the Senate to work. Yet that is exactly the way the majority leader has anticipated the Senate should work now for some long while.

If we had this rule in place last year, for example, the Senator from Nevada knows we would not have been able to offer the agriculture relief package we offered and got attached to the agriculture appropriations bill. The first portion of the farm crisis relief package was done in the Senate as an amendment that I and Senator CONRAD offered to the agriculture appropriations bill. It would not be allowed under the rule change that is now being proposed by the majority leader.

So we have a circumstance where the majority has decided that it really wants to debate its agenda. I understand that. If I were on their side, I would want to debate their agenda. They have a right to do that; that is their right. I will vote every day to support their right to do that. But then they say: Not only do we want to debate our agenda, we want to prevent the other side from offering amendments that relate to their agenda.

That is not appropriate. It is not the way the Senate should work. The reason we have had to offer amendments to appropriations bills is because authorization bills have not been passed. When they do come to the floor, the majority leader decides he does not want amendments offered to authorization bills.

Let me give one example, if I might. Does anybody know anything about the Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization bill? That is an important

bill. It describes how we run the airways in this country—the control towers, the safety of air transportation. Do you know we just passed the other night, by unanimous consent, a 2-month extension of the FAA bill? I will bet there are not 10 Senators who know we passed, by unanimous consent, a 2-month extension. Why did we pass a 2-month extension? Because we should have passed an FAA reauthorization bill in the last Congress and it did not get done because we have a huge fight going on.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from North Dakota a question. The Senator from North Dakota served in the House of Representatives how many years?

Mr. DORGAN. I was in the House of Representatives 12 years.

Mr. REID. It is true that it is a very large body, 435 Members. Over the years they have developed certain rules to move legislation because it is a large body?

Mr. DORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. REID. Every bill that comes to the House floor has a rule placed on it—how long it can be debated, what amendments can be debated. My colleague recalls those days, as do I, being a former House Member?

Mr. DORGAN. The Senator from Nevada is absolutely correct about the procedures of the House.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, isn't his memory of how the House operates simply how the majority is now trying to operate the Senate? The leadership in the majority is trying to make it the same, is that not true?

Mr. DORGAN. That is exactly what is happening in the Senate, and it causes some heartburn for many people who understand how the Senate has traditionally worked and ought to work. This is not the House. We do not have a Rules Committee which decides what amendments should be offered. I know some want to change this into a body that operates identically to the House of Representatives, but it is not the way the Framers of this Government decided how it should work.

I want to go back for a moment to this issue of the FAA reauthorization bill. It describes our problems. We are not passing authorization bills. They are all hung up with big disputes here and there, and when one does come to the floor, the folks who bring it to the floor fill up the legislative tree and decide they do not want the rest of us to be able to offer amendments. That is a big problem. If the Senate were operating the way it should, I do not think there would be any concern about whether or not you could legislate on an appropriations bill. But because the Senate is not operating the way it should, the Democrats are largely prevented from offering amendments in most cases.

And motions to shut off debate before debate starts, or even before the first amendment is offered, have now become routine. Think of that again. The filing of motions to shut off debate, even before the first amendment is filed, has become routine in the Senate.

If you went back to that little room in Philadelphia where they wrote this Constitution, I will bet they would be aghast at that. When Mason and Madison and Franklin and George Washington, talked about what kind of a framework they wanted to describe for governance of this country, they created a Senate that was deliberately inefficient. It required things to slow down a bit and that there to be a lengthy public debate about what ought to happen and what is good and what is not good public policy. They did that deliberately.

Now we have all these folks who say we do not want the Senate to be able to consider, for any length of time, these issues. We do not want amendments to be offered; we want this place to be kind of a slam-dunk, highly efficient mirror image of the U.S. House of Representatives. That is not what it ought to be.

I know outside this Chamber this notion of rule changes and rule XVI sounds like a foreign language.

I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this must sound like a foreign language to people—rule XVI, legislating on appropriations bills, germane. It is not a foreign language. It is about whether folks have the right to stand at these desks and engage in debate and offer amendments.

This desk I am standing at is the desk that was sat in by Robert La Follette, the great, popular Senator from Wisconsin. In fact, I am told on May 29, 1908, they tried to poison Robert La Follette at this very desk. The Senate historian sent me information about that. He had been filibustering and had been on his feet for some 8 hours or so, and he put a glass of eggnog to his lips and spat the eggnog and claimed he had been poisoned. There is a lot of mystery about that circumstance. It was at this desk in 1908 that a great, popular Senator in the middle of a filibuster suffered that indignity.

Having heard that story now and seen the evidence from the Senate historian, I am probably not likely to filibuster anytime soon. At least if I do, I will not from this desk.

The point is, back in the old days, the way the Senate used to work, and the not so old days even going back 10, 20, 30 years, the Senate was a deliberative body. Its ability to debate was not choked by someone filing cloture motions before anyone else had the opportunity even to offer an amendment. That is not the way the Senate should work.

The change in rule XVI allowed us to offer legislative amendments on appropriations bills. That is necessary only because the Senate is now being operated in a way that, in my judgment, was not intended at all by the framers of the Constitution and certainly was not the way it was run for the first 180 years or so of its existence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DORGAN. I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for giving me this time.

I listened with great interest and confusion—I guess a little bit—to what the Senator from North Dakota was saying. He is right on target. I served 10 years in the House of Representatives before I came to the Senate. We were always a little frustrated at that time, I remember, by the Rules Committee because they would set up the rules by which we could debate. We only had 5 minutes in the House. You could speak 5 minutes, and that was it. Once in a while, you were lucky to get consent to speak for 7 or 8 minutes.

We always knew that if the majority party or minority party or interested people could not get an amendment up because of the Rules Committee, it could always be done in the Senate. I cannot think of any time since I came to the Senate in 1975 when an issue we wanted to debate in the House but were prevented from doing so by the action of the Rules Committee was not then later followed up with full debate on the Senate floor.

That is as the framers of our Constitution envisioned. The Senator from North Dakota is right, and the Senator from Nevada is right. With 435 Members in the House, there is no way it could function if it functioned under the same rules as the Senate, so they have to have a Rules Committee. I understand that.

In the Senate, as envisioned by the framers of our Constitution, we are to have open and deliberative debate about the great issues of the day, and it is to be just that, deliberative.

Mr. REID. Will my friend yield for a question?

Mr. HARKIN. I am delighted to yield to the Senator.

Mr. REID. I reminded my friend from Iowa just the other day of one of the first legislative sessions I attended while in the Senate. The Senator from Iowa came to the Senate a couple years prior to this Senator. It was 2:30 in the morning. We were debating an issue, and the Senator from Iowa felt very strongly about aid to the contras in Central America. Even though it was inconvenient, even though it was 2:30 in the morning, and even though most of us wished the Senator had not offered an amendment, the Senator from Iowa had the right at 2:30 in the morning to offer an amendment on a bill

that was before the Senate. There were no rules on that bill, and the Senator offered an amendment on aid to the contras because the Senator from Iowa felt strongly about that and he had a right to offer it. Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. HARKIN. I do remember that, I tell the Senator. I remember it very well, as a matter of fact.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend, we are a better country, no matter how one felt about aid to the contras—I happened to agree with my friend from Iowa—for having been able to debate that issue in the light of day.

Mr. HARKIN. I say to the Senator, he is absolutely right. I remember that time. I remember some of the great debates we had. I say to my friend from Nevada, when I came to the Senate, the Republicans were in charge, and then the Democrats were in charge, and then it went back to the Republicans again. In all those years—first it was under Senator Dole, then Senator BYRD, Senator Mitchell, Senator Dole again—in all that time, we had free and open debate in the Senate. Once in a while, the majority would try to skirt it a little bit, but that was used very rarely. The general rule in the Senate was that we had authorizing bills, we offered our amendments, and we debated them fully. Sometimes they lasted until 2:30 or 3 in the morning—not often, but once in a while when it was an important issue of the day, when those who felt strongly about those issues thought it needed a full airing.

I do not remember at any time during that period that anything got held up, that this body came to a screeching, grinding halt. We had our say. We had good deliberations. That is gone now. We do not have that any longer. We do not have a free-flowing debate in the Senate any longer. A person gets up, gives a speech, and leaves the floor. Why? Because the way things are being structured now does not really allow for the free-flowing, deliberative debate we have had in the past.

When we changed rule XVI in 1995, when the then-new Republican majority voted to change rule XVI, I was opposed to that. I thought we should continue to operate as we had been operating. But since 1995, what has happened is, under the new leadership in the Senate, we have a structure that does not allow for that kind of debate and deliberation on authorizing bills. It has been common now for the majority to take the position that we do not have any regular debate on controversial subjects. We are not allowed the orderly amendment process to be considered in the Senate.

We are all products of our backgrounds, our upbringing, what we learned earlier in life. I know the distinguished majority leader—who is a fine man, and I have the greatest amount of respect for him—in his tenure in the House served on the Rules Committee. I am openly wondering whether or not the Senate majority leader's tenure on the House Rules Committee is somehow affecting his leadership in the Senate. Is the Senate majority leader trying to run the Senate the way the House Rules Committee runs the House? It seems to me that is what is happening, moving the Senate toward House procedures.

The pattern has become clear. The Republican leader decides on a particular measure; they move to consider it in a process where no amendments can be offered or only a limited number of predetermined amendments may be offered.

Again, the argument of limited time is often suggested as a reason—we do not have all this time—but that is clearly a veil that hides nothing.

Several days are spent working out the details of what may be allowed instead of proceeding to the bill and allowing us to debate.

How many days, I ask my friend from Nevada, have we spent on the floor with nobody here, quorum call after quorum call, simply because the majority leader does not want to have a measure on the floor to which we can add our amendments and openly debate them?

The reason given is that, well, it will take too much time if Senator HARKIN or Senator REID or Senator JOHNSON or Senator DORGAN get up and start offering their amendments and debate them. Yet we spend the entire week in quorum calls while they try to work out the details of some agreement on how to proceed.

The Patients' Bill of Rights is a great example. We passed that in our committee, the committee on which I serve, last spring. We wanted to bring it out on the floor for debate. The majority leader would not allow it: Oh, it would take too much time, don't you see.

What were we forced to do? We were forced to offer it on the agriculture appropriations bill. It should not have been there. We should have had open and free debate. That brought the ag appropriations bill to a standstill.

Then they tried to work out how we were going to do this. Finally, there was a unanimous consent agreement that established a very tight rule, similar to the House Rules Committee, in order for us to bring up the Patients' Bill of Rights. Why didn't we bring it up in the first place a month or two ago and debate it in the orderly process and be done with it?

Another example is the proposed lockbox, a procedure under which surpluses could be blocked from being spent year to year. There are a variety of ways this could have been accomplished. There are a lot of different views on this lockbox and how we are going to proceed on it. But look what has happened. Not once, not twice, but three times the majority leader moved to invoke cloture to block any amendments from being offered to lockbox—three times to shut off any amendments. So we still do not have the measure before us. Yet time is consumed, time is wasted around here. More time is wasted in the Senate than any place I have ever seen. We still have not brought up the lockbox. We could have brought it up a month ago and debated it.

Mr. REID. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes.

Mr. REID. It is my understanding that the cloture provision in our rules was set up to stop endless debate; is that right?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes. I say to the Senator, it was to stop endless debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 10 minutes have expired.

Mr. REID. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from Iowa, the lockbox is used as an illustration. There has not been a single word of debate on that, has there been?

Mr. HARKIN. Not one word of debate.

Mr. REID. Why would you want to file cloture when there is no talk, no conversation on anything relating to it?

Mr. HARKIN. That is what I do not understand. The Senator makes my point. The majority leader is trying to run the Senate like the Rules Committee, saying: We are bringing it up, but we don't want your amendments, we don't want you to discuss this.

The Senate must be an open body. Placing authorizing measures on appropriations bills is an imperfect but, under the way the Senate is running now, a necessary method of bringing matters to the consideration of the Senate.

In light of the actions by the Republican leader to cut off our debate and our ability to have open deliberation, we have been forced to use the appropriations bills as a method of doing that.

These issues should be discussed seriously. I do not know that we need to change our rules so much around here as we need to show a greater willingness to be open, to allow for the smooth flow of ideas and amendments on the floor, rather than gagging Senators, preventing them from offering timely amendments.

I must say, if we do not move toward some accommodation on this, parliamentary procedures will be used to deteriorate the ability of the Senate to function. The restoration of rule XVI will restrict our options on the minority side. But I cannot believe—and I say this to my friend from Nevada; I say this to the occupant of the Chair—I cannot believe that any serious student of parliamentary procedure believes that rule XVI will effectively block Senators from eventually getting votes on desired matters. It will happen, but it is going to take a terrible toll on this place.

We should be debating issues such as the minimum wage and fair pay. The

other day I saw a figure that said, if you took the CEOs of the Fortune 500 companies, the CEO pay in 1960 and the minimum wage in 1960, and you brought them forward to 1999, if the minimum wage had gone up at the same rate as CEO pay, the minimum wage today would be $40 an hour.

I would like to debate that on the floor. I would like to debate the necessity and the need to raise the minimum wage. Mr. President, $10,700 a year, that is what it is right now for people trying to raise their families. We need a full deliberation on this. It is an important issue. Yet we are choked off and gagged from even doing so.

I can assure the majority that this can only escalate. The reimposition of rule XVI will invite the use of alternative, more disruptive parliamentary methods in order for the minority to raise these important issues for the benefit of the American people. Furthermore, I believe that this, then, will cause further erosion of the good will of this body in the smooth consideration of legislation.

We had 48 cloture votes in the last Congress. We have already had 17 this session. As the Senator from Nevada said, it is laid down immediately, not after we have debated it for some time; and the majority, exercising its right to bring debate to a close, files cloture. No. It is done right in the beginning before one amendment is offered, before one word is even uttered on the issue before us.

So I say to the majority, do not escalate, because one escalation leads to another. The reimposition of rule XVI will lead to some other action taken on this side for the minority to exercise its rights. Then there will be another escalation on the other side, and then in the end the Senate will be the loser, our Government will be the loser, and the American people will lose.

Let us not overturn the 1995 precedent on rule XVI. Let us, instead, have a substantive series of discussions to work out the necessary adjustments to the way we operate so that we can, once again, as we had until recent times, have open and fair deliberation of the major issues before this body.

I thank the Senator for yielding me time.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Iowa for his statement.

I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Nevada. I associate myself with the remarks of my friend and colleague from Iowa, Senator HARKIN, on this issue.

Today the Senate is considering the reinstatement of rule XVI, the Senate rule preventing authorizing legislation from being included on appropriations bills.

The reason the Senate is forced today to consider the reinstatement of rule XVI is because the Republican majority overturned the ruling of the Chair in 1995. Prior to 1995, it always was the rule that no authorizing language could be added to an appropriations bill.

Having had several years of experience under this new regime, the majority comes back with a proposal now to go back to that old rule, whereby authorizing language way not be added to an appropriations bill. If debate were being brought forward on the floor of the Senate in the way that it had over most of the history of this institution, I do not think there would be very much resistance to going back to rule XVI.

But what needs to be pointed out is the context we find ourselves in post-1995, the way in which, frankly, the current majority party seems to be bringing legislation to the floor, and the fact that this process has changed radically, and for the worse, not only for the minority party but for the American people.

If debate on amendments were brought forward in a fair fashion, with the majority party and the minority party being allowed to bring amendments and legislation to the floor, to have a reasonable discussion of those issues—whether it be about HMO managed care reform, whether it be about campaign finance reform, whether it be about minimum wage, whether it be about farm disaster legislation—regardless of what it might be, I do not think there would be any opposition to bringing those amendments up outside the context of an appropriations bill.

In recent years, it has become common practice, in fact the usual practice, for authorizing legislation, when it is brought to the floor of the Senate, to be brought with what amounts to a gag order on the minority party. By a gag order, I mean legislation is frequently now brought to the floor by our majority leader with the amendment tree filled, meaning that no minority amendments are permitted whatsoever to authorizing legislation, allowing for no additional amendments to be offered. Then cloture is filed before there is any debate on anything relative to the amendments the minority party ordinarily is allowed to bring.

What does the majority fear? Why is there this concern? Is it really a matter of saving time? As my colleague from Iowa has noted, we go days at a time around this place with no constructive legislative progress being made on the floor of the Senate, with a quorum call in progress, with no one here. Is it really to save time or is it, in fact, a concern on the part of the majority that the American people should not be allowed to share the discussion and debate on the floor about key issues that ought to be before the American public, about where this country ought to be going relative to its domestic and international agendas. Is there a gag rule for some reason other than saving time? One would have to conclude that, yes, that is the case; that apparently the majority finds it embarrassing to have Members of this body discussing an agenda that is not being addressed by the Senate.

All of this really amounts to the minority party being shut out of the process, being denied the right to amend legislation when that legislation comes to the floor.

An example, Mr. President, is when legislation to create a so-called lockbox for the Social Security trust fund was brought to the floor on several occasions earlier this year. Grossly inadequate lockbox legislation was being brought to the floor. It belied what most people would think of when they think of a lockbox. But there was no opportunity for amendments to be offered or even considered.

The minority party understands it is the minority party. It may lose a vote on a proposed amendment. But that party ought to be allowed the opportunity to point out the deficiencies of legislation and to have a fair up-or-down vote. There are times when Democrats will vote with Republicans, and Republicans will vote with Democrats. That is the way the process ought to work. Yet that opportunity is being denied this body.

The question for all of us to consider, again, is, What is the majority afraid of? Do they not believe Senators in the minority have the right to offer amendments, or that any Senator in the majority might from time to time vote with the minority? It is a sad commentary about the bipartisan politics of this body if that, indeed, is the case.

I had the honor of serving in the other Chamber for a number of years. Over there, where they have 435 Representatives, there is a Rules Committee that decides which amendments will be considered and when, and how that legislation is brought to the floor. In the other body, that process is sometimes abused but probably is necessary, given the sheer size of the body. The possibility of 435 Members offering multiple amendments obviously boggles the mind and could, indeed, slow down the process.

But one of the great strengths of the Senate has been, because of our smaller size and the historic collegiality that has existed most of the time in this body, we don't have that kind of Rules Committee, that kind of power. Here we bring these issues to the floor for an open and fair and balanced debate; obviously, with the majority and the minority dividing the time and proceeding with debate in an orderly, constructive fashion but with an opportunity to address the key issues facing the Nation, whether brought by the majority or brought by the minority, to have that discussion. Unfortunately, the current majority—and this is out of precedent going back throughout the history of our country—wants to deny Senators in the minority a chance to offer the amendments they believe need to be offered.

I think there would be few Senators on the part of the minority who would object to reaching bipartisan agreements on the amount of time to be spent on particular legislation or the number of amendments to be offered. It is very common that these agreements about numbers of amendments and time agreements are reached in a bipartisan fashion so that we can continue to proceed in an orderly fashion so that there is no real risk of debate on these issues somehow clogging up the process and denying the ability of the Senate to move forward with its agenda. This is not a tradeoff between orderly development of legislative issues and the opportunity for the minority to bring up amendments and discuss them in a reasonable manner.

I think it is important for everyone who is following this debate, then, to keep these circumstances in mind, to fully understand what the restoration of rule XVI really is all about. It is not about orderly progress of legislation. It is not about saving time. It is about trying to gag the minority party with no opportunity to bring up legislation which the majority party is ignoring. It is a means of preventing the minority party from pointing out the deficiencies and inadequacies, as they see it, of legislation being offered by the majority. It is the majority party's effort to see to it that their own Members don't cross the aisle to vote with the minority party on selected pieces of legislation and to save themselves from that apparent embarrassment.

I point out another important issue that must be discussed again in this context. That is Senator DASCHLE's amendment to reinstate the scope of conference point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time requested by the distinguished Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON. May I have 1 additional minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON. Prior to 1996, a point of order could be brought in conference committee against an amendment that had not been offered and debated in either the House or the Senate but was included in one of their versions of the bill. The majority is also overturning that rule, meaning they have the opportunity, then, to deny minority amendments on the floor of the Senate, but then, when they are in conference committee behind closed doors, with no media, no press, the majority party can amend legislation any way they wish, without regard to action of the House or the Senate on the floor.

I hope in the context of all of this the Senate will remain consistent with precedent in supporting Senator DASCHLE's effort to make sure there is some continuity of action in those conference committees. This is particularly important in light of the changes being proposed on rule XVI.

I yield back such time as I have to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend from South Dakota, I very much appreciate his statement. I also say that the people in South Dakota are very fortunate that South Dakota doesn't have a lot of people but, through Senators DASCHLE and JOHNSON, has great power in the Senate. I appreciate very much the Senator's remarks.

I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from California, Mrs. BARBARA BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I thank Senator REID, our distinguished minority whip, who has done such a fine job on so many issues.

Mr. President, I say to the public who may be watching this debate, it may sound a little arcane, but we are debating the rules of the Senate. They will hear about rule XVI, they will hear about rule XXVIII, and they will say: What does this have to do with us? What does this have to do with my daily life as an American citizen?

Let me tell you, it has everything to do with the daily lives of the American people because this debate is about the power to bring issues to the American people by way of the Senate. It is about who has the right to bring issues to this floor for debate—issues that really matter to people, issues that relate to their jobs, issues that relate to their health care, issues that relate to their kids' education, issues that relate to how much congestion there is on a freeway or at an airport. So the power to bring up issues on the floor of the Senate is, in essence, the ability for all of us as Senators to make a difference in the lives of the American people.

If you were to ask me who has the right to bring issues to the Senate floor, my answer would be every single Senator, be they Republican, Democrat, or Independent. I think it is a very sad day today because, very clearly, the way this place has been running there is an attempt to shut down all but the Republican Senators. Because the Republican Senators control these appropriations bills in the committee, they will be able to load them up with all kinds of legislation. But once those bills get to the floor, there will be no way for Democratic Senators or Independent Senators to add their voices to that legislation.

There was a time in the Senate when things weren't like this. Perhaps they were the golden days of the Senate. When I first got here, we worked well—the Democrats did—with the Republicans. In those days, the Democrats were in charge. We worked well together. We weren't afraid to take the tough votes. We had full debate. Authorization bills were brought to the floor of the Senate. There was open debate.

Now we have a majority leader whom I like very much. Notwithstanding that, every chance he gets, his goal is to shut down the debate, to not allow a full debate. If he were in a position to open up the debate on authorizing bills, I say to the distinguished whip, we would not be here today fighting against reinstating rule XVI.

I want to take a look at how we actually got to this point. Rule XVI of the Senate rules prohibits amending appropriations bills. In other words, the rationale—which is a very good rationale—is that appropriations bills are merely bills that decide how much we spend on a particular item, and therefore they should be immune from the larger debate about underlying law and changes in underlying law. I always thought that was a good rule. We had it in place, as I say, when I got here.

Then, in 1995, the Republicans changed the rule. It came about because a Republican Senator wanted to stop the Endangered Species Act in its tracks and she wanted to attach an environmental rider to an appropriations bill. She needed very much to change rule XVI in order to win her point.

I remember being very upset at that time for two reasons. No. 1, I thought it was really bad to change rule XVI because I thought we had fair and open debate. Secondly, I thought, here is a major policy change, a major change in the law, without going through the authorizing committees, no hearings, no witnesses, no real debate in the committee.

The Endangered Species Act has been a great act. Is it perfect? No. But it saved the California condor and the bald eagle. Yet we have a Senator wanting to throw the whole thing out, essentially, and stop all the new listings because she didn't like it. In order to do that, her colleagues accommodated her and they went back to allowing legislation on appropriations; 54 Republicans voted with her at the time.

Now, after several years of seeing some of us move our legislation, such as the Patients' Bill of Rights, campaign finance reform, taking a page out of the book of the Senator from Texas, they suddenly say in the middle of the Congress that they have changed their minds. I know why they have changed their minds. They have figured out how to run this place similar to the House of Representatives, as my friend, Senator REID, pointed out.

I served in the House of Representatives for 10 years. That place runs very differently from the Senate. They shut you down. They shut down debate. How many times have you seen House Members try to deliver a whole speech in 30 seconds or a minute? I know because I learned to do it over there. The fact is that there are time constraints over there. There are so many people over there. The Senate is a different place.

Let me put it in a different way. This used to be a different place. I say to my friend—and then I will yield to him—when I was a little girl, my father used to tell me, years before I would even dream that I would even be in politics,

because in those days women were not in politics: Honey, I want you to watch the U.S. Senate because that is where they really debate everything. The people who are there serve for 6 years. They are not afraid to take a tough stand, and they are not afraid of issues. They are willing to debate them; they are courageous; you hear all the different views. It is the greatest deliberative body in the world.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. It is my understanding that the State of California has about the seventh largest economy in the world. Is that true?

Mrs. BOXER. That is correct.

Mr. REID. Is it true that the Senator from California represents over 30 million people?

Mrs. BOXER. About 33 million people.

Mr. REID. I come from the neighboring State of Nevada, which has about 2 million people. We have a lot of things we would like to be talking about. The Senator talked about environmental issues. Our States share beautiful Lake Tahoe. There are environmental issues we need to be talking about that would protect that beautiful gem we share. We need to talk about minimum wage, fair wages, and the fact that women who work comparable jobs should make the same amount of money as men. We need to talk about campaign finance reform. I am sure, representing 33 million people, the Senator believes—and we came to the House of Representatives together in 1982—that we in the Senate should act and be treated as Senators, not as Members of the House of Representatives. There is nothing wrong with Members of the House of Representatives, but that is a large body and they need different rules than we do; is that not true?

Mrs. BOXER. My friend is exactly right. We did serve together in the House of Representatives, and it was a thrill to be there for 10 years. But there are differences between the two bodies. One of them certainly is the breadth and depth of the debate that goes on in the Senate as compared to the House. It is a different institution.

I think it is, in fact, a sad time. What happens when a piece of authorizing legislation comes before the Senate? We have the majority leader blocking our attempts to amend those pieces of legislation. My friend is right.

When I ran for reelection in the Senate in 1998, there were many differences between my opponent and me. It was a very hotly contested race. We talked about health care, campaign finance reform, protecting children from toxic waste; We talked about raising the minimum wage; We talked about more teachers in the classrooms. We talked about fixing school infrastructure because we have schools, I say to my friend, that are falling down because they are so old; We talked about the importance of afterschool programs, preschool, cops on the beat, sensible gun laws, and ending violence at women's clinics. These were issues of great importance.

I told my constituents: Look, I don't know if we are going to win on all these issues because it could be that when I get back to the Senate, the other party will be in control and they are not for raising the minimum wage; they are not for campaign finance reform; they are not for afterschool programs, and a lot of these things. But I promise you one thing: I am going to put up a fight. We are going to have those debates.

So the point is, I say to my colleagues who may be listening today, it seems very strange that when a party is in control and they have a good number more seats than we do, they should not be so insecure that they don't even allow us to offer amendments to authorizing legislation; now they have decided to shut us down on appropriations bills when they are the ones who fought for that right themselves.

This is not an arcane debate. This is a very important debate. I think you have to put all of this in the context of how the minority party has been treated. I love this institution. I agree that we shouldn't legislate on appropriations bills. But I say that with a caveat—if we are treated fairly on all the other legislative vehicles; if we are allowed to offer amendments without having the majority fill up the so-called amendment tree and block us out; if we can have bills brought to this floor.

The Senator from North Dakota brought up a very important point. Because the majority leader wasn't ready to bring up the FAA reauthorization act, we did a 2-month extension. I wonder why. Can it be that he doesn't want to bring a piece of authorizing legislation to the floor because then he couldn't stop us that easily from bringing up our issues?

I don't know the answer to that. But I do know that I am going to join with a vast majority of Democrats to fight for the kind of Senate my dad talked to me about when I was a little girl, the kind of Senate where, regardless of political party, every single Senator has a right to bring an issue important to his or her State to the floor of this Senate. I think that is the least we could do.

I say to my distinguished whip, who does such a fine job in leading us on this side, that I really appreciate the fact that he is leading this particular effort. I think the issue of rule XXVIII is important because if we are going to shut down our ability to amend bills on the floor, we ought to shut down the ability of the majority to add anything they want in the conference that may not have passed either House. I don't know how that can be considered democratic.

Arcane though this debate might be, I say to the American people who may be focusing in on this debate, it is very important to you. If you want your Senator, regardless of party, to be able to come to the floor of the Senate and bring up issues that are important to you, then you ought to work to make sure that this Senate is open and is fair.

Thank you very much. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished whip.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I assume we are having time to discuss the Senate resolution on rule XVI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The majority has 168 minutes 18 seconds. The minority has 93 minutes 31 seconds.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I wanted to talk about this issue because I feel very strongly about it. I have not been able to hear everything this morning, but it seems we have turned this into a little fairness technique which I have a little trouble understanding.

What we are talking about is whether or not you put authorizing legislation on appropriations bills. It seems to have been turned into kind of a contest of who is being treated fairly. I don't quite understand that, frankly.

There has been a lot of talk about the House. I served in the House. This is a different place. We have different rules—no question about that. We should have, and we will continue to have different rules.

Since I have been here, I think this leader has been very fair in operating to give everyone a chance to speak, as should be the case. On the other side of the coin, we haven't heard much about the fact that these appropriations bills are amended with things that have nothing to do with them, and we lose track of where we are going on these appropriations bills.

I think there is some responsibility on the part of the minority to feel that we need to accomplish something in this place other than simply introducing amendments that have nothing to do with the bill that is being considered. As you can see, I feel fairly strongly about that.

One of the things which I think is important is to separate the idea of authorizing committees from appropriations. That is why we have an Energy Committee; that is why we have an Armed Services Committee; that is why we have an Agriculture Committee—to talk about the policy in those particular areas, and to determine what the authorizations are going to be and what the role of Government is going to be. Then we follow with the appropriations bills, which also, by the way, have a great deal of power because, obviously, you can't do a great deal in terms of policy unless there are some funds with which to do it.

But when you do it the other way, as the minority apparently is urging, then

you avoid hearings and you avoid having any real discussion in committees on the issue. They apparently want to just come to the floor with the issue having had no background at all. I am afraid I don't understand that. It seems to me to be a little naive to suggest that we have rules of that type.

I wanted to talk a little bit about it.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS. No. I will continue a little bit, and then I will be happy to answer the question when I am finished.

I think we ought to emphasize this idea of authorizations. I was happy to be on the appropriations committee when I was in the Wyoming State legislature. So I have had some experience with that.

The idea that you just simply ignore the authorizing committees and begin to do everything on appropriations is wrong, absolutely wrong.

How we got here I am not sure. The minority whip has been here longer than I and I suspect remembers when Democrats were in charge. But I think maybe he has forgotten a little bit about the way it operated then. As I understand it, when the Senator from Maine was in charge, it operated very much the same way. I am not suggesting that should be the case, nor am I suggesting it is. It seems to me that there have been real efforts to be as fair as we can be, and that should be. We need to do that.

In addition to having the opportunity to put everything on the floor, which I agree with, there is also a responsibility on the part of all of us to accomplish some things.

My recollection is that during the last number of months amendments that have come from the other side of the aisle have generally been to stop anything from happening. There are a good deal of examples of that. Frankly, that is very frustrating for me—to bring up something and then the bill has to be withdrawn from the floor because we have lost completely the direction of things.

What is this debate about? It is very simple. It simply says that in the precedence of the Senate, unless an amendment has to do with the same subject as does the appropriations bill, it is not allowed on the bill. You can make a point of order. And there has to be a majority vote to follow it up. That is pretty simple. I think it is fairly reasonable. If you are going to come in through the appropriations bill and put an appropriations amendment on it, you can have a point of order, have a vote on it, and, if it isn't appropriate, it isn't used. I don't find much of a problem with that.

I think we ought to get to the topic and talk about what it is we are doing rather than going through all of these gyrations of fairness, and so on, in terms of getting on the floor. If that is a problem, if that is a real problem, then we have to resolve that problem. This is not the way to resolve that problem.

We have some things that we have to do. We have to accomplish things right now. What do we have, 13 appropriations bills with which we have to deal? I think we have dealt with about seven. There are a number of examples of how nongermane issues have been raised and have been withdrawn. We have to withdraw the topic from the appropriations bill.

What we are doing is seeking to overturn the ruling of the Chair with respect to legislation on appropriations bills.

If the minority whip would like to make a comment, or ask a question, I would be more than happy to respond.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate my friend yielding.

Rule XVI was changed by virtue of the majority voting to change it.

I ask my friend this question: The minority leader has filed an amendment to change rule XXVIII. Rule XVI would say that there would be no legislation on appropriations bills. Rule XXVIII goes one step further and says: Fine. If we are not going to legislate on appropriations bills, then a conference committee should only be able to take up matters in the bill that they are conferencing and that has within it confined limits. Will the Senator comment on whether or not he believes, if we are going to change rule XVI, we should also change rule XXVIII which would mean that a conference committee cannot do things outside the scope of the two bills they are dealing with?

Mr. THOMAS. I can answer that very quickly. Yes, I agree with that. I think it is the same concept as coming to the floor with an amendment on an issue that has never been discussed, has never been authorized. To do that in the conference committee, I believe, is equally wrong.

Mr. REID. I appreciate that very much. We had here the senior Senator from New York who went on at some length, as only he can do, using an example of that huge bill last fall which the Senator and I came back to vote on—I came back from Nevada and he came back from Wyoming—that we had not even seen. I think we would be hard-pressed to say we could lift it, much less to have read it. Yet a few people in the conference committee, together with the White House, drew this bill. If we were working under the confines of rule XXVIII, that would not be possible. I appreciate very much the comments of the Senator from Wyoming, acknowledging that would also be a good idea.

Mr. THOMAS. I do think so. I do think it is the same concept there. What we want to avoid, in many ways, is putting more authority into this Appropriations Committee. It is a very important committee. I recognize that. But it ought not be the center of all of our activity, and it can be if we are not careful. So I think there is a balance in both these areas. I support both the propositions that are here, and I hope we have some action that will put them into place.

Mr. REID. If the Senator will yield just for another comment, I serve on the Appropriations Committee. I am very fortunate; I have been able to do that since I have been in the Senate. But, having said that, I think we need to get a process where we are doing more legislating on authorizing legislation than what we are doing. Almost all of our attention is now focused on the 13 appropriations bills, and we have kind of lost track of the fact that we should be legislators on things other than appropriations bills.

Mr. THOMAS. I have listened just a little bit to the Senator and his associates, and I have the feeling you are not for changing the rules?

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from Wyoming, I think he is going to find a protest vote, saying we want a more open debate. We are going to support the change in rule XXVIII, and we are confident rule XVI will be changed if rule XXVIII were changed in addition to that. The minority leader is offering that as an amendment. I think it would be a pretty good day for the country.

But the conversations today on this side of the aisle, I say to my friend from Wyoming, have been to the effect we need to do more legislating. An example of the lockbox has been used. That is a very important concept, that we should lock away enough money from the surpluses to protect our Social Security system. But we would like to talk about that a little bit. Not talk forever; no one wants to filibuster that. That is something we believe in, too. But we may not believe in it exactly the way the majority has presented it to us. We have had three cloture motions filed on that particular bill and we have not been able to say a single word about it. That is what we are complaining about.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that. I think it was five, but as a sponsor of the lockbox, I am very much for it. But in this instance it just seems to me that is what I am talking about, simply blocking it. There has been much opportunity to talk about lockbox. You can talk about it whenever you choose.

I guess the reason the Senator voted against cloture is because he wanted an opportunity to amend.

Mr. REID. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think anyone could argue against the need for a fair process. But I think to talk about all those things with respect to rule XVI is inappropriate. I think we very much need this. I urge the Senator's support.

I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent a quorum call be initiated and the time be charged equally against both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I see in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, JAY ROCKEFELLER. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Presiding Officer, as well as I thank my esteemed friend from Nevada.

Mr. President, I came a bit earlier than was anticipated. I look forward to expressing what are some strongly held views on my part.

In a formal sense, I rise today to object to the reinstatement of Senate rule XVI. That is my purpose in being here. Up until 1995, it prohibited legislating on appropriations bills. That is the reason I formally rise.

The Republican majority, in fact, is responsible for overturning the rule which was designed to keep legislative matters unrelated to appropriations bills from bogging down the appropriations process. The Republicans themselves were responsible for overturning the longstanding Senate precedent by rejecting the ruling of the Chair, something that was given little notice and was little commented upon but is now of increasing monumental proportions.

I cannot support returning to the previous order because I respect the Senate. It seems to me anybody who has a sense of what the Senate was designed for and what the Senate is, what the Senate should be, what the American people expect the Senate to be, will vote as I will vote because to do otherwise is to diminish this body, which I think has been diminished substantially in the last 5 or 6 years in any event, in terms of its impact on American debate, its impact on discussion, its impact on the intellectual activity of the Senate, and, in fact, its impact on American society as a whole.

I happen to represent steelworkers, farmers, airport managers, veterans, rural people, patients, doctors, nurses, just as the Presiding Officer does. This Senator may have a few more steelworkers in his State than the Senator from Kansas does in his State; otherwise, we represent more or less the same people. I do not think these people ought to have their business pushed aside, their concerns, their worries, what they care about pushed aside in order to make the Senate's bill or the Senate's way of working more manageable, more efficient, more to the liking of the leadership, more House-like, more limiting, less substantial, less interesting, less of scope, less of dignity, less of the power of the tradition of the Senate.

(Mr. THOMAS assumed the Chair.)

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I believe the majority is interested in controlling debate. I have wanted to say this a long time, and I have not found the place to do it properly, but I find so today. I believe the majority—not the Presiding Officer who has changed since I began my remarks, who is an entirely different kind of person—the people who run the majority, who speak for the majority, who lead the Senate on behalf of the majority, are interested in controlling debate, minimizing debate in making the Senate more like the House from whence they came and in trivializing the Senate. Those are harsh words, but they come from a disturbed and unhappy Senator—not disturbed in a psychological sense, I point out to the Presiding Officer, but disturbed in the sense of not feeling good about the work I am able to do as opposed to the way it used to be a number of years ago when I first came to the Senate.

I wish I could tell my colleagues I believe the Senate is functioning in a way that means legislative business can occur on authorizing legislation, but I cannot. I wish the Senate would return to a more efficient appropriations process that does not deal with extraneous legislative matters, but under the Senate's current leadership, Members of the majority party have effectively gagged—there is no other word for it—the minority from raising policy matters on the Senate floor.

Every Tuesday, members of both parties have caucuses. Those caucuses, in the case of the Democrats, used to deal broadly with issues and with functions and divisions of responsibility and debate within the caucus. Now, for the most part, they are taken up with, how can we make ourselves heard? How is it that we can, by some manipulation or clever method, try to work our way through a loophole which allows us to bring up an amendment, to speak on behalf of our constituencies?

In every single caucus there is a question of how the majority is diminishing the minority, not in a way which would just be satisfying in the sense of a Republican making a Democrat feel less important or making a Democrat's role less important in the Senate, but in the sense of diminishing honest and open and real debate.

That is what I came to the Senate for in 1985—honest and real debate. I did not expect to win everything. I did not expect to lose everything. But I did expect to be able to debate, to be able to make my views known, as one can in a committee. All committees are run relatively fairly. The Finance Committee, the Commerce Committee, which I sit on, are run fairly by their majority leadership. This place is not; the floor of the Senate is not. We are gagged, as in the Patients' Bill of Rights doctors were gagged. We are not allowed to express our views.

I resent that enormously, I say to the Presiding Officer. It takes a lot away from being a Senator. I know no longer the greatness of the difference between being a Member of the House and being a Member of the Senate. There is, of course, a difference. I stand here and speak, and I speak as I choose to speak, and nobody is stopping me, but that is because we have this arrangement for this day. For most of the rest of the time, morning business has been closed off—or had been—quorum calls were not honored, to be able to interrupt them, as this one was honored. It is a different body. It is a distressing situation. All of us, on both sides, all 100 of us, are diminished by the way this Senate is run.

Let me give an example of a piece of legislation, and it is not even the first one on the minds of most, but it is a big one in terms of this Senator: This legislative body's failure with respect to the FAA and the airport improvement reauthorization bill, which is, for the fourth time in less than a year, on the brink of expiring.

Last fall we threw a 6-month extension into the omnibus appropriations bill. When that expired on March 31, we did a 2-month extension—embarrassing—until May 31; then a 65-day extension—embarrassing—through August 6. And now we are close to August 6, and we may have to—and probably will—have to do yet another extension. All of these short-term extensions may make us feel better temporarily, but they are not solutions. They do not obviate the need to take up and debate and pass an authorization bill.

But we cannot debate it. We cannot debate anything on this floor except what it is the majority wants to debate. Then they fill up every tree, preclude every amendment, and we are all diminished, and the public process is diminished at the same time.

So in the current Senate environment, which I deplore, regret—I like the people who lead the Senate on the majority side, but I do not respect the way they lead this Senate. I think all of us suffer from the way they lead this Senate; that is, to make the Senate more like the House—puppets.

So in this current Senate environment, I am not willing to give up a single avenue for getting my work done. I will not support giving the majority one more way to cut off debate on important policy issues—such as aviation or the future of our Nation's steel industry, restoring money to Medicare providers who have been too deeply cut. We hear more about this than any other subject when we go home. Have we discussed it? No. Research and development, lots and lots of other things.

So the arcane rules of the Senate may not be at the forefront of the concerns of everyday Americans, but the rules of this Senate guide the way our democracy works or fails to work. They guide the way the people trust their Government, and they also guide the way people within the Government trust the Government within the framework of which they work as best as they can.

The legislative process is honorable. It is time honored. I fear that we are

dangerously close to the Senate losing its reputation and role as a great deliberative body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 10 minutes.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I recognize my time is up. I hope my colleagues will support me in objecting to the reinstatement of Senate rule XVI.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from West Virginia, through the Chair, how much I appreciate him being here today. The people of West Virginia are very fortunate to have Senators BYRD and ROCKEFELLER representing their interests. I appreciate the Senator's statement today very much. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Connecticut, CHRIS DODD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Nevada. And I thank my colleagues who have spoken on this issue this morning, an issue that may seem to the general public as sort of an arcane debate involving the internal machinations of this body. But in my brief remarks this afternoon, I would like to suggest that this debate may be one of the most significant ones we have in this Congress because it is the process and the procedures which determine the ability of a minority in this body to be heard.

If that ability is constrained, is gagged, is muffled, then the public is denied the opportunity which the Senate, as a forum, has historically provided to the citizenry of this Nation, and that is a full airing of the issues that they should hear, that they should be aware of, as we deliberate the matters which will affect their lives and the lives of their families for years and decades to come.

So while a procedural debate may sound boring to some and may not sound as if it is of terribly great import to others, this is, in truth, a significant debate and discussion. Therefore, I add my voice to those who have raised concerns about a vote that will occur later this afternoon dealing with rule XVI of the Senate.

I am in somewhat of a unique position. I am standing next to my dear friend and colleague from West Virginia, who is recognized by all in this Chamber, regardless of party, and those who have come before us, as one of the truly great historians of the Senate, arguably the most knowledgeable person who has served in this body in its 210-year history when it comes to the role of the Senate both in terms of our own history as well as the role of senates throughout recorded history.

I am also in a unique position in that I am the inheritor of the seat once held by a distinguished Senator from Connecticut by the name of Roger Sherman. Roger Sherman, among other things, was the only Founding Father, as they are referred to, to have signed the four cornerstone documents, as we call them, of our Nation. He signed the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights.

He was from New Haven, CT. I sit in his seat in the Senate, as you track a Senate seat from those who first represented the Thirteen Original Colonies in the Senate to the modern Senate of today. But maybe more importantly than his signature on those four cornerstone documents, he was the author of what was called the Connecticut Compromise. The Connecticut Compromise produced the Senate of the United States as a body.

There was a crisis, politically, at the time of the debate in the constitutional convention between large States and small States about where power would reside. Roger Sherman, along with others, proposed the Connecticut compromise, which gave birth to the Senate as a place where small States would be equally represented by the participation of two Senators from each State regardless of the size of the State.

But more importantly than that debate, it was also designed to be a forum wherein the rights of a minority could be heard. The rules of the House of Representatives—I served in that body for 6 years—were and are specifically designed to guarantee the rights of the majority. Majority opinion prevails in the House, and that is how it should be. We had come off a system ruled by one individual, a king. We wanted to establish a system of government where the majority opinion of the American people could be heard and their voices could result in opinions being rendered and decisions being made which reflected those majority feelings.

But the Founding Fathers and those who supported them in their wisdom understood there could be a tyranny of the majority, that quick decisions made rapidly without a great deal of thought or consideration could in some instances do more harm than good. So the Senate was created as a balance, as a counterweight, in many ways.

The Senate was designed to be a place where those majority decisions, as important as they are, would then have to be brought for further consideration in this Chamber where additional consideration and thought would be offered, where the views of those who may not have been heard in the House of Representatives could be heard, where the rights of a minority, including a minority of one Senator, would absolutely be guaranteed the right to be heard, as long as that Senator could stand on his or her feet and express their opinions—the filibuster rule which protects the right of one of us out of 100. Ninety-nine people cannot stop one Senator from speaking, once that Senator has gained recognition from the Presiding Officer. It is a unique set of rules, completely contrary to the rules of the House, where one Member of the House cannot command the attention of the entire Chamber, or that person is limited to 5 minutes in talking and must get unanimous consent to speak for a 6th minute. In the Senate, that is not the case. As long as you can stand and be heard, no one can interrupt you or break the flow of debate.

There are many other distinctions which make the Senate unique and special, but that is certainly one of them.

This afternoon we are going to debate and vote on a rule which also goes to the very heart of whether or not the Senate is going to maintain its unique and distinct role as being sort of the antithesis, if you will, the counterweight, as was described by Thomas Jefferson when he argued against the creation of the Senate, that this would be the saucer in which the coffee or the tea would cool, where temperatures could be lowered, the heat of debate would be softened, consideration and thought would be given to the decisions that the majority had made in the other Chamber.

I come to this issue with a sense of history about Roger Sherman, in whose seat I sit, who authored the creation of the Senate with the Connecticut compromise, with a deep sense of appreciation for the role of the House, having served there, and also a very strong sense of the role that the Senate should play and why this debate on rule XVI is more than just an internal discussion, a debate among Senators that has little or no impact on the daily lives of the people we seek to represent.

As the ranking member of the Senate Rules Committee, I yield to no one except, as I mentioned earlier, the senior Senator from West Virginia, in my respect for the standing rules of the Senate, as intended by the Founding Fathers. The Senate is respected as the most deliberative body in the world. The rules, as I have suggested, of the Senate assure that such deliberation can occur, must occur, and that the rights of a minority will always be protected.

We are all familiar with the story of the conversation I mentioned a moment ago between Thomas Jefferson and George Washington in which Thomas Jefferson questioned the need for the United States Senate. Washington reportedly responded to Thomas Jefferson, as Jefferson was pouring his tea into a saucer to cool it during the informal discussion they were having, so legislation would be poured into the senatorial saucer to cool it, Washington suggested to Jefferson, and thus the value of the Senate.

Similarly, as reported by our own historian, Dick Baker, James Madison, writing to Thomas Jefferson, explained the Founding Fathers' vision of the Senate. Madison reminded Thomas Jefferson that the Senate was intended to be the ''anchor'' of the government. According to Madison, the Senate was ''a necessary fence against the fickleness and passion that tended to influence the attitudes of the general public

and Members of the House of Representatives.''

Within the first month of its convening, on March 4, 1789, this anchor, the Senate, recognized that to function efficiently rules were going to be required. Almost from the beginning there was a recognition of the need to separate the authorizing and appropriating functions of the Senate, the very matter with which rule XVI is concerned.

The first Senate rules were adopted on April 16, 1789, and the Senate adopted general revisions to those rules seven times over the 210-year history of our Nation, including revisions in 1806, 1820, 1828, 1868, 1877, 1884 and 1979. Although the current language of rule XVI did not appear until the 1979 revisions, the prohibition on adding general legislation to an appropriations bill had its roots in rule XXX of the 1868 revisions adopted in the 48th Congress. The 1868 general revisions were the ones last proposed by the special committee prior to the establishment of the Rules Committee as a standing committee in 1874.

I ask for an additional 5 minutes, if I may.

Mr. REID. Three minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. DODD. I thank my distinguished colleague from Nevada.

The 1877 general revisions expanded the 1868 rules to specifically prohibit amending general appropriations bills with general legislation, or with amendments not germane or relevant to the subject matter of the bill.

The next set of general revisions to the rules was adopted by the Senate during the 48th Congress, on January 11, 1884. These revisions renumbered the rules and consolidated the language regarding amendments to appropriations bills. The prohibition on including amendments to an appropriations bill dealing with general legislation as incorporated into Rule XVI.

Then in 1979, under the leadership of our colleague, Senator BYRD, a comprehensive revision of the standing rules of the Senate was adopted. These revisions contained the current language of rule XVI and rule XVIII, regarding the scope of conference reports.

I do not wish to belabor the history of the Senate rules with my colleagues, but I take this time to stress the historic importance of rule XVI in order to put the action of the majority leader in context.

The prohibition on legislating on appropriations bills has been part of the parliamentary fabric of this great deliberative body almost since its inception. And that should come as no surprise. The orderly consideration of legislation is paramount to the ''cooling'' effect of the Senate's deliberations.

For that reason, under normal circumstances, I would support the majority leader in his effort to restore the rule XVI point of order against legislating on appropriations bills. Under normal circumstances, I would agree that the rules offer Senators ample opportunity to engage in debate on legislation. Under normal circumstances, I would agree that appropriations bills are too important to be the subject of legislative amendments, especially given the need to keep the Federal Government running.

But these are not normal circumstances, Mr. President.

What brings us to this debate, again, has nothing to do with the longstanding notion that legislation ought not to be included on appropriations bills. I don't know of anyone who disagrees with that longstanding proposal. If taken alone, everything else being equal, if all the other rules which guarantee the right of this body to function, as intended by the Founding Fathers, then I would stand first and foremost in a long line, I presume, of my colleagues in demanding that rule XVI be upheld and that legislation be kept off appropriations bills. Unfortunately, you cannot look at rule XVI alone today. We have watched slowly, some would argue rapidly, over the last several years how the rules of the Senate, such as rule XVIII, have been so fundamentally altered that today this body de facto functions as a 99–100 Member reflection, not the antithesis, not the corollary, not the counterweight, but as a reflection of the House of Representatives. That is not as it should be. This body ought to function very differently.

In the four and one-half years since the Republicans regained the majority in this Chamber, we have witnessed a profound and regrettable change in the way we do business. Instead of allowing legislation to come to the floor for amendment and debate, the majority has seemingly used every opportunity to limit the minority's right to offer amendments and be heard.

It is this attempt to silence opposing views that poses the greatest threat to the Founding Fathers' vision of the Senate as an anchor for our democratic form of Government.

For example, the majority has repeatedly employed the tactic of combining a motion to proceed to a bill with the immediate filing of a cloture petition—which, by definition, is designed to limit debate. The cloture petition is then used as leverage to obtain a limit on the number of amendments and the allotted time for debate on the bill. In some cases, the majority has even insisted on approving, in advance, the very few amendments that the minority has been allowed to offer.

My colleagues might be surprised to learn that from 1996 to the present, the majority has tried to silence the debate by forcing the Senate to vote on 102 cloture petitions. But what is even more remarkable is that 33 of these votes—or nearly one in three—involved cloture petitions on motions to proceed.

While the majority are certainly within their rights and consistent with the rules to offer so many cloture petitions, it is not the norm. In fact, during the 4 years immediately preceding the 1994 elections, the Democratic leadership also availed itself of the procedural tactic of filing cloture on a motion to proceed—twice, on the motor voter bill. In general, Mr. President, cloture petitions on motions to proceed have been used by this majority to attempt to dictate the terms of debate. It is almost as if the majority does not want the American people to hear this deliberative body speak.

But cloture petitions are not the only silencing tactic employed by our friends in the majority. They also rely on the arcane parliamentary maneuver known as ''filling the amendment tree.''

Mr. President, I am willing to bet that only a handful of people in the world—most of whom are present in this chamber today—could provide a clear explanation of how one ''fills the tree.'' But the effect of such a parliamentary maneuver is clear. It is to choke off debate by making it impossible for any member to offer amendments that have not been approved by the senator who has filled the tree.

A review of the use of this tactic reveals that since 1995, the majority has ''filled the tree'', and thereby restricted debate, a total of 9 times. Most recently, this maneuver was used during the debate on the social security lockbox legislation and most notably on legislation to reform our system of campaign finance, where the tactic has been used repeatedly and with great effect to stymie the growing calls for reform.

Again, a comparison of the 4 years of Democratic leadership prior to the 1994 elections reveals that Senate Democrats used the parliamentary procedure sparingly—at most once. And the sponsor of the amendment at the time denied that the amendment tree had been filled.

Regrettably, Mr. President, since our friends in the Republican majority took office in 1994, there has been unprecedented use of parliamentary maneuvering to choke off debate and dictate the terms of the Senate's business. Under Republican leadership, the rules of the Senate no longer ensure the cooling off that was intended to take place here. Instead, the rules have become the majority's weapon to prevent the very deliberation, and even disagreement, that the Founding Fathers intended.

As we have seen time and again over the last 4 years, the most effective means for the minority to ensure that its voice is heard is by offering amendments for debate to must-pass legislation, such as the appropriations bills. Whether it be debate on raising the minimum wage for working Americans, or protecting taxpayers from arbitrary decisions by HMOs, the ability to amend appropriations bills has ensured

that the people's concerns can be heard.

If the Senate could return to the normal open and deliberative process that the founding fathers envisioned for it, I would welcome the reinstatement of rule XVI. But until that time comes, I must oppose the majority's efforts.

But if we are going to reform the rules, we should not stop with rule XVI. We should also restore rule XVIII to its original intent. Rule XVIII establishes a point of order against conference reports which contain provisions outside the scope of the conference. Again, under this majority, rule XVIII has been overturned so that today, conferees may insert any matter into privileged conference reports, even neither the Senate nor the House has debated the issue.

To deny Members the opportunity to be heard, to allow for a conference report to include extraneous matter never considered by either body, particularly when both Chambers are controlled by one party, to rush to cloture petitions with the incredible acceleration that the majority has authored over the last 4 or so years, undermines the role of this institution. One hundred of us serve in the Senate, have an obligation to represent our constituents, have an obligation to do the Nation's business. We also bear a collective responsibility, as temporary custodians of this valued institution, to see to it that its historical role will not be undermined, will not be changed by the precedents we establish in the conduct of our business.

Over the last 4 or so years, regretfully, the majority in this Chamber has so warped the rules of the Senate that the minority is denied the opportunity to raise critical issues the American public wants us to debate and on which they want to have our voices heard.

Without rule XVI, as presently enforced under the 1995 precedent, which allows us to raise the issues that we are denied to bring up under normal circumstances, and without rule XXVIII which prohibits matters which have not been publicly aired from being included in conference reports, it is not just a matter that I am denied the opportunity to be heard, it is that my constituents and the American public are denied an opportunity to be heard. We are their voices here.

So, for these reasons I will support the Democratic leader in his efforts to restore rule XXVIII to prohibit the majority from adding provisions in conference that have not been considered by either the House or the Senate. It flies in the face of common fairness to shut out the minority's opportunity to be heard on appropriations bills, but then allow the majority to have unlimited scope to add any provision to a privileged conference report.

I would urge my colleagues in the majority to think carefully before opposing Senator DASCHLE's amendment. When both the House and the Senate are in the hands of the same party, it is tempting to ignore rule XXVIII and use highly privileged conference reports to pass legislation that the minority in the Senate might otherwise attempt to stall by use of the Senate's rules.

But such a short-term view can come back to haunt a majority if the leadership changes in one of the houses of Congress. The tactic the majority uses today to shut out dissent and debate and force through legislation can just as easily be turned against it tomorrow by an opposing party.

In the end, rule XXVIII maintains the balance between the House and the Senate. The rule ensures that neither House, regardless of party, has so great a leverage over the other that it can force legislation through without debate.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to make it perfectly clear that Democrats are not asking for the right to control the Senate. The voters determine who is the majority. But as the majority, the Republican leadership knows that on any issue it can summon the votes to thwart a minority victory. Nonetheless, the constitution provides for a body that is intended to engage in full and open debate.

I urge my colleagues to restore the Senate to its place as the deliberative anchor of Government by supporting the Daschle amendment and opposing the restoration of rule XVI at this time. And I urge the majority, on behalf of history, to modify their behavior in the Senate and allow this institution to function as its creators and founders intended.

I thank my colleague from Nevada for the time.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the ranking member of the Rules Committee, Senator DODD.

At this time, I yield 25 minutes to the former President pro tempore of the Senate, former chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and former majority leader, Senator BYRD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator.

We have just witnessed what is wrong with this Senate. I have been yielded 25 minutes. We don't have time today to properly discuss one of the most fundamental questions that ever comes before this Senate: fundamental freedom of speech; freedom of debate; freedom to offer amendments.

I am limited to 25 minutes. Yes, I agreed to this 6-hour rule, but you can see how it is playing out. Most of the 3 hours allotted to the minority are being played out over here. Nobody is talking on the other side. Perhaps one, two, or three Senators will. I think the distinguished Senator who now presides over the Senate made some remarks earlier. But the point of it is, the minority will have said about all it has time to say under this agreement, and then its time will have run out. As a consequence, the majority will be able to speak during the latter hours or moments, and there won't be much time for real debate.

Mr. President, I am in my 41st year in this body. I was in the other body for 6 years. I saw the actions of the other body. When I came to the Senate, I wanted to come to the Senate. I wanted to come to a forum in which one could speak as long as his feet would hold him, as long as he could stand, and the floor could not be taken away from him by the Chair, a majority leader, or anybody else. He could speak for as long as he wished.

For all these years, I have talked about this institution, about its importance in the constitutional system, about the fact that it is the only forum of the States, the only forum in this Government, where small States such as West Virginia have the same powers, the same prerogatives, the same rights, along with the same responsibilities as the States that are great in territory and in population, such as California, Texas, Florida, New York, and others. I wanted to be in this forum. William Ewart Gladstone referred to the Senate of the United States, as ''that remarkable body, the most remarkable of all the inventions of modern politics.''

But it is getting to where this Senate is not so remarkable. There are things unique about the Senate that were meant to be unique, that were made unique by virtue of the framers of the Constitution. Among those, of course, is the responsibility to approve the resolutions of ratification of treaties, to approve nominations, and to act as a court in the trial of impeachments. But aside from those several unique things, the two things in particular that make this body the most unique of any upper body in the world, the most unique Senate that has ever existed—and there have been many senates—is the fact that this Senate has the right to amend bills, and Senators have the right to speak and to debate at length.

The right to debate and the right to amend: The right to amend is mentioned in that provision of the Constitution that says revenue bills shall originate in the House of Representatives, but the Senate shall have the right to amend as in all other bills. So there it is. The Senate has the right to amend, and Senators have the right to debate at length.

Now, I have been majority leader. I have been elected to the majority leadership three times—twice during the Carter years and once during the 100th Congress. When I came to the Senate, Lyndon Johnson was majority leader; then there was Mike Mansfield; I was the next majority leader; Howard Baker then became majority leader followed by Bob Dole, and then, in the 100th Congress, I was majority leader again, George Mitchell followed me as majority leader and then Bob Dole became the Majority Leader a second time. Mr. LOTT is now the majority

leader. So I have seen several majority leaders operate in this Senate.

Mr. President, I think the Senate is losing its uniqueness in that we are being deprived, in considerable measure, of the right to debate, the right to debate at length. If I come up here and want a few minutes to speak about the departing of some deceased friend, or some other matter—it may not be one of the great moments in history—I can't come up here and speak as I used to be able to. I can't get the floor. And when I get the floor, I am limited. I don't like that.

I can understand the importance of having time limitations, and we do enter into time limitations. We have always done that, when there is a unanimous consent agreement limiting time, or the Senate is operating under a cloture motion. Otherwise, there is no limitation on debate and there is no germaneness of amendments under the Senate rules, except under rule XVI, when appropriation matters are before the Senate and also when cloture is invoked. Otherwise, we have freedom of debate.

Woodrow Wilson said that the information function of the legislative branch is as important as the legislative function. It is through debate that we inform the American people. It is through debate that we better inform ourselves.

I was in a meeting with the British over the weekend, the British-American Group. We met in West Virginia at the Greenbrier. Senator REID was there. Senators on both sides of the aisle were there, including the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. DOMENICI. We didn't win or lose. We each came away being better informed by the other side. We didn't agree with the British point of view on certain issues and they didn't agree with ours, but we all came away better informed. We had a better understanding of what their viewpoint was and the reasons for it, and, hopefully, they have a better viewpoint of our reasoning.

But here in the Senate, it has become dog-eat-dog. It has become very partisan—very partisan. Politics is very important, and political party is important. But some things are more important than political party. One of those things is the right to debate and the right to amend. It isn't for the benefit of the Democratic Party that I want the right to amend. It is not for the benefit of the Democratic Party that I want the right to debate. It is for the benefit of the American people. That is why the Senate is here. There were no political parties when this Senate was first created. But it seems that, anymore, the idea is that the majority is always to have its way while the minority is to be shut out and, in some ways, gagged.

That approach does not benefit the people of America.

I say these things with misgivings because I have many friends on the other side of the aisle. I think that the Senators in the leadership on that side of the aisle are friends of mine. But we are talking about the Senate here today and not the party. I don't come to the Senate floor today emphasizing party. I am here today because I am seeing the right of the minority to engage in free debate and to offer amendments shut off in some instances.

There is a complaint here that too many amendments are offered on this side of the aisle to bills. This side of the aisle, as does that side of the aisle, has a right to offer whatever amendments they wish to offer.

When I was majority leader, I never said to the minority leader: Now, you are going to be limited. You have too many amendments. We are not going to take the bill up; or, we will let you have 5 amendments, or no more than 10. What are your amendments? I never said that.

I said to Members on both sides of the aisle: Let us know what your amendments are. Let the people at the front table here know what your amendments are on both sides. Call the Cloakrooms. Let's find out what amendments there are yet outstanding. There might have been 40. There might have been 55. There might have been 75. But I didn't go back and say: We are going to pull this bill down if you do not cut your amendments down to 10. Never did I say that. Never did I say you can only call up five, or so, amendments. How many do you have? Then we got the list. Then I said: Now, let's try to get a unanimous consent to limit the amendments to this number—whatever it was, be it 50 or 60 or whatever. Let's try to get an agreement to limit the amendments to this list.

So when we put that word out, other amendments came out of the wall—another half a dozen and another dozen. They just kept coming.

But finally we had a list of amendments. We agreed that those then would be all. Then we would go to the individual Members on the list and say: Are you willing to enter into a time agreement on your amendment?

Sometimes some of the amendments would peel off and we wouldn't end up with all that many amendments, or Members would be agreeable to a time limit. But never did I attempt to muzzle the minority.

I took the position, let the minority call up their amendments. We can move to table them. Or, in many instances, they insisted on an up-or-down vote, and we gave them an up-or-down vote. We could defeat the amendment, in many instances. But in some instances their amendments carried, which was all right. That is what the legislative process is all about.

The majority is not always right as we have often seen throughout the course of history. Many times the minority throughout history has been right. We are not serving the good interests of the American people when we muzzle the ox.

The Bible says: ''Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn.'' The Senate is the ox. It is the central pillar of this Republic. This isn't a democracy; it is a Republic. The Senate is the central pillar. The Senate is where we can debate at length and offer amendments.

As long as there is a Senate and men and women can debate to their hearts' content and offer amendments, the people's liberties will be secure. But once the Senate is muzzled, the people's liberties are in danger.

The majority is virtually all powerful here. They have the votes, which is all right, but they must recognize that the minority has rights. That is why the Senate is like it is. That is what it was meant to be—a bastion for protection of the minority.

Many times when I was leader I insisted on the rights of the minority on that side of the aisle. I said that there may come a time when we Democrats would be in the minority. I say that to the majority today. You have been in the minority. There may come a time when you will again be in the minority.

We must be respectful of the constitutional rights of Senators who represent the States and the people. We must be respectful of those rights. If it takes longer—if it takes longer than three days or a week to do the work—then let's do the work. That is why we are sent here.

But we should not forget the reason for the Senate's being. I came from the House of Representatives. I never wanted this body to become another House of Representatives. The Senate is unique in that respect, and we must not give away the uniqueness of this body. This is not a second House of Representatives. We ought to understand that. The Constitution made the Senate different from the other body, and we ought to do our utmost to keep this as an institution where debate is unlimited and where Senators have the right to offer non-germane amendments.

I don't enter into these bickerings and these discussions very often. I am no longer in the elected leadership. Senators do not hear me saying these things often. But I have always been interested in the Senate as an institution. If the Senate is not the institution that it was meant to be, whose fault is it? The people who make up the Senate—it is our fault.

I wanted to speak out on this. I am not interested in who wins on every political battle that is fought here. I am not interested from a party standpoint always. Party isn't all that important to me. But I am interested in the Senate. I want it to remain the institution that it was meant to be.

I wish we would get away from the idea that we ought to make this a more efficient institution. The Senate was not meant to be efficient. The institution was meant to be a debating forum where ideas would be expressed, and through the medium of debate the right consensus would be hammered out on the anvil.

I hear it said: Well, if there are too many amendments, the bill will be taken down. I would suggest that if we want to stop so many legislative amendments from being offered to appropriations bills, then let's call up some of the legislative bills. Let's call up authorization bills.

When I was the majority leader, there were times we had to authorize legislation on appropriations bills because the authorizing committees sometimes did not do their work. For example, there were years when we had to reauthorize State Department legislation on appropriations bills, because the authorizing committee simply did not do its work. But if bills reported from legislative committees are not called up in the Senate, Senators who are interested in amendments to such legislation do not have the opportunity to offer their amendments. Consequently, when appropriations bills are called up, Senators will offer legislation on appropriations bills, because it is their only opportunity. They have no other opportunity, no other legislative vehicle on which to call their amendments up, so they are forced to offer their legislative amendments to appropriations bills. That is why we have the problem with appropriations bills that we are having.

Another problem we are having when we go to conference with the other body is that major legislation that has not been before either body is added in conference. We talk about the upper House and the lower House. There is a Third House. The conference committee has become a Third House, where hundreds of millions of dollars, even billions of dollars and major legislation are added in conference and come back to each body in a conference report. We have no opportunity to amend that conference report. Authorizing measures are added in conference that have not been before either body. They are stuck in, in conference—in the ''Third House,'' as I want to name it.

Another flaw in that operation is that it gives the executive branch too much power, in some instances all power, because, as we saw last year when it got down to the conferences on the final appropriations bills, eight appropriations bills were wrapped into the conference report, one I believe a supplemental, and tax legislation all in that conference report. These items had not been properly taken up before either body.

And, as a result, who sat in? Who made the decisions in conference? The decisions in conference for the more important legislation were made by the Speaker of the House, the majority leader of the Senate—both of whom were Republican—and the President's agents.

Who represented the Democrats in the conference? The executive branch. We Senate and House Democrats weren't represented in those higher echelons. We were left out. The Democratic minority in the House and Senate was not represented in the conference. It was the Republican leadership of both Houses and the President of the United States, through his OMB Director.

That is not the way it is supposed to be. That galls me, to think that in appropriations matters of that kind the executive branch calls the shots in many instances and we House and Senate Democrats are not even represented. The Democrats in the Senate, the Democrats in the House, are left out. That is not the way it ought to be. But that is the result of our delaying action on separate appropriations bills. Then they are all put into an omnibus bill. At the end, we vote on that bill without knowing what is in it. How many hundreds of millions, how many billions of dollars may have been added in conference? And we vote on the conference report when we really do not know what is in it. That galls me.

I think we ought to reinstitute rule XXVIII. I voted to uphold the Chair when rule XVI was changed here, and when the Senate overruled the Chair, I voted to uphold the Chair. I favor the reinstitution of rule XVI. But because of the muzzling of the minority, because the minority is not allowed to offer as many amendments as we need to offer, I am going to uphold the Chair's position today.

Mr. REID. I yield the Senator 5 more minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

I am not going to vote to go back to rule XVI. I want to go back. I do not like the vote I am going to cast. But how else am I going to protest?

I think the minority should have the opportunity to offer its amendments, and not jerk a bill down just because amendments are coming in from the minority side.

Another thing: There is no rule of, as I say, germaneness or relevancy in the Senate. When we call up bills, except for the two instances which I referred to there, cloture and on appropriations bills under rule XVI, there is no rule of relevancy to say: Cut down your amendments; we will give you 5 amendments or 10 amendments and they have to be relevant. Who said they have to be relevant? The rules of the Senate don't say they have to be relevant. But if an appropriation bill is the only vehicle you are ever going to have on which to try to take a shot at something that is not relevant, you have to take it. And the minority is being robbed of that opportunity. The minority is being placed under the gag rule. It is being laid down here: You will do it our way or we will jerk the bill down. You have to do it our way. You have to limit your amendments to 5 or 6 or 8 or 10—no more. That is not in this Senate rule book. That is not in this Constitution. And it is not in the best interests of the American people that the Senate is being run that way.

Personally, I have a very high regard for the leadership on the other side, for the individuals themselves. I have a high regard for Senators on the other side of the aisle. Some of the finest Senators I know sit on that side of the aisle. Some of the most knowledgeable Senators I know are on that side of the aisle. Some of the smartest Senators are on that side of the aisle.

But, Mr. President, I am talking about the Senate as an institution, and I do not want and I do not intend to see us run over continually and denied the opportunity to offer amendments, and to debate, without a shot being fired.

I stacked the legislative tree very few times when I was leader. But very few times did I resort to that. My rule was one of the basic reasons for the Senate to let the minority have their rights, because as long as the minority have their rights in this forum, the people's liberties will not be taken from them. I want the minority to be given their rights.

Mr. President, I am going to close with the words of Aaron Burr, who spoke to the Senate in 1805, on March 5, after presiding over the Senate for 4 years. He said:

> This House is a sanctuary; a citadel of law, of order, and of liberty; and it is here—it is here, in this exalted refuge; here, if anywhere, will resistance be made to the storms of political phrensy and the silent arts of corruption; and if the Constitution be destined ever to perish by the sacrilegious hands of the demagogue or the usurper, which God avert, its expiring agonies will be witnessed on this floor.

Mr. President, I think we are seeing something akin to its expiring agonies because the Senate is not being allowed to fulfill its purposes for being. It is not being allowed to work its will. The people are being denied. It is not just the Democrats at this moment who are being denied, it is the people who are being denied the right of the minority in this Senate to speak their wills, to offer their amendments, to fully debate the legislation that is in the interests of the people.

In the interest of the people, I urge the leadership, I implore the leadership to stop thinking so much, as apparently it does, in terms of who will win today—''we have to win on this one.'' Let's think of the people. Protect the rights of the minority, allow full freedom to debate and amend, and the people's rights and the people's liberties will be secured.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, Senator DOMENICI and I are here to talk about the tax cut, but I cannot listen to our dear colleague from West Virginia without giving a little bit of response.

First of all, I agree with virtually everything the Senator from West Virginia has said. I do believe we tread on our institution and we potentially reduce its ability to preserve our freedom and our Republic when we engage in

partisan politics. I agree with virtually every word Senator BYRD said.

We all know we have used the appropriations process to offer amendments that were not part of any national agenda, that did not represent any real debate on behalf of causes, but in many cases both parties have engaged in the kind of politics where the minority—and that minority changes sides from time to time. I hope that will not occur in the future, but knowing institutions as I do, I am sure it will. What happens is, too often, the minority delays the work of the majority, and then at the time for electioneering accuses the majority of not getting its work done. If we ought to preserve this great institution and all we love about it and all it stands for for America, one of the things we have to do is to prevent partisan abuse of the system.

When we voted to overturn the Chair now several years ago, I was very reluctant to overturn the Chair. I found myself in a position of having a colleague who had offered an amendment with which I strongly agreed and who also was in a position where it was critically important to her to see the Chair overturned. I knew no good could come out of it. I thought it would be easier to fix than it has turned out to be. I intend to vote to fix it today.

I do not believe we ought to be legislating on appropriations bills. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia is correct in that it has become so easy for the authorization process to be disrupted that we have virtually trivialized authorizations. Authorization committees often go an entire term without having any kind of authorization bill passed. Legislation builds up, we end up putting it on appropriations bills, and in doing so, we also hurt the institution.

I have heard every word our colleague from West Virginia has said. I believe we do need to set a threshold for offering legislation on an appropriations bill. It can be overcome with 51 votes. But every Member has to know that when they do that, when they overrule the Chair, they open that avenue for anyone else to do it in the future. In doing so, we take down a small shield which I think is as big as it needs to be, because there are times when the minority deserves the right to speak, and if they feel strongly enough about it and they can convince a majority to do it, they have a right to do it.

I intend to vote today to put rule XVI back into place. I do not intend to be in any hurry to see it pulled down again because it is a very good and important barrier.

Mr. REID. Will my friend from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. GRAMM. I will be happy to yield very briefly.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's statement regarding Senator BYRD's brilliant statement, but I also say to my friend from Texas, there is also going to be an amendment offered by the minority leader to change rule XXVIII—Senator BYRD spoke at some length about that—to stop the procedure whereby we wind up with an appropriations bill that is 1,500 pages long, that has been negotiated by two or three people from the House, a couple of people from the Senate, the President's emissaries, and we get this big bill. A rule XXVIII change would say if you have a bill going to conference, you can only deal with the matters brought up in conference. Does my friend from Texas also agree with Senator BYRD that it would be a good idea to change that?

Mr. GRAMM. I do not believe I will. It is something that should be looked at. I remind our colleague from Nevada that our effort today is not to change the rules of the Senate but to put the rules back where they were before we overrode the Chair on the endangered species provision to an appropriations bill, now several years ago.

Senator BYRD has raised a critically important issue. Too much work is done in conference. Anyone who has ever chaired a conference—and I am relatively new at it as a new committee chairman—immediately discovers that the only rule of the conference is you have to get a majority of the members to sign the conference report. Other than that, for all practical purposes, there are no rules.

This should be looked at, but I am not ready today to change the rules of the Senate. I am ready to go back and undo a mistake that we made some 4 or 5 years ago. I will be willing to look at this. I will be willing to study it, to participate in a discussion about it. We ought to hold hearings on it and look at it, but I am not ready to overturn the rules of the Senate today.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRAMM. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first, I did not understand what the Senator from Texas said when he talked about 20 minutes and he and I being on the floor. Did he intend to share that?

Mr. GRAMM. I had intended to use less than that. The Senator can get any amount of time he wants.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senator from Texas is finished, I be allowed to proceed for up to 20 minutes thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Parliamentary inquiry. Will the Chair state how much time the minority has remaining and how much time the majority has remaining. I think that will be helpful to the two Senators on the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority has 33 minutes; the majority has 144 minutes.

Mr. REID. I will take 1 minute and say to my friend from Texas, the activities today on rule XVI are directly related to the rule and the same thing on rule XXVIII. All we are trying to do with rule XXVIII is to restore it to the way it used to be, just like rule XVI.

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if the Senator will permit me to make an observation on my time.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, he can make it on my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I was here, as was the Senator from Texas, when the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, spoke. What kept coming to my mind was: When are Senators from authorizing committees expected to bring their bills to the floor and have votes? I came up with a very simple conclusion, with which my friend, Senator BYRD, will not agree, but I want to state it anyway.

The problem we find ourselves in where Senators must offer authorizing legislation time and time again on appropriations bills comes about because this institution, this beloved Senate, insists on doing every single appropriations bill every single year. There is no time for anything else. That is the real problem. Then we do a budget resolution every single year. I believe there is a number around that we use up about 67 to 70 percent of the available time of the Senate on just those two functions.

I hope, as we consider trying for 2-year appropriations and 2-year budgets, my good friend from West Virginia will be participating. We would like to hear his views. But I hope we can make the case that for the betterment of this institution, which he expressed my views on today when he spoke of how important it is to America, I have learned, as he has learned—when I came to the Senate, I was not steeped like him, so I did not know about it—it is to be a revered institution, and I want to keep it that way.

My last observation is, I think I might have been able to get up—not under your majority leadership, but sometime during my 28 years here, most of which was as a minority Member—and make the same speech you just made as to the leadership on that side of the aisle when your side was in the majority, because when you have what we are having take place here with fair regularity, as we try to pass 13 appropriations bills, and we hear the other side—not you, Senator—the other side say: You will not pass them until we get to take up our agenda—and their agenda is not appropriations; it is a list of eight or nine items that are their agenda; and in this body they are probably minority views, but they want to get them up—then I say that is a challenge to the majority leader.

That is hard stuff, because how do you then get the appropriations bills done and not have six of them wrapped up into one, which you just talked about, and put everything else in it but the kitchen sink?

So, frankly, I appreciate your discussion today. Clearly, it is intended to help your side of the aisle in a debate on whether or not the appropriations bills should have more authorizing amendments on them that Senators on your side want to offer. In joining

them, I commend you. It is pretty obvious to this Senator you have joined them so that you can make their case that they ought to be permitted.

But I also say, if you were in Senator LOTT's shoes, or if I were, and you were being told on every one of these bills this is another one we are going to get something that is the minority agenda, and you will have to vote on it or else, I would be looking for ways to get the appropriations bills done.

Mr. BYRD. Would the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is under the control of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has asked me a question. He said: If you were here and Senators on the other side of the aisle said that——

Mr. DOMENICI. I did not make it a question. But if you think it is a question——

Mr. BYRD. I thought you said——

Mr. DOMENICI. I ended with a period; it wasn't a question mark.

Mr. GRAMM. I yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. But I will be glad to have your answer.

Mr. BYRD. The answer to that is, call up authorization bills. Let Members on this side offer their nongermane amendments to them. Then come to the appropriations bills, and the Senators on this side will have already had their chance. Call the legislative bills up. Why not have those bills called up? What are we afraid of?

The numbers are on that side of the aisle. As I said to the distinguished majority leader on one occasion: You have the numbers; you have the votes. Why not let the Democrats call up their amendments? You can beat them. You can reject them. You can table them. But if you do not have the votes to defeat them, perhaps that amendment is in the best interest of the country. And the Senate will have worked its will.

May I close by saying this—and I thank you for giving me this privilege—reference has been made to the time when I was majority leader, very graciously by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, because he stated it was not done during my tenure of leadership while he has been here. But over one-third of the Senate today—over one-third of today's Senators—were not here when I was majority leader of the Senate.

I walked away from that position at the end of 1988 and became chairman of the Appropriations Committee in January 1989. More than one-third of the Senators were not here when I was majority leader. Even the distinguished majority leader, Mr. LOTT, was not in this body when I was majority leader.

But when I was majority leader, I say again, I attempted to protect the rights of the minority because I saw that as one of the reasons for the Senate's being.

I thank both Senators. Both Senators have been very kind to me and very courteous. I think very highly of them both. I respect their viewpoints.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. We are always kind to the Senator from West Virginia for two reasons: One, we love him; and, two, we know that we had best not be unkind to him because we know he is smart and tough.

TAX CUTS

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I want to say a few words about taxes. I want to deviate from my background in schoolteaching to be brief because I have to run over for a 2:30 meeting on the banking bill and I want to hear a little bit of what the Senator from New Mexico has to say before I leave.

We are beginning a debate that is a very proper and important debate. I am frustrated in this debate because, in trying to discuss this issue with the White House, we have a concerted effort on their part to try to confuse the issue and mislead the American people as to what the choices are.

I want to direct my comments to the choice we face. Basically, we have the great and good fortune of having two things that have occurred at the same time. No. 1, beginning in the mid-1980s we started the process of gaining control over spending. It was not a dramatic change in policy, but over the years we have seen a gradual slowdown in the rate of growth in Government spending, beginning in the mid-1980s.

In the early 1990s we started to see an explosion of productivity as modern technology became incorporated in the workplace in America, and the result has been rapid economic growth and, with that economic growth, a growth in Federal revenues. We therefore have a situation which anyone would dream of having during their period of service in public life, and that is, we have a very large budget surplus.

Initially, the President proposed spending part of the surplus that comes from Social Security. I am proud to say that Senator DOMENICI, I, and others rejected that, and finally the President reached an agreement with us, in the best spirit of bipartisanship, that we were not going to spend the Social Security trust fund.

We are trying to lock that into law in the so-called Social Security lockbox. We have an agreement with the President on the principle. We have not reached an agreement with the President and with the minority party in the Senate on exactly how to lock it up, but we are working on that.

The debate we are beginning today is a debate about what to do with the surplus that comes from the general budget that does not come from Social Security, and, try as they may at the White House to confuse the issue and to mislead the public, there really are two stark choices being presented to the American people.

The first choice is presented by the President and his administration. In regard to what is called the President's mid-session review, the Congressional Budget Office, which is the nonpartisan budget arm of the Congress, reviewed both the Republican budget and the budget submitted by the President. They concluded that the President's budget proposes $1.033 trillion worth of new Government spending on approximately 81 new programs, above and beyond increases for inflation.

That $1.033 trillion of new spending that the President's budget has proposed is so big that it not only uses up, for all practical purposes, the non-Social Security surplus, but in 3 of the next 10 years it will require plundering the Social Security trust fund or running an outright non-Social Security deficit because the level of spending is too big.

As an alternative, Republicans have proposed that out of the $1 trillion non-Social Security surplus, we give $792 billion back to the working people of America who sent the money to Washington to begin with and that we keep $200 billion plus to meet the basic needs of the country and to meet uncertainties we might face.

That is a pretty clear choice. The President's budget says spend $1.033 trillion on new Government programs. That is how they would use the non-Social Security surplus. Our proposal says, take about 80 percent of it and give it back to working people in broad tax cuts and keep 20 percent of it to meet critical needs and to deal with contingencies.

If that were the debate we were having, Republicans might be winning the debate, we might be losing the debate, but we would be having a meaningful debate. The problem is, the administration continues to mislead the American public and basically to claim they are not proposing to spend this money. While proposing $1 trillion of new spending, they say that, by giving less than $800 billion back to the public in tax cuts, in the words of the President, we ''imperil the future stability of the country.'' This is quoting the President at a fundraiser, naturally, in Colorado, that by giving this $800 billion back in tax cuts, we ''imperil the future stability of the country.'' Yet to spend $1.033 trillion on new programs, the President would do wonderful things for the country.

If the President were honest enough to stand up and say, Don't let Senator DOMENICI, don't let Senator LOTT, don't let Senator GRAMM give this money back to working people, let me spend it, I would have no objections to the debate. But I have to say that it begins to grate on a person when day after day after day this administration says things that are verifiably false with a level of dishonesty in public debate that is without precedent in the history of this country. No administration in debate on public policy has ever been as dishonest as this administration is. When you look at the actual numbers in their budget and then listen to what they are saying, it is as if

we are talking about two totally separate budgets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 20 minutes have expired.

Mr. GRAMM. I yield the floor so Senator DOMENICI may speak.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 30 minutes prior to the vote at 5:30 be equally divided between the two leaders so they can have the last word on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the distinguished Senator from Texas has joined me on the floor and that I am permitted to join him in the beginning of a debate. I know the Senator has to leave, and I will try to make my most succinct points in the next 5 minutes.

First, I will share with the American people, and in particular with my friend, how I see giving back some money to the taxpayers versus what else we are going to do with the surplus. I choose today, even though I looked around for a different dollar, an American dollar. This one is not signed by the new Secretary of the Treasury. I looked for one. I am not sure he signed any yet. This is one signed by his predecessor.

I want everybody to look at that. It represents, in my analogy today, the entire surplus that is going to be generated. According to the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget, using moderate economics, even assuming we are going to have a couple of downturns or recessions in the next 10 years, the total surplus we are going to accumulate is this number, if you will all just look at this chart. It is a little bigger than the Senator has been using, and the numbers are a little bigger in terms of how much we have left over to be spent, but it is $3.37 trillion in the next decade.

Mr. GRAMM. You are using Social Security.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am using everything. This represents everything. Here is what the President says. The President says: Spend it all. Is that true? Does he say spend it all?

Well, look here. Here is a chart showing the entire $3.71 trillion. He says, and we say, put $1.9 trillion of it on the debt by putting it in a lockbox for Social Security. Then the Congressional Budget Office evaluates the rest of the President's proposal. Here it is in yellow. It is $1.27 trillion, and every bit of that is literally spent, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

The President will argue about that because he even says he has a tax cut. We have looked at the tax cut he proposed. Not PETE DOMENICI, not PHIL GRAMM, but the Joint Tax Commission evaluated it. They said it is not even a tax cut. It is an expenditure. It is in this spending, because the President is saying, collect taxes, give some of it back to some people so they can save it, but you are giving them tax dollars; you are not cutting their taxes. That is an expenditure of tax money.

Believe it or not, when you do that, the President increases taxes in his budget by $95 billion.

Let me use the same dollar and let me share it with the Senator. Here is the entire accumulated surplus. Republicans say very simply, here are two quarters. We are going to put those two quarters into the Social Security trust fund, 50 percent. The number that is available for spending is bigger than the Senator said. It is $434 billion for Medicare and other highly critical Federal programs, if there are any. So I am going to say one quarter for spending. And, lo and behold, what is the other quarter for? Tax cuts.

I ask the American people, out of $1, is 25 cents given back to the American people for overtaxation too big a tax cut? Is it something we should become worried about, that we are going to destroy our Government?

I believe the truth of the matter is that you can't have any tax cuts if you propose what the President has proposed, because I will show you again what he proposes. On Social Security, he finally came our way, as the Senator said, and said put it all in a trust fund. All of the rest is spent.

Let me ask, if we spend it all, is there any left for tax cuts? I mean, by definition, he is spending it all so there is nothing left for tax cuts.

A lot has been said about the distinguished economic stalwart of America, Dr. Alan Greenspan, in the last few days. What has he said about it? I want to tell my colleagues that regardless of what was said in the last few days, Alan Greenspan has essentially made two statements about a surplus. I will give verbatim one of them from January 29 before our committee. Here is what he said: I would prefer that we keep the surplus in place; that is, reduce the debt. ''If that proves politically infeasible,'' he said, ''cutting taxes is far superior to spending, as far as the long-term stability of the fiscal system and the economy is concerned.''

In the last speech he made, and I quote: ''Only if Congress believes that the surplus will be spent rather than saved is a tax cut wise.''

Now, we don't have to guess about that. Why do we not have to guess about that? Because the President has already told us he is going to spend it. So Dr. Greenspan said, if you are going to spend it, it is far better for America's economic future to cut taxes.

Essentially it seems to this Senator that we are being sold a bill of goods.

We are being told that to spend one quarter of the surplus, that giving back the American people some of their overtaxation is risky to the economy. Dr. Alan Greenspan said the riskiest thing to do with the surplus is to spend it. That is what he just said. We are saying that we agree with him. We think it is too risky to do what the President is recommending. He will, by the time he is finished, have spent every cent of it, and he will call some of it ''saving Medicare.''

I want everybody to know this. Let's look at this chart again. I don't know how much it is going to cost for the Finance Committee and the House Members to fix Medicare. They are working on it. They have all worked terribly hard on a bipartisan commission, and the President shot it down. Senator BREAUX was involved in that, and he believed that we had one going. What we are saying—and this is very, very important—when we have completed our tax cut, there is $434 billion left for a Medicare fix, Medicare reform, and prescription drugs, if you want it, and for other highly important programs, such as education, defense, and others. In fact, we might, as the debate goes on, put together a budget and come to the floor and show how this $434 billion might be used so that everyone will know there is money for education, if that is what you want, and there is money for Medicare reform, if that is what you want, and there is money for defense, because we have been told that that is what is left over as a surplus item, and it doesn't belong to Social Security. So it is either used for tax cuts or it is spent. We are saying: Save a quarter of it, give it back in tax dollars, and put a quarter of it in a rainy day fund, so to speak—a quarter of the dollar I showed you.

I want to close with a few more comments.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the Senator yield before he gets into his closing remarks?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, let me make a point that I think goes right to the heart of the statement by the President that something is extreme about our fairly modest tax cut. I have a chart here that I wish every American could see and understand. It shows the percentage of the economy that was coming to Government the day Bill Clinton became President.

The day Bill Clinton became President, the Government was collecting in taxes 17.8 cents out of every dollar earned by every American. As you will recall, in 1993, we had a very big tax increase, and with the growth in the economy, the Government is now taking in 20.6 percent of every dollar earned by every American. If we took the entire surplus—not the $794 billion being proposed by Republicans, but the whole $1.33 trillion, or whatever it is—if we took the whole surplus, which we are not proposing to do, and gave it back in a tax cut, 10 years from now, when it was fully implemented, the Federal Government would still be taking 18.8 percent of every dollar earned in taxes, which is substantially more than it was the day Bill Clinton became President.

So what Bill Clinton is calling a ''dangerous, huge tax cut'' is actually a

relatively modest tax reduction as compared to the tax increase and revenue growth that has occurred in the 6½ years that Bill Clinton has been President, even if we cut taxes by the amount of the entire surplus, which we are not proposing to do. But even if we did, the tax burden would still be higher than it was the day Bill Clinton became President. That is a point I think people need to understand.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to wrap this up, and I intend to do this everywhere I can, anyplace I am asked, on any TV show I can get on. In summary, plain and simple, it is the following: The man who is most responsible for a good American economy is probably Dr. Alan Greenspan of the Federal Reserve Board. He has said:

> I would prefer that we keep the surplus in place and reduce the public debt. If that proves politically infeasible, cutting taxes is far superior to spending it.

Here is the Republican budget: Debt reduction in Social Security, in literal numbers. I used in the summary 50 percent; it is actually 56 percent. Literally, the tax cut is less than a quarter; it is 23 percent. The money left over for Medicare and other programs is 20.1 percent. Frankly, that is a good plan. That is balanced, and it is not risky.

Here it is encapsulated in another manner. Here is the President's plan: Of the $3.3 trillion accumulated over the next decade, $1.901 trillion goes into Social Security and debt service. He contends he has done more in debt service than we have. Frankly, who do you believe? We believe the Congressional Budget Office. They say we are putting more on the debt than the President is. So when his emissaries get on television and say ''we want to reduce the debt,'' the implication is that Republicans don't. But we are doing the same amount, or more, than the President. It is right there.

The President then says that they don't want to do any tax cuts because, if you look at his budget, according to the Congressional Budget Office, including a tax cut—which is not a tax cut—he spends every nickel of it. If you want to talk about a risky policy, that is a risky policy. From what I can tell, that is what Dr. Alan Greenspan said would be the worst thing to do—to spend all the surplus.

Last, our plan: Debt reduction and Social Security trust fund encapsulated, so they can't be spent, in a lockbox. Tax cuts, $794 billion, and for expenditure items that are very necessary, such as Medicare, education, defense, and others, there is $434 billion left over.

Now, it is very difficult when the Secretary of the Treasury—the new one—gets on talk shows and says what a risky policy this is. He talks about the fact that they want to preserve or do more on the debt than we do. We are bound by the Congressional Budget Office in the Congress, and they tell us we are doing as much, or more, than the President in that regard. They tell us the President is spending every dime of the surplus on one program or another, or for a tax cut that is not a tax cut. And they maintain that a Republican plan that says, use 75 cents on a dollar for Social Security, debt reduction, Medicare, and domestic priorities, and give 25 percent back to the public, is risky. What is risky about it? Is it risky to give 25 cents out of a dollar back to the public to spend and less risky to keep it here and let the Federal Government spend it? I don't believe anyone would agree it is more risky to give some of it back to Americans and let them spend it, as compared with keeping it here and spending the entire 100 percent of the surplus on Federal Government-controlled programs and projects.

Whatever time I have remaining, I yield back, and I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAPO addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. President, I will commit most of my time to comments on the debate with regard to returning to the full import of Rule XVI. However, before I do that, I want to comment on the debate that has just taken place regarding tax relief. I think it is critical that we in America today understand that we have moved into a time of budget surplus, just what those surpluses mean, and what the opportunities are for the American people.

Prior to the last 3 or 4 years, we saw, I think, that most Americans became accustomed to the fact we were running very large deficits, and that the Federal Government was not able to conduct its fiscal policy in a manner that was balanced. One of the commitments I made when I ran for the House of Representatives 6 years ago was to work to try to balance the Federal budget. Fortunately, for me, and I think for all Americans, we were able to successfully achieve that objective.

The budget today is balanced. In fact, the projections we just heard talked about show that no matter how you look at the budget—whether you count the Social Security dollars, which I don't think should be counted, or whether you don't—we are moving into a balanced posture for the Federal Government.

The debate today is over what we do in a surplus posture. It is a debate that Americans have not been able to have for decades because our Government has not run surpluses. Now that we are engaged in this debate, it is critical for Americans to focus and to identify what our fiscal policy should be as we move into an era of projected surpluses.

In that context, I think it is critical that a few important priorities be recognized and acknowledged by the country.

First and foremost, I am glad we have agreement on the principle, even though we don't have agreement on the details yet, that we have to protect the Social Security trust fund surplus dollars, and make certain that what Americans pay into the Social Security system is not then taken by Congress and the President and spent on other spending by counting those surpluses against the unified budget.

We have a lock—in a way, a lockbox—which is now before the Senate that we have voted on six or seven times this year. We have to make sure those parts of the surplus remain dedicated to the Social Security trust fund. With the remainder of what I call the true budget, the onbudget surplus, we have to decide as a country on what we are going to focus.

Over the next 10 years, we will have a surplus somewhere in the neighborhood of $1 trillion. You have heard different numbers discussed today. I think it is important that we not continue the path of growing the Federal Government, expanding the spending posture of the Federal Government, and spending those surplus dollars. If we do so, we will find a time in the near future when we will not be able to maintain surpluses in our budget; we will return to deficits, and we will see the national debt continue to rise.

As a result of that, I think it is critical we focus on two high priorities. One is to reduce the national debt. Although we have balanced the Federal budget, we haven't reduced the national debt to zero. That should be one of our highest priorities. Two is to make sure that we return to the American people a tax cut.

The American people recognize that this is an opportunity. It is an opportunity that we may not have too many times as we work through these difficult budget times to achieve tax relief. But to use, as the Senator from New Mexico indicated, just one quarter of this total surplus picture for tax relief I think is an appropriate commitment.

That leaves us the opportunity to provide resources to parts of our Federal obligation that need strengthening. It gives us and the American people the opportunity to strengthen and to stabilize the Social Security trust fund. It is a sound policy.

I think America should begin to focus on this debate as Congress works its way into a very important new era: How do we deal with budget surpluses?

RESTORATION OF THE ENFORCEMENT OF RULE XVI—Continued

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I came to the floor to talk about the question that we will vote on at 5:30; namely, will we restore the meaning of rule XVI?

Over the last 2 or 3 months, there has been a lot of debate and discussion among us in the Senate on this issue. One part of that debate has been that it was the Republicans who changed the rule by voting to override it a couple of years ago. The Democrats at that time voted not to override it.

Today, you have the anomaly on the floor where the Republicans are saying let's restore that rule because it was a mistake to override it, and the minority is saying we don't want to restore that rule because it is something that we are able to use as a tool in the current climate.

I wasn't here 2 years ago. I am in the seventh month of my first year in the Senate. I wasn't a part of that debate. But I can go back to 7 years ago now when I ran for Congress. I ran for the House of Representatives. One of the things I said then was that I thought a problem in our system in Washington was the fact that amendments were being put forward by Members of the House and the Senate—Republican and Democrat—that were not related to that legislation.

I come from Idaho. In the Idaho Legislature, that is not allowed. You can't offer an amendment to a bill that doesn't relate to the bill on which you are working. I think that is probably the way it is in most State legislatures. It is the way the Senate rules require that we operate.

I think one of the other Senators who was debating it earlier in the day indicated that these are not new rules we are fighting over now in this rather partisan era of politics. The genesis of this approach was way back in, I think, 1868 in one of the earlier predecessors to this rule XVI, when it was recognized by the Members of the Senate that proper legislative protocol was that the bill on the floor should be amended by amendments that were related only to that bill.

Why would we have a big debate over that concept?

When I was running for office 6 years ago, I thought there was a pretty strong national understanding that one of the problems we were facing in the Federal Government was the fact that legislation was proliferating, spending was proliferating, and there seemed to be no way to bring it under control. Part of the problem was all of the nongermane or unrelated legislation that was being tacked on as riders to legislation that was moving through. Legislation that wouldn't necessarily have the ability to move on its own was being attached to a vehicle that was moving through, and then that vehicle would carry it through to success and enactment into law.

I believe that is wrong legislating. That is the wrong policy under which we should legislate. I think it results in bad policy decisions being worked into law because they are attached to something else that has the ability to carry them over the finish line when they themselves don't have the merit to be enacted.

I believe that is why in 1868 the Senate proposed the predecessor to this rule that would start the Senate down the road of having a protocol that you could not put amendments on legislation that was not relevant to that legislation.

What does rule XVI say? What does the rule we are fighting over say?

Sometimes people say to me these procedural issues are arcane and you shouldn't spend so much time worrying about them. But, frankly, I think it is critical. There is an issue that is important to this institution, and it is important to America. It has a very big impact on the kinds of policy decisions that this Nation will make.

What does the rule we are fighting over say? It says:

> On a point of order made by any Senator, no amendment offered by any other Senator which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriations bill, nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received, nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto.

That is a sensible statement of what the policy should be. This rule says as to appropriations bills—I think that we should have it be that way with regard to all bills—an amendment that doesn't relate to that bill is not in order.

That is the issue we are debating today.

I was on the floor earlier when several of my colleagues from the other side gave very strong and impassioned arguments as to why they are going to vote against this legislation.

Actually, as Senator GRAMM from Texas indicated, after listening to those same arguments, I found very little that I disagreed with in their debate about what they believe should be the protocol of the Senate and what they believe should be our attitude toward this great institution of government.

The argument that seems to be made is that because we are not able to get all of our agenda put forward on the bills that we want to see put forward, we need the opportunity to bring nongermane amendments to appropriations bills. It was said that the opportunity to bring their issues forward was not being allowed to them.

I agree that they should have that opportunity, although I find it a little difficult to see that they are not having it.

I remember 2 or 3 weeks ago when this issue came to a point when we were debating the agriculture appropriations bill. An amendment related to health care was brought and debated on the floor of this Senate with regard to the agriculture appropriations bill. At the time, what happened? We had a lot of debate about whether we should be debating health care on an agriculture bill. Ultimately we reached a resolution by which we took the agriculture appropriations bill off the floor, came back a week or so later, and brought the health care legislation to the floor, had a full week of debate on the health care issue, and finally a vote on that health care issue.

To me, the question of whether the legislation is moving forward or the issues the minority wants to see brought forward can be brought forward is one that has to be focused on closely. In the Senate—and the good Senator from West Virginia very well and very carefully explained the difference between the House and the Senate—in the Senate, as compared to the House, the minority rights do give the minority many powerful opportunities to bring forth their legislation and their ideas, not the least of which are the filibuster, the hold, and any number of other procedural opportunities they may have. I am convinced the minority's rights to bring forward their issues for argument are well protected. I would say to the Senators who are concerned about that, I agree with them, they should be protected.

The way a legislature should operate is that both sides should be able to bring forward their issues and the clash of ideas should take place on the floor of the Senate. The Senate should then vote based on principle, on what the policy of the country should be on the issue being debated.

What should not happen is that, as an important bill that is moving forward is being debated, something that cannot survive the clash of ideas gets attached to it as a rider and then slides through into law without that opportunity for the clear and concise focus that would be followed if rule XVI were followed.

Although we are debating a procedural issue today, the issue could not be more important to the governance of this Senate and to the governance of this country. I do not remember who it was, but one of the great political leaders of the country once said: If you give me control over the procedure, I can control the outcome. Procedures are critical to the proper outcome in a legislative body. I agree wholeheartedly with my colleagues; our procedures must be fair; they must be balanced. In that context, I would willingly support any efforts to make the system here more fair and more balanced.

I look at this not as a Republican or a Democrat. As I said, I was not here 2 years ago when the fight took place to change the rule from what it was before. I believe Republicans and Democrats break the spirit of this rule regularly in the Senate. To me, we have to look at what is the right principle by which this great institution should be governed. When we identify the principle by which we should be governed, without partisan considerations, we should enact that principle into our rules. That is what I believe was done in 1868. I think that is what the Senate has done historically with what is now rule XVI and with the principle that we should not allow nongermane riders to be attached to legislation being considered on the floor of the Senate.

I would like to conclude my remarks by going back to a theme that has been brought up by the Senator from West Virginia, and that is his respect for this great institution. It is one of the

greatest honors that ever could be bestowed on anyone to have the privilege to serve in this Chamber, the Senate. I feel about my opportunity that deeply. I want to do nothing other than to make this institution the great institution our Founding Fathers intended for it to be. It will be that kind of institution if we look beyond partisanship, beyond politics, and beyond personal attacks, and identify the principles by which we should govern ourselves, put those principles into place, and then operate within their limits.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is my understanding the order of business is S. Res. 160, a resolution to restore an interpretation of rule XVI of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Further, it is my understanding this interpretation of the rule would allow a Senator to make a point of order against any amendment to an appropriations bill that is not germane to appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The issue is legislation on an appropriations bill.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. So in effect it would not allow a Senator to legislate policy changes on appropriations bills if a point of order was made against the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I think this is one of the most significant opportunities this body has had in some time to address an internal disregard for our responsibility. As a consequence, I rise in strong support of S. Res. 160, the resolution, that would overturn the rule XVI precedent the Senate adopted on March 16, 1995, which effectively hijacked the authorization process by allowing Senators to routinely offer legislative amendments on general appropriations bills.

Doing a little research, it was less than a year ago when the Senate voted on the 4,000-page, 40-pound, $540 billion omnibus appropriations bill. Not only did that bill contain funding for various Federal agencies including the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, State, and Justice, the District of Columbia, Foreign Ops, Interior, and Labor-HHS; but it also included numerous authorization bills. A few of them contained in that package were the American Competitiveness Act, the Internet Tax Freedom Act, the Internet Decency Act, the Vacancies Act, the reauthorization of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the Drug Free Workplace Act, the Drug Demand Reauthorization Act, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act, the Chemical Weapons Convention Implementation Act—I could go on and on.

In addition, that monstrosity of a bill included tax extender legislation and more than $20 billion of so-called emergency spending.

One has to ask the question why we need authorizing committees when we allow appropriations bills to include authorizing legislation. Why should the Finance Committee, for example, exist if the appropriators can include tax legislation in their bills? Why should the Commerce Committee hold meetings when the American Competitiveness Act can be included in an appropriations bill?

We have example after example. I recall not so long ago the battle we fought over the fiscal 1998 Interior appropriations. The Clinton administration at that time decided on its own to acquire the Headwaters Forest in northern California—that was at a cost of $315 million—further, the Administration also decided to acquire the New World Mine site in Montana, at a cost of $65 million.

I am not going to speak to the merits of these acquisitions, but I am going to speak to the manner in which they were done because here you have an administration that prides itself on public participation. These decisions were made with no congressional involvement. The administration sought to bypass the authorizing committees entirely and have the appropriators essentially just write a check for the purchase of those properties, and that is just what they did.

I happen to be chairman of the authorizing committee with jurisdiction, the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. I wanted the opportunity for the committee to carefully review the merits of these acquisitions. We tried, but the argument failed, and the authorization and funding were included in the 1998 Interior appropriations bill. That was much to the administration's delight. They got their way. But the public, the process, the committee of jurisdiction, had no opportunity to review these significant purchases, no opportunity to hold hearings, no opportunity for open debate or any type of public review. That is what is wrong with this system.

Today we have an opportunity to begin to change that. Moreover, what has happened since this precedent was changed in 1995 is that appropriations bills become far more difficult to pass. As we know—we have seen it lately—they are held hostage to nonappropriations issues, and the delays in getting them completed raise the specter of a Government shutdown at the end of each session. We saw it just 3 weeks ago, an example of how authorizing legislation stands in the way of the appropriations process.

For nearly a full week, the agriculture appropriations bill was stalled because Members on the other side of the aisle demanded we consider the Patients' Bill of Rights. As a result, the Senate had to stop the appropriations process for an entire week as we debated this important health issue.

I happen to support the Patients' Bill of Rights that was adopted by the Senate. I believe we should, first of all, have completed all of the appropriations bills before we engaged in that debate and other debates. As of today, we still have not moved forward on the agriculture bill.

Because of the delays in the appropriations process, what has been happening in recent years is that when the end of the fiscal year approaches, the appropriators and the leadership have to come together to engage in a negotiation with the White House to ensure the Government continues to function. As was demonstrated last year, authorizing bills and appropriations bills get mixed in together in a single omnibus bill which is negotiated by a handpicked group of people. Authorizers do not participate in the process and, therefore, have no say in the substance of the legislation.

This is wrong. This is not the way the Senate was set up to function.

As a consequence, as we look at where we are today, the founders intended the Senate to operate with a representative process with the authorizing committees doing their job. They were not created simply to provide oversight. Those committees do important things such as holding hearings, drafting legislation based on their knowledge gained from such hearings, and that is why we have the structure of the authorization committees because they have expertise and their professional staffs have an expertise on much of the complicated issues before us. If we continue to allow appropriations bills to be laden with authorization legislation, I can assure my colleagues we are going to see a repeat of last year's last-minute omnibus bill.

In closing, I will make a reference to how we are seen by the administration, and I am speaking as an authorizer, as chairman of an authorizing committee.

One Secretary, Secretary Babbitt, Secretary of the Interior, has become adept at circumventing the Congress. Babbitt has indicated that he is proud of his procedure and proud of the way he is doing it. I quote:

> . . . "We've switched the rules of the game. We're not trying to do anything legislatively," says Babbitt.

That is the National Journal, May 22, 1999.

A further quote from Secretary Babbitt:

> One of the hardest things to divine is the intent of Congress because most of the time . . . legislation is put together usually in kind of a House/Senate kind of thing where it's the munchkins—

The munchkins, Mr. President—

> who actually draft this legislation at midnight in a conference committee and it goes out.

It is a statement from Cobel v. Babbitt, page 3668.

Lastly, from Secretary Babbitt:

> I am on record around this town as saying that the real business on these issues is done in the appropriation committees, and I, I am a regular and frequent participant at all levels in those. That's, that's where the action

is, that's where things get done. The authorizing committees are partisan wrangles of the first order. I mean, nothing ever gets done on any level in the authorizing committees.

Cobel v. Babbitt, page 3811–3812.

Mr. REID. Will my friend yield for a brief question?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I have one brief statement, and then I will yield.

It is my hope we will overturn this precedent and return the Senate to the way it has operated for nearly all of its history. Otherwise, we might just as well abandon our authorizing committees and enlarge the size of the Appropriations Committee to all 100 Members.

I believe my friend from Nevada has a question.

Mr. REID. I do have a brief question to ask the chairman of the most important Energy and Natural Resources Committee. I asked a similar question—in fact, the same question—earlier this morning of the senior Senator from Wyoming who shares a lot of the interests of the Senator from Alaska.

He said he felt it was appropriate to change rule XVI. The minority leader is going to file a motion to amend rule XXVIII for that to go back the way it used to be.

In 1996, on the FAA authorization bill, a point of order was raised that the conferees brought back information and material that was not contained in either bill of the House or the Senate. A point of order was raised that it was not. The Chair ruled that it was true. It was overruled.

I say to my friend from Alaska in the form of a question, I hope in his support to change rule XVI that he will also look at rule XXVIII because, as the senior Senator from New York who spoke earlier today said and the senior Senator from West Virginia said, the problem we are facing is magnified even more so than what the Senator from Alaska stated. The Senator from Alaska was called back from his State, and I was called back from my State last fall, and we voted on a 1,500-page bill he had not read and, I am sorry to say, I had not read. I probably could not lift that bill, let alone read it.

The fact is, there was so much material contained in that, material to which I am sure the Secretary of Interior referred. He had stuff in that bill with which the Senator from Alaska had nothing to do with and it was put in, even though he is the chairman of the committee of jurisdiction. Certainly the appropriators did not work on it. It was done by the Chief of Staff of the White House principally, a few people from the Senate, a few people from the House, and they did the work for all of us.

I hope that my friend from Alaska, who certainly has so much to do with what we do around here, especially those of us in the Western United States, will look favorably also at changing rule XXVIII back the way it used to be.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I very much appreciate my friend from Nevada highlighting the inequity associated with the responsibility of the authorizers because, as I indicated in my statement, we get down to a situation where we are out of time and, as I stated, a few hand-picked individuals come together with the White House and basically negotiate a resolve with no participation from the authorizers. As a consequence, as he pointed out, we cannot read the material. It is basically put together simultaneously with the process of negotiation. We are short-changing our responsibility. I very much appreciate his attention given to this matter.

Mr. REID. I will also say to my friend from Alaska, the Senator from Wyoming said he agreed with us that the rule should be changed.

I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Indiana, EVAN BAYH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Chair. It is an honor for me to be in the Chamber of this great institution once again with you serving as our Presiding Officer this afternoon. I thank my colleagues also for being here today.

Before I begin my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my time, my colleague from Minnesota be recognized. He has very graciously allowed me to cut ahead of him in line this afternoon. I want him, if there is no objection, to be recognized at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Chair and my colleagues. I am pleased to be here, and I rise in opposition to Senate Resolution 160 because I believe that it represents bad public policy. It represents a lack of conviction and consistency on the part of the majority in this Chamber, and it represents a continuing erosion of the traditions of this great body which imperil the very vitality of our democracy.

I say these things, although I have no doubt that if we asked many who are in the galleries today or the citizens in my State exactly what rule XVI involves, they would have very little awareness of this or of the significance of the change that has been proposed. I do believe that if the citizens of our country understood the importance, the symbolic changes this resolution represents, they would be concerned, indeed, because the citizens of our country do care about good public policy.

The best avenue to ensuring that the people of our country have good public policy, with the fostering of vigorous, open debate, is the contest of ideas right here in the well of the Senate, where the good ideas triumph and the bad ones are weeded out.

Someone said, the best disinfectant is sunshine. That holds true in the Senate as it does in other forums. We will not get the best Government that the people of our country deserve if the minority in this Chamber is not given the privilege of introducing our ideas before the American people and debating them in a free and open forum.

Think with me for a moment of some of the ideas that would not have been allowed to come up over the last 6 months that I have been privileged to serve in the Senate if this resolution proposed before us today were adopted.

The Patients' Bill of Rights is important to every citizen across our country. Mr. President, if you believe in the right to have access to a specialist, in emergency care, you should care about this resolution. If you believe in the right to have an effective appeal to the denial of coverage, you should support defeat of this resolution.

Likewise, the juvenile justice bill, which we addressed in the tragic aftermath of the Columbine incident, would never have come before this Chamber if this resolution that we consider today were in effect.

Something I worked very hard on, with a bipartisan group, to ensure that the States have access to the proceeds from the tobacco litigation, would never have come before this Chamber and would not have been a part of the emergency supplemental passed into law if this resolution we consider today had been in effect.

Important issues of public policy, my fellow Americans, would not be heard on the floor of this great body, the greatest deliberative body in the history of man, if the resolution proposed before us goes into effect.

Your well-being, the well-being of our country, and those about whom we care will be substantially affected if this resolution is adopted. We should not let that happen to future debates about education or the minimum wage or other things that we, as Americans, care about.

Likewise, Mr. President, I am distressed to state it, but I believe this resolution represents a very real lack of conviction, a lack of conviction on the part of the majority now controlling this Chamber. If they truly have the best ideas, if their ideas are in the best interests of the American people, why not have them subjected to amendment and debate on the floor of the Senate?

Moreover, I ask those here in our presence today, and those viewing us at home, if our ideas on this side of the Chamber are so weak, so lacking in merit, what is the fear in allowing us to debate them and vote on them in the Senate?

My friends, I think the answer is distressingly clear. There are some Members of this body who do not want to cast the tough votes. They do not want to be forced to make the tough decisions. They do not want to have to address the compelling challenges of our time. They would rather limit debate and too often gag the Members of the minority from presenting our ideas.

The answer to this, Mr. President, is simple: It is not to stifle debate, it is

not to prevent votes. If you do not believe in having a vigorous debate on the floor of the Senate, why run for the office in the first place?

As Harry Truman once said: If you can't stand the heat, you better not go into the kitchen. That is what this resolution is really all about.

Next, this resolution, unfortunately, represents a real lack of consistency on the part of the majority. It is a flip-flop, more worthy of a gymnastics contest than a debate on the floor of the Senate.

Just 4 short years ago, the majority voted to overturn the historic practice of not allowing legislation on appropriations. Now they propose to change it back. I could not blame Americans listening to our comments today if they thought what was really holding sway on the floor of the Senate had more to do with expediency in politics than consistency of principle.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, it represents something that Americans have come to view as too often is the case in Washington today, and that is the pursuit of power above all else—certainly, the pursuit of power above principle, all too frequently. And that is not how it should be.

I remind my colleagues, the majority, that the test of character is not how you behave when you are weak; the real test of character is when we see how you behave when you are strong. That is what we see today. I am afraid we are not passing this test if we go forward and gag and muzzle the minority from offering our ideas to the American people.

Let me offer this observation in conclusion.

I represent a State of 6 million souls. I believe I was elected to represent them on the floor of the Senate, to offer the ideas that will best serve to increase the opportunity that they will have in their lives. That is why I was sent to the Senate. It is not right to muzzle their elected Representative from offering the ideas that I believe will serve them best, or the Senator of Nevada believes will serve his constituents best, or the Senator from Minnesota or the other Senators in this body.

I have hanging in my office a print entitled ''The United States Senate,'' circa 1850. It is a wonderful print that I believe embodies the history and the legacy of this institution at its finest.

In the center of this print is Henry Clay, speaking on the floor of the Senate in the historic Old Senate Chamber. And listening intently to him on the floor of the Senate were some of the giants in the Senate: Daniel Webster, John Calhoun, Thomas Hart Benton. Future Presidents of the United States were in attendance listening to the debate.

They were not debating an arcane subject that would be of no interest to the people of this country. They were debating the very union that is the foundation upon which our Nation is built. What would our forefathers think of the changes that have taken place in this Senate if they felt that the issues of union and disunion, States rights and Federal rights, the very liberties we hold dear, were no longer allowed to be debated on the floor of the Senate?

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

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I believe they would be distressed, as I am today, and as people would be today if they understood what was at stake here. I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution and to uphold the traditions of our Senate.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Thank you, Mr. President. I might not even need to take that much time.

First of all, I thank the Senator from Indiana for his comments. I was thinking about what he said. When I was a college teacher, I used to talk a bit about Birch Bayh, some of the Senators who took strong, principled stands. The Senator mentioned other great Senators, but I think the Senator represents a really wonderful tradition.

I think what Senator BAYH said at the very end of his remarks is what is most important to me. I was thinking about when I ran for the Senate from Minnesota. It would be an honor to be a Member of the House of Representatives; the Presiding Officer was a Member of the House of Representatives. As a Senator, you could do a much better job of being an advocate for the people in your State, because the rules of the Senate were such that you could come to the floor, even if it was you alone—maybe others would not agree with you, but hopefully you could get a majority—if you thought the Senate was in a disconnect with the people, to the concerns and circumstances of people you represented, to express your concerns.

I just mention a gathering I was at the Dahl farm in northwest Minnesota. It is a huge problem in Arkansas, too. Farmers showed up, coming from a long distance away. It was a desperate situation. In the Senate you can come to the floor and say: I have to come to the floor and fight for family farmers. I have to come to the floor to talk about comprehensive health care. I have to come to the floor and figure out a vehicle whereby I can talk about ending this discrimination when it comes to people who are struggling with mental illness. I have to come to the floor to talk about poor children in America. I have to come to the floor to talk about veterans health care and the gap in veterans health care in Minnesota and around the country.

The great thing about being a Senator is you can come to the floor with an amendment and you can fight for it.

Mr. REID. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I would be pleased to yield.

Mr. REID. You are a former professor of government. It is true, is it not, that the Constitution was drawn to protect the minority, not the majority?

Mr. WELLSTONE. That is true.

Mr. REID. Isn't it true that there is nobody better to protect the Constitution and the minority than the Senate?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, that is part of the genius of the Senate and the way Senators have conducted themselves over the years.

Mr. REID. Do I understand the Senator to say, unless we have more of an opportunity to speak out on issues, that those minorities, in effect, are not represented here?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, the reason I am going to vote against this resolution is, to be very direct—I am not full of hatred about this; I am just making a political point, and we do make political points on the floor of the Senate—when I look at the context of what has been going on here, I am in profound opposition to what the majority leader and the majority party have been doing, which is to sort of what we call fill up the tree, basically denying Senators the right to come to the floor with amendments, to try to make sure we don't have to debate tough and controversial questions, to try to make sure we can't move forward agendas that we, as Senators, think are important to the people of our States.

I am absolutely opposed to what I think is being done here. Therefore, I think this resolution fits into that pattern of trying to stifle dissent, trying to stifle a minority opinion, trying to stifle individual Senators from coming to the floor and doing their absolute best to be the strongest possible advocates for the people of their States. That is why I am voting against this resolution.

It is sort of two issues. One is the question that the Senator from Nevada spoke on, which is, what is the role of the Senate in relation to the House of Representatives, in relation to making sure that we have respect for minority rights, so on and forth, what is the role of the Senate as a deliberative body, as a debate body. The other issue, which is even more important to me, is whether or not I can, as a Senator, do the best possible job for the people of my State. That is why I am going to oppose this resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 7 minutes as in morning business.

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

VETERANS BUDGET REPORT

Mr. WELLSTONE. This is an area in which the Presiding Officer has done a lot of work. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his good work on veterans issues.

Mr. President, on June 15th I sent letters to each of the twenty-two VISN

Directors of the VA health care system to ask for data on how their network would be affected by the President's flat-lined budget. I conducted this survey because the stories coming from rank and file VA staff and veterans who I had talked with were horrible:

Veterans with PTSD waiting months to get treatment;

Veterans living in fear that facilities would be closed and access to care would be cut off;

VA nurses working mandatory overtime, frequent back to back shifts because of staffing shortages.

But I wasn't getting complete answers in Washington. So to find the truth I went to the VISN Directors themselves. By the middle of July, all 22 VISN Directors had responded. I am pleased to say that overall their responses were very candid. They took my letters in the spirit that I intended: to understand the stakes involved in the VA health care budget debate here in Washington. Many of these directors showed real courage in responding as frankly as they did.

My staff summarized the responses in a report. I think the findings should be of great concern to every one of my colleagues.

I can best describe the results in two points:

1. The legacy of the Clinton administration's budget will be fewer VA staff, offering fewer services, and treating fewer Veterans.

2. The House and Senate cannot buy off the nations veterans by adding a few hundred million dollars to the President's budget. Only full funding will restore the VA to a capacity America's veterans deserve.

Let me be specific: The report finds that:

20 VISNs would have funding shortfalls under the Clinton Budget:

As many as 10,000 employees would be cut under the Clinton budget: 19 of the 22 VISNs indicated that staff reductions would be necessary under the Clinton administration fiscal year 2000 budget. One VISN indicated that under the President's budget it would need to reduce employment by 1,454 FTEEs, a cut of 15.4 percent of that VISN's workforce.

10 VISNs would reduce patient workload under the Clinton budget: Only one VISN said it could treat more veterans this year than last year under this budget.

71,129 fewer veterans would be served under the Clinton budget: One VISN reported that it may need to eliminate services to as many as 17,000 veterans. And this number is only the total from the 6 VISNs who gave us an estimated number. Again. Four other VISNs said they would treat fewer veterans.

But even an increase of $500 million above the President's budget would not reverse this trend. On the contrary, this report shows that an increase of such a small amount would still require hard choices and in some cases reductions in services, staff, and veterans served.

At least 12 VISNs would have short falls under Clinton budget plus $500 million: the largest deficit for an individual VISN was $100 million.

At least 13 VISNs would reduce staffing under the Clinton budget plus $500 million—in one VISN by over 1,100 employees.

At least 38,155 fewer veterans would be served under the Clinton budget plus $500 million: Again, only one VISN said it could positively increase services to veterans under this scenario. One VISN said it would still turn away 9,600 veterans.

Veterans health care is at a crossroads. While the nation's twenty-two VISNs have struggled valiantly to do more with a shrinking budget, the results of this survey suggest that urgent action is required to reverse what has become a funding crisis in VA health care—even as America's veterans population becomes older and more reliant on VA services. Spending decisions made by Congress in the next few months will determine whether predictions made by the 22 VISNs become reality or a disaster narrowly averted.

This funding crisis will affect the World War II veteran, who has to drive 6 hours to get care because funding problems prevented the VA from opening a community based out-patient clinic in his area.

This funding crisis will affect the VA nurse who has to work 16 hour shifts because hiring enough nurses is too expensive.

It is outrageous that with federal budget surpluses 20 VISNs will run a deficit. It is outrageous that staff will be cut, or furloughed while being asked to work harder and longer hours. It is outrageous that over 71,000 fewer sick and disabled veterans would be treated by the VA next year even as they get older. These veterans need more health care not less.

But this story doesn't begin with my report. It is really a continuation of a battle begun 13 years ago with the release of the first Independent Budget by the major veterans groups. It is the continuation of a battle fought by Senator JOHNSON in the Budget Committee—to provide full funding for veterans. And of a battle TIM and I fought on the floor on the Senate to provide full funding for veterans in the Senate budget resolution—a fight that we won with a unanimous vote to increase VA funding to the level recommended by the independent budget.

But let me be clear, this is also a fight we must carry on to Appropriations.

What this report suggests is that we are through cutting the fat out of the VA budget. There is nothing left to pare but bone and muscle. The VA has reached its fighting weight and has plunged dangerously below.

We've squeezed just about as much money out of the system as we possibly can. People on the front lines of veterans health care—whether care providers or recipients—know that the VA health care system is desperately short of resources. I worry that my friend Lyle Pearson, of North Mankato, decorated for his service in WWII, disabled vet, who receives care at VA facilities in Minnesota, will not get the care he needs if the flat-line budget is not improved. I worry that veterans across the nation will be caught between increasing need and flat-lined funds. Veterans in Bangor, Maine are concerned because a VA inspector general report noted that their outpatient clinic had a 10 month backlog of new patients. Things were so bad last Fall that the clinic couldn't see walk-in patients or urgent-care patients, and there was a four month wait to see the clinic's part-time psychiatrist. Veterans in Iowa are facing the possible closure of one of their three major veterans hospitals because of budget shortfalls.

The last chance for veterans this year is VA/HUD appropriations. But we still don't know what the funding level will be the VA/HUD appropriations bills. In two and a half months, fiscal 1999 will end and we still don't even have a start on funding FY 2000. The bills have not been marked up by the committee. This is unacceptable. If veterans funding is allocated in the dark of night in a last minute omnibus spending bill, I fear the veteran will be short changed. Bring the VA/HUD bill to the floor. If there isn't enough money in it for veterans, we'll amend it to add more.

A story in the July 18th edition of the Richmond Times Dispatch quotes in chairman of the VA/HUD appropriations Subcommittee as saying that the budget situation that we face this year is very tough. That same article says that VA health care might be facing a $1 billion cut.

I've heard that rumor. I've heard the rumor that veterans will get an increase. Well let me start a rumor this morning that veterans can take to the bank: I give notice now to my colleagues that I will be on the floor of the Senate offering an amendment to VA/HUD appropriations the first opportunity I get if the funding is not enough.

The veteran has borne the pain of budget cuts for too long. Tax cuts should come after relief for veterans. Defense buildups should come after relief for veterans. Let's make the veteran the priority again.

This is a fight to make VA health care the gold standard for health care again. It is a fight to keep a promise to the veteran: If you served your country your nation will stand up for you. If you were injured you will be healed. If you are disabled, the country will raise you up—not cast you aside.

I call on my colleagues to join me and the veterans in this fight. It will take every U.S. Senator and every Member of the House. It will take the VFW, the DAV, the PVA, the AMVETS, and the Vietnam Vets and all the other groups besides.

Most importantly, America's veterans must demand it. Veterans need to hear the call one more time.

Together we can restore the funds and keep our covenant with the veteran.

Mr. President, today the Vice President announced that the White House is going to be asking for another $1 billion. Veterans organizations last week—I thank them—came together with us and presented this data. We said there are huge problems in the country; a lot of veterans aren't going to get the care they need and the care that they deserve.

The Vice President stated the White House is going to ask for an additional $1 billion. I thank the Vice President for his announcement. That helps. However, we are going to have to do a lot better. That still leaves us with a $2 billion shortfall. To my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and to the White House and to the Vice President, I say that the veterans community is organizing. It is good grassroots politics. They are going to hold us all accountable. We will have to do a lot better.

STOP WORSENING REPRESSION IN BURMA

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I want to speak today on the distressing human rights situation in Burma. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations, ASEAN, held their Annual Ministerial Meeting in Singapore this weekend. And this week Secretary Albright will be in Singapore for the ASEAN regional forum and the Post-Ministerial Conference. It is essential that during all of these meetings serious attention is focused on the worsening human rights situation in Burma.

We haven't heard much about Burma in the media recently. There have been no major news events in Burma recently to grab the attention of the world: No Tiananmen Square scale massacres, no Kosovo scale dislocations, no bloody street clashes like we've seen in East Timor or Iran. But in Burma today something equally chilling is proceeding, out of the world's view: A slow, systematic strangling of the democratic opposition. Since last fall, the ruling military regime has detained, threatened and tortured opposition party members in increasing numbers. At least 150 senior members of the opposition National League for Democracy are being held in government detention centers. 3,000 political prisoners are held in Rangoon's notorious Insein prison. The regime has forced or coerced nearly 40,000 others to resign from the opposition party in recent months. In a videotape smuggled out of Burma in April and delivered to the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva, the leader of the National League for Democracy, Aung San Suu Kyi, said government repression had worsened greatly in the past year on a scale ''the world has not yet grasped.'' She said on the tape: ''What we have suffered over the last year is far more than we have suffered over the last six or seven years.'' According to one Western official, the regime intends to do nothing less than eradicate the opposition ''once and for all.''

Mr. President, most of this repression takes place quietly, through intimidation, arrests at night and other activities out of the public eye. The Burmese regime carefully controls access to the country for journalists. So we have no video footage of the repression and only scant reporting from a few brave journalists and human rights workers. But just because we cannot see what is going on in Burma does not mean we can ignore it. It is all the more important for us to speak about the situation there and show our support for the forces of democracy and human rights.

In July 1997, when Burma became a full ASEAN member, ASEAN countries claimed that such a move would encourage the regime—the so-called State Peace and Development Council, or SPDC, to improve its human rights record. In fact the opposite has been true. As the Washington Post put it in a recent editorial: ''ASEAN's logic was familiar: Engagement with the outside world would persuade Burma's dictators to relax their repressive rule. The verdict on this test case of the engagment theory thus far is clear: The behavior of the thugs who run Burma has worsened, and so has life for most Burmese.''

Not only has the SPDC stepped up its repression of the opposition party, the National League for Democracy, it has intensified its campaign of oppression against the country's ethnic minoriites. The regime has increased forcible relocation programs in the Karen, Karenni, and Shan States. The use of forced labor in all seven ethnic minority states continues at a high level, and forced portering occurs wherever there are counter-insurgency activities.

Amnesty International has just issued three new reports which describe in compelling detail the harsh, relentless mistreatment of farmers and other civilians of ethnic minority groups in rural areas. Let me read a few brief passages from these excellent, detailed reports:

In February 1999, Amnesty International interviewed recently arrived Shan refugees in Thailand in order to obtain an update on the human rights situation in the central Shan State. The pattern of violations has remained the same, including forced labor and portering, extrajudicial killings, and ill-treatment of villagers. Troops also routinely stole villagers' rice supplies, cattle, and gold, using them to sell or to feed themselves. According to reports, Army officers do not provide their troops with adequate supplies so troops in effect live off the villagers. One 33 year-old farmer from Murngnai township described the relationship between the Shan people and the army:

> Before, I learned that the armed forces are supposed to protect people, but they are repressing people. If you can't give them everything they want, they consider you as their enemy . . . it is illogical, the army is forcing the people to protect them, instead of vice-versa.

Amnesty International also reports similar abuses in Karen state:

Karen refugees interviewed in Thailand cited several reasons for leaving their homes: Some had previously been forced out of their villages by the Burmese army and had been hiding in the forest. They feared being shot on sight by the military because they occupied ''black areas'' where the insurgents were allegedly active. Many others fled directly from their home villages in the face of village burnings, constant demands for forced labor, looting of food and supplies, and extrajudicial killings at the hands of the military.

These human rights violations took place in the context of widespread counter-insurgency activities against the Karen National Union (KNU) one of the last remaining armed ethnic minority opposition groups still fighting the military government. Guerilla fighting between the two groups continues, but the primary victims are Karen civilians. Civilians are at risk of torture and extrajudicial executions by the military, who appear to automatically assume that they supported or were even members of the KNU. Civilians also became sitting targets for constant demands by the army for forced labor or portering duties. As one Karen refugee explained to Amnesty International, ''Even though we are civilians, the military treats us like their enemy.''

A similar situation exists in Karenni State. Three-quarters of the dozens of Karenni refugees interviewed by Amnesty International in February 1999 were forced by the military to work as unpaid laborers. They were in effect an unwilling pool of laborers which the military drew from to work in military bases, build roads, and clear land. When asked why they decided to flee to Thailand, many refugees said that forced labor duties made it impossible for them to survive and do work to support themselves. Several of them also mentioned that forced labor demands had increased during 1998.

Unpaid forced labor is in contravention of the International Labor Organization's (ILO) Convention No. 29, which the government of Burma signed in 1955. The ILO has repeatedly raised the issue with the government and in June 1996 took the rare step of appointing a Commission of Inquiry. In August 1998 the Commission published a comprehensive report, which found the government of Burma ''. . . guilty of an international crime that is also, if committed in a widespread or systematic manner, a crime against humanity.''

Mr. President, I am under no illusion that the military regime in Burma will reform overnight and end its human rights abuses. But I think it is critically important that we keep the

world's attention focused on the terrible repression of democracy and abuse of ethnic minorities going on there. I hope our message of concern, backed by the invaluable reporting done by Amnesty International, will get through somehow to the Burmese people and to their courageous leader, Nobel laureate Aung San Suu Kyi.

ASEAN member countries are gathering in Singapore currently for a series of meetings. We need to encourage them to develop a new strategy for dealing with the SPDC's intransigence regarding human rights. Now that criticism of fellow ASEAN members is no longer completely taboo, I hope some of the ASEAN countries that have improved their own human rights records will take the initiative to prod the Burmese to move in the right direction. The ASEAN regional forum (ARF), which deals with Asian security issues, will meet at the same time and should address this as a security problem. Western nations, including the U.S., who will also be present at the ARF should work closely with all concerned countries to encourage the SPDC to improve its human rights record.

Even if we don't see quick improvement, those of us who care deeply about human rights have a duty to keep the plight of the Burmese people before the world community. I am committed to doing that, and I hope my colleagues will join me in pressing the Burmese regime for real, measurable improvements in these areas.

RESTORATION OF THE ENFORCEMENT OF RULE XVI—Continued

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I express my appreciation for the statement of the Senator from Minnesota regarding the rule change in his usual deliberate style.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise to speak to the resolution that will be before us for a vote at the end of the afternoon, S. Res. 160, to restore enforcement of rule XVI.

Mr. President, I believe in the Senate as an institution. I think it is an important part of the workings of our democracy that the Senate carry out its duties and responsibilities in a way that it has done throughout the more than 200-year history of our Republic.

In a sense, this is a difficult issue for me because I voted not to waive rule XVI, or, in effect, not to overrule the ruling of the Chair, at the time the ruling was made. That, of course, was a motion offered by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I thought, well, we really should not change the way we do business. But what has happened since that time is, increasingly, that the minority has been really frustrated by the lack of opportunity to come to the floor of the Senate to offer its positions, to have them considered and voted upon. Therefore, I am going to vote against this resolution when it comes to a vote this afternoon simply, among other things, to make a very strong statement of protest against the procedures that are now being followed in the Senate, which are effectively preventing us from considering important issues.

Now, repeatedly, we have had a situation in which the majority leader, once a measure is offered, fills up the amendment tree by gaining first recognition, which is the majority leader's entitlement under our process, and then the minority has no opportunity to offer its proposals. I ask the minority whip and the assistant minority leader, isn't it the case that time and time again we have simply been blocked out from even putting an issue before the Senate? I am not complaining about being blocked out if we then go to a vote on it—well, I would complain, but you decide these things by majority vote. We are even being precluded from offering amendments in order to have positions considered; is that not correct?

Mr. REID. That is absolutely true. For example, on the issue of the lockbox, cloture has been filed three to five times. We have never uttered a single word in a debate about that issue. We have never had the opportunity to offer a single amendment. We agree with the lockbox concept, but does it have to be theirs? Can't we try to change it a little bit?

Mr. SARBANES. As I understand it, the way that has been structured now, the minority is totally precluded from offering any alternative proposal or any different proposal because they have completely blocked us out from offering any amendments; isn't that correct?

Mr. REID. That is absolutely true. I ask my friends, are they so afraid of discussing an issue, and are they so afraid they will lose a couple of Members and we will be right? Is that the problem? I don't know. Why won't they let us at least offer an amendment?

Mr. SARBANES. It raises this question in a democracy: What happens when you can't pose issues and have them debated and voted upon?

It seems to me an elementary way of proceeding. Traditionally, the Senate has always offered that opportunity, as a matter of fact. I have been in this body a long time and I can recall when, not too long ago, we were in the majority, and even earlier when that was the case, when the Senate was essentially run in a way that enabled Members to bring up proposals and have them considered and voted upon. It by no means guaranteed that your proposal was going to prevail; You might lose, and that was obvious. But that is part and parcel of the democratic process. But not to even be able to offer your amendments—and, of course, this resolution would, in effect, limit down the opportunities as well.

Essentially, if you had a Senate that was operating in the traditional way, you could offer your proposals. That sort of limitation is one that we traditionally lived with. But this was lifted by the majority, and at the same time they did this, subsequently, they have increasingly developed other ways of blocking the minority out from simply laying their positions before the Senate for consideration. Is that not the case?

Mr. REID. It is absolutely the case. The fact is that all we want is to be treated like the Senate. My friend from Maryland served in the House of Representatives, as I did. That is a huge body, 435 Members. They need specific rules—and they have always had them—to move legislation along. You can't have unlimited debate in that body. But the Senate was set up differently. We do not need, or should we have, a rule on every piece of legislation that comes through, as does the House of Representatives. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. SARBANES. I agree completely with that. In fact, even in the House the procedure has gotten so rigid that there is significant complaint that they do not have an opportunity when important measures are before——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the minority has expired, with the exception of 15 minutes that was reserved.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, since nobody is on the floor, I ask unanimous consent that we be allowed to continue for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend, in responding to the question asked, with his experience in the House and in the Senate, can he tell us how he believes the Senate should be treated differently than the House of Representatives.

Mr. SARBANES. Well, the thing that struck me when I came to the Senate from the House was, in a sense, how much more wide open the Senate was in terms of considering proposals of the Members of the Senate. In the House, of course, you have title rules. You adopt a rule, and that limits the amendments that can be offered. We even had the so-called closed rule in which no amendment could be offered. You either had to vote up or down on the measure that was reported by the committee to the floor of the House. But usually you would get a rule that would perhaps give the minority an opportunity to offer a couple of amendments. One came to the Senate and discovered that both the majority and minority Members had much more of an opportunity to have amendments offered by the body and considered and voted upon.

Of course, in order to control that procedure, we had a rule that you could

not legislate on an appropriations bill, which seemed to make good sense. Now, that was overturned a few years back when the majority wanted to have a certain measure considered and the Chair ruled that it constituted legislation on an appropriations bill; therefore, it was not in order. The majority—the other side of the aisle—then went forward and appealed the ruling of the Chair and they overruled the Chair. That established the precedent that you could offer legislation on an appropriations bill.

Mr. REID. I ask permission to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield for a question.

Mr. REID. I remember that very clearly because I was the Senator who raised the point of order. It was on an appropriations bill, a supplemental appropriations bill. The junior Senator from Texas offered an amendment on the Endangered Species Act that would do great harm to that act. I raised a point of order it was legislating on an appropriations bill. The Chair, without question, upheld my point of order. There was an appealing of the rule, as the Senator said, and a longstanding rule, with all the precedence, was turned on its head.

Now it has been 4 years, and we have been working under this situation that was created by the majority. The minority didn't do that. But I say to my friend, the reason we in the minority are so concerned is because it is not only that rule they are going to overturn, the fact of the matter is that we don't have any opportunities to offer amendments, to debate substantive issues in this country, based upon the gag rule placed on all legislation brought here; isn't that true?

Mr. SARBANES. The Senator is absolutely correct. What has happened is longstanding precedent was overturned. Therefore, you could legislate on an appropriations bill. That is the precedent we have been working under for the last 3 or 4 years. On occasion, the minority—our side—has offered legislation on an appropriations bill. Now the majority wants to go back to the old ruling. Having overturned the old ruling themselves, they now want to return to it.

Well, as an institutionalist, you know the old rule made some sense. But what has happened to the Senate in the interim, in the meantime, since the overturning of this old rule, is that other techniques have also been developed to block the minority from offering amendments on the various matters that come before the Senate. So, in effect, they are closing out the minority from having any voice, any opportunity to present our positions, any opportunity to have a judgment made on our positions.

I am very frank to tell you that is not the way the Senate ought to work.

Previously, even when we had the old rule, we didn't have a couple with these other techniques that are now being used in order to keep the minority from bringing their position before this body. Until we can remedy that situation and get some assurance that we are going to have an opportunity to really present our amendments in an orderly and reasonable fashion, I am not going to support any measure that could have the possibility of closing out some opportunity that we now have in order to present our positions.

Mr. REID. May I ask my friend another question?

Mr. SARBANES. Certainly.

Mr. REID. Is the Senator aware that the minority leader is going to offer an amendment to S. Res. 160 which will reinstate the scope of the conference report rule? That is when you go to conference and the conference committee must stay within the scope of the two bills on which they are working. It will be interesting to me to see if the majority will vote to support the overturning of rule XVI, which we know they will do, to see if they are logically consistent by going ahead and voting to also reinstate rule XXVIII. Also, this precedent was overturned in 1996 on the reauthorization bill.

Does the Senator think it would be consistent for them to vote to make rule XVI the way it used to be and rule XXVIII the way it used to be? How can you vote for one and not the other?

Mr. SARBANES. Absolutely. In fact, the rule XXVIII issue is also very important. That was also overturned by the majority to permit matters to be included in a conference report that were not within either of the two bills that the House and the Senate sent to the conference. Of course, what that means is that a conference can come back with something that is outside of the scope of the conference and present it to these bodies—a matter that neither the House nor the Senate considered in the course of sending that legislation to conference.

Talk about potential mischief. You could bring back in here, contained in a conference report with all of the sort of protections that a conference report has in terms of its consideration, and so forth, matters that were outside of what was sent to conference. The minority leader is trying to remedy that matter.

I can't for the life of me see why someone who supports S. Res. 160 would oppose the proposal of the minority leader. But I guess we will discover that when we come to a vote on the matter later this afternoon.

It eventually comes back to the very basic question. That is, What are to be the rights of the minority in this body? One of the great strengths of the Senate traditionally has been that it has accorded to the minority a real opportunity to participate in the consideration of matters on the floor of the Senate. The minority has not traditionally been closed out of participating. In fact, some have argued that minorities traditionally have been given too much of an opportunity to participate. They argue that.

But what has been happening in recent years is, the majority has been using its majority to overrule these precedents of the Senate, which effectively then allows the majority to do what it wants to do and completely leaves the minority outside of the process.

That is, in a sense, the issue that is at stake. That is why there has been such a strong reaction to this proposal, because S. Res. 160 comes in the context of these other matters that have been happening, all of which have moved in the same direction; namely, to preclude the minority from having a fair opportunity to present its positions to the Senate, to have them considered, and to have judgment rendered upon them. It is fundamentally changing the nature of the Senate.

One of the great things about American democracy that any political commentator always points to is that, unlike many systems, it isn't run in such a tight, rigid, disciplined fashion that the minority can be excluded from any opportunity to be heard and to have its positions considered. Particularly the Senate has been the great bulwark of strength in that regard.

Now we have a proposal to overturn the very precedent which the majority themselves established only a few years ago, and to do so at the very time that increasingly the majority is using other techniques to block the minority from presenting its position, including, of course, this technique of filling up the amendment tree so that no amendments can be offered.

We really are moving very much in the direction of saying to the minority, in effect, well, you can come here and sit at your desks, but that is about all you can do around here; there is not much else you can do in terms of trying to constructively affect the legislative process.

I am very frank to say that I think we must resist that development. I think it is significantly undercutting the nature of the Senate as an institution and the role it has played in the country's history. I think this is a very important debate. I think the matter that is coming before us has a great deal to do with saying how the institution ought to run.

I must say that if the procedures were all fair and if we were given a fair opportunity to present our positions, there might be something that could be said for going back and treating what was done as a mistake, as some of us assert it was at the time. But in light of these subsequent developments, it seems to me that the minority has to really insist that no opportunity to offer its position should be denied to them. Therefore, that is the position I intend to take when this matter comes to a vote at the end of the day.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, 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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be charged to the majority.

The reason I say that is so the Presiding Officer, either in his capacity as Presiding Officer or as a Senator from Arkansas—we have been very diligent in the minority in using up all of our time. Both leaders have sought to have a time in the evening to complete our vote. If the time doesn't run off, the time is charged to the majority now. This could go on forever and we wouldn't vote until sometime late at night.

I ask unanimous consent that be the case.

If there is some objection from the majority leader, he can come right back and change that.

That is my unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, 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. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. I inquire how the time has been divided and what time is remaining on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has remaining 54½ minutes; the minority has used all of their allocated time. Fifteen minutes at the end has been allocated to Senator DASCHLE and there is an allotment of 15 minutes remaining for the majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, one further parliamentary inquiry. That means, then, during the quorum call all time is coming out of the majority side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, then I yield myself time out of this 54 minutes, realizing I also would have an opportunity to use my 15 minutes in closing. But there has been so much revisionist history espoused on the floor of the Senate today, I just did not want to let 1 hour 15 minutes go by without maybe correcting some of the record or putting an accurate history back into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A famous quote comes to my mind, from what I have heard here today. I fear ''[thou] doth protest too much.'' In other words, there is an awful lot of protesting by the Democrats that has been going on that makes anybody who is a dispassionate, disinterested watcher just looking in, inquire why are they protesting so much?

I have to note the inconsistency that is involved, too. Basically what the minority is saying, the Democrats are saying: As a protest statement, we are going to vote against reinstating rule XVI but we want to turn right around and reinstate rule XXVIII.

This is Senate gibberish, I know, but it is inconsistent because they are saying we want to continue to offer legislation on appropriations bills but we do not want anything coming back out of conference between the House and Senate that exceeds the scope of what was in the bill. I think there is an inconsistency there. I think we ought to take a close look at the scope of the conferences question. We have time to do that. We have committees, a Rules Committee, and we have a Governmental Affairs Committee that have been considering rules changes. I think there are a number of rules in the Senate that should be reviewed.

I think budget rules should be reviewed. For instance, this very week on the reconciliation bill which would provide some tax relief, at the end of the 20 hours, if amendments are still pending, we still have this very poor procedure where we might have to have what is called a ''vote-arama,'' of one vote after the other, one right behind the other every 2 minutes; I guess it would be 12 minutes between the votes—a very poor way to do legislative business. I think we ought to take a look at that and see if we cannot find a way to improve it. So there are a number of things we can do that I think will help the way the Senate does business.

I would like to go back and remind Senators how this rule was changed, this rule XVI. Rule XVI was overturned by the Senate on March 16, 1995, on the Department of Defense supplemental appropriations bill. Senator HUTCHISON of Texas appealed the ruling of the Chair, in that the Chair ruled her amendment regarding a restriction on appropriations funds to make a final determination with respect to the endangered species list was legislation on an appropriations bill. In other words, this involved the Endangered Species Act. The Chair ruled this was legislating on an appropriations bill and therefore was out of order.

That ruling was appealed. Many Members on the Republican side of the aisle supported her appeal. As a result, the Parliamentarian can no longer entertain a point of order that extraneous language is legislation on an appropriations bill. Again, keep in mind that up until that point that point of order would have been upheld by the Chair. That ruling was overturned and therefore a new precedent was set.

Interestingly, in that vote, No. 107, on March 16, 1995, 54 Republicans voted to overturn the Chair, 44 Democrats voted to sustain the Chair's ruling.

I am sure for the most part on both sides what was really being voted on was the substance of this endangered species list amendment. For instance, one interesting quote on that occasion came from our colleague, Senator REID, who has been on the floor a good deal today. I think he summed up what was going on with regard to this particular amendment because I think probably, without putting words in his mouth, he was at least sympathetic to what Senator HUTCHISON was trying to do. But this is what Senator REID said:

> But this is not the way to treat a very important matter. I am very upset. I am going to do everything that I can to make sure the President, if in fact this bill passes, will veto it if we start conducting business in this way.

Basically he had indicated, I believe, that while he had some understanding and sympathy on the issue, he thought this was no way to be doing business.

As a result of the overturning of the Chair, the appropriations process has certainly lost some of its legitimacy and has been complicated by the number of amendments, and their variety—and I am going to cite some amendments that were offered. The appropriations process is a very important part of our constitutional duty to the Federal Government. Yet with each passing year since this vote in 1995, it gets more difficult to get our appropriations bills through because of all the legislating that occurs on the appropriations bills.

Let me emphasize, while I thought that most of the comments from the Democratic side today were very partisan, I don't view this as partisan. It should not be. The discussions we have had across the aisle over the past 4 years have been that this was a mistake; we ought to work together to change it. But let me give a recent example. This past week on the State-Justice-Commerce appropriations bill, I do not know how many amendments showed up on that bill, probably a hundred or so. I know of at least one specific example. I will not cite the specific bill because that Senator would know what I was talking about and would not feel that it would be appropriate that I cite his particular bill, but it was a whole bill that had not been introduced, had not been referred to committee, had not been reviewed by the committee, and would significantly change the way a process works in the Federal Government. That was going to be offered to the appropriations bill. That Senator was on my side of the aisle.

So I really question that that is the way Senators would want this body to work, where whole bills will be cut out of whole cloth and brought to the floor of the Senate in a Senator's hand and he or she will say: I want this bill added to the appropriations bill.

That is no way to legislate. We should not be doing that. But that is the kind of thing that has been happening since we had this ruling and then the appeal of the ruling of the Chair in 1995 that set this new precedent.

The Senator from California was here earlier today commenting on this. Yet when this vote took place, she said:

I think to come to this floor of the U.S. Senate and to add an amendment to the Defense emergency supplemental bill that deals with a very important and sensitive environmental issue is simply not the right way to legislate.

Holy smoke, she is absolutely right. She said that on March 16, 1995. That was not what I thought I heard her saying today. Maybe I misinterpreted what was being said today. But that is the point. Senators will have an opportunity to offer amendments on other bills. The point is made quite often in this body, unlike the House—and nobody wants to make the Senate the House—any Senator can come to the floor on a bill involving, let's just say bankruptcy, and he or she can offer an amendment to deal with health care or can offer something to do with the Forest Service. We do not have these strict germaneness rules. We do take up legislative issues.

But one of the reasons why the majority leader cannot bring more legislative bills to the floor is because, in many instances, it has taken so long to get through other issues such as juvenile justice or the Patients' Bill of Rights or other appropriations bills; therefore, making it very difficult to bring up other important legislative issues such as the Federal aviation reauthorization bill, the bankruptcy bill that I referred to, or the nuclear waste bill that has been reported out of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. It makes it more and more difficult for anything to be done other than appropriations and reconciliation. And the reconciliation procession is very important because it is the only way you can get a bill dealing with taxes, for instance, to the floor without it being threatened by a filibuster or all kinds of other Senate legislative maneuvers.

This is one where you bring it up, you have a specified period of time, you have an amendment process, you go through those amendments, and then you have a vote. That process moves quite easily through here. Right now we are in a period where appropriations bills and reconciliation are about all we can get done.

There are complaints about filling up the tree. I have not gone back and done the research, but this process of so-called ''filling up the tree'' again is Senate language that is used to describe that all the different opportunities to amend are filled with amendments. I didn't invent that procedure. Other Senators who have been majority leader certainly have used that. Senator Mitchell used it. Senator BYRD used it. That is a very legitimate tactic or process which can be used, one that should not be used all the time, and one that has been used relatively rarely, but it certainly is a legitimate thing the majority leader can do to focus debate and to get debate concluded in a reasonable period of time.

Let me give some examples of the kinds of things that have been tying up the Senate since we have been without the ability to strike them down by using rule XVI. First of all, it seems to me if you look at history, probably there has been an increasing number of amendments which have been offered on these appropriations bills. It seems now it is quite often within the range of 80 to 100 or 120 amendments on just about anything that comes along. Every Senator dumps his out basket on the floor of the Senate with every amendment he or she has ever dreamed of and some of the things with which we have to deal on appropriations bills, where it clearly would have been legislating on an appropriations bill, dealing with grasshopper research, lettuce genetic breeding, peach tree short life, tomato wilting, the feasibility of using poultry litter as possible fuel. Other examples are: removing of computer games from Government computers, repainting of water towers, swimming pool construction, the study of green tree snakes. These may be legitimate agriculture issues, but with others, they certainly would be considered to be frivolous in nature in terms of being offered as amendments on appropriations bills.

While we have those examples, the ones that are the most startling and striking to me are the ones where whole bills or major amendments are offered on the floor of the Senate to appropriations bills that clearly is legislating on an appropriations bill, that do not apply in any way in terms of substance, where the committees have not been allowed to act, where the committee chairman has not had any input. It is time we bring this process under control. On more than one occasion, the exchanges between the Democratic leader and the majority leader have indicated that there has been a willingness or a desire on both sides to begin bringing this under control.

I urge my colleagues to look at how this happened. A lot of people on both sides of the aisle at the time it happened did not realize the significance of it and, secondly, said at the time: Yes, this is probably a mistake.

It has been a tool the Democrats have used over the past 4 years, and that is the way it works in the Senate. When you have a precedent, then Senators have a right to take advantage of it until a new one is set or until the Senate decides it is going in some other direction. There is nothing unusual about that at all.

We should reinstate this rule XVI. We should look at a number of rules and budget procedures we have. We have appropriators who have come to me and expressed concern about this. People with a long history of paying attention to the rules of the Senate and the budget procedures and the appropriations bills, such as Senator DOMENICI and Senator STEVENS and others, have said we need to get this back on track, we need to change the way we are doing business.

I hope we can get through the appropriations process this year as soon as possible, so we can do some of these other bills that are very important to our country, so Senators will have an opportunity to fully debate and discuss these issues and offer amendments to issues that are outside the appropriations process.

I hope we will have time to work with serious leaders in the Senate who are worried about the budget process, who are worried about the rules, and have some debate on the floor and make some changes. There is no desire at all to set up a Rules Committee in the House of Representatives sense, but there is a desire by this majority leader, as by every majority leader, to find a way to move the process and the legislation through the Senate.

We did a marvelous job last week, if you look at it. It did not look pretty at various times, but last week we did pass reorganization of the Department of Energy. After probably a month of resisting doing the fundamental reorganization we need at the Department of Energy to stop the leaks of our very important nuclear secrets to China or anybody else, we finally got it to a vote last Tuesday, and the vote was, I think, 96–1—overwhelmingly bipartisan.

One might ask: Why did it take you so long? That is the way the Senate works sometimes. We have to think about it; we have to have debate; we work out some amendments. Also, it might be that nobody wanted to be on record as being against reorganization of the Department of Energy. Again, it was dragged out, and we had problems getting to the intelligence authorization bill. We even had to have a cloture vote to get to the intelligence authorization bill, the bill that provides for the intelligence information for our Federal Government, for the CIA.

I did not want to have to file a cloture motion on that, but I was told, in effect, that the Democrats were going to filibuster the motion to proceed. That meant the Democrats were going to filibuster even taking up the bill because they were not ready to debate the reorganization of the Department of Energy, I guess. I did not quite understand it. In order to get to a very important, very sensitive issue such as the intelligence authorization, the intelligence community of our Federal Government, which is such an important part of the defense of this country, the majority leader of the Senate had to file a cloture motion to even take up the bill for its consideration. If a change of heart had not happened, I would have had to file a second cloture motion to get to the substance of the bill.

The pontificating we do sometimes around here, the posturing about, oh, we are cut off—what is a leader supposed to do when told the motion to proceed to a bill is going to be filibustered? At that point, I have to take action to move a bill, such as the intelligence authorization, forward. When the smoke cleared, it passed. We got that bill done.

We got to the State-Justice-Commerce appropriations bill, a bill that quite often takes days, sometimes weeks, sometimes longer than weeks, with lots of amendments offered. As a matter of fact, with the cooperation of both sides of the aisle, on Thursday night at approximately 9:45 that legislation was passed.

Today I went over and shook the hand of Senator REID of Nevada and said: It would not have happened without your aggressive work in clearing amendments that could be accepted, in getting amendments withdrawn that really did not need to be offered.

We did it on both sides of the aisle. I went to Republicans and said: You do not want to do this here. And Senator DASCHLE did the same thing on the Democratic side of the aisle. That is how one works through the appropriations bills because many of these amendments had no business being offered at that hour on that bill and on those subjects with no consideration being given by the committees or by the chairmen.

If we can reinstate rule XVI today, we will see our appropriations bills able to go through without as much dilatory action or without as many amendments that really are strictly legislation on appropriations bills. I do believe that on both sides of the aisle Members know this precedent needs to be put back in place.

Will it cure all the problems? No. As a matter of fact, Senators may just use other dilatory tactics, and if they can find a way to do that or if they can appeal the ruling of the Chair, maybe the precedent will be reversed again. That will be the will of the body. I will have no great concern about that. Then we can move on from this to the next step.

Senator STEVENS and Senator BYRD have proposed amendments that will go beyond what reinstating this particular rule XVI will do. I hope we would take a look at that before this year is out.

So I may have to come back later on to respond in wrapup on some of these issues. But I do, again, refer you to the Shakespeare quote from Hamlet: I do think you ''protest too much'' as we work to reinstate a precedent that we all know will serve the institution quite well.

Mr. REID. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. LOTT. I am glad to yield. You have no time; you have used it all today. We understand you had a lot of speakers. I would like to reserve as much of our time as possible for other Senators who wish to come to the floor to speak on this subject on our side.

Having said that, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. REID. Thank you.

I say to my friend, for whom I have the utmost respect, I know how hard you work trying to move things along. I have tried to be as much help as I can be. But from the most junior Member of the Senate, Senator BAYH, to the most senior Member on this side, Senator BYRD, there has been a general belief today that we need to do more legislating, with fewer quorum calls; some more debate needs to take place. So I hope my friend understands the belief of the membership of the minority that we need to do more legislating.

I also say to my friend that I have asked—in colloquies here with Members from the majority who came to speak today—how is it logically consistent that you can vote to change rule XVI and not vote to change rule XXVIII? And they all three said—I only asked three the question—it is not logical to do that.

I hope that the majority would take a very close look at rule XXVIII to see to it that we do not wind up with a situation like we wound up in last fall, with a 1,500-page bill that just a few people developed.

So I hope, I repeat, that the Senator will listen to the spirit of the debate today. It was not acrimonious. I think it was constructive criticism. We all love the Senate. You are the leader. We recognize that. But we need to move along and do more legislating as the Senate, we think, should be legislating.

I thank you very much for yielding.

Mr. BYRD. Will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, having been majority leader in the 95th and the 96th and again in the 100th Congress, I want to assure the distinguished majority leader that I have experienced all of his troubles, all of his problems. And this business of having to deal with a filibuster on a motion to proceed is nothing new around here. That has been the case for decades. So the distinguished majority leader is not experiencing something that I did not experience or that other leaders did not experience.

The motion to proceed to the civil rights bill of 1964 was debated 2 weeks. That was just the motion to proceed. And the bill itself was before the Senate 77 days. It was actually debated 57 days, including 6 Saturdays. All in all, including the time that it took to get up the motion to proceed, and the time to deal with the bill itself, and then including, I believe it was, 9 days following cloture before the vote on passage occurred on the bill, it took 103 days—103 calendar days—to deal with the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

I was the only non-Southern Democrat—the only non-Southern Democrat—to vote against that bill. And I was against cloture on it. Other than Senator Hayden and Senator Bible, I was the only non-Southern Democrat to vote against cloture. So I have been through all these travails and trials that the majority leader has experienced. And I empathize with him and sympathize with him, because I have been there, too. But it is nothing new to be confronted with a possible filibuster on a motion to proceed. I had to deal with that many times.

Mr. LOTT. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. The distinguished Senator has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Didn't the Senator occasionally file a cloture motion on a filibuster of a motion to proceed?

Mr. BYRD. I did.

Mr. LOTT. That is what I have had to do on occasion, too. And sometimes the majority leader might decide not to do that, to go ahead.

Mr. BYRD. This leader did so on occasion. But this leader did not do it all the time, nor did this leader fill the tree all the time. I filled the tree a few times, very few times, but not all the time.

I do not call up many amendments here. I am not one of those whom the distinguished majority leader has in mind when he talks about Senators calling up many amendments.

Mr. LOTT. That is right.

Mr. BYRD. I do not do that often. But Senators do have the right to offer amendments. The distinguished majority leader has his problems. I know them. I know them well. I sympathize with him and want to work with him and want to help him.

I call attention to the fact that there are 63 Senators in this body who never served in this body when I was majority leader—63. I said this morning that more than a third, but it was actually almost two-thirds of the Members of this body were not here when I was majority leader.

I was glad to hear the Senator quote Shakespeare. Let me quote from Shakespeare also:

'Tis in my memory lock'd
And you yourself shall keep the key of it.

So, Mr. President, I certainly will always want to cooperate with the distinguished leader when I can. I have to say I think there is too much partisanship in this Senate, on both sides, far more partisanship in the Senate than there was when I came here. I would urge again that the distinguished Majority Leader let Democrats call up amendments and that he call up legislative bills, and thereby give Senators a chance to call up their amendments so that they will not have to resort to offering them on appropriations bills.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, could I respond to some of the comments Senator BYRD has made?

Mr. BYRD. Absolutely.

Mr. LOTT. Because there are several points you have made to which I would like to respond.

Mr. BYRD. Absolutely.

Mr. LOTT. We have other Senators who may want to speak, but I did not want to interrupt if you were about to make a point. But I do want to comment on some of those issues that you mentioned.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will proceed.

Mr. LOTT. First of all, with regard to the partisanship, as a matter of fact, I

think I would have to disagree with the Senator from West Virginia. I have not been in the Senate nearly as long as he has, but I have been working with Congress for 30 years—30 years. I am 57. I came here when I was 26. I was a staff member for 4 years; 16 years in the House. I saw partisanship at its worst in the House when I was a Member and part of an oppressed minority in the House.

I have been in the Senate for going on 11 years. I really do not feel that much partisanship. I feel a real warmth toward a number of Democrats. And I thought it was just this year, just a short time ago, that we came through a historic impeachment trial in which we stood in these aisles—this center aisle here—together and said, this was a tough task; it was a constitutional requirement we had a duty to do. We performed our duty, and whether you agreed with the end result or not, most folks felt it was done fairly and not with shrill partisanship.

Even when we disagree on substantive issues, I think the Senate is almost the only place in this city where it does not get to be shrill partisanship. I see the distinguished ranking member from New York of the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee is probably the most bipartisan, nonpartisan committee in the entire Congress. We do not always come out with a bipartisan bill, but usually we report a bill that has votes from both sides of the aisle. That was the case just last week on the tax bill; a couple Democrats voted with the Republicans.

I don't believe that is partisanship, No. 1. The reason I think it doesn't get that shrill is because we are sensitive to each other's needs to be heard, to our individual needs. We have tried to be a Senate that understands that Senators have families, and I think just that relationship helps because Members are not exhausted and mad at each other. I want to continue to further that.

In terms of giving the Democrats a chance, while there has been a lot of hollering about it, the fact is, you have been getting a pretty good chance. As a matter of fact, on the juvenile justice bill, I could have gone through all kinds of contortions and gyrations to try to block that, but I thought it was a bill that came out of the Judiciary Committee on a bipartisan basis after 3 years of work, and we ought to take it up.

Did I like the way it went on a week more than I had been told it would take to get it done? No. As the Senator from West Virginia said, the Senate had to work its will, and there were more amendments cooking out there. I didn't run around out here trying to block them. Some of my colleagues said I should have done that. We worked our will.

We wrangled around on the Patients' Bill of Rights for almost a year. We could have done that bill last fall, but we couldn't come to agreement. We came to agreement. We took the bill up. We got it done.

Now, there were some speeches made the day before we completed that bill about how terrible the process was, but the night we got it done, Senators on both sides stood up and said: Well, I don't like all this and it wasn't perfect, but basically we got our fair shot, and we got our work done.

As far as giving people the chance, I have a list, two pages of bills that have been done this year that are not appropriations bills. We did the first concurrent budget resolution on time, only the second time in 25 years. We provided small business loan guarantees to small businesses that have year 2000 problems. We passed a national missile defense bill, which the President signed just the other day. And by the way, in his statement with his signing it, he misstated what the bill did. We passed a soldiers' and sailors' pay raise bill. We passed education flexibility. We had some Democrats who worked on that all the way. The President was saying all the way: I will veto it; I will veto it. Finally we got it done and he signed it. We passed the water resources bill. This is an area where we haven't passed an authorization bill, I think, in 5 years. We have passed it. The House has passed it, and after a lot of work, we actually got it into conference. Juvenile justice, we passed that through. The majority leader is trying to get to conference on that. We are going to have to have a bipartisan effort to get to conference.

Defense authorization; energy bill package; financial modernization, a bill that has been coming for 10 years—people didn't think the Senate would have any chance to pass a financial modernization bill. We got it through the Senate. Hopefully, we will get it through. The list goes on in terms of Senators being able to have amendments on authorizations bills and getting important authorization bills through.

While the majority leader has to sometimes say we ought to be doing more, the fact of the matter is, we have been doing pretty good this year. I invite my colleagues and the public to take a look at this two-page list of bills. As a matter of fact, we have already passed eight appropriations bills. We are probably a week or maybe a bill or two behind where we ought to be on appropriations, but in recent history, that is pretty good progress. I would like to keep that going.

In terms of filling up the tree, again, I didn't invent this idea. In fact, I think I first saw it when Senator Mitchell used it. But Senator Dole used it on the 1985 budget resolution. Senator BYRD used it in 1977 on the energy deregulation bill. In fact, to study the brilliant use of the rules of the Senate, I have gone back and read and reread that particular bill and how Senator BYRD handled it. Of course, as I recall, I think Senator Baker was probably working with you on that issue, but I know it was tough. You had to have vote after vote after vote after vote to break basically an amendment filibuster.

Mr. BYRD. Which bill was that?

Mr. LOTT. The energy deregulation bill, of 1977, during the Carter years. As I recall Senator Metzenbaum and others were resisting in every way possible. Senator BYRD filled up the tree on the Grove City bill in 1984, and the campaign finance bill in 1988, Senator BYRD filled up the tree there—there were eight cloture votes on that particular bill—and then on the emergency supplemental appropriations bill in 1993.

Sometimes I thought it was a brilliant move. Sometimes I thought it was the right thing; sometimes I didn't.

But the Senator is right, the majority leader has a job to do. Sometimes it is not easy. Sometimes it is quite difficult. But I think it is important that he continues to try to encourage the Senate forward and do it in such a way that when he leaves at the close of business on Monday, the 26th, he will be able to come back the 27th and work with every Senator the next day.

I wanted to respond on some of those comments.

Mr. BYRD. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. LOTT. Surely.

Mr. BYRD. The majority leader was not on the floor earlier when I said that as the majority leader, I resorted to filling the tree a few times. So what the distinguished majority leader said doesn't reveal anything that is new and doesn't really reveal anything that I haven't myself already said today. I did that. I may have been the first one to fill up the tree in my service in the Senate—I am not sure—but I did do that on a few occasions, but only on a very few occasions. I didn't make it a practice.

I also compliment the majority leader, and have done so on several occasions, for his judicious and very fair handling of the impeachment trial. I think the Senate did itself honor and did well by virtue of the fact that both leaders put the welfare of the Senate and the welfare of the country ahead of political party. I complimented the majority leader at that time, and I do again. He demonstrated real statesmanship on that occasion.

Let me just say, again, what I said earlier this morning about political party. It is important to me, but I have never felt that political party is the most important thing. The Senate is more important than any political party. Many things are more important than political party. I have said that. But during my tenure as the majority leader, I always tried to protect the rights of the minority. Many times I made a point of it. I tried to protect the rights of the minority because that is a great part of what this forum is all about, protection of minority rights.

I can also say that Senator STEVENS and I did work together to come up

with some proposals that would have improved our situation, I think. We came up with a resolution containing several rules changes, with the understanding of the distinguished majority leader and with his full knowledge. I wanted it to be called up and debated and acted upon, but it is still in the Rules Committee. Nothing has ever been done about it.

Our concern, going back to rule XVI, is this: Under the earlier operation of Rule XVI, a point of order could be made against legislation on an appropriations bill. If the question of germaneness was raised, the matter was submitted to the Senate for an immediate vote. The Senate voted on it. If the Senate decided on that vote that the House had already opened the door to legislation on an appropriations bill, the Senate certainly had a right to respond by further amendment.

The problem now is, we are calling up appropriations bills that come out of the Senate Appropriations Committee. They are Senate appropriations bills. No point of order can be made that they constitute legislation on appropriations bills. There is no question of germaneness. If we go back to rule XVI, unless we take up the House appropriations bills, we cannot make the point of germaneness against a Senate appropriations bill. That is our problem.

Senators right now, myself included, who voted to uphold the Chair on that occasion and stay with rule XVI, are concerned about going back to it now because we are normally acting on Senate appropriations bills, not House Appropriations bills. I have to applaud Senator STEVENS. He is one of the best Appropriations Committee chairmen I have served with, and he seeks to take advantage of the time and get something done. We have Senate hearings and we mark up regular appropriations bills and then we act on them on the floor. When the House bill comes over to the Senate we substitute the text of the Senate bill in lieu of the House bill. That is all well and good. It saves time. But it does away with the opportunity to raise the question of germaneness. The question of germaneness cannot be raised unless we bring the House Appropriations bill up and the House has previously opened the door to legislation. I hate to vote against going back to rule XVI; I would like to go back to it.

Mr. LOTT. If the Senator will yield, I had the impression earlier that Senator STEVENS wanted to reinstate rule XVI, and I actually had the impression that the Senator from West Virginia also wanted to.

Mr. BYRD. I did. But as I explained this morning, it is the only way Senators, in many instances—the majority leader has mentioned the juvenile justice bill and he has mentioned——

Mr. LOTT. The Patients' Bill of Rights.

Mr. BYRD. Yes, the Patients' Bill of Rights. Those are bills that he allowed the Senate to work its will on. The product that came out at the end was a product of the will of the Senate.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could, if the Senator will allow——

Mr. BYRD. If I might finish my sentence, the majority leader has the floor, but I hope he lets me respond to the point he is making. We majority leaders like to finish our points, you know.

Mr. LOTT. I get awfully excited when a point is made that I feel like I need to respond to. I will withhold until the Senator finishes his statement.

Mr. BYRD. I have always been a majority leader willing to hear the other man respond. He mentioned two or three bills, and those are good examples of the work the Senate can do when it is given the opportunity to offer amendments and take time on the bill. I hope that we do more of that.

My reason for voting, as I will later today, against going back to that rule is two or threefold. One is, the majority who had the votes then overturned the rule. The majority, which has the votes now, will reinstitute it. In the future, I am wondering if the situation will arise when it will be to the majority's benefit again and it will use its vote to overturn the rule again. But the reason I will vote against it today is because Senators on this side, according to my observations—and I don't make much of a big to-do often here—but Senators on this side of the aisle are simply not given the right to act on legislative bills much of the time, so they have no other resort but the appropriations bills. Therefore, I think I have to vote against reinstituting the rule.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I might respond to that, I think what is involved here is Democrats want to dictate the schedule around here. The Democrats want to dictate what the schedule is. When you say yes, juvenile justice and the Patients' Bill of Rights are examples of the way it can be done around here, it is because those were bills on which there was pressure to bring them up, not in the order that had been planned. But is the Senator saying, for instance, that the Democrats didn't also support or were not involved in these other bills that actually had bipartisan support, such as the national missile defense, which Senator INOUYE was a cosponsor of; the soldiers and sailors pay raise bill, which had bipartisan support; education flexibility, which had bipartisan support; water resources, which passed unanimously, and defense authorization? These are not bills that I bring up because they are bills Republicans want; these are bills that are in the interest of the country.

Mr. BYRD. The majority leader is preeminently correct. He is talking about bills that can be brought up in which both sides have had an opportunity to give and take and offer amendments, so the country benefits.

Mr. LOTT. The list is very long here. I don't quite understand what the complaint is.

Mr. BYRD. If I wanted to point to a list, I could point to a list of bills on this calendar that is very long that haven't been taken up.

Mr. LOTT. That is partially because of the amount of time that has been taken up with other bills that were not scheduled. Bankruptcy, for instance, has been bumped several times because it took longer. The will of the Senate was to take longer in the debate of other bills. There is the case of the nuclear waste legislation, which the Senate passed a couple years ago. Now the Energy and Natural Resources Committee has come up with a bill that is very different. I think maybe it could have even broader support than the previous bill, which I think got about 63, 64, or 65 votes, or was going to have that many.

So the point is, the majority has to try to bring up bills in which there is broad interest and that have support—things such as the State Department and Defense Department authorizations. My goodness, if we don't authorize the legislation for the Department of Defense, we can't get the appropriations bill, or it causes all kinds of problems. A lot of what I bring up is dictated by, frankly, what the Constitution requires, or what has to be done to keep the Government operating in an appropriate way.

Here is a bill, the Workforce Incentives Improvement Act, which had problems when it came out of committee. They were worked on and this bill passed, I think, probably overwhelmingly, if not unanimously. It is one that was a high Democratic priority, but also had the support of the chairman of the Finance Committee and the ranking member. The Y2K bill was a bill that had bipartisan support out of Judiciary and also out of a second committee, where you had Democrats involved in both instances. Yet it took us weeks to get that bill done. I think we had to go through three cloture votes to get that bill done, which the President signed into law.

Mr. BYRD. But if it is an important bill, what is wrong with taking 3 weeks?

Mr. LOTT. Because if you take 3 weeks on a bill like Y2K liability limits, which should have gone through here relatively quickly, that makes it more difficult to call up other bills that Senators would also like to consider.

I think maybe the Senator and I are involved in a discussion of scheduled events and rules which is important to us and important to the way the body works. I think the main thing we need to be saying to the American people is that we are going to work together to try to get our business done. By the way, the length of speech doesn't necessarily mean that the merit is all that great.

In terms of bipartisanship, I think I have proven several times, including

working with the administration in 1996 and 1997 to get Medicare reform, tax cuts for working Americans, budget restraint, welfare reform, illegal immigration reform, health care portability—we have worked in a lot of areas in a bipartisan way across the aisle and across the Capitol and with the administration. I would like for us to continue doing that. I am one of the few Members—to show just how nonpartisan or bipartisan I am, I came to the city thinking I was a Democrat, but I was elected as a Republican. So I served on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. I certainly don't want to appear to be trying to take anything away from the distinguished majority leader, who has accomplished many things. I compliment him, and I have done so many times. I have spoken behind his back as well as to his face that he has many attributes that I admire. But surely the distinguished majority leader didn't mean what he said when he said the Democrats were trying to dictate the scheduling. This Democrat doesn't do that, and the majority leader knows that. This Democrat has no such intention, and I don't think the Democrats here, who are in the minority, would attempt to try to dictate the schedule.

The Democrats, as I observe them, are trying to stand up for their rights, and they certainly have the right to debate and the right to offer amendments. I have no interest in taking over the schedule here. But I do have an interest in the Senate. I think the Senate has gone downhill. I think it is too partisan, and I don't think the minority has been given the right to call up amendments. I have seen the distinguished majority leader call up a bill and immediately put a cloture motion on it. I have done that a few times, too, my friend, but I never made it a practice to do it day after day and time after time. You can search my record if you want to, but I also have a memory. I was majority leader here, as I say, before 63 of the current Senators, including the majority leader, got here. I am pretty well informed about what has gone on before.

I am not here to attack the majority leader today. I admire him. I count him as my friend. As far as I am concerned, he will remain that way. But I think the Senate is being hurt. I don't want the Senate to be hurt. I think the American people want their work done.

I had the same problem that the Senator is talking about. I called our Democratic Senators one day into my office, and I said: Now, I'll tell you what I am going to do. We are going to have a week's or ten-day break every 4 weeks here. We are going to go home and talk to our people.

I got a big hand of applause.

Then I said: Now, the other side of that coin is, we are going to be here 5 days a week, and we are going to work 5 days a week. And we are going to have votes 5 days a week, on Mondays as well as on Fridays.

I first offered the carrot, and then I offered the stick, and it worked.

I am the one—I am the culprit—who started this business of having breaks every 4 or 5 weeks. But I also kept the Senate here. Not everybody on this side of the aisle liked me for it. As I said, it is not the quality of life around here that counts to me; as long as I am the majority leader, it is the quality of work that counts.

I have been through all of that. We got the work done. Senators were able to call up their amendments. They were able to get votes on them. Look at the Record of the 100th Congress. You will see a good record.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, when the Senator was talking about the rights of the minority, I thought it was I speaking. I remembered my saying the same thing. In fact, I was sitting right over there. I think there were only three desks there. I remember pleading with Senator Mitchell, who was standing right there, the majority leader. I believed I was being oppressed and that the minority rights were not being honored.

I remember also sitting right over there pleading with the Senator from Texas, who was chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator Bentsen, to offer an amendment. As I recall, it had something to do with university loans or scholarships. I remember being prohibited from offering that amendment.

I know when you are in the minority you are not always happy with the way you are treated. But I think we need to work together to try to not have that be the all-consuming viewpoint around here, and I don't think it has.

I remember how rough it was being in the minority. I was there for 21 years. I didn't like it at all. I like the majority much better. But I think you have to try to be reasonable on both sides of the aisle. That is why I have been a little bit shocked today by the tone of the debate which I was watching. Although I was not participating in it, I thought I had to come out here and, in effect, explain what happened—explain what this really means, and a little bit to defend my honor.

But I appreciate what the Senator has said. I know he has been helpful since I have been the majority leader. I am sure he will help us try to get our work done in the future as he has done in the past.

If I could, let me ask unanimous consent.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator allow me once more?

Mr. LOTT. I would, but I would point out that we only have a few minutes left. I need to hold a few minutes. I see Senator CHAFEE may want to speak.

I will yield one more time.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator cannot quote one time today, or before today, in which I said anything that would or could be properly interpreted as impugning his honor. I would not do that. If he can cite one time, I will apologize for it right now.

Mr. LOTT. I wouldn't, couldn't, and would never expect to even try.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank Senator BYRD.

I ask unanimous consent that the votes in regard to the scope amendment and the vote on adoption of S. Res. 160 occur at 5:30 p.m. in stacked sequence with 2 minutes of debate between each vote and the final vote in the sequence being the cloture vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President. I strongly support S. Res. 160, and urge my colleagues to vote for this important measure.

If this resolution is approved, it will restore Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate—a rule which, in one form or another, has served the Senate well since 1850. By restoring Rule XVI, Senators will again have at their disposal a procedural tool—a point of order—which can be raised against legislative amendments to appropriations measures. Though this point of order can be waived by a simple majority, it nonetheless reinstates an important procedural safeguard to discourage this harmful practice of legislating on appropriations bills.

Since 1995, when the Senate voted in effect to overturn Rule XVI, we have witnessed a proliferation of so-called ''legislative riders'' on appropriations bills. Regrettably, much of this activity has been aimed at undermining our environmental laws. However, no authorizing committee's turf is safe without firm dividing lines clearly to differentiate the functions performed by these two types of committees.

Authorizing committees are responsible for developing and overseeing the laws and programs which fall within their respective jurisdictions. The Appropriations Committee is then tasked with establishing appropriate funding levels on an annual basis for each of these programs, based upon the availability of discretionary resources.

Shortly, the Senate is scheduled to consider the Fiscal 2000 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill. Unfortunately, this measure is laden with legislative riders. By singling these provisions out, I do not mean to suggest that they are not deserving of our consideration. To the contrary, these provisions should be thoroughly examined—but not in the context of the appropriations process.

The authorizing committees, which have the substantive expertise, are the proper fora within which to consider and evaluate these provisions. However, as most of us know, by attaching a rider to an appropriations bill, one

avoids having to defend it from the public scrutiny that comes with the authorizing committee process. Moreover, as part of must-pass annual funding bills, these often objectionable provisions are virtually assured of being signed into law, despite any misgivings a President might have.

In addition to miring the appropriations process in controversy, the ability to attach legislative riders to annual spending bills also undermines the power of the authorizing committees to advance authorizing legislation. In fact, appropriations riders have, in some cases, made it difficult to reauthorize some government programs.

Thus, Mr. President, the public interest is not well-served by the practice of including legislative provisions in appropriations bills. Unfortunately, reinstatement of Rule XVI will not fully address this problem because the point of order—this is important to note—only applies to legislative amendments which are offered on the floor, and not to legislative provisions added during committee action.

In the days when the Senate Appropriations Committee took up and amended House-passed appropriations measures, all of the Committee's changes were considered amendments. Today, as a general matter, the Senate Appropriations Committee develops its own original bills. Thus, the Rule XVI point of order does not apply to legislation added during the committee process—rather only to legislative amendments that are offered on the floor.

In other words, in a bill coming from the Appropriations Committee you can have, in effect, a legislative rider. That is there. As we are proposing it, as I understand it, the reinvigoration of rule XVI only applies to those legislative measures that are added on the floor.

Thus, while S. Res. 160 is an important first step, it does not go far enough. In order to fully protect the interests of the authorizing committees, the Rule XVI point of order should be made applicable to legislative provisions which have been added to appropriations bills during committee action.

For this reason, we should not only restore Rule XVI, but also strengthen it, as Senators STEVENS and BYRD have proposed in S. Res. 8, which they introduced earlier this year. As the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, these Senators know better than most of us that legislative riders have hindered their ability to secure timely passage of the 13 annual spending bills. Their proposal would subject all legislation contained in appropriations measures—regardless of whether added on the floor or in committee—to the Rule XVI point of order.

Thus, while I will vote for S. Res. 160, I will continue to press my colleagues to further strengthen Rule XVI by adopting S. Res. 8.

I thank the Chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1343

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] proposes an amendment numbered 1343.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent 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 add the following:

The presiding officer of the Senate shall apply all precedents of the Senate under Rule XXVIII in effect at the conclusion of the 103rd Congress.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, this amendment addresses what we consider to be one of the major procedural problems facing Senators today. It has to do with what is referred to here as the scope of conference.

For those who may be watching this debate and are not totally familiar with parliamentary procedure, after a bill is passed in the House and passed in the Senate, the bill goes to conference. Here the House- and Senate-passed bills, two separate pieces of legislation, are melded into one in a way that hopefully will be acceptable to members from both Chambers of Congress. Only one bill can become law. The conference report represents an agreement between the House and the Senate as to what specific proposals ought to be included in a single piece of legislation.

It has always been the case that when a bill comes to conference, if there is something in the House bill that is not in the Senate bill, or something in the Senate bill that is not in the House bill, a vote is taken and a decision made about the propriety of including that provision for the final version in the conference agreement.

At no time, up until recent years, was there ever consideration given to a situation where if a provision did not appear in either the House or Senate versions, could it even be considered in the conference.

However, a decision was made by the majority to allow original legislative provisions to be taken up in the conference, that is language that may not have even been debated in either body let alone received a recorded vote.

As a result of this decision made by the majority, we can go into this conference—whose purpose it is to work out the differences between the House and the Senate—and completely bypass the relevant authorizing and appropriations committees. In a sense, this decision set up a ''super'' legislative committee that makes up its mind oftentimes without the benefit of House or Senate hearings, without the benefit of action in any House or Senate committee, and without a vote on either the House or Senate floor. It is an amazing set of circumstances.

We have seen that happen over and over again. The most consequential incident occurred at the end of the last session when the White House and a relatively small group of Senate and House conferees made decisions that were not based on any actions taken in either body of Congress.

The distinguished Presiding Officer, after it happened on October 20, addressed this issue as eloquently and as succinctly as any Member I have heard. If my colleagues haven't had the opportunity to hear what he said, I think this excerpt states it so well:

I don't believe the Founding Fathers of this country ever intended for a few Members and staff to make more than one half of a trillion dollars worth of arbitrary, closed-door decisions for the rest of us, for America—almost one-third of the Federal budget—and then present them to all other Senators and Representatives, men and women, elected by the people of this country, by the taxpayers, and then say take it or leave it, an up-or-down vote.

So said the Senator from Nebraska.

The Senator from Utah said something similar and equally on point. Senator HATCH, on the same day on the Senate floor, said:

We should all be concerned about the perception this backward procedure—one in which we are considering conference reports on bills that have not even passed the Senate yet—will set a precedent for the future. Mr. President, I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in a sweeping denunciation of this as anything other than a one-time event.

I wish this had been a one-time event. Unfortunately, it happens over and over and over. It is a complete emasculation of the process our Founding Fathers had set up. It has nothing to do with the legislative process.

If you were going to write a book on how a bill becomes a law, you would need several volumes. In fact, if the consequences were not so profound, some could say you would need a comic book because it is almost hilarious to look at the lengths we have gone to thwart and undermine and, in an extraordinary way, destroy a process that has worked so well for 220 years.

This amendment simply says let's get real. If we mean what we say, and if we truly want to end this amazing process, now is our chance. This is the opportunity. I am very hopeful our colleagues will support our effort to put democracy back into the legislative process, to ensure the committees, authorizing and appropriating, have an opportunity to express themselves and to ensure every single Senator on the

Senate floor has an opportunity to express himself or herself.

As I noted earlier, the dictatorial, take-it-or-leave-it approach referred to by the two Republican Senators is, unfortunately, not a one-time event. It has happened over and over. If we are serious about making changes, I cannot think of anything that ought to change more quickly and with broader bipartisanship than this. We will have an opportunity.

I appreciate very much the eloquence, leadership, and interest in making changes expressed by our colleagues over the course of many different occasions, occasions just as egregious as the one last October. On each of these occasions, Senators have been denied their basic rights as elected Representatives of the people of their State, and a mockery has been made of our legal and legislative process.

This is a very critical amendment. We will have an opportunity to vote on it in 15 minutes. I hope we make the right decision. I hope it is a bipartisan decision. I hope we can do it in a way that will allow us the opportunity, once and for all, to put common sense and some semblance of order into our conference process and the conference reports that we are called to vote on after the process has been completed.

Mr. President, I will speak just briefly about the underlying matter; that is rule XVI. I appreciate very much the effort made by the assistant Democratic leader. He has managed our time so exceptionally well. I am grateful to him once more for the extraordinary effort he has made in making sure colleagues have the opportunity to express themselves and to orchestrate our response to arguments made by our colleagues on the other side. I think the record clearly shows what the Democratic position was several years ago when our colleagues overturned the ruling of the Chair. We had said at the time that rule XVI was there for a reason. We believe rule XVI existed because there is an authorizing and an appropriating process. What has happened since that vote is interesting. What has happened is the Senate has become more like the House of Representatives than I believe it has, probably, ever been in our Nation's history.

The House of Representatives has a very tight process by which amendments are considered. There has to be a Rules Committee. The Rules Committee decides, on each and every piece of legislation, how many amendments are offered. The majority dominates the Rules Committee, as we know, by a two-thirds to one-third ratio. When Democrats were in the majority, when I was in the House, I thought what an incredible power that is. For the Rules Committee, with its membership ratio tilted so heavily in favor of the majority, to decide means the majority gets its way virtually every single time. Only on rare occasions do a combination of minority and majority Members of the House join forces to thwart the will of the majority. That does not happen very often.

The Founding Fathers, in their wisdom, saw fit not to have a Rules Committee in the Senate in that same sense of the word. We do have a Rules Committee. It is very important and carries out some functions that are in large measure directly related to how this Senate operates. However the committee does not dictate how the Senate floor operates. There is no gatekeeper when it comes to legislation. The gatekeeper is all of us, 60 votes.

Yet, what do we see now all too frequently? On virtually every single piece of legislation that comes to the Senate floor, the bill is filed, the so-called parliamentary tree is filled, and cloture votes are scheduled. Why would we be opposed to that? We are opposed to that because once there is no opportunity for us to offer amendments—whether they are directly germane to the bill or not—we are precluded from being full partners as legislators. We are precluded from the opportunity to express ourselves, to make alterations, to offer suggestions, to have the kind of debate on public policy that I think our Founding Fathers understood.

As a result of all of this, we have become increasingly concerned about what is happening to the Senate as an institution, as well as what it is doing to the Democratic Members who want very much to be a part of the legislative process as full-fledged Senators. So our vote is in large measure a protest of the extraordinary ways the legislative process has been altered now for the last several years; a process I do not believe our Founding Fathers ever anticipated; a process that is very much in keeping with the attitude and the mentality created by the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives. That is not what we were supposed to be.

People who want those kinds of rules ought to run and get elected to the House of Representatives. They ought not want to serve in the Senate. The Senate is a different body. Who was it who said the Senate is a saucer within which emotions and the rage of the day cool. Legislation oftentimes can be passed directly through the House of Representatives. It is only after they have been deliberative and thoughtful and considerate of a lot of different issues, and a supermajority, sometimes on controversial issues, having been supported, do we ultimately allow a bill to be passed in the Senate.

So this vote is about the institution. It is about protecting Senators' rights to be full-fledged Members of this body. It is about whether we, as Senators, want to be more like the House or more like what the Founding Fathers envisioned in the first place—full-fledged U.S. Senators with every expectation we can represent our people, we can represent our ideas and our agenda in whatever opportunity presents itself legislatively. Our Democratic and Republican colleagues certainly should support that notion.

Our Republican colleagues used it many times to their advantage when they were in the minority. We simply want the same opportunity to do it now.

My colleagues will be voting against this overturning of the ruling of the Chair in large measure because we still are not confident the majority is prepared to open up the legislative process as it was designed to be open up the process to allow amendments, open up and give us the opportunity to work with them to fashion legislation that will create a true consensus on whatever bill may be presented.

We will have two votes at 5:30 p.m. The first will be the vote on whether or not legislation that has never been considered in the House or the Senate ought to be included in a conference report. Democrats say no; no, we should not allow that.

The second vote will be about whether we permit Members of the Senate to offer legislation, whether it is on appropriations or authorization bills, without the encumbrance of a Rules Committee, a right that, by all description, was anticipated by the Founding Fathers.

I hope we can adopt the amendment I have offered. I hope we will reject the overturning of the Chair on rule XVI. I hope we can work together to accomplish more in a bipartisan fashion in a way that will allow all Senators to be heard and to contribute.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I noted that Senator DASCHLE used a quotation from a statement I made last fall concerning the Omnibus Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1990 in his arguments for his amendment to S. Res. 160.

I am flattered that he felt my words were of such import that he had them blown up to poster size and displayed them for all to see. I wish he would do that with all of my speeches.

In this case, however, I just wish he had quoted the entire statement. Although I, like many of our colleagues, expressed genuine frustration with the unusual process that resulted in the Omnibus Appropriations bill, my statement also defends it as necessary to prevent a devastating government shutdown. I regret that Senator DASCHLE took this excerpt out of context. Those who read my entire statement will see that it provides a much different position than what the Minority Leader suggests by excerpting this small section.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1343. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 221 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Akaka	Feingold	Lieberman
Baucus	Feinstein	Lincoln
Bayh	Graham	Mikulski
Biden	Hagel	Moynihan
Bingaman	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hollings	Reed
Breaux	Inouye	Reid
Bryan	Johnson	Robb
Byrd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Cleland	Kerrey	Roth
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Schumer
Dodd	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Durbin	Leahy	Wyden
Edwards	Levin	

NAYS—51

Abraham	Enzi	Mack
Allard	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Ashcroft	Frist	Murkowski
Bennett	Gorton	Nickles
Bond	Gramm	Roberts
Brownback	Grams	Santorum
Bunning	Grassley	Sessions
Burns	Gregg	Shelby
Campbell	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Chafee	Helms	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Hutchinson	Snowe
Collins	Hutchison	Specter
Coverdell	Inhofe	Stevens
Craig	Jeffords	Thomas
Crapo	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Warner

NOT VOTING—2

McCain	Voinovich

The amendment (No. 1343) was rejected.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

There are two minutes equally divided.

Who yields time?

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I 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.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we yield our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If all time is yielded, the question is on agreeing to the resolution. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 222 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Abraham	Enzi	McConnell
Allard	Fitzgerald	Moynihan
Ashcroft	Frist	Murkowski
Baucus	Gorton	Nickles
Bennett	Gramm	Roberts
Bond	Grams	Roth
Brownback	Grassley	Santorum
Bunning	Gregg	Sessions
Burns	Hagel	Shelby
Campbell	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Chafee	Helms	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Hutchinson	Snowe
Collins	Inhofe	Stevens
Coverdell	Jeffords	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Crapo	Lott	Thurmond
DeWine	Lugar	Warner
Domenici	Mack	

NAYS—45

Akaka	Feingold	Levin
Bayh	Feinstein	Lieberman
Biden	Graham	Lincoln
Bingaman	Harkin	Mikulski
Boxer	Hollings	Murray
Breaux	Hutchison	Reed
Bryan	Inouye	Reid
Byrd	Johnson	Robb
Cleland	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kerry	Schumer
Dodd	Kohl	Specter
Dorgan	Landrieu	Torricelli
Durbin	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Edwards	Leahy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

McCain	Voinovich

The resolution (S. Res. 160) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 160

Resolved, That the presiding officer of the Senate should apply all precedents of the Senate under rule 16, in effect at the conclusion of the 103d Congress.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM ACT OF 1999

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote scheduled for this evening be vitiated and that the Senate now turn to H.R. 1501.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1501) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide grants to ensure increased accountability for juvenile offenders; to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to provide quality prevention programs and accountability programs relating to juvenile delinquency; and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1344

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk to the pending juvenile justice bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] proposes an amendment numbered 1344.

(The text of the amendment is located in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the substitute to Calendar No. 165, H.R. 1501, the juvenile justice bill:

Trent Lott, Frank Murkowski, Chuck Hagel, Bill Frist, Jeff Sessions, Rick Santorum, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Christopher Bond, Orrin G. Hatch, John Ashcroft, Robert F. Bennett, Pat Roberts, Jim Jeffords, Arlen Specter, Judd Gregg, and Connie Mack.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now send another cloture motion to the desk to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 165, H.R. 1501, the juvenile justice bill:

Trent Lott, Frank Murkowski, Chuck Hagel, Bill Frist, Jeff Sessions, Rick Santorum, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Christopher Bond, Orrin G. Hatch, John Ashcroft, Robert F. Bennett, Pat Roberts, Jim Jeffords, Arlen Specter, Judd Gregg, and Connie Mack.

AMENDMENT NO. 1345 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1344

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk to the pending substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] proposes an amendment numbered 1345 to amendment No. 1344.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask 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:

In the substitute add the following:

This bill will become effective 1 day after enactment.

Mr. LOTT. I now 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1346 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1345

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send a second-degree amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] proposes an amendment numbered 1346 to amendment No. 1345.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask 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:

In the amendment to the substitute add the following:

The bill will become effective 2 days after enactment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1347

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk to the language proposed to be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] proposes an amendment numbered 1347 to the language of the bill proposed to be stricken.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask 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:

In the bill add the following:

The bill will become effective 3 days after enactment.

Mr. LOTT. I now 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1348 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1347

Mr. LOTT. Finally, Mr. President, I send a second-degree amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] proposes an amendment numbered 1348 to amendment No. 1347.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask 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:

In the amendment to the bill add the following:

The bill will become effective 4 days after enactment.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, I have filled the tree on the juvenile justice bill with the text of the Senate bill in an effort to send this bill to conference. The cloture vote on the pending amendment will occur on Wednesday morning.

I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote occur at 9:45 a.m. on Wednesday and that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. LOTT. It is interesting to note, Mr. President, that after a lot of concern or even complaints about the process of filling up the tree, here I am having to do that in order to go to conference. In this case, I am sure the Democrats and the Republicans support this effort so we can get this legislation to conference for its consideration. This is a perfect example of the majority leader sometimes having to use this type of technique.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I came to the floor last Wednesday to demonstrate the seriousness with which Senate Democrats take the matters included in S. 254, the Hatch-Leahy juvenile justice bill. I took the extraordinary step of propounding a unanimous-consent request to move the Senate to a House-Senate conference. I talked to the Majority Leader and the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee in advance of making the unanimous-consent request. I noted the history of this measure and the need to move to conference expeditiously if we are to have these programs in place before school resumes in the fall in the course of my colloquy with the Majority Leader last week.

The Hatch-Leahy juvenile justice bill, S. 254, passed the Senate after 2 weeks of open debate and after significant improvements over two months ago, on May 20, by a strong bipartisan vote of 73–25. More than one month ago, on June 17, the House passed its version of juvenile justice legislation but chose not to take up the Senate bill and insert its language, as is standard practice to move Congress toward a conference and final passage of legislation.

Instead, what the House did was wait until last week to send the Senate a ''blue slip'' returning S. 254 to the Senate on the ground that it contains what they consider a ''revenue provision'' that did not originate in the House. The provision they point to is the amendment to S. 254 that would amend the federal criminal code to ban the import of high capacity ammunition clips. Whatever the merits of that particular provision—and I will simply say that I did not support it—it appeared to me that the House had resorted to a procedural technicality to avoid a conference on juvenile justice legislation.

Two weeks ago, Republican leaders of the House and Senate were talking about appointing conferees by the end of that week. Instead, they took no action to move us toward a House-Senate conference but, instead, were moving us away from one. By propounding the unanimous consent last week, I was trying on behalf of congressional Democrats, to break the logjam. The unanimous consent would have cured the procedural technicality and would have resulted in the Senate requesting a conference and appointing conferees without further delay.

While I regret that Republican objection was made to my request last Wednesday, I note that it was repropounded by the Majority Leader the next day. I thank the Majority Leader for that. Unfortunately, even then, objection was made and the process is being extended from literally seconds into days and possibly weeks before we can conference this important matter.

Today, the Senate takes the first step outlined in my unanimous request, proceeding to take up the House-passed bill. Senators can cooperate in taking the additional steps outlined in my consent request to get to a conference and the Senate could proceed to appoint its conferees and request a conference without further delay, today. Alternatively, Senators can exercise their procedural rights to obstruct each step of the way and require a series of cloture petitions and votes. I hope that in the interests of school safety and enacting the many worthwhile programs in the Hatch-Leahy juvenile justice bill, they will begin to cooperate. The delay is costing us valuable time to get this juvenile justice legislation enacted before school resumes this fall. This is just plain wrong.

I spoke to the Senate before the July 4th recess about the need to press forward without delay on this bill. I contrasted the inaction on the juvenile justice bill with the swift movement on providing special legal protections to certain business interests. In just a few months, big business successfully lobbied for the passage of legislation to protection themselves against any accountability for actions or losses their products may cause to consumers. By contrast, some are dragging their feet and now actively obstructing the House and Senate from moving to appoint conferees on the juvenile justice bill that can make a difference in the lives of our children and families.

New programs and protections for school children could be in place when school resumes this fall. All of us—whether we are parents, grandparents, teachers, or policy makers are puzzling over the causes of kids turning violent in our country. The root causes are likely multifaceted. Nevertheless, the Hatch-Leahy juvenile justice bill is a firm and significant step in the right direction. The passage of this bill shows that when this body rolls up its sleeves and gets to work, we can make significant progress. But that progress will amount to naught if the House and Senate do not conference and proceed to final passage on a good bill.

Every parent, teacher and student in this country is concerned this summer about school violence over the last two years and worried about the situation they will confront this fall. Each one of us wants to do something to stop this violence. There is no single cause and no single legislative solution that will cure the ill of youth violence in our schools or in our streets. But we have an opportunity before us to do our part. It is unfortunate that the Senate is not moving full speed ahead to seize this opportunity to act on balanced, effective juvenile justice legislation.

I want to be assured that after the hard work we all put into crafting a good juvenile justice bill, that we can go to a House-Senate conference that is

fair, full, and productive. We have worked too hard in the Senate for a strong bipartisan juvenile justice bill to simply shrug our shoulders when the House returns a juvenile justice bill rather than proceeding to a conference and a narrow minority in the Senate would rather we do nothing. I will be vigilant in working to maintain this bipartisanship and to press for action on this important legislation.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business, with Members able to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I will announce that it is the intent of the majority leader to go to the Interior appropriations bill tomorrow morning. There are some procedures we are having to work through. I hope that can be accomplished overnight and we will be able to move to the Interior appropriations bill soon after morning business as possible on Tuesday. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Ms. LANDRIEU and Mr. AKAKA pertaining to the introduction of S. 1434 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

(The remarks of Mr. CONRAD pertaining to the introduction of S. 1436 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

TRIBUTE TO MAJ. GEN. PAUL V. HESTER, USAF

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment today to recognize one of the finest officers in the United States Air Force, Major General Paul V. Hester. On July 30th, General Hester will leave his current job as Director of the Air Force Office of Legislative Liaison to take over the important posts of Commander, United States Forces, Japan; Commander, 5th Air Force; and Commander, United States Air Forces, Japan. During his time here in Washington—particularly with regard to his work on Capitol Hill—General Hester personified the Air Force core values of integrity, selfless service and excellence in all things. Many Senators and Staff enjoyed the opportunity to interact with him on a variety of important issues and came to appreciate his many talents. Today it is my privilege to recognize some of Paul's many accomplishments since he entered the military 27 years ago, and to commend the superb service he provided the Air Force, the Congress and our Nation.

Paul Hester entered the Air Force through the Reserve Officer Training Corps from my alma mater, the University of Mississippi. While at ''Ole Miss'', he completed both bachelor's and master's degrees in Business Administration. He earned his pilot wings in December of 1971 at Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi and was then assigned to Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, where he flew the A–7D Corsair. A short time later, he was deployed to Southeast Asia where he distinguished himself flying combat missions and earned five Air Medals for outstanding airmanship and courage. Over his career, General Hester demonstrated his skill in other fighter aircraft, including the F–4, F–15 and F–16, and logged more than 2,600 hours of flying time.

General Hester's exceptional leadership skills were always evident to his superiors and he repeatedly proved himself in numerous select command positions. While stationed at Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, he served as the commander of the 94th Fighter Squadron, Captain Eddie Rickenbacker's famed ''Hat in the Ring Gang.'' He was also the first Commander of the 18th Operations Group, Kadena Air Base, Japan; Commander of the 35th Fighter Wing at Misawa Air Base, Japan, and prior to his assignment here in Washington, Commander of the 53rd Wing, Eglin Air Force Base, Florida. At each and every one of these important posts, Paul Hester inspired the airmen under his command to achieve their best, and ensured our forces were sharpened and ready to undertake our warfighting commitments.

Paul Hester also excelled in a variety of key staff billets. He served in the Air Force Directorate of Plans at the Pentagon, and he was a member of the Commanders' Action Group, Headquarters Tactical Air Command, Langley Air Force Base, Virginia. He experienced joint duty as both the J–5 Division Chief to the Joint Staff and as the Joint Chiefs of Staff representative to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, Vienna, Austria. As a Lieutenant Colonel, he was selected as the Chief of the Air Force's Legislative Liaison Office to the U.S. House of Representatives. His performance in that important position is the reason he was brought back as a Major General to lead the entire legislative directorate for the Secretary of the Air Force.

During his service to the 105th and 106th Congresses, General Hester has been the liaison to the Air Force on a variety of readiness issues and most recently, ALLIED FORCE operations in Kosovo. His clear, concise, and timely information was instrumental in supporting our deliberations of National Security matters. He was a crucial voice for the Air Force in representing its many programs on the Hill. General Hester's leadership, professional abilities and expertise enabled him to foster excellent working relationships that benefitted both the Air Force and the Senate. Throughout the time I have known Paul, I have been impressed with his skill in working with the Congress to address Air Force priorities.

We were all pleased to see that Paul was recently nominated by the President for his third star, which will be pinned on by the Air Force Chief of Staff this Friday. I offer my congratulations to him, to his wife Lynda, and three children Leslie, Doug and Shelby. The Congress and the country applaud the selfless commitment his family has made to the Nation in supporting his military career.

I know I speak for all my colleagues in expressing my heartfelt appreciation to General Hester. He is a credit to both the Air Force and our great Nation. We wish our friend the best of luck and are confident of his continued success in his new command.

A REFLECTION ON JOHN F. KENNEDY JR.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, of the half-dozen great journalists who wrote of the Kennedy era, as we think of that Presidency, none was closer to those involved, where they had come from, who they were, who they wished to be than Martin F. Nolan of the Boston Globe. He has done so once again, in a moving reflection of the deaths of John F. Kennedy, Jr., his wife and her sister, entitled ''Life Goes on, but it'll Never be the Same.''

I ask unanimous consent that his reflections be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe]

LIFE GOES ON, BUT IT'LL NEVER BE THE SAME

(By Martin F. Nolan)

When Sander Vanocur, the former NBC correspondent, first heard the news, he recalled what John O'Hara, the Irish-American novelist, said on a hot July day in 1937. ''They tell me that George Gershwin is suddenly dead at 38. That's what they tell me, but I don't have to believe it if I don't want to.''

The composer and songwriter died of a brain tumor, a celebrity death which, like many, caused shock, disbelief, and grief among thousands, even millions, who had never met him.

The death of John F. Kennedy Jr. is different because of Americans' attitude about history. However imperfectly, they knew that the young man who perished with his wife and sister-in-law while approaching Martha's Vineyard was ''a part of history.''

The prayers, the sadness, the flowers in TriBeCa all flow to a clan whose rise to glory began on the margins of American society, an underdog dynasty. John F. Kennedy Jr. was born 17 days after his father became the first Roman Catholic president amid the

fears of millions that the White House would be an outpost of the Vatican. Friday, as his life is celebrated at a Mass at St. Thomas More Church is New York City, anti-Catholicism has almost vanished in America.

The Kennedy saga covers most of the century. John F. ''Honey Fitz'' Fitzgerald was elected to the US House of Representatives in 1894. One of his grandsons, John, became president; two more, Edward and Robert, became senators; and two of his great-grandsons, Joseph and Patrick, also have served in the House. A half-dozen Frelinghuysens from New Jersey have served in Congress, but only four from another Dutch dynasty, the Roosevelts. The grandchildren of Franklin Delano Roosevelt have known little political fame.

The future has always been Kennedy country and the greatest Kennedy success could lie among its women. Caroline Kennedy Schloseberg has been a key decision maker on many matters, including her father's library. Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, the lieutenant governor of Maryland, may possess as much charm and savvy as her father, Robert, her uncles and cousins, and even her grandfather.

The much-photographed Kennedys have been reviled and revered. In a society anxious about ''family values,'' theirs has been on exuberant display for four decades, along with those of the Bouviers, Shakels, Bennetts, Smiths, Lawfords, and Shrivers. (A large family means many in-laws.)

In a nation of small families, size matters. When Edward Kennedy barely escaped death in the crash of a small plane in 1964, his brother Robert visited him and remarked in that ruefully wry Kennedyesque way, ''I guess the reason my mother and father had so many children was that some of them would survive.''

Edward Kennedy, the ninth of nine, is, at 67, the sole surviving son, the patriarch, and an all-too-accomplished eulogist. The Kennedys' famous fatalism was once expressed by President Kennedy's citation of a French fisherman's prayer: ''Oh God, thy sea is so great and my boat is so small.'' Thursday's burial was private and at sea off Cape Cod, that slip of land of which Henry David Thoreau said in 1865: ''A man may stand there and put all America behind him.''

The America John F. Kennedy Jr. leaves behind is one in which the median age is younger than his at his death. The vast majority of his fellow citizens have no contemporary memory of his father's violent death in 1963 nor that of his uncle in 1968. The grief of the Kennedys has been vivid in the nation's tribal memory as only a photograph or a video image, but no less vivid for being so.

Stanley Tretick, who died last week at 77, was a photographer for Look magazine. One of his most famous pictures was of the President Kennedy's young son climbing through a desk in the Oval Office. ''The Kennedys are great, but you have to do things their way,'' Tretick once said.

The Kennedys stage-managed their own public image in the days before 24-hour cable channels and the vast hordes of paparazzi that their fame and glamour enticed. The Hyannis Port family compound this week has been a logo for media fascination with one family's grief.

The old Latin liturgy once included an Augustinian admonition, ''Vita mutatur non tollitur''—''Life is changed not taken away.'' That belief sustains those of faith, in addition, there's always the Irish wake tradition of stories and memories, happy and sad.

Arthur N. Schlessinger Jr. wrote in ''A Thousand Days'' of how a young assistant secretary of labor, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, reacted to President Kennedy's death. ''I don't think there's any point in being Irish if you don't know that the world is going to break your heart eventually. I guess that we thought we had a little more time,'' Moynihan said. ''Mary McGrory said to me that we'll never laugh again. And I said, 'Heavens, Mary. We'll laugh again. It's just that we'll never be young again.' ''

Across America and the world, many people feel a lot less young than they did a week ago.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, July 23, 1999, the Federal debt stood at $5,636,001,455,884.82 (Five trillion, six hundred thirty-six billion, one million, four hundred fifty-five thousand, eight hundred eighty-four dollars and eighty-two cents).

One year ago, July 23, 1998, the Federal debt stood at $5,537,084,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred thirty-seven billion, eighty-four million).

Fifteen years ago, July 23, 1984, the Federal debt stood at $1,534,379,000,000 (One trillion, five hundred thirty-four billion, three hundred seventy-nine million).

Twenty-five years ago, July 23, 1974, the Federal debt stood at $474,854,000,000 (Four hundred seventy-four billion, eight hundred fifty-four million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,161,147,455,884.82 (Five trillion, one hundred sixty-one billion, one hundred forty-seven million, four hundred fifty-five thousand, eight hundred eighty-four dollars and eighty-two cents) during the past 25 years.

FUNDING FOR EMBASSY SECURITY

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, last week the Senate passed S. 1217, the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill. I want to take a minute now to express my serious concerns about the low level of funding for embassy security contained in the bill.

Just about one year ago, two United States embassies in East Africa were destroyed by terrorist bombs, killing hundreds of people and injuring thousands. The bombings underscored the great vulnerability of our diplomatic missions. In response, Congress promptly provided $1.4 billion in emergency funding to rebuild the two embassies and to take other urgent steps to bolster security at overseas missions.

Soon thereafter, two panels were convened by the Secretary of State to review the bombings. The two commissions were chaired by retired Admiral William Crowe, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and former Ambassador to the United Kingdom. The Crowe commissions recommended that the U.S. government devote $1.4 billion per year for each of the next ten years to security.

Unfortunately, the legislation before the Senate falls far short of what the Crowe commissions recommended. The bill appropriates just $300 million for security in the State Department operations accounts, and just $110 million for security in the capital account. But of this latter amount, only $36 million is provided for construction or renovation of new embassies—$264 million below the President's request. Moreover, the bill rescinds $58 million in previously-appropriated funds in this same account. Neither the bill nor the Committee report explains how these funds will be restored to meet continuing and future needs.

Finally, the bill denies the Administration's request for $3.6 billion in advance funding for capital projects for Fiscal Years 2001 to 2005. The Department based this request on bitter experience. In the mid-1980s, after a commission chaired by Admiral Bobby Inman recommended massive increases in embassy security, Congress initially responded by providing significant funding and significant promises. But as the years passed, security became a second-order priority; the requested funding for security was denied by Congress, and some of the money that had been allocated for security was either rescinded by Congress or redirected to other priorities. By the mid-1990s, the Inman Commission report was collecting dust on government bookshelves, its recommendations barely recalled, and funding for security had been reduced considerably.

So, understandably, the State Department is skeptical that the grand promises made in the wake of the embassy bombings will be fulfilled. With considerable justification, the State Department experts have told Congress that it can best move forward on a sensible and rational construction program if it can be assured in advance of the necessary funds. Otherwise, the Department of State rightly fears, we will see a repeat of the experience after the Inman Commission.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, and then the full Senate, responded to this plea by providing a $3 billion authorization over five years in S. 886, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. But that was just the first step. The authorization will be useless without appropriations. Unfortunately, the Committee on Appropriations has ignored the State Department's request in this bill.

I believe this bill breaks faith with the bold promises that were made in the wake of the embassy bombings last summer. We need to do much, much more to protect our dedicated public servants working overseas. I strongly urge the chairman and ranking member to look for additional resources to fund this important account, without compromising the other important foreign affairs accounts.

THE HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, one of the most significant amendments adopted by the Senate in consideration

of the Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2000 is the Hate Crimes Prevention Act. I commend Senator KENNEDY for his leadership in this effort and on this bill, and I am proud to have been an original cosponsor. This legislation amends the federal hate crimes statute to make it easier for federal law enforcement officials to investigate and prosecute cases of racial and religious violence. It also focuses the attention and resources of the federal government on the problem of hate crimes committed against people because of their sexual preference, gender, or disability.

Violent crime motivated by prejudice demands attention from all of us. It is not a new problem, but recent incidents of hate crimes have shocked the American conscience. Just this month, an adherent of a white supremacist group killed two people and wounded nine others in a shooting rampage in Illinois and Indiana that was apparently motivated by racial and religious hate. Billy Jack Gaither, 39, was beaten to death in Alabama because he was gay. Matthew Sheppard, 21, was left to die on a fence in Wyoming because he was gay. James Byrd, Jr., 49, a father of three, was dragged to his death behind a pickup truck in Texas because he was black. These are sensational crimes, the ones that focus public attention. But there also is a toll we are paying each year in other hate crimes that find less notoriety, but with no less suffering for the victims and their families.

It remains painfully clear that we as a nation still have serious work to do in protecting all Americans from these crimes and in ensuring equal rights for all our citizens. The answer to hate and bigotry must ultimately be found in increased respect and tolerance. But strengthening our federal hate crimes legislation is a step in the right direction. Bigotry and hatred are corrosive elements in any society, but especially in a country as diverse and open as ours. We need to make clear that a bigoted attack on one or some of us diminishes each of us, and it diminishes our nation. As a nation, we must say loudly and clearly that we will defend ourselves against such violence.

All Americans have the right to live, travel and gather where they choose. In the past we have responded as a nation to deter and to punish violent denials of civil rights. We have enacted federal laws to protect the civil rights of all of our citizens for more than 100 years. This continues that great and honorable tradition.

Several of us come to this issue with backgrounds in local law enforcement. We support local law enforcement and work for initiatives that assist law enforcement. It is in this vein as well that I support the Hate Crimes Prevention Act, which has received strong bipartisan support from state and local law enforcement organizations across the country.

The bill has been materially improved since its introduction on March 16th. At that time, I questioned whether the bill was sufficiently respectful of state and local law enforcement interests and cautioned against federalizing prohibitions that may already exist at the state and local level. The Senate-passed bill includes a new certification requirement, which provides that the Federal government may only step in where the State has not assumed jurisdiction, the State has requested that the federal government assume jurisdiction, or the State's actions are likely to leave unvindicated the Federal interest in eradicating bias-motivated violence. I am satisfied that this provision will ensure that the Hate Crimes Prevention Act operates as intended, strengthening Federal jurisdiction over hate crimes as a back-up, but not a substitute, for state and local law enforcement.

The Hate Crimes Prevention Act gives us a formidable tool for combating acts of violence motivated by race, color, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, gender, or disability. I urge its speedy passage into law.

SENATE QUARTERLY MAIL COSTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in accordance with section 318 of Public Law 101–520 as amended by Public Law 103–283, I am submitting the frank mail allocations made to each Senator from the appropriations for official mail expenses and a summary tabulation of Senate mass mail costs for the first and second quarter of FY99 to be printed in the RECORD. The first and second quarters of FY99 cover the periods of October 1, 1998, through December 31, 1998, and January 1, 1999 through March 31, 1999. The official mail allocations are available for franked mail costs, as stipulated in Public Law 105–275, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 1999.

I ask unanimous consent that the frank mail allocations and summary tabulation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senators	FY 99 Official mail allocation	Senate quarterly mass mail volumes and costs for the quarter ending December 12, 1998				Senate quarterly mass mail volumes and costs for the quarter ending March 31, 1999			
		Total pieces	Pieces per capita	Total cost	Cost per capita	Total pieces	Pieces per capita	Total cost	Cost per capita
Abraham	$111,746	0	0	$0.00	0	0	0	$0.00	0
Akaka	34,648	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Allard	63,266	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Ashcroft	77,190	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Baucus	33,847	0	0	0.00	0	23,970	0.0300	21,348.57	0.02672
Bayh	60,223	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Bennett	40,959	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Biden	31,559	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Bingaman	41,646	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Bond	77,190	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Boxer	301,322	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Breaux	66,514	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Brownback	49,687	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Bryan	41,258	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Bumpers	13,218	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Bunning	46,853	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Burns	33,857	0	0	0.00	0	4,295	0.00538	3,399.30	0.00425
Byrd	43,560	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Campbell	63,266	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Chafee	34,307	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Cleland	95,484	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Coats	21,139	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Cochran	50,337	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Collins	37,775	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Conrad	31,000	198,640	0.31096	30,318.17	0.04746	37,870	0.05928	6,075.13	0.00951
Coverdell	95,484	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Craig	35,841	0	0	0.00	0	3,000	0.0298	568.71	0.00056
Crapo	27,070	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
D'Amato	183,036	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Daschle	31,638	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
DeWine	132,302	5,182	0.00048	4,549.16	0.00042	3,130	0.00029	2,072.47	0.00019
Dodd	56,116	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Domenici	41,646	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Dorgan	31,000	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Durbin	128,275	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Edwards	76,489	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Enzi	29,891	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Faircloth	29,275	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Feingold	72,089	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Feinstein	301,322	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Fitzgerald	97,925	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0

Senators	FY 99 Official mail allocation	Senate quarterly mass mail volumes and costs for the quarter ending December 12, 1998				Senate quarterly mass mail volumes and costs for the quarter ending March 31, 1999			
		Total pieces	Pieces per capita	Total cost	Cost per capita	Total pieces	Pieces per capita	Total cost	Cost per capita
Ford	16,353	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Frist	76,208	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Glenn	35,757	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Gorton	78,087	1,410	0.00029	192.02	0.00004	0	0	0.00	0
Graham	182,107	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Gramm	204,461	0	0	0.00	0	2,551	0.00015	902.37	0.00005
Grams	67,542	5,800	0.00133	1,169.33	0.00027	23,558	0.00538	10,939.04	0.00250
Grassley	52,115	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Gregg	35,947	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Hagel	40,350	0	0	0.00	0	133,000	0.0846	24,409.19	0.01546
Harkin	52,115	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Hatch	40,959	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Helms	100,311	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Hollings	61,281	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Hutchinson	50,285	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Hutchison	204,461	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Inhofe	58,788	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Inouye	34,648	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Jeffords	30,740	0	0	0.00	0	18,439	0.03277	7,600.92	0.01351
Johnson	31,638	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Kempthorne	9,246	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Kennedy	82,469	3,000	0.00050	1,036.89	0.00017	5,678	0.00094	2,019.95	0.00034
Kerrey	40,350	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Kerry	82,469	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Kohl	72,089	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Kyl	68,434	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Landrieu	66,514	78,000	0.01848	13,801,20	0.00327	0	0	0.00	0
Lautenberg	97,304	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Leahy	30,740	1,128	0.00200	901.17	0.00160	3,123	0.00555	2,499.77	0.00444
Levin	111,476	0	0	0.00	0	2,000	0.00022	403.63	0.00004
Lieberman	56,116	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Lincoln	38,142	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Lott	50,337	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Lugar	79,091	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Mack	182,107	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
McCain	68,434	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
McConnell	61,650	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Mikulski	71,555	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Moseley-Braun	128,275	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Moynihan	183,036	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Murkowski	30,905	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Murray	78,087	0	0	0.00	0	1,300	0.00027	433.14	0.00009
Nickles	58,788	0	0	0.00	0	702	0.00022	564.90	0.00018
Reed	34,307	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Reid	41,258	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Robb	87,385	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Roberts	49,687	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Rockefeller	43,560	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Roth	31,559	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Santorum	138,265	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Sarbanes	71,555	0	0	0.00	0	9,300	0.00195	2,039.43	0.00043
Schumer	139,902	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Sessions	67,265	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Shelby	67,265	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Smith, Gordon	56,383	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Smith, Robert	35,947	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Snowe	37,755	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Specter	138,265	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Stevens	30,905	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Thomas	29,891	4,052	0.00893	3,488.32	0.00769	0	0	0.00	0
Thompson	76,208	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Thurmond	61,281	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Torricelli	97,304	7,585	0.00098	6,746.15	0.00087	8,410	0.00109	7,622.56	0.00098
Voinovich	101,012	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Warner	87,385	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Wellstone	67,42	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0
Wyden	56,383	0	0	0.00	0	915	0.00032	723,80	0.00025
Total		304,797	0.34394	62,202.41	0.06179	281,241	0.23104	93.622.88	0.07952

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today to thank Chairman GREGG and Senator HOLLINGS for accepting an amendment I offered to the FY2000 Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill that will provide $500,000 for a truck safety program in New Jersey. This critical initiative will allow the State Police to finally purchase much needed portable scales and accompanying computer equipment that will enable them to better monitor and control large trucks that utilize local roads.

This amendment was necessary because more than 5,300 people, including 660 children, died in highway crashes with big trucks last year, and the number of carriers on local roads throughout the nation continues to rise. This problem has become particularly acute in New Jersey. For example, Route 31 in the northwest part of the state previously accommodated several hundreds trucks a day. That number has now grown to well over 3,000 trucks a day, and four people have died in truck related accidents on this road in the past 24 months.

In order to increase safety through improved enforcement efforts, I introduced this amendment to provide the New Jersey State Police with the modern equipment necessary to effectively regulate these oversized vehicles. This additional funding will be used to purchase almost 120 new mobile truck scales and 60 mobile data computers. The current scales, which often break down and require heavy, outdated batteries, will be replaced with lighter scales that are maintenance free. The new computers, which can be mounted in trooper's vehicles, would allow the police direct access to the Commercial Vehicle Information Safety Network and enable them to perform immediate checks on truckers who are violating the law.

This new equipment will go a long way towards keeping these oversized carriers off of smaller, undivided local roads and will send a strong message that we remain committed to protecting our communities. Again, I am grateful to Senators GREGG and HOLLINGS for their support.

EU HUSHKIT BAN

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a sense of the Senate amendment regarding the recent unilateral action of the EU effectively banning hushkitted and re-engineered aircraft from operating in European Union states. If this rule is implemented on May 1, 2000 it will have a discriminatory impact on U.S. carriers and equipment manufacturers, not to mention setting a bad precedent for action by countries or groups of countries outside of the established International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) standards-setting process.

This legislation was adopted by the EU on April 29, 1999, but implementation was delayed until May 2000 to

allow U.S. and EU representatives to work out the framework of a new, more stringent global aircraft noise standard within ICAO. The Federal Aviation Administration and the State Department have been in negotiations with the EU on the eventual withdraw of this unfair and discriminatory statute.

Many of my colleagues have seen recent efforts by the European Union to gain the upper hand over the United States in matters of trade. Aviation has proven to be no different. And this is deeply troubling, because aviation is not only a primary source of a favorable balance of trade for the United States, but, because of its global reach, represents an area where international standards are crucial to facilitating that commerce among nations. Yet, as I stated earlier, the EU has acted to preempt U.S. air carriers and carriers from other parts of the world from serving points in Europe with certain hushkitted or re-engineered aircraft. This restriction applies even though those aircraft fully comply with Stage 3 international noise standards adopted by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO).

This European regulation, although its implementation has been deferred until May 2000, has already created financial hardships for U.S. aerospace manufacturers and airlines. It must be withdrawn or we will see a continued impact on U.S. jobs and profits. Modifying the rule or deferring its implementation for an added period of time will not offer the relief needed by U.S. aviation interests—the financial markets simply do not respond favorably to uncertainty. The U.S. government has engaged in extensive discussions with the European Council for the past year, without achieving a commitment to a repeal of this rule, which I might add expressly protects European aviation interests. The time has come to achieve a timely resolution of this problem through action.

The Sense of the Senate resolution I offer today cites the need for complying with international standards in the aviation arena and highlights the problems the rule is causing for U.S. manufacturers and operators. Failing an early commitment by the Europeans to withdraw this arbitrary and discriminatory rule, the resolution calls upon the Department of State to initiate an Article 84 proceeding before ICAO. It is my understanding that this type of proceeding is not a sanctions mechanism, but instead affords a process that provides an opportunity for the international aviation body to rule on whether this regulation complies with international aviation standards.

This Sense of the Senate further calls upon other agencies of the executive branch to use the tools at their disposal as well to achieve the early repeal of this rule. There is a broader point to be made as well, which is that, without restoring credibility to the international aviation standards process, we can have little or no confidence about any future international standards adopted by the international aviation community through ICAO. That is a very dangerous precedent for the global aviation environment in the future.

MAYOR'S PETITION ON THE NO_X SIP CALL

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, last year, EPA finalized the NO_X SIP call, forcing 22 states to submit plans to meet mandated reductions of nitrogen oxide (NO_X) emissions. Our nation's mayors are concerned that the SIP call will have adverse effects on brownfields redevelopment and economic growth.

Earlier this year, the National Conference of Black Mayors and the U.S. Conference of Mayors held their annual conferences. Over 100 mayors from around the country signed a petition calling on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to provide utility energy providers with maximum flexibility and the leadtime necessary to avoid higher energy costs to municipalities and local communities, including industrial and residential consumers.

The mayors are asking U.S. EPA to reconsider how the deadlines set in the NO_X SIP call could affect electricity reliability in urban and rural areas. In essence our mayor's are saying that any new programs to control NO_X emission must be weighed against potential economic adverse implications.

Mr. President, the U.S. Court of Appeals issued a stay of EPA's NO_X SIP call pending a decision on the lawsuit brought by states. Nonetheless, the Mayors' petition represents a commonsense plea to EPA that, should the agency move forward to implement NO_X reductions, that it do so in a way that allows for compliance in a cost-effective manner that does not adversely impact economic growth or significantly increase utility prices to consumers.

I ask unanimous consent that the petition be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION

EPA OZONE TRANSPORT NO_X SIP CALL

As part of its Ozone Transport initiative, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has finalized a rulemaking forcing States to submit Implementation Plans (SIPs) to meet mandated reductions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_X) emissions in the Agency's effort to control inter-state ozone transport impacts. The rule focuses on 22 mid-eastern States, with the likelihood that EPA will expand the application of the rule to several additional States.

Several States have joined in litigation challenging the EPA rule on grounds that it is contrary to congressional intent, an abuse of Agency discretion and disregards traditional Federal/State relationships. EPA has even taken the unprecedented step of threatening to impose its own Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) in the absence of acceptable State action. Several additional States are considering whether to file an amicus brief in support of the Complaint. The U.S. Court of Appeals recently stayed EPA's NO_X SIP Call pending appeal of the Court's decision setting aside EPA's new Ozone and Particulate Matter standards.

One element of the rule would force local utilities to control NO_X emissions at levels unprecedented to date. The reductions are of a magnitude that will require capital intensive technology with likely significant passthrough costs to energy consumers. The unavoidable consequence will be higher energy costs to municipalities and local communities, including industrial and residential consumers alike. As rural and urban communities seek investment to spur economic growth, the shadow of higher energy costs could have significant adverse effects on Brownfields redevelopment and rural/urban revitalization generally.

The EPA compliance deadline are so stringent that electric utilities could be forced to shut down generating plants to install the necessary control equipment within a very short time. This could result in a temporary disruption of electricity supply.

Significant NO_X emissions reductions will continue to be realized under *existing* mobile and stationary control programs as the Clean Air Act continues to be implemented thus minimizing the need, if any, for such potentially disruptive requirements as called for in the EPA NO_X rule. This is especially true for local areas in the mid-east that are dealing effectively with ozone compliance challenges. Any new control programs, before being implemented, must be weighed against the potential adverse implications for local rural and urban communities.

Accordingly, by our signatures below, we collectively call on EPA to reconsider the NO_X rule in light of these concerns. In light of the Court's stay of the NO_X SIP Call, at a minimum, we urge EPA to provide maximum flexibility to and address lead-time needs of utility energy providers so as to minimize potential adverse economic consequences to local rural and urban communities. Further, we call on EPA to restore balance and cooperation between states and EPA so that States can comply with the rule while protecting their rights to determine the best methods of doing so.

Finally, we direct that copies of this Petition be provided to the President, the Vice President, Members of Congress, Governors and other local officials as are appropriate.

Alabama: Moses, Walter S. Hill.

Arkansas: North Little Rock, Patrick H. Hayes; Marianna, Robert Taylor; Sunset, James Wilburn.

California: Alameda, Ralph J. Appezzato; Fairfield, George Pettygrove; Fresno, Jim Patterson; Inglewood, Rosevelt F. Dorn; Modesto, Richard A. Lang; Turlock, Dr. Curt Andre; Westminster, Frank G. Fry.

Florida: Eatonville, Anthony Grant; Gretna, Anthony Baker; North Lauderdale, Jack Brady; South Bay, Clarence Anthony; Tamarac, Joe Schreiber; Titusville, Larry D. Bartley.

Georgia: Augusta, Bob Young; Dawson, Robert Albritten; East Point, Patsy Jo Hiliard; Savannah, Floyd Adams, Jr.; Stone Mountain, Chuck Burris.

Guam: Santa Nita, Joe C. Wesky; Yigo, Robert S. Lizama.

Illinois: Brooklyn, Ruby Cook; Carol Stream, Ross Ferraro; Centreville, Riley L. Owens III; Dekalb, Bessie Chronopoulos; East St. Louis, Gordon Bush; Evanston, Lorraine H. Morton; Glendale Heights, J. Ben Fajardo; Lincolnwood, Madeleine Grant; Robbins, Irene H. Brodie; Rockford, Charles E. Box; Sun River Terrace, Casey Wade, Jr.

Indiana: Carmel, Jim Brainard; Fort Wayne, Paul Helmke.

Louisiana: Boyce, Julius Patrick, Jr.; Chataignier, Herman Malveaux; Cullen,

Bobby R. Washington; Jeanerette, James Alexander, Sr.; Napoleonville, Darrell Jupiter, Sr.; New Orleans, Marc Morial; St. Gabriel, George L. Grace; White Castle, Maurice Brown.

Maine: Lewiston, Kaileigh A. Tara.

Maryland: Seat Pleasant, Eugene F. Kennedy.

Massachusetts: Leominster, Dean J. Mazzarella; Taunton, Robert G. Nunes.

Michigan: Detroit, Dennis Archer; Garden City, James L. Barker; Inkster, Edward Bevins; Muskegon Heights, Robert Warren; Taylor, Gregory E. Pitoniak.

Minnesota: Rochester, Charles J. Canfield; Saint Paul, Nori Coleman.

Mississippi: Fayette, Roger W. King; Glendora, Johnny Thomas; Laurel, Susan Boone Vincent; Marks, Dwight F. Barfield; Pace, Robert Le Flore; Shelby, Erick Holmes; Tutwiler, Robert Grayson; Winstonville, Milton Tutwiler.

Missouri: Kinloch, Bernard L. Turner, Sr.

Nebraska: Omaha, Hal Daub.

New Jersey: Chesilhurst, Arland Poindexter; Hope, Timothy C. McDonough; Newark, Sharpe James; Orange, Muis Herchet.

New York: Hempstead, James A Garner; Rochester, William A. Johnson, Jr.; White Plains, Joseph Delfino.

North Carolina: Charlotte, Pat McCrory; Durham, Nicholas J. Tennyson; Greenevers, Alfred Dixon.

North Dakota: Fargo, Bruce W. Furness.

Ohio: Columbus, Greg Lashutka; Lyndhurst, Leonard M. Creary; Middleburg Heights, Gary W. Starr.

Oklahoma: Muskogee, Jim Bushnell; Oklahoma City, Kirk D. Humphrey; Tatums, Cecil Jones.

Oregon: Tualatin, Lou Ogden.

Rhode Island: Providence, V.A. Cianci, Jr.

South Carolina: Andrews, Lovith Anderson, Sr.; Greenwood, Floyd Nicholson.

Tennessee: Germantown, Sharon Goldsworthy; Knoxville, Victor Ashe.

Texas: Ames, John White; Arlington, Elzie Odom; Beaumont, David Moore; Bedford, Richard D. Hurt; Euless, Mary Lib Salem; Hurst, Bill Souder; Hutchens, Mary Washington; Kendleton, Carolyn Jones; Kyle, James Adkins; North Richland Hills, Charles Scoma; Port Arthur, Oscar G. Ortiz; Waxahachee, James Beatty.

Virginia: Portsmouth, Dr. James W. Holley III.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING BENCHMARKS IN BOSNIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 51

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 7 of Public Law 105–174, the 1998 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act, I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on progress made toward achieving benchmarks for a sustainable peace process.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 23, 1999*.

REPORTS ENTITLED ''MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY'' AND ''HIGHWAY SAFETY'' FOR CALENDAR YEARS 1996—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 52

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1996 calendar year reports as prepared by the Department of Transportation on activities under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, the Highway Safety Act, and the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act of 1972, as amended.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 26, 1999*.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time and placed on the calendar:

S. 1427. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to appoint a special counsel to investigate or prosecute a person for a possible violation of criminal law when the Attorney General determines that the appointment of a special counsel is in the public interest.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated on July 22, 1999:

EC–4291. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Central and Southern Florida Project-Comprehensive Review Study''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4292. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals dated July 12, 1999; transmitted jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, to the Committee on Appropriations, to the Committee on the Budget, to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4293. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Compromises'' (TD 8829), received July 19, 1999; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4294. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''T.D. 8828, Electronic Funds Transfers of Federal Deposits'' (RIN1545–AW41), received July 12, 1999; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4295. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''August 1999 Applicable Federal Rates'' (Revenue Ruling 99–32), received July 19, 1999; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4296. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''1999 Federal Financial Management Status Report and Five-Year Plan'', dated June 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4297. A communication from the Deputy Director for Support, Personal and Family Readiness Division, U.S. Marine Corps, Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Retirement Plan for Civilian Employees of the United States Marine Corps Morale, Welfare and Recreation Activities; The Morale, Welfare and Recreation Support Activity and Miscellaneous Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities'', dated June 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4298. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Physicians Comparability Allowances; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4299. A communication from the Under Secretary for Domestic Finance, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for calendar year 1998 of the Resolution Funding Corporation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4300. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Bureau of the Public Debt, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Call for Large Position Reports,'' received July 13, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4301. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations; Commerce Control List: Revisions to Categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9 Based on Wassenaar Arrangement Review'' (RIN0694–AB86), received July 15, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4302. A communication from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''21 CFR Part 712; Credit Union Service Organizations,'' received July 15, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4303. A communication from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''21 CFR Part 712; Credit Union Service Organizations,'' received July 15, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4304. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for calendar year 1998 for the Orphans Products Board; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4305. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Criteria and Procedures for DOE Contractor Employee Protection Program'' (RIN1901–AA78), received July 16, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4306. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Conference Management'' (N 110.3), received July 16, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4307. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Deviations, Local Clauses, Uniform Contract Format, and Clause Matrix'' (AL 99–05), received July 16, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4308. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for calendar year 1998 relative to Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management Progress; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4309. A communication from the General Counsel, the Presidio Trust, transmitting, pursuant to law, the draft of a proposed rule entitled ''Management of the Presidio: Environmental Quality,'' received July 19, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4310. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Pratt and Whitney JT9D Series Turbofan Engines; Docket No. 98–ANE–31 (7–16/7–19)'' (RIN2120–AA64) (1999–0273), received July 19, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4311. A communication from the Senior Analyst, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Passenger Tariff-Filing Requirements Exemption'' (RIN2105–AC61), received July 19, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4312. A communication from the Attorney, Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pipeline Safety: Adoption of Consensus Standards for Breakout Tanks'' (RIN2137–AC11), received July 19, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated on July 26, 1999:

EC–4313. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the report of a certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement for the export of defense services under a contract in the amount of $22,000,000 with Italy and Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4314. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the report of a certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement for the export of defense services under a contract in the amount of $50,000,000 or more with the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4315. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the report of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or services under a contract in the amount of $50,000,000 or more to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4316. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the report of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or services under a contract in the amount of $50,000,000 or more to France; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4317. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the report of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or services under a contract in the amount of $50,000,000 or more to France and the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4318. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to commercial and industrial functions performed by contractors during fiscal year 1998; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4319. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Pilot Program for Revitalizing the Laboratories and Test Evaluation Centers of the Department of Defense,'' dated May 1999; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4320. A communication from the Director, Administration and Management, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of the Under Secretary of the Air Force, the designation of an Acting Under Secretary, and the nomination of an Under Secretary; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4321. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of a retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4322. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''CHAMPUS Extension of the Active Duty Dependents Dental Plan to Overseas Areas'' (RIN0720–AA36), received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4323. A communication from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semi-annual ''Monetary Policy Report,'' dated July 22, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4324. A communication from the Executive Director, Committee for the Purchase from People who are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Additions to and Deletions from the Procurement List,'' received July 6, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4325. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1998, through March 31, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–4326. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Veterans Education: Effective Date for Reducing Educational Assistance'' (RIN2900–AJ39), received July 21, 1999: to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–4327. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Secondary Direct Food Additives Permitted in Food for Human Consumption'' (98F–0894), received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4328. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Secondary Direct Food Additives Permitted in Food for Human Consumption'' (98F–0894), received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4329. A communication from the General Counsel, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''AmeriCorps Education Awards'' (RIN3045–AA09), received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4330. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Mexican Fruit Fly Regulation; Removal of Regulated Areas'' (Docket No. 98–082–5), received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4331. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Licensing Requirements for Dogs and Cats'' (Docket No. 97–018–4), received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4332. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Cut Flowers'' (Docket No. 98–021–2), received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4333. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Citrus Canker; Addition to Quarantined Areas'' (Docket No. 95–086–3), received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4334. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to Part 47—Rules of Practice Under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act (PACA)'' (Docket No. FV98–358), received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4335. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California and Imported Table Grapes; Revision in Minimum Grade, Container, and Pack Requirements'' (Docket No. FV98–925–3 FIR), received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4336. A communication from the Deputy Under Secretary, Natural Resources and

Environment, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Land Uses; Appeal of Decisions Relating to Occupancy and Use of National Forest System Lands; Mediation of Grazing Disputes'' (RIN0596–AB59), received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4337. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Zinc Phosphide; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions'' (FRL #6090–9), received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4338. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Priorities List for Uncontrolled Hazardous Waste Sites'' (FRL #6401–5), received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4339. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan; Indiana'' (FRL #6401–9), received July 20, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4340. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; California'' (FRL # 6378–2), received July 20, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4341. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Classification of the San Francisco Bay Area Ozone Nonattainment Area for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program Purposes'' (FRL # 6401–6), received July 20, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4342. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Application Requirements for Publicly Owned Treatment Works and Other Treatment Works Treating Domestic Sewage'' (FRL # 6401–2), received July 20, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4343. A communication from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Monitoring the Effectiveness of Maintenance at Nuclear Power Plants'' (RIN3150–AF95), received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4344. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Steller Sea Lion Protection Measures for the Pollock Fisheries off Alaska'' (RIN0648–AM08), received July 22, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4345. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Proposed Establishment of Class E Airspace; Imperial County, CA; Docket No. 98–AWP–33 (7–16/7–19)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0224), received July 19, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4346. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class E Airspace; Indianapolis, IN; and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Greenwood, IN; Docket No. 99–AGL–26 (7–16/7–19)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0227), received July 19, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4347. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Legal Description of the Class D Airspace; Cincinnati, OH; Docket No. 99–AGL–25 (7–16/7–19)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0225), received July 19, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4348. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Legal Description of the Class D Airspace; Cincinnati, OH; Docket No. 99–AGL–25 (7–16/7–19)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0225), received July 19, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4349. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of VOR Federal Airways; Kahului, HI; Correction; Docket No. 99–AWP–35 (7–16/7–19)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0223), received July 19, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4350. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Minden, NV; Docket No. 97–AWP–33 (7–16/7–19)'' (RIN2120–AA66) (1999–0222), received July 19, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4351. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna; Retention Limit Adjustment (Angling Category),'' received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4352. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna; Inseason Transfer (Purse Seine Category),'' received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4353. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transportation security for calendar year 1997; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4354. A communication from the Director, Office of White House Liaison, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Inspector General of the Department of Commerce, the designation of an Acting Inspector General, and the nomination of an Inspector General; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4355. A communication from the Associate Administrator for Human Resources and Education, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Administrator; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4356. A communication from the Under Secretary, Food, and Nutrition and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Stamp Program: 1995 Quality Control Technical Amendments'' (RIN0584–AB38), received July 21, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4357. A communication from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Governmentwide Policy, transmitting, pursuant to law, on behalf of the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the Report of a rule entitled ''FAC 97–13, Reform of Affirmative Action in Federal Procurement'' (RIN9000–AH59), received July 19, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated on July 22, 1999:

POM–260. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska relative to tobacco settlement funds; to the Committee on Finance.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLVE NO. 5

Whereas the State of Alaska, taking all of the risks inherent in litigation, brought suit against major cigarette and smokeless tobacco manufacturers based on state antitrust and consumer protection claims solely to collect the state's smoking-related expenditures; and

Whereas none of the claims asserted by the state were based on a Medicaid recoupment statute or included the assertion of claims based on federal law for the federal government's tobacco-related medical expenditures; and

Whereas the State of Alaska entered into a settlement agreement in state court based on state antitrust and consumer protection law claims with cigarette and smokeless tobacco companies for $669,000,000 on November 23, 1998; and

Whereas the federal government, through the Health Care Finance Administration, has asserted that it is entitled to a significant share of the state settlement on the basis that it represents the federal share of Medicaid costs; and

Whereas the federal government declined to bring its own action to assert a claim for the federal money it spent for the treatment of smoking-related illnesses in Alaska and provided no assistance to the state during the litigation or during settlement negotiations; and

Whereas the federal government asserts that it is authorized and obligated, under Social Security Act, to collect its share of any settlement funds attributed to Medicaid; and

Whereas the state tobacco lawsuit was brought for violation of state law under state law theories and the state lawsuit did not make any federal claims; and

Whereas the state bore all the risk and expense in the litigation brought in state court and settled without any assistance from the federal government; and

Whereas the state is entitled to all of the funds negotiated in the tobacco settlement agreement without any federal claim; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-First Alaska State Legislature respectfully requests the Congress to enact and the President to sign legislation to prohibit any federal claim against money obtained by settlement of state tobacco litigation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Twenty-First Alaska State Legislature respectfully urges the President of the United States to direct the Health Care Finance Administration to refrain from taking steps to pursue recoupment of dollars.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Bill Clinton, President of the United States; the Honorable Al Gore, Jr., Vice-President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Donna E. Shalala, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; the Honorable Trent Lott, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Kay Bailey Hutchison, U.S. Senator from Texas; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Frank Murkowski, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

POM–261. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the State of Illinois relative to tobacco settlement funds; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 139

Whereas, The November 23, 1998 tobacco settlement and prior settlements in four states call for the distribution of settlement funds to states over the next 25 years; we must act quickly to ensure that the settlement funds actually reach the states; and

Whereas, Receipt of half or more of these funds is in doubt because of the federal government's attempt to recoup state settlement money as Medicaid overpayments; and

Whereas, There is a bi-partisan congressional coalition led by Texas Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, Florida Senator Robert Graham, Washington Senator Slade Gorton, Indiana Senator Evan Bayh, Ohio Senator George Voinovich, and Florida Congressman Michael Bilirakis that is advocating legislation to negate the recoupment claim; and

Whereas, States initiated the suits that ultimately led to the settlements; and

Whereas, The States assumed all risks; and

Whereas, The States used their resources to challenge the tobacco industry; and

Whereas, The federal government played no role in the suits nor in the settlements; the November 23 accord makes no mention of Medicaid or federal recoupment; and

Whereas, Our State is making initial fiscal determinations regarding the most responsible allocation of these settlement funds; and

Whereas, We cannot and should not be threatened with the seizure of these funds by the federal government; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the ninety-first General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we call on the United States Congress and urge its members to support United States House Resolution 351; and be it further

Resolved, That a suitable copy of this resolution be delivered to the Illinois Congressional delegation, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate, the Vice President of the United States, and the President of the United States.

Adopted by the House of Representatives on May 5, 1999.

POM–262. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska relative to the marriage penalty; to the Committee on Finance.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLVE NO. 16

Whereas the federal government is anticipating a budget surplus of $1.6 trillion over the next 10 years; and

Whereas the Congress is considering various options for returning some of that surplus to hardworking taxpayers; and

Whereas, under current law, 21,000,000 married couples pay approximately $1,400 more a year in taxes than they would if they were single; and

Whereas the institution of marriage should be supported and not penalized by the federal government; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Alaska State Legislature, That the Congress of the United States is urged to pass legislation to remove from the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 the current discrimination against married individuals in all instances of such discrimination; and be it further

Resolved, That the income tax rate paid by a married couple be no higher and the standard deduction no lower than that of two single individuals.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Bill Clinton, President of the United States; the Honorable Al Gore, Jr., Vice-President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Robert E. Rubin, Secretary of the U.S. Treasury; the Honorable J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Trent Lott, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Frank Murkowski, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress; and to all other members of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives serving in the 106th Congress.

POM–263. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska relative to the federal estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLVE NO. 15

Whereas our form of government is premised on the right to enjoy the fruit of one's labor, to own one's own possessions, and to pass on one's bounty to one's heirs; and

Whereas, when a person works for a lifetime to build assets, saving and investing money, building a business, or buying and developing land, that person has a moral right to pass those assets on to the person's family without being penalized with inheritance taxes; and

Whereas there is a fundamental problem of double taxation when a decedent's survivors are forced to pay an inheritance tax on assets acquired by the decedent with after-tax dollars; and

Whereas we need a tax system that encourages lifelong saving and enterprise and that rewards, rather than punishes, the traditional family; and

Whereas we need a government that rewards ''blood, sweat, and tears'' by abolishing the estate and gift taxes completely; and

Whereas repealing the federal estate and gift taxes is not an issue of politics and wealth but a matter of principle; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature respectfully requests the United States Congress to enact H.R. 86 and repeal subtitle B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, relating to the federal estate, gift taxes, and generation-skipping transfer.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Bill Clinton, President of the United States; the Honorable Al Gore, Jr., Vice-President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Trent Lott, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Christopher Cox, U.S. Representative from California, primary sponsor of H.R. 86; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Frank Murkowski, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

POM–264. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska relative to the proposed ''American Land Sovereignty Act''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLVE NO. 13

Whereas the United Nations has designated 67 sites in the United States as ''World Heritage Sites'' or ''Biosphere Reserves,'' which altogether are about equal in size to the State of Colorado, the eighth largest state; and

Whereas art. IV, sec. 3, United States Constitution, provides that the United States Congress shall make all needed regulations governing lands belonging to the United States; and

Whereas many of the United Nations' designations include private property inholdings and contemplate ''buffer zones'' of adjacent land; and

Whereas some international land designations such as those under the United States Biosphere Reserve Program and the Man and Biosphere Program of the United Nations Scientific, Educational, and Culture Organization operate under independent national committees such as the United States National Man and Biosphere Committee that have no legislative directives or authorization from the Congress; and

Whereas these international designations as presently handled are an open invitation to the international community to interfere in domestic economies and land use decisions; and

Whereas local citizens and public officials concerned about job creation and resource based economies usually have no say in the designation of land near their homes for inclusion in an international land use program; and

Whereas former Assistant Secretary of the Interior George T. Frampton, Jr., and the President used the fact that Yellowstone National Park had been designated as a ''World Heritage Site'' as justification for intervening in the environmental impact statement process and blocking possible development of an underground mine on private land in Montana outside of the park; and

Whereas a recent designation of a portion of Kamchatka as a ''World Heritage Site'' was followed immediately by efforts from environmental groups to block investment insurance for development projects on Kamchatka that are supported by the local communities; and

Whereas environmental groups and the National Park Service have been working to establish an International Park, a World Heritage Site, and a Marine Biosphere Reserve

covering parts of western Alaska, eastern Russia, and the Bering Sea; and

Whereas, as occurred in Montana, such designations could be used to block development projects on state and private land in western Alaska; and

Whereas foreign companies and countries could use such international designations in western Alaska to block economic development that they perceive as competition; and

Whereas animal rights activists could use such international designations to generate pressure to harass or block harvesting of marine mammals by Alaska Natives; and

Whereas such international designations could be used to harass or block any commercial activity, including pipelines, railroads, and power transmission lines; and

Whereas the President and the executive branch of the United States have, by Executive Order and other agreements, implemented these designations without approval by the Congress; and

Whereas the United States Department of Interior, in cooperation with the Federal Interagency panel for World Heritage, has identified the Aleutian Island Unit of the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge, Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Cape Krusenstern National Monument, Denali National Park, Gates of the Arctic National Park, and Katmai National Park as likely to meet the criteria for future nominations as World Heritage Sites; and

Whereas the Alaska State legislature objects to the nomination or designation of any World Heritage Sites or Biosphere Reserves in Alaska without the specific consent of the Alaska State Legislature; and

Whereas actions by the President in applying international agreements to lands owned by the United States may circumvent the Congress; and

Whereas Congressman Don Young introduced House Resolution No. 901 in the 105th Congress entitled the ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act of 1997'' that required the explicit approval of the Congress prior to restricting any use of the United States land under international agreements; and

Whereas Congress Don Young has reintroduced this legislation in the 106th Congress as House Resolution No. 883, which is entitled the ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act''; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature supports House Resolution 883, the ''American Land Sovereignty Protection Act,'' that reaffirms the constitutional authority of the Congress as the elected representatives of the people over the federally owned land of the United States and urges the swift introduction and passage of such act by the 106th Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature objects to the nomination or designation of any sites in Alaska as World Heritage Sites or Biosphere Reserves without the prior consent of the Alaska State Legislature.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Bill Clinton, President of the United States; Honorable Al Gore, Jr., Vice-President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Trent Lott, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Frank Murkowski, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

POM–265. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Guam relative to the election of the Attorney General of Guam; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

RESOLUTION NO. 126

Whereas, in 1998 Guam's delegate to the U.S. Congress introduced, and the Congress passed into law, an amendment to the Organic Act of Guam that allows for the election of the Attorney General of Guam in the next gubernatorial general election, which is scheduled for the year 2002; and

Whereas, I Miná Bente Singko Na Liheslaturan Guahan subsequently passed, and I *Magálahen Guahan* signed into law, Public Law Number 25–44, which mandates an elected Attorney General starting with the election allowed by the newly amended Organic Act of Guam; and

Whereas, three and a half (3½) years seems like an inordinately long period of time to postpone what should be the right of the people of Guam; Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That I MináBente Sigko Na Liheslaturan Guahan does hereby, on behalf of the people of Guam, respectfully request that Guam's Delegate to the U.S. Congress introduce legislation that would further amend the Organic Act of Guam to allow for the first election of the Attorney General of Guam to be held in the General Election in the year 2000; and be it further

Resolved, That the Speaker certify, and the Legislative Secretary attests to, the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the U.S. Senate; to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; to Guam's Delegate to the U.S. Congress; and to the Honorable Carl T.C. Gutierrez, I Magálahen Guahan.

POM–266. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska relative to evaluation and selection criteria for military base realignment and closure; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLVE NO. 4

Whereas the Secretary of the United States Department of Defense has called for the reestablishment of a Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission to conduct two new rounds of military base closures beginning in 2001; and

Whereas, under the process established for the BRAC Commissions in 1991, 1993, and 1995, each of the armed services developed categories for its own bases and evaluated and ranked each of its bases within those categories by applying criteria established by the United States Department of Defense and the Congress; and

Whereas these single-service evaluations severely restricted the opportunity to consider the effect of a base's closure on the operational readiness of the United States Department of Defense's total force; and

Whereas the shortcomings of this single-service approach were recognized by the BRAC Commission that recommended that the United States Department of Defense develop procedures for considering potential joint or common activities among the services in several training and support areas; and

Whereas this recommendation led to the creation in 1994 of Joint Cross-Service Groups that worked with the services in the five functional areas of depot maintenance, military medical treatment facilities, test and evaluation, undergraduate pilot training, and laboratories, in preparation for the 1995 BRAC round; and

Whereas the strategic challenges now facing the United States as we enter the new century may require an even greater emphasis on creating and fielding a fully integrated total force capable of projecting our nation's military power around the world from bases with our country's borders; and

Whereas this military force structure should be supported by a military base structure that is focused on strategic mobility, joint operations, and joint training considerations in addition to individual service considerations; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature respectfully requests the President of the United States, the United States Congress, and the Secretary of the United States Department of Defense to establish new Joint Cross-Service Groups this year to study issues of power projection and deployment, joint training, joint operations, and other total force considerations; and be it further

Resolved by the Alaska State Legislature, That these Joint Cross-Service Groups then be directed to develop new evaluation and selection criteria and procedures based on their findings to be incorporated into any future base realignment and closure proceedings to ensure that total force and power projection factors are major military value considerations in base structure decisions.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Bill Clinton, President of the United States; the Honorable Al Gore, Jr., Vice-President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Strom Thurmond, President Pro Tem of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable William S. Cohen, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Defense; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Frank Murkowski, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

POM–267. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska relative to a recent article published by the American Psychological Association; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLVE NO. 18

Whereas children are a precious gift and responsibility; and

Whereas the spiritual, physical, and mental well-being of children is our sacred duty; and

Whereas no segment of our society is more critical to the future of human survival and society than our children; and

Whereas it is the obligation of all public policymakers not only to support but also to defend the health and rights of parents, families, and children; and

Whereas information endangering to children is being made public and, in some instances, may be given unwarranted or unintended credibility through release under professional titles or through professional organizations; and

Whereas elected officials have a duty to inform and counter actions they consider damaging to children, parents, families, and society; and

Whereas Alaska has made sexual molestation of a child a felony and has declared parents who sexually molest their children to be unfit; and

Whereas virtually all studies in this area, including those published by the American Psychological Association, condemn child sexual abuse as criminal and harmful to children; and

Whereas the American Psychological Association has recently published, but did not endorse, a study that suggests that sexual relationships between adults and willing children are less harmful than believed and might even be positive for ''willing'' children; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature condemns and denounces all suggestions in the recently published study by the American Psychological Association that indicates sexual relationships between adults

and willing children are less harmful than believed and might even be positive for ''willing'' children; and be it further

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature urges the United States Congress and the President of the United States to likewise reject and condemn, in the strongest honorable written and vocal terms possible, any suggestion that sexual relations between children and adults are anything but abusive, destructive, exploitive, reprehensible, and punishable by law; and be it further

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature encourages competent investigations to continue to research the effects of child sexual abuse using the best methodology so that the public and public policymakers may act upon accurate information.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Bill Clinton, President of the United States; the Honorable Al Gore, Jr., Vice-President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Trent Lott, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable David Satcher, M.D. Ph.D., Surgeon General of the United States; and to the Honorable Ed Stevens and the Honorable Frank Murkowski, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

POM–268. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska relative to the Amchitka nuclear tests; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLVE NO. 19

Whereas the largest underground nuclear bomb tests ever conducted by the government of the United States were conducted as part of the Amchitka nuclear bomb test program; and

Whereas many Alaska workers who worked at the Amchitka Island, Alaska, nuclear bomb test program have reported what appears to be an inordinately high rate of radiation-related diseases, including various kinds of cancer; and

Whereas the workers have been unable for years to obtain information on the tests in which they were involved in order to prove their entitlement to compensation for their medical needs because the United States Department of Energy has advised them that the information is classified; and

Whereas the Amchitka Technical Advisory Group has unanimously requested a medical surveillance program of Amchitka workers; and

Whereas some of the information necessary for workers to establish their entitlement to medical benefits and other compensation has been released, but more information apparently remains classified; Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature requests the Congress of the United States to fund a medical surveillance program to cover the health concerns of the Amchitka workers; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States Department of Energy and the department's subcontractors are requested to expeditiously resolve the pending worker compensation claims and litigation filed by injured workers from Amchitka and the surviving family members of deceased workers at Amchitka; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States amend the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act of 1990 to include Amchitka Island, Alaska, within its coverage.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Al Gore, Jr., Vice-President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Trent Lott, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Bill Richardson, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Energy; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Frank Murkowski, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

POM–269. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska relative to oil and gas exploration, development, and production in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

LEGISLATION RESOLVE NO. 8

Whereas, in sec. 1002 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), the United States Congress reserved the right to permit further oil and gas exploration, development, and production within the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; and

Whereas the oil industry, the state, and the United States Department of the Interior consider the coastal plain to have the highest potential for discovery of very large oil and gas accumulations on the continent of North America, estimated to be as much as 10,000,000,000 barrels of recoverable oil; and

Whereas the residents of the North Slope Borough, within which the coastal plain is located, are supportive of development in the ''1002 study area''; and

Whereas oil and gas exploration and development of the coastal plain of the refuge and adjacent land could result in major discoveries that would reduce our nation's future need for imported oil, help balance the nation's trade deficit, and significantly increase the nation's security; and

Whereas domestic demand for oil continues to rise while domestic crude production continues to fall with the result that the United States imports additional oil from foreign sources; and

Whereas development of oil at Prudhoe Bay, Kuparuk, Endicott, Lisburne, and Milne Point has resulted in thousands of jobs throughout the United States, and projected job creation as a result of coastal plain oil development will have a positive effect in all 50 states; and

Whereas Prudhoe Bay production is declining by approximately 10 percent a year; and

Whereas, while new oil field developments on the North Slope of Alaska, such as Alpine, Badami, and West Sak, may slow or temporarily stop the decline in production, only giant coastal plain fields have the theoretical capability of increasing the production volume of Alaska oil to a significant degree; and

Whereas opening the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge now allows sufficient time for planning environmental safeguards, development, and national security review; and

Whereas the oil and gas industry and related state employment have been severely affected by reduced oil and gas activity, and the reduction in industry investment and employment has broad implications for the state's work force and the entire state economy; and

Whereas the 1,500,000-acre coastal plain of the refuge comprises only eight percent of the 19,000,000-acre refuge, and the development of the oil and gas reserves in the refuge's coastal plain would affect an area of only 2,000 to 7,000 acres, which is less than one-half of one percent of the area of the coastal plain; and

Whereas 8,000,000 of the 19,000,000 acres of the refuge have already be set aside as wilderness; and

Whereas the oil industry has shown at Prudhoe Bay, as well as at other locations along the Arctic coastal plain, that it can safely conduct oil and gas activity without adversely affecting the environment or wildlife populations; and

Whereas the state will ensure the continued health and productivity of the Porcupine Caribou herd and the protection of land, water, and wildlife resources during the exploration and development of the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; and

Whereas the oil industry is using innovative technology and environmental practices in the new field developments at Alpine and Northstar, and those techniques are directly applicable to operating on the coastal plain and would enhance environmental protection beyond traditionally high standards; Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Alaska State Legislature, That the Congress of the United States is urged to pass legislation to open the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, to oil and gas exploration, development, and production, and that the Alaska State Legislature is adamantly opposed to further wilderness or other restrictive designation in the area of the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska; and be it further

Resolved, That that activity be conducted in a manner that protects the environment and uses the state's work force to the maximum extent possible.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Bill Clinton, President of the United States; the Honorable Al Gore, Jr., Vice-President of the United States and president of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Trent Lott, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate; to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Frank Murkowski, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress; and to all other members of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives serving in the 106th United States Congress.

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated on July 26, 1999:

POM–270. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire relative to oxygenate additives for gasoline; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 9

Whereas, the federal Clean Air Act has required that oxygenates be added to gasoline for the purpose of reducing air pollution and, in particular, ground-level ozone and carbon monoxide; and

Whereas, automobile improvements over the last several years have considerably reduced the benefits of oxygenates for controlling carbon monoxide emissions by eliminating much of the carbon monoxide which would be emitted in the absence of oxygenates; and

Whereas, automobile improvements over the last several years have likewise considerably reduced the benefits of oxygenates for controlling hydrocarbon emissions; and

Whereas, substantial evidence has been developed over the last few years that, in much of the country, the formation of ground-level ozone is not significantly dependent upon amounts of hydrocarbon emissions; and

Whereas, questions have been raised as to whether one oxygenate in common use,

methyl t-butyl ether (MTBE), is degrading water quality to an extent that more than offsets its limited and decreasing benefits for air pollution control; and

Whereas, the threat that MTBE poses to the water resources of New Hampshire could be lessened in the short term by substituting conventional gasoline, which contains a much lower concentration of MTBE, for reformulated gasoline in the 4 southern counties (Hillsborough, Merrimack, Rockingham, and Strafford) required by federal regulation to use reformulated gasoline; and

Whereas, such gasoline substitution is not possible in New Hampshire without the Environmental Protection Agency granting the state a waiver to do so; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened:

That Congress should eliminate the oxygenate requirements of the federal Clean Air Act without imposing any new federal requirements to reduce air pollution; and

That the Environmental Protection Agency should expeditiously grant New Hampshire the short-term waivers necessary to permit the substitution of conventional gasoline for reformulated gasoline, without requiring substitute air emission reduction strategies as part of the state's air pollution implementation plan; and

That such gasoline substitution should be allowed prior to the completion of the ongoing, long-term comparative risk studies that will eventually identify the relative health and environmental costs and benefits of using gasoline formulations that have reduced MTBE levels; and

That when a better understanding has been reached of the comparative risks of different gasoline formulations, the Environmental Protection Agency should utilize incentive-based programs, rather than command-and-control measures, to further reduce MTBE levels in gasoline, provided that such reduction is consistent with the comparative risk analyses; and

That copies of this resolution be sent by the house clerk to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, the chairpersons of committees of the United States Congress having jurisdiction over the Clean Air Act, the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, and each member of the New Hampshire congressional delegation.

POM–271. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire relative to federal air pollution programs, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

Whereas, the federal Clean Air Act has in the past allocated pollution allowances, which are items of commercial value, to pollution sources based on emissions existing on arbitrary baseline dates, where higher emissions equated to being granted more allowances; and

Whereas, such a policy has rewarded dirtier operators by allocating to them more allowances than their cleaner competitors, and further, has unfairly served to punish operators who have happened to install expensive air pollution controls shortly before the baseline dates; and

Whereas, these past actions have made it more difficult to encourage polluters to reduce emissions prior to regulatory deadlines; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in General Court convened:

That future federal air pollution legislation should avoid using baseline pollution as a basis for allocation of allowances or other items of commercial value, or any future reduction requirements; and

That to the extent that the federal government chooses to continue to use baseline emissions to determine allowance allocation and future reduction requirements, either to individual polluters or to states, that it choose a baseline date far enough in the past in order that recently-improved sources are not placed at a competitive disadvantage against dirtier competitors that have not made such investments and have smaller capital and operating costs as a result; and

That such care with baselines be used not only for sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions, but also for any other emissions which the federal government may subsequently choose to control with allowance-based mechanisms; and

That copies of this resolution be sent by the house clerk to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, the chairpersons of committees of the United States Congress having jurisdiction over the Clean Air Act, the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, and each member of the New Hampshire congressional delegation.

POM–272. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire relative to border corridor highways; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4

Whereas, recent authorization of the Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century, (TEA–21), provides funding for the coordinated planning, design, and construction of corridors of national significance, economic growth, and international or interregional trade during federal fiscal years 1999–2003 under Sections 1118 and 1119; and

Whereas, allocations of funding may be made to transportation corridors identified in Section 1150(c) of TEA–21's predecessor, ISTEA and to other designated border transportation corridors using specified considerations; and

Whereas, the Coordinated Border Infrastructure Program has been established to improve the safe and efficient movement of people and goods at or across the United States/Canadian and United States/Mexican borders; and

Whereas, U.S. Route 2 traverses laterally through the northernmost parts of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, originating in Bangor, Maine and continuing through New Hampshire to Alburg, Vermont on the shores of Lake Champlain; and directly providing key connectivity to the Canadian provinces of New Brunswick and Quebec at Maine and Vermont as a de facto East-West Highway Connector; and

Whereas, U.S. Route 2 also serves as a major gateway and longitudinal connector for northern New England to the rest of the nation through its connectivity with Interstate Highways I–89, I–91, and I–93 in Vermont, and I–95 in Maine, and enjoys a tri-state designation as a primary east-west corridor by the states of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont; and

Whereas, the future economic viability of northern New England through its trading and tourism relationship with Quebec and the Maritime Provinces is contingent upon the upgrade and maintenance of the U.S. Route 2 transportation corridor link; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, the senate concurring:

That the United States Secretary of Transportation expeditiously authorize the inclusion of U.S. Route 2 through the states of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont as a designated border corridor highway under the auspices of Sections 1118 and 1119 of the Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century; and

That copies of this resolution, signed by the speaker of the house and the president of the senate, be forwarded by the house clerk to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, the Secretary of Transportation, and the congressional delegations of New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine.

POM–273. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire relative to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

Whereas, since its enactment in 1975, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) has helped millions of children with special needs to receive a quality education and to develop to their full capacities; and

Whereas, the IDEA has moved children with disabilities out of institutions and into public school classrooms with their peers; and

Whereas, the IDEA has helped break down stereotypes and ignorance about people with disabilities, improving the quality of life and economic opportunity for millions of Americans; and

Whereas, when the federal government enacted the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, it promised to fund 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States; and

Whereas, the federal government currently funds, on average, less than 9 percent of the actual cost of special education services; and

Whereas, local school districts and state governments end up bearing the largest share of the cost of special education services; and

Whereas, the federal government's failure to adequately fulfill its responsibility to special needs children undermines public support for special education and creates hardship for disabled children and their families; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, the senate concurring:

That the New Hampshire general court urges the President and the Congress to fund 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States as promised under the IDEA to ensure that all children, regardless of disability, receive a quality education and are treated with the dignity and respect they deserve; and

That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the house clerk to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, and the members of the New Hampshire congressional delegation.

POM–274. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire relative to Nuclear Decommissioning Reserve Funds; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 11

Whereas, proper decommissioning of nuclear power plants serves important public health and safety goals; and

Whereas, existing federal tax provisions recognize the importance of adequately funding decommissioning costs by providing incentives for establishing and adequately funding Nuclear Decommissioning Reserve Funds; and

Whereas, section 468A of the Internal Revenue Code permits taxpayers with qualifying interests in nuclear power plants to deduct contributions to Nuclear Decommissioning Reserve Funds; and

Whereas, the income of Nuclear Decommissioning Reserve Funds is taxed at a fixed 20 percent rate rather than at the normal corporate tax rate; and

Whereas, the amount that taxpayers with qualifying interests may contribute to Nuclear Decommissioning Reserve Funds is limited to a portion of the total nuclear decommissioning costs which is based on the estimated useful life of the nuclear power plant; and

Whereas, electric utility restructuring by the states may encourage or require actions by taxpayers with qualifying interests that deviate from the decommissioning funding formula in federal tax laws, including: prefunding of decommissioning obligations as a condition of the sale of the qualifying interest; the discontinuation of including decommissioning funding in cost of service rates, which will be replaced by competitive market-based rates; and reliance on nonbypassable transition charges to retail customers of a former nuclear power plant owner, such as stranded cost or wires charges, to recover future decommissioning contributions; and

Whereas, states may require that nuclear decommissioning funding be completed in a period shorter than the estimated useful life of the nuclear power plant, and some portion of these state-mandated contributions may be ineligible for deposit in a Nuclear Decommissioning Reserve Fund; and

Whereas, there should be no federal tax disincentive to fund as promptly as possible the expenditures required for the safe decommissioning of nuclear power plants; and

Whereas, compliance with state electric utility restructuring requirements and the transition to a competitive electric market may force nuclear power plant owners into decommissioning funding obligations with adverse federal tax consequences under current law; and

Whereas, these adverse federal tax consequences will ultimately cause higher rates for retail electricity customers; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, the senate concurring:

That the general court of New Hampshire hereby urges the United States Congress and the Internal Revenue Service to make changes to the Internal Revenue Code and federal tax regulations necessary to broaden the ability of taxpayers to make tax-deductible contributions to Nuclear Decommissioning Reserve Funds and to permit all contributions toward future decommissioning expenses to receive beneficial tax treatment; and

That copies of this resolution, signed by the speaker of the house of representatives and the president of the senate, be forwarded by the house clerk to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to each member of the New Hampshire Congressional delegation, and to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

POM–275. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire relative to health care choices for senior citizens; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

Whereas, all senior citizens in New Hampshire deserve access to all Medicare options to ensure greater health care choice; therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, the senate concurring:

That the general court of New Hampshire hereby urges the federal government to review Medicare policies and procedures to ensure that New Hampshire senior citizens retain all Medicare options. Specifically, the federal government should evaluate the Medicare environment in New Hampshire to ensure that:

(a) Existing policies and procedures provide for citizens to have a choice of Medicare options;

(b) Medicare reimbursement rates for physicians, hospitals, and home health care providers are sufficient to allow for access to needed care statewide and greater product choice in rural areas of the state;

(c) Medicare premium rates for New Hampshire managed care products be set at a level that allows attractive benefit coverage to citizens;

(d) Applications for Medicare insurance product introduction or expansions in New Hampshire receive high priority status by the federal government; and

(e) Congress reviews the impact of the ''Balanced Budget Act'' of 1997 on the ability of Medicare health maintenance organizations and home health care providers to continue to operate in New Hampshire; and

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the house clerk to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the New Hampshire delegation.

POM–276. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire relative to tobacco settlement funds; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

Whereas, on November 23, 1998, representatives from 46 states signed a settlement agreement with the 5 largest tobacco manufacturers; and

Whereas, the Attorneys General Master Tobacco Settlement Agreement culminated legal action that began in 1994 when states began filing lawsuits against the tobacco industry; and

Whereas, the respective states are presently in the process of finalizing the terms of the Master Tobacco Settlement Agreement, and are making initial fiscal determinations relative to the most responsible ways and means to utilize the settlement funds; and

Whereas, under the terms of the agreement, tobacco manufactures will pay $206 billion over the next 25 years to the respective states in up-front and annual payments; and

Whereas, New Hampshire is projected to receive $1,304,689,150 through the year 2025 under the terms of the Master Tobacco Settlement; and

Whereas, because many state lawsuits sought to recover Medicaid funds spent to treat illnesses caused by tobacco use, the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) contends that it is authorized and obligated, under the Social Security Act, to collect its share of any tobacco settlement funds attributable to Medicaid; and

Whereas, the Master Tobacco Settlement Agreement does not address the Medicaid recoupment issue, and thus the Social Security Act must be amended to resolve the recoupment issue in favor of the respective states; and

Whereas, as we move toward final approval of the Master Tobacco Settlement Agreement, it is imperative that state sovereignty be preserved; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the State house of representatives, the senate concurring:

That the New Hampshire legislature urges the United States Congress to enact legislation amending the Social Security Act to prohibit recoupment by the federal government of state tobacco settlement funds; and

That it is the sense of the New Hampshire state legislature that the respective state legislatures should have complete autonomy over the appropriation and expenditure of state tobacco settlements funds; and

That the New Hampshire state legislature most fervently opposes any efforts by the federal government to earmark or impose any other restrictions on the respective states' use of state tobacco settlement funds; and

That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the house clerk to the President of the United States; the President and the Secretary of the United States Senate; the Speaker and the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives; and to each member of New Hampshire's congressional delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROTH, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. 1429: An original bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 104 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000 (Rept. No. 106–120).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany the bill (S. 692) to prohibit Internet gambling, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106–121).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, for the Committee on the Judiciary:

Carlos Murguia, of Kansas, to the United States District Judge for the District of Kansas.

(The above nomination was reported with the recommendation that it be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ROTH:

S. 1429. An original bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 104 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000; from the Committee on Finance; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Oregon):

S. 1430. A bill to set forth the policy of the United States with respect to Macau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 1431. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixtures of sennosides; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1432. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on dark couverture chocolate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 1433. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a retail excise

tax on merchandise sold via the Internet, through catalogs, or sold other than through local merchants in other to supplement the funding for elementary and secondary school teacher salaries; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. CLELAND):

S. 1434. A bill to amend the National Historic Preservation Act to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 1435. A bill to amend section 9 of the Small Business Act to provide for the establishment of volunteer mentoring programs; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. CONRAD:

S. 1436. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Transition Act to provide support for United States agricultural producers that is equal to the support provided agricultural producers by the European Union, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN:

S. 1437. A bill to protect researchers from compelled disclosure of research in Federal courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. Res. 162. A resolution to authorize testimony of employee of the Senate in State of New Mexico v. Felix Lucero Chavez; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. Res. 163. A resolution to establish a special committee of the Senate to study the causes of firearms violence in America; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon):

S. Con. Res. 48. A concurrent resolution relating to the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Oregon):

S. 1430. A bill to set forth the policy of the United States with respect to Macau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE UNITED STATES-MACAU POLICY ACT OF 1999

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, I rise to introduce S. 1430, the United States-Macau policy Act of 1999. I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1430

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''United States—Macau Policy Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2 FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.

The Congress makes the following findings and declarations'

(1) The Congress recognizes that under the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal on the Question of Macau, dated April 13, 1987—

(A) the People's Republic of China and the Republic of Portugal have agreed that the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau on December 20, 1999, and until that time, Portugal will be responsible for the continuing administration of Macau;

(B) the People's Republic of China has guaranteed that, on and after December 20, 1999, the Macau Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, will continue to enjoy a high degree of autonomy on all matters other than defense and foreign affairs;

(C) the People's Republic of China will implement a ''one country, two systems'' policy with respect to Macau, under which Macau will retain its current legal, social, and economic systems until at least the year 2049;

(D) provision is made for the continuation in force of bilateral and multilateral agreements implemented as of December 20, 1999, and for the ability of the Macau Special Administrative Region to conclude new agreements.

(2) The Congress supports the full and complete implementation of the provisions of the Joint Declaration.

(3) The Congress supports the policies and objectives set forth in the Joint Declaration.

(4) It is the sense of the Congress that—

(A) continued economic prosperity in Macau furthers United States interests in Asia and in our relationship with the People's Republic of China;

(B)(i) support for principles of democracy is a fundamental tenent of United States foreign policy, and as such, will also play a central role in United States policy toward Macau, now and after December 19, 1999; and

(ii) safeguarding the human rights of the people of Macau is of great importance to the United States and is directly relevant to United States interests in Macau;

(iii) a fully successful transition in the exercise of sovereignty over Macau must safeguard those human rights; and

(iv) human rights also serve as a basis for Macau's continued economic prosperity.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) prior to December 20, 1999, the term ''Macau'' means the Portuguese Dependent Territory of Macau, and on and after December 20, 1999, the term ''Macau'' means the Macau Special Administration Region of the People's Republic of China;

(2) the term ''Joint Declaration'' means the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal on the Question of Macau, dated April 13, 1987; and

(3) the term ''laws of the United States'' means provisions of law enacted by the Congress.

TITLE I—POLICY

SEC. 101. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States should play an active role before, on, and after December 20, 1999, in assisting Macau in maintaining its confidence and prosperity, its unique cultural heritage, and the mutually beneficial ties between the people of the United States and the people of Macau; and

(2) through its policies, the United States should assist Macau in maintaining a high degree of autonomy in matters other than defense and foreign affairs as guaranteed by the People's Republic of China and the Republic of Portugal in the Joint Declaration, particularly with respect to such matters as trade, commerce, law enforcement, finance, monetary policy, aviation, shipping, communications, tourism, cultural affairs, sports, and participation in international organizations, consistent with the national security and other interests of the United States.

TITLE II—THE STATUS OF MACAU IN UNITED STATES LAW

SEC. 201. CONTINUED APPLICATION OF UNITED STATES LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any change in the exercise of sovereignty over Macau, and subject to subsections (b) and (c), the laws of the United States shall continue to apply with respect to Macau, on and after December 20, 1999, in the same manner as the laws of the United States were applied with respect to Macau before such date unless otherwise expressly provided by law or by Executive order under section 202.

(b) INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.—For all purposes, including actions in any court of the United States, the Congress approves of the continuation in force on and after December 20, 1999, of all treaties and other international agreements, including multilateral conventions, entered into before such date between the United States and Macau, or entered into force before such date between the United States and the Republic of Portugal with respect to, or as applied to, Macau, unless or until terminated in accordance with law. If, in carrying out this title, the President determines that Macau is not legally competent to carry out its obligations under any such treaty or other international agreement, or that the continuation of Macau's obligations or rights under any such treaty or other international agreement is not appropriate under the circumstances, the President shall promptly notify the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate concerning such determination, and shall take appropriate action to modify or terminate such treaty or other international agreement.

(c) EXPORT CONTROLS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a) or any other provision of law, within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act the President—in close consultation with the relevant committees of the Congress—shall establish with respect to Macau, such export control policies and regulations as he determines to be necessary to protect fully the national security interests of the United States.

SEC. 202. PRESIDENTIAL ORDER.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION.—On or after December 20, 1999, whenever the President determines that Macau is not sufficiently autonomous to justify treatment under a particular law of the United States, or any provision thereof, different from that accorded the People's Republic of China, the President may issue an Executive order suspending the application of section 201(a) to such law or provision of law. The President shall promptly notify the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate concerning any such determination.

(b) FACTOR FOR CONSIDERATION.—In making a determination under subsection (a) with respect to the application of a law of the United States, or any provision thereof, to Macau, the President should consider the terms, obligations, and expectations expressed in the Joint Declaration with respect to Macau.

(c) PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—Any Executive order issued under subsection

(a) shall be published in the Federal Register and shall specify the law or provision of law affected by the order.

(d) TERMINATION OF SUSPENSION.—An Executive order issued under subsection (a) may be terminated by the President with respect to a particular law or provision of law whenever the President determines that Macau has regained sufficient autonomy to justify treatment under the law or provision of law in question. Notice of any such termination shall be published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 203. RULES AND REGULATIONS.

The President is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as he considers appropriate to carry out this Act.

SEC. 204. CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS.

In carrying out this title, the President shall consult appropriately with the Congress, in particular with:

(a) the Committee on International Relations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(b) the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

TITLE III—REPORTING PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than March 31 of each of the years 2000, 2001, and 2002, the Secretary of State shall transmit to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on conditions in Macau of interest to the United States. This report shall cover (in the case of the initial report) the period since the date of the enactment of this Act or (in the case of subsequent reports) the period since the most recent report pursuant to this section, and shall describe, inter alia—

(1) significant developments in United States relations with Macau;

(2) significant developments related to any change in the exercise of sovereignty over Macau affecting United States interests in Macau or United States relations with Macau and the People's Republic of China;

(3) steps taken by the United States to implement section 201(c) (relating to export controls with respect to Macau), including any significant problems or other developments arising with respect to the application of United States export controls to Macau;

(4) the laws of the United States with respect to which the application of section 201(a) (relating to the application of United States laws to Macau) has been suspended pursuant to section 202(a) or with respect to which such a suspension has been terminated pursuant to section 202(d), and the reasons for the suspension or termination, as the case may be;

(5) the treaties and other international agreements with respect to which the President has made a determination described in the last sentence of section 201(b) (relating to the application of treaties and other international agreements to Macau), the reasons for each such determination, and the steps taken as a result of such determination;

(6) the development of democratic institutions in Macau;

(7) compliance by the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal with their obligations under the Joint Declaration; and

(8) the nature and extent of Macau's participation in multilateral forums.

SEC. 302. SEPARATE PART OF COUNTRY REPORTS.

Whenever a report is transmitted to the Congress on a country-by-country basis, there shall be included in such report, where applicable, a separate subreport on Macau under the heading of the state that exercises sovereignty over Macau.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 1431. A bill to suspend temporarily the duties on mixtures of sennosides; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1432. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on dark couverture chocolate; to the Committee on Finance.

DUTY SUSPENSION LEGISLATION

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bills be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1431

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MIXTURES OF SENNOSIDES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by inserting in numerical sequence the following heading:

"	9902.39.00	Mixtures of sennosides (provided for in subheading 2938.90.00)	Free	No Change	No Change	On or before 12/31/2002.	"

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) applies with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the 15th day after the date of enactment of this Act.

S. 1432

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DARK COUVERTURE CHOCOLATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by inserting in numerical sequence the following new heading:

"	9902.18.06	Dark couverture chocolate (provided for in subheading 1806.20.50)	Free	No Change	No Change	On or before 12/31/2002.	"

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) applies with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. CLELAND):

S. 1434. A bill to amend the National Historic Preservation Act to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise on behalf of myself and Senators AKAKA and CLELAND to introduce this legislation that would extend the authorization for appropriations for the National Historic Preservation Fund, as established by the Historic Preservation Act amendments of 1976. On September 30, 1997, the authorization for deposits into the Historic Preservation Fund from revenues due and payable to the United States under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act expired. So we introduce this legislation with the purpose of reauthorizing the deposits at the same level of $150 million annually through the year 2005.

As you are aware, and others in this Chamber, this fund account supports roughly one-half of the cost of the Nation's historic preservation programs. State governments contribute the other half. This is a partnership that is working—preserving our communities, creating jobs, and providing opportunities for this partnership to flourish.

States and certain local governments and Native American tribes carry out our historic preservation programs under the act for the Secretary of the Interior and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. This program involves the identification of historic places, working with property owners in nominating significant places to the National Register, consulting with Federal agencies on projects that may adversely impact historic places, advising investors on important tax credits for the rehabilitation of historic buildings, and offering information and educational opportunities to the private and public sectors on historic preservation.

This program is made possible through the Historic Preservation Fund, and it contributes significantly, as I have said, to community revitalization and to economic development.

We believe it is extremely worthwhile, it is a program that works, and we must reauthorize this fund so the State historic preservation offices and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation may continue this important work.

I would just like to state for the RECORD some very brief examples of how this has worked around the Nation.

One example is from my hometown in New Orleans. The Maginnis Cotton Mill, which was constructed in 1884, was the largest textile manufacturing plant in the South. It was once a ''model institution'' employing 450 workers. The Maginnis Mill remained the largest in the South until it closed in 1944. Over 50 years had passed before

any restorative work was done to the mill.

In 1996, while maintaining the original ascetic integrity of this enormous complex in downtown New Orleans, the Historic Restoration Group, Inc., converted the old mill into 267 apartments. It has now been completed. It is a beautiful renovation project. It is now the home for 267 residents and their families, and it has increased the housing in that area by 26 percent. The building, which has been called a ''freeze frame'' of the development of the city, has greatly increased property values in that area, not to mention the surrounding area.

Another example is Chinatown, Honolulu. Once nearly engulfed with high-rise redevelopment, Chinatown today is protected by a requirement that new construction be reviewed by a design commission. Tools used include a National Register of Historic Places nomination, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation review, and the preservation tax incentives.

Another example is the Indianapolis Union Railway Station. A $40 million rehabilitation project over a decade drew on several Federal funding programs and extensive consultation with the State and has spurred other adjacent rehabilitations. The station now serves as a festival marketplace with hotel and transportation facilities.

Another example is Formosan Termite Control. A threat to the Vieux Carre and other historic districts in the South, the Formosan termite is immune to common treatment. A Historic Preservation Fund grant is enabling Louisiana State University to study ways of improving detection and eradication of the pest.

Another example is Ledbetter Heights low-income housing, Shreveport. Section 8 housing designation and the preservation tax incentives were used to purchase and rehabilitate shotgun houses in the St. Paul's Bottoms Historic District. Shreveport Landmarks, Inc., cooperated with a tenants' council in the process.

There are literally hundreds of other examples of successful renovation projects that would not be possible without the Historic Preservation Fund. From Hawaii to Maine, from Louisiana to North Dakota, and all in between, there are places in urban and rural areas that have greatly benefited by the presence of this fund.

So I introduce this legislation tonight. I look forward to finding the funding for not just a one-time appropriation. As you know, S. 25 is a bill that seeks to find a permanent source of funding for many important environmental and wildlife conservation projects. Perhaps our National Historic Fund could become part of that so this permanent source of funding could go on to our cities and our communities so they would have a steady stream of revenue to continue to improve these areas in our communities, both in urban and rural parts of our Nation.

Mr. AKAKA. I join my colleague, Senator LANDRIEU, in introducing legislation to reauthorize the Historic Preservation Fund and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. As my colleagues may know, the authorization for the Historic Preservation Fund expired on September 30, 1997, and the authorization for the Advisory Council expires on September 30, 2000. This bill would reauthorize the fund and the Council through fiscal year 2005.

There is a growing backlog of preservation needs throughout our country that is not being met. To ensure that this situation is not exacerbated, and to address these shortfalls on a long-term basis, the Historic Preservation Fund should be reauthorized at the earliest opportunity.

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 was amended in 1976 to establish the Historic Preservation Fund. Administered by the National Park Service, the Fund provides grants-in-aid to States, certified local governments, and outlying areas. The National Historic Preservation Act provides that $150 million from Outer Continental shelf oil and gas receipts is deposited in the Fund each year. The revenue remains available in the Fund until appropriated by Congress. Since September 30, 1997, no additional deposits from OCS revenues into the Fund have been authorized.

Reauthorization of the Historic Preservation Fund is critical because it provides for the continuation of grants used by States, Tribes, Native Hawaiians, Alaska Natives, and local governments to pay the costs of surveys, comprehensive historic preservation plans, National Register nominations, brochures and educational materials, as well as architectural plans, historic structure reports, and engineering studies necessary to repair listed properties.

Since 1968, over $800 million in grant funds has been awarded to 59 States, territories, local governments, Native Hawaiian organizations, Indian tribes, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation. In Fiscal Year 1998, the States received a total of $29.4 million in historic preservation grants-in-aid, an average allocation of $524,000, which typically is matched by $350,000 in non-federal matching share contributions.

During 1998, States surveyed 14.9 million acres of historic resources and added 185,100 properties to their inventories. Also in 1998, States submitted 1,602 nominations to the National Register of Historic Places and reviewed 89,000 Federal projects for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. In Hawaii, over 38,000 properties are maintained on the state's inventory of known historic properties.

Besides providing grants-in-aid, the Historic Preservation Fund also administers a grant program for Native Hawaiians, Indian Tribes, and Alaska Natives for cultural heritage programs. The Tribal Preservation Program has directly assisted over 170 tribes through the award of 259 grants.

For example, the Hopi Tribe in Arizona received a grant to document the rock art sites at Antelope Mesa, resulting in 100 sites being included in their Cultural Resources Management Plan. In Alaska, the Native Village of Venetie drafted a historic preservation plan for Venetie and Arctic Village utilizing a grant from the Historic Preservation Fund. The Seneca Nation of Indians in New York used a grant to develop educational materials for their school children using oral interviews with tribal elders.

In all, more than $9 million in grant funds has been used to assist tribes in assuming State Historic Preservation Office responsibilities, in drafting preservation ordinances, implementing cultural resource management plans, identifying and protecting historic sites, and conducting preservation needs assessments.

In addition, the Fund provides matching grants to Historically Black Colleges and Universities to preserve threatened historic buildings located on their campuses. Funding for preservation projects has been used at Fisk University and Knoxville College in Tennessee; Miles College, Talladega College, Selma University, Stillman College, Concordia College in Alabama; Allen University, Claflin College, Voorhees College in South Carolina; and Rust College and Tougaloo University in Mississippi.

In addition to the Historic Preservation Fund, Congress created the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. As an independent federal agency, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, the Council is the major policy advisor to the Federal government on historic preservation. The Council administers programs including, but not limited to, the Historic Preservation Fund, the National Register, and programs of the National Trust. The Council also reviews the policies of Federal agencies in implementing the National Historic Preservation Act, conducts training and educational programs, and encourages public participation in historic preservation. The Council's authorization expires in Fiscal Year 2000.

The Council's role in working with Federal agencies to support the National Historic Preservation Act is essential for protecting this country's historical resources. The Council coordinates many different preservation programs. The Council works with the Housing and Urban Development's HOME program for affordable housing, promotes preservation of historic properties during natural disasters, and promotes preservation and reuse of historic properties during military base closures. The Council, working with State and local governments through State Historic Preservation Officers, has significantly enhanced our ability to preserve our national heritage.

Both the Historic Preservation Fund and the Advisory Council contribute to ongoing Federal, Native Hawaiian, Tribal, State, local and private partnerships in historic preservation. Matching funds are contributed by the States and local and private partners to enhance the investment in our historic heritage. Federal and State funding for historic preservation creates jobs, promotes economic development, and helps leverage commitments from private and public sources.

Historic sites in our country are tangible reminders of our diverse and rich heritage and provide us with a sense of continuity with our past. The Historic Preservation Fund has provided numerous opportunities for preserving our country's irreplaceable historic and archeological resources. For example, in Hawaii, preservation projects in the Oahu Market in Chinatown and at the Mission Houses were funded through Historic Preservation Fund grants. Similarly, New Hampshire used preservation funding to assist with the transformation of the 1925 Goffstown High School into an apartment complex for the town's older inhabitants. The Alaska Gold Rush Centennial was developed as a heritage tourism initiative of the Alaska State Historic Preservation Office using historic preservation funds to establish State-community partnerships. Also, the Save America's Treasures program funded by the Historic Preservation Fund has provided grants for preservation projects of national scope and significance, including restoration of the Star-Spangled Banner and the Declaration of Independence.

A similar bill introduced by the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) passed the Senate last year by unanimous consent but was not acted on by the House. I hope that the legislation we are offering today—a simple reauthorization of the Fund and Council through 2005—can be adopted expeditiously.

This legislation is supported by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, the National Alliance of Statewide Preservation Organizations, the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History, Preservation Action, the Society for American Archaeology, and the American Historical Association. I urge my colleagues to support this measure as well.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. KERRY):

S. 1435. A bill to amend section 9 of the Small Business Act to provide for the establishment of volunteer mentoring programs; to the Committee on Small Business.

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A VOLUNTEER MENTORING PROGRAM FOR THE SBIR AND STTR PROGRAMS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, small businesses are the biggest job producers in our economy and technology is an increasingly important component to those growth figures. Contributing to that continued high technology job growth is a high technology procurement program that allows small and innovative high technology companies to bid on some of the federal government's research and development proposals. The Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program gives these small technology companies a tool to compete in the big leagues by giving them fairer access to federal research and a way to finance that research in order to commercialize it. It also gives the federal government access to highly innovative companies that can custom design and develop specialized technology for an agency's specific needs—something bigger companies may not be able to do as well.

The SBIR program does this by mandating that each federal agency with a research and development budget that is contracted to outside vendors in excess of $100 million designate 2.5 percent of this budget for awards to small businesses. Currently there are 10 federal agencies participating in the SBIR program. A smaller component of this program is the Small Business Technology Transfer program (STTR), which allows 5 agencies to allocate three twentieths of one percent of these funds to small businesses that partner with non-profit institutions to do the research and development.

The SBIR program creates jobs, increases our capacity for technological innovation and boosts our international competitiveness. According to an April 1998 GAO study, about 50 percent of SBIR research is commercialized or receives additional research funding. That's a pretty good success rate. It's also a great example of federal agencies working together with small businesses to develop technologies to solve specific problems and fill government procurement needs in a cost effective way.

The SBIR and STTR programs are successful programs and we can make them even more successful by establishing a volunteer mentoring program. Such a program would partner CEOs of small high technology companies that have successfully completed a SBIR or STTR program with small businesses in low participation areas to guide them through the process, increasing their chances for success and, ultimately, the commercialization of their research.

Many states believe they can do better regarding the number of SBIR awards their small businesses win. Since the SBIR and STTR programs are highly competitive and merit-based programs and should remain so, I believe the best way to increase participation is through outreach and mentoring. My bill would target its mentoring program to low participation areas which receive a disproportionately low number of SBIR awards as compared with other areas in the state or in the country.

Michigan is just one example of a state which has many low participation areas within it that could improve their participation in the program. In 1997 Michigan small businesses nevertheless won 102 SBIR awards worth a total of $24.6 million, ranking it 14th nationally. But Michigan should be doing better. Based on its population, Michigan ranks 8th nationally, not 14th as it does in number of SBIR awards. I believe the volunteer mentoring program I am proposing will help small high technology businesses from those areas within Michigan and around the country that lack access to research universities, venture capital or other resources to increase their chances of participating successfully in this program.

Last summer, the Senate Small Business Committee held an SBIR oversight hearing to begin to develop a hearing record in preparation for SBIR's reauthorization. At that hearing, GAO presented a study favorably reviewing the program. It pointed out, however, that because agencies are adhering to the program requirements that they not use SBIR funds to pay for the administrative costs of the program, this funding restriction has limited their ability to provide some needed administrative support. For example, some agencies reported they do not have the necessary funds to provide personnel to act as mentors to their SBIR companies or engage in activities that could possibly increase the program's success in phase III. GAO also said the lack of administrative support means agencies are unable to provide SBIR participants with much-needed training in business skills. A volunteer mentoring program could fill this void.

Also at that hearing, a number of Senators expressed a desire to see more geographical distribution of SBIR awards and hearing witnesses suggested this could be addressed through outreach to make more high technology small businesses aware of the program. A natural complement to reaching out to new companies to tell them about the SBIR and STTR programs is the establishment of a mentoring program to increase their odds for success in those programs.

Many SBIR-company CEOs have benefitted from the program, are committed to its success and have told me they want to give something back. They propose doing this in the way of mentoring small businesses that are new to the SBIR process. The bill I am introducing today would establish a program to coordinate that process and reimburse volunteer mentors for their out-of-pocket-expenses. It would also address the desire to expand participation in the program by targeting the mentoring to low participation areas.

I am pleased to have the Senate Small Business Committee Ranking Member, JOHN KERRY, join me as an original cosponsor of this bill. My legislation also has the support of key members of the SBIR community.

My bill would establish a Mentoring program where past SBIR and STTR recipients partner with new applicant companies in low participation areas to help guide them through the process and increase their chances of success. A small business's failure to obtain a phase I or Phase II award may have nothing to do with the capability of its technology but rather is often a result of a lack of understanding the government procurement process and procedures. This mentoring program would help bring new companies into the SBIR program from areas that have not traditionally participated at high rates. It would also increase Phase III awards and commercialization of the technology being developed.

Specifically, my bill would establish a competitively bid volunteer mentoring grant program for the SBIR and STTR programs. The Small Business Administration would be responsible for administering the program. Organizations representing SBIR and STTR awardees could apply for grants ranging from $50,000 -$200,000 to participate in the program. Qualifying organizations would match small businesses in low participation areas new to the SBIR/STTR process with CEOs and others of small, high technology companies that have successfully completed one or more SBIR/STTR contracts, grants or cooperative agreements. The ''volunteer mentors'' would be reimbursed only for their out-of-pocket expenses. Their time, energy and know-how would be donated free-of-charge. The program would be authorized at $1 million per year to cover administration of the program and reimbursement of volunteer mentors for their out-of-pocket expenses.

There are a number of effective organizations and entities representing SBIR and STTR companies that would be eligible to apply for the program. This legislation is intended to attract organizations such as the Small Business Technology Coalition, various regional groups or entities working with SBIR companies as well as some technology oriented specialized Small Business Development Centers, and others. Some of these eligible entities and organizations may even chose to partner together in a collaborative effort to apply to the program.

The SBIR program, originally established in 1982 and reauthorized and expanded in 1992, expires in fiscal year 2000. This highly competitive program has a well deserved reputation for success and has enjoyed bipartisan support over the years. I hope my bill can be included in that reauthorizing legislation to improve what is already a successful program giving small high technology companies access to federal research and development and the federal government access to some of the world's best innovation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letters of endorsement for the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY COALITION,
Washington, DC, July 22, 1999.

Hon. CARL LEVIN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEVIN: The Small Business Technology Coalition (SBTC) wishes to express its support for your ''mentoring'' bill to amend the reauthorization of the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Program. The amendment would provide much needed support to small business in ''low participating areas'' applying for grants under the SBIR program.

As you know, the amendment would establish a competitively bid volunteer mentoring grant program for the SBIR. The Small Business Administration would be responsible for administering the program. Organizations representing SBIR awardees could apply for grants ranging from $50,000 to $200,000 to participate in the program. Qualifying organizations would match small businesses new to the SBIR process with CEOs and other of small, high-technology companies that have been successful SBIR award winners. These ''volunteer mentors'' would be reimbursed only for their out-of-pocket expenses incurred while mentoring, not for their time. The program would be authorized at $1 million per year to cover administration of the program and reimbursement of volunteer mentors for their out-of-pocket expenses.

As the nation-wide trade association of small high tech business CEOs, SBTC can attest to the value of a mentoring program to help small businesses new to the SBIR process. SBTC members have hands-on experience and know the importance of expert technical assistance in locating venture capital, seeking Phase III partners and commercialization. SBTC speaks for the small high tech business community and knows through experience that mentoring is a key to success in the SBIR process.

The anticipated result of your amendment would be an increase in SBIR awards to businesses in areas which traditionally have had low numbers of awards. With the passage of this amendment, businesses in certain areas that do not have access to research or venture capital for example, could connect with companies with demonstrated expertise in those fields. Successful mentoring in these low participating areas would broaden the geographic and demographic distribution of SBIR awards.

As the leading industry association representing the interest and needs of small, emerging, research-intensive, technology-based companies, we support your amendment to help small businesses in rural areas succeed in the SBIR program.

Sincerely,

JEFF NOAH.

SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, June 28, 1999.

Hon. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SNOWE: On behalf of the Small Business Legislative Council (SBLC), I urge you to support an amendment to the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) reauthorization to be offered by Senator Levin. The purpose of the amendment is to create a ''mentoring'' program to encourage small businesses in states not currently benefitting from the SBIR program to participate.

As you know, the SBIR program is a ''win-win'' program. The federal government obtains necessary research and small businesses obtain the opportunity to develop commercially feasible products and processes.

SBLC is a permanent, independent coalition of eighty trade and professional associations that share a common commitment to the future of small business. Our members represent the interest of small businesses in such diverse economic sectors as manufacturing, retailing, distribution, professional and technical services, construction, transportation, tourism and agriculture. Our policies are developed through a consensus among our membership. Individual associations may express their own views. For your information, a list of our members is enclosed.

Sincerely,

JOHN S. SATAGAJ,
President and General Counsel.

MEMBERS OF THE SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ACIL.
Air Conditioning Contractors of America.
Alliance for Affordable Services.
Alliance for American Innovation.
Alliance of Independent Store Owners and Professionals.
American Animal Hospital Association.
American Association of Equine Practitioners.
American Bus Association.
American Consulting Engineers Council.
American Machine Tool Distributors Association.
American Nursery and Landscape Association.
American Road & Transportation Builders Association.
American Society of Interior Designers.
American Society of Travel Agents, Inc.
American Subcontractors Association.
American Textile Machinery Association.
Architectural Precast Association.
Associated Equipment Distributors.
Associated Landscape Contractors of America.
Association of Small Business Development Centers.
Association of Sales and Marketing Companies.
Automative Recyclers Association.
Automotive Service Association.
Bowling Proprietors Association of America.
Building Service Contractors Association International.
Business Advertising Council.
CBA.
Council of Fleet Specialists.
Council of Growing Companies.
Direct Selling Association.
Electronics Representative Association.
Florists Transworld Delivery Association.
Health Industry Representatives Association.
Helicopter Association International.
Independent Bankers Association of America.
Independent Medical Distributors Association.
International Association of Refrigerated Warehouses.
International Formalwear Association.
International Franchise Association.
Machinery Dealers National Association.
Mail Advertising Service Association.
Manufacturers Agents for the Food Service Industry.
Manufacturers Agents National Association.
Manufacturers Representatives of America, Inc.
National Association for the Self-Employed.
National Association of Home Builders.
National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors.

National Association of Realtors.
National Association of RV Parks and Campgrounds.
National Association of Small Business Investment Companies.
National Association of the Remodeling Industry.
National Chimney Sweep Guild.
National Community Pharmacists Association.
National Electrical Contractors Association.
National Electrical Manufacturers Representatives Association.
National Funeral Directors Association, Inc.
National Lumber & Building Materials Dealers, Association.
National Moving and Storage Association.
National Ornamental & Miscellaneous Metals Association.
National Paperbox Association.
National Society of Accountants.
National Tooling and Machining Association.
National Tour Association.
National Wood Flooring Association.
Organization for the Promotion and Advancement of Small Telephone Companies.
Petroleum Marketers Association of America.
Printing Industries of America, Inc.
Professional Lawn Care Association of America.
Promotional Products Association International.
The Retailer's Bakery Association.
Saturation Mailers: Coalition.
Small Business Council of America, Inc.
Small Business Exporters Association.
Small Business Technology Coalition.
SMC Business Councils.
Society of American Florists.
Turfgrass Producers International.
Tire Association of North America.
United Motorcoach Association.

• Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today I join my colleague from Michigan, Senator LEVIN, in introducing the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Small Technology Transfer (STTR) Volunteer Mentoring Program. This bill seeks to increase, through company-to-company mentoring, the number of SBIR awards given to small businesses located in areas, known as ''low participation areas,'' where historically few awards have been made in proportion to other areas of the country.

The Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program is a great example of how government and business can work together to advance the cause of science and a healthy economy. The results have been dramatic for small, high-technology companies participating in the program. Since 1983 when the program was started, some 16,000 small, high-technology firms have received more than 46,000 SBIR research awards through 1997, totaling $7.5 billion.

Complementing the SBIR program, we have the Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) program, another important R&D opportunity for small businesses. It was established to provide a strong incentive for small businesses and technical experts at research institutions to team up and move ideas from the laboratory to the marketplace.

Technological advancement is a key element of economic growth. According to a recent Congressional Research Service Report, Small, High Tech Companies and Their Role in the Economy: Issues in the Reauthorization of the Small Business Innovation (SBIR) Program, ''technical progress is responsible for up to one-half the growth of the U.S. economy and is one of the principle driving forces for increases in our standard of living.''

As Ranking Member of the Senate Small Business Committee, and a Senator representing a state with one of the most active hi-tech industries in the country, I am always interested in new initiatives, or improving existing ones, to develop and nurture technology-based companies throughout the region and the nation.

The SBIR program has been good to my home state of Massachusetts. So good that we are the second largest recipient of SBIR awards in the country. In 1997, Massachusetts' small, hi-tech firms won 702 awards, totaling $164 million. But it's not by coincidence—it's because we have the right mix of small high-tech companies, an active venture capital community, and a cluster of universities that understand the benefits of technology transfer, attract academic research funds and graduate a highly qualified workforce.

Similarly, a variation of that combination is also what cultivates and supports innovative hi-tech companies in states such as California, Virginia and Ohio that have historically been among the largest recipients of SBIR awards.

We on the Senate Small Business Committee have the tough job of crafting a solution that helps small businesses in states that don't have this infrastructure. However, we should not change the program's reliance on competition. Merit is the only way to maintain the integrity of the research. Only one in seven or eight Phase I proposals is awarded. The highly competitive nature of SBIR awards is one of the main reasons the program has been so popular and successful.

One of the experiments working around the country is mentoring—experienced SBIR award winners helping SBIR applicants navigate the process. For example, Innovative Training Systems (ITS) in Newton, Mass., mentored Pro-Change Behavior Systems out of West Kingston, RI, when it applied for its first SBIR award. ITS specializes in health care multi-media programs such as smoking prevention and cessation for high school students and has gotten several SBIR awards from the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Pro-Change also specializes in health care multimedia for health behavior change and needed help getting an SBIR award for cancer prevention from NIH. Pro-Change says, among many things, the mentoring helped by explaining the rating system (it learned to target resources to those aspects of the proposal that counted most) and by saving the company time and reducing confusion on the financial and business requirements behind a proposal. As a representative for Pro-Change said, ''SBIR mentoring leads to long-lasting business partnerships, spawning exciting new ventures.''

Mentoring may not be exclusively responsible for Pro-Change's success in getting its first SBIR award, but it played an important role. Just look at the numbers. The process is highly competitive, with only one in seven or eight Phase I proposals getting funded. Furthermore, this company got another award in Rhode Island, a state where only six awards were given in 1997. Since that first award in 1998, Pro-Change has gone on to apply for three more Fast-Track Phase II proposals and one Phase I proposal to NIH. We can and should replicate and facilitate this process.

This bill would elevate and reinforce that informal mentoring by authorizing competitive grants, ranging from $50,000 to $200,000, to any entity that represents small businesses that participate in SBIR or STTR programs. The entity would be obligated to match experienced, successful SBIR or STTR award winners with small businesses located in low SBIR-participation areas—advising and guiding them from application to award to project completion.

Though it will be up to the SBA Administrator to define what areas receive a disproportionate amount of awards, this bill is intended to help states such as such as Maine and Montana, which received only five awards in 1997, and rural pockets of states such as Michigan and Massachusetts which do well overall in the program but get the concentration of awards in university towns or the largest city.

Because founders of hi-tech companies are often more scientific inventors than business experts, the mentor companies could help with management assistance, proposal writing, commercialization or venture capital networking. The mentor companies would be volunteers, but would be eligible for reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, authorized travel and reasonable bills for telephone calls and faxes. And like the volunteers in SBA's successful volunteer business counselor program, the Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE), SBIR mentor volunteers would get automatic liability coverage.

I know the Committee on Small Business will have a roundtable on August 4th to discuss with program managers, SBIR companies and SBIR advocates how to increase the low number of awards given in certain states, and I look forward to hearing comments on this bill and on any alternative programs.

Mr. President, in closing, I want to thank Senator LEVIN for his work on this bill and ask that a letter of support from the Small Business Technology Coalition be included for the RECORD.

The letter follows:

SMALL BUSINESS
TECHNOLOGY COALITION,
Washington, DC, July 16, 1999.

Senator JOHN KERRY,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KERRY: The Small Business Technology Coalition (SBTC) urges you to cosponsor Senator Levin's amendment to the reauthorization of the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Program. The amendment would provide much needed support to small businesses applying for grants under the SBIR program.

Senator Levin's amendment would establish a competitively bid volunteer mentoring grant program for the SBIR. The Small Business Administration would be responsible for administering the program. Organizations representing SBIR awardees could apply for grants ranging from $50,000 to $500,000 to participate in the program. Qualifying organizations would match small businesses new to the SBIR process with CEOs and other of small, high-technology companies that have been successful SBIR award winners. These ''volunteer mentors'' would be reimbursed only for their out-of-pocket expenses incurred while mentoring, not for their time. The program would be authorized at $1 million per year to cover administration of the program and reimbursement of volunteer mentors for their out-of-pocket expenses.

As the nation-wide trade association of small high tech business CEOs, SBTC can attest to the value of a mentoring program to help small businesses new to the SBIR process. SBTC members have hands-on experience and know the importance of expert technical assistance in locating venture capital, seeking Phase III partners and commercialization. SBTC speaks for the small high tech business community and knows through experience that mentoring is a key to success in the SBIR process.

The anticipated result of Senator Levin's amendment would be an increase in SBIR awards to businesses in states which traditionally have had low numbers of awards. With the passage of this amendment, businesses in certain states that do not have access to research or venture capital for example, could connect with companies with demonstrated expertise in those areas. Successful mentoring in these states would broaden the geographic and demographic distribution of SBIR awards.

As the leading industry association representing the interest and needs of small, emerging, research-intensive, technology-based companies, we urge you to cosponsor Senator Levin's amendment and help businesses in rural areas compete in the SBIR program.

Sincerely,

JEFF NOAH,
Executive Director.●

By Mr. CONRAD:

S. 1436. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Transition Act to provide support for United State agricultural producers that is equal to the support provided agricultural producers by the European Union, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

AMENDING THE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING TRANSITION ACT

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise to introduce new, permanent farm legislation. I think virtually everyone from farm country understands that our farmers have been hit by a triple whammy—the triple whammy of bad prices, bad weather, and bad policy. The results are catastrophic.

In my home State of North Dakota, one of the most agricultural States in the Nation, our farmers are being pressured as never before. They are in a cost price squeeze that is almost unprecedented. The results will be the loss of thousands of farm families unless there is a Federal response.

I think most of us know we need to have a disaster response because prices have collapsed, and adverse weather conditions continue across the country. So it is critically important that we take short-term steps to address what is happening in farm country.

A disaster bill is not enough. We need more than that. We also need to respond with a long-term change in farm policy.

If I could direct the attention of my colleagues and others who might be watching to this chart, when I talk about the triple whammy of bad prices, bad weather, and bad policy, this shows what has happened to prices over the last 53 years. The blue line shows what has happened to wheat prices; the red line to barley. As a viewer can see, we are now at the lowest level for these commodities in constant dollars in 53 years.

We are witnessing a price collapse that is almost unprecedented. That is putting enormous pressure on our producers.

In addition to that, in my State we have been hit by almost a 5-year pattern now of bad weather—weather that is overly wet in my State; other parts of the country it is overly dry. In North Dakota, we have 3 million acres that have not even been planted this year. On top of bad prices and bad weather, we are also hit by bad policy because the last farm bill put us at a very severe disadvantage with our major competitors, the Europeans.

The EU trumps the U.S. in farm support. This chart shows just with respect to wheat and corn for 1999—the red bar is what the Europeans provide their producers on wheat; the blue bar what we are doing in the United States. You can see, they are trumping us by 38 percent. In other words, their support is 38 percent higher in wheat, 46 percent higher in corn.

It does not end there because the Europeans are also badly outspending us with respect to export subsidy. This shows for 1998—the last year for which we have full figures—this is the European Union in red: $5 billion a year of support for subsidies. This is the United States: $104 million.

For that 1 year alone, the Europeans are outspending us, are outgunning us, 50 to 1. It is no wonder that our farmers are at a disadvantage. We, in effect, are saying to our farmers: You go out there and compete against the French farmer, the German farmer; and while you're at it, you take on the French Government and the German Government, as well.

That is not a fair fight.

If we look worldwide at agricultural export subsidies, what we see is that the European Union accounts for 84 percent of agriculture subsidies worldwide. The United States has 1.4 percent. We are outgunned 60 to 1 by that measure.

Whether it is 50 to 1 or 60 to 1, the hard reality is, the U.S. producers are not in a fair fight. Something must be done to respond.

If we look back at the policy change that was made in the farm bill—our last farm bill—what we see is there was a dramatic cut in the level of support for our producers.

Under the previous farm bill, the 1990 farm bill, we were getting on average $10 billion a year of support for our farmers. That was cut in half to $5 billion—that at the very time our major competitors are spending $50 billion a year to support their producers. So $50 billion for Europe; $5 billion for the United States.

It is not a fair fight. The result is, our farmers are losing the battle. I call this ''unilateral disarmament.'' We would never do that in a military confrontation. Why have we done it in a trade confrontation? The results are the same: They win; we lose. The chief negotiator for the Europeans told me several years ago: Senator, we believe we are in a trade war in agriculture with the United States. He said: Senator, we believe at some point there will be a cease-fire. We believe there will be a cease-fire in place, and we want to occupy the high ground. And the high ground is market share.

How well that strategy and plan are working, because the Europeans, in just the last few years, have moved from being major importers to being major exporters. They have gone from being the biggest importing region in the world to being the biggest exporting region in the world, and they have done it the old-fashioned way—they have gone out and bought these markets.

In the last 10 years alone, they have spent $500 billion, and now they are starting to get a return on that investment, because in the last trade negotiation, what happened? Europeans have a higher level of support than we do. They are at a higher level. We are at a lower level. Was there a closing of the gap? Not at all. Instead, the conclusion was equal percentage reductions on both sides—36 percent in export subsidies, 24 percent in domestic support. The result is that our farmers were again left in a second position.

If it happens again in the trade talks that are to begin this fall, our farmers will be put in a position of perhaps falling off the cliff, being put in a position that they cannot possibly survive.

Some say let's let the market work. I am all for letting the market work. But that is not what is happening in world agriculture. What is happening in world agriculture is, the Europeans are spending enormous sums of money

to win a dominant position. They believe that is a position they can preserve because they think the United States is unwilling to fight back.

We have to prove them wrong. We have to demonstrate that the United States is not going to roll over, is not going to surrender, is not going to give up, that we intend to fight for these markets to achieve a level playing field so our farmers have a chance to compete. Our farmers can compete against anyone anywhere, but they can't compete against the governments of the European Union. That is not a fair fight.

We can see the pattern because while we have cut support for our producers and the Europeans have had a 50- to 60-to-1 edge on us with respect to export subsidy, the value of our farm exports has dropped like a rock. We have gone from $60 billion a year as recently as 1996 to, this last year, $49 billion. At the same time, if we look at the European pattern, we see they have gone from being a major importer to a major exporter. They have a strategy; they have a plan. It is working. If we don't fight back, we are going to wake up after this next round of negotiations and we are going to find that the United States is falling off the cliff. We are going to find literally thousands of our farm families consigned to failure. That is the message I have received in farm meeting after farm meeting all across my State.

I asked our Trade Representative: What is our leverage in the next round of trade talks? The truth is, we have no leverage because the Europeans are occupying the high ground. They are waiting for the cease-fire, the cease-fire in place. They are waiting to win this victory. They are confident the United States will not fight back. We have to prove them wrong. We have to demonstrate that the United States is not willing to cede these markets.

This chart shows what has happened to just one commodity, wheat. This blue line is European exports; the red line is American exports. You can see the trend line for the United States is down, down, down—lots of zigzags along the way, but the trend line is straight down; the European trend line, straight up. They have had a little setback recently, but you can see they have gone from being in a totally inferior position, a more than two-to-one gap between us to our advantage, to their now being in the dominant position, and they have accomplished this in less than 20 years.

That is what my FITE legislation is all about. It says: Let's fight back. Let's send a message the United States is not going to wave the white flag of surrender. The United States intends to fight for these markets. The United States intends to give our farmers a fair chance to compete. That is what this legislation does.

These charts show it. FITE levels the playing field for wheat. Under our proposal, as I described before, Europe is at $5.20 in wheat, we are at $3.22. We would level the playing field. If they are going to provide $5.20, we will provide $5.20. We do the same thing on corn. We even the score on corn. They are at $4.85 today. We are at $2.25 a bushel on corn. If they want to stay at $4.85, we will match them; we will meet them in the competition. We will take them on head to head, dollar for dollar, so we don't surrender these markets and find ourselves in an inferior position.

Not only do we even the score with respect to support to producers, we even the score with respect to export subsidy, because in the FITE bill we provide $4 billion a year of support for export subsidy, because we believe that will send a message to the Europeans that the United States intends to fight. This would put us in a strong position for the talks this fall because right now we have no leverage.

The question is, How do we respond?

I have a series of letters from groups endorsing the FITE legislation. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA ASSOCIATION OF RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES,
Mandan, ND, July 26, 1999.

Senator KENT CONRAD,
Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

SENATOR CONRAD: As president of the North Dakota Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives, I want to commend you for bringing forth your ''FITE'' proposal in response to the current farm crisis.

In our program, we know this ag crisis is real. We deal, every month, with the stranded assets of people leaving the land—giving up the dream of making their living and raising their families on the land.

Your Farm Income and Trade Equity Act is a thoughtful, fair and solid response to the crisis. You've correctly identified in this proposal that unfair trade subsidies and rock-bottom commodity prices are at the root of this crisis. Your FITE proposal provides a solution to this problem.

You can count on North Dakota's RECs to help get this legislation through the Congress and on the President's desk for his signature. We need action, and this FITE proposal makes a great deal of sense to us. We'll help however we can.

Sincerely,

ADOLPH FEYEREISEN,
President.

NORTH DAKOTA NATIONAL FARMERS ORGANIZATION,
Marion, ND, July 21, 1999.

Senator KENT CONRAD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CONRAD: The North Dakota National Farmers Organization is happy to endorse your introduction of FITE (Farm Income and Trade Equity Act of 1999).

I must also add that on behalf of NDNFO members, we appreciate your efforts to help correct the severe income problems we are experiencing in rural America and particularly in North Dakota.

Good luck and thanks,

RALPH DANUSER,
President.

U.S. DURUM GROWERS ASSN.,
July 23, 1999.

Senator KENT CONRAD,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

SENATOR CONRAD: The US Durum Growers Association would like to congratulate and thank you for introducing the Farm Income and Trade Equity Fairness Investment Transition Act farm package. Your work in developing a comprehensive farm program that would finally put US producers on equal footing with European farmers is to be complimented.

As you know, commodity prices are extremely low. That is particularly true of durum, which is substantially lower than the average prices of recent years. The low farm prices have pushed the northern plains economy, which is very dependent on durum production, into a near depression-like state. The support levels that you are proposing in the FITE legislation would enhance durum farmers' profitability and in turn, contribute to the revitalization of the rural economy.

The USDGA has a long standing policy in support of increasing marketing loans and we are pleased that your farm program proposal offers that as a base of support. The additional payment over the loan rate to equalize the subsidies received by US and European producers helps ensure a competitive environment in the world trade of durum.

The FITE is the only proposal to date that puts US producers at a competitive position with the farmers in the European Union. The support offered by this bill will provide the US with negotiating power needed in this fall's WTO talks.

Thank you for your work in formulating and introducing the bill, the US Durum Growers Association pledges to work with you to gain acceptance for this bill in Congress.

Sincerely,

MARK BIRDSALL,
President.

MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION OF NORTH DAKOTA, INC.,
Manning, ND, July 22, 1999.

Senator KENT CONRAD.

DEAR SENATOR CONRAD: We the Milk Producers Association of N.D. support your effort to make positive changes in Congress to help our Nations family farmers. Although this bill does not intend to help the Dairy Industry directly, we believe that indirectly it will benefit us by strengthening our family farm economy.

Needless to say, time is running out for many of our family farmers and we urge you to work hard in the next few months to get this bill passed through Congress.

Sincerely,

DOUG DUKART.

AMERICAN RENEWABLE OIL ASSOCIATION,
Bismarck, ND, July 23, 1999.

Senator KENT CONRAD,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CONRAD: The American Renewable Oil Association (AROA), represents North Dakota's 350 plus crambe growers. The AROA appreciates the efforts you have made to try and address the inequities in the US farm program. We support farmer assistance equal to that of other countries.

In order for the American producer to survive in the global market, producers must be on an equal playing field with all trading partners. The 'FITE' bill addresses these inequities. The AROA has not been able to schedule a board meeting to take an official stance on the bill. I do see a potential problem with base acres and land diversion.

Please forward me a full draft when possible so I may review it with the full AROA board. I look forward to working with you on this bill.

Sincerely,

RAY FEGLEY,
President.

NORTH DAKOTA
BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
Bismarck, ND, July 23, 1999.

Hon. KENT CONRAD,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CONRAD: On Thursday I surveyed the NDBA Board of Directors and Ag Committee to determine their level of support for the Farm Income and Trade Equity Act (FITE) to be introduced on Monday.

I received 16 responses and all indicated that NDBA should endorse the concept embodied in the legislation and support your efforts on this issue. Kirby Josephson, chairman of the NDBA Ag Committee from Litchville, ND, stated that ''ag lenders in North Dakota will support your efforts to improve farm income. It is time we do something to address the ag crisis our North Dakota farmers are facing. Senator Conrad is taking a bold approach to restoring farm income.''

Respondents indicated that they believe the Export Enhancement Program has been under utilized. However, some concerns were expressed with the 10 percent conservation set aside and the fact that this legislation may encourage overproduction and discourage crop diversification.

Please keep NDBA advised of your efforts and the status of this legislation and please feel free to call if you need any further clarification on the position taken by the North Dakota Bankers Association.

Cordially,

JAMES D. SCHLOSSER,
Executive Vice President.

CENTRAL POWER ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE
BOARD OF DIRECTORS RESOLUTION #1999–06

FARM INCOME AND TRADE EQUITY ACT OF 1999

Whereas, American farmers are the world's most efficient and productive, but heavy farm subsidies in competing countries have put U.S. producers at an unfair advantage, and

Whereas, Senator Kent Conrad (D–ND) has introduced the Farm Income and Trade Equity Act of 1999 (''FITE'') to level the playing field beetween U.S. farmers and their primary competitors in Europe by matching European Union subsidies dollar-for-dollar, and

Whereas, Central Power Electric Cooperative is sensitive to the economic crisis currently facing farmers.

Now therefore be it *Resolved*, That the Board of Directors of Central Power Electric Cooperative hereby supports the FITE legislation and its goals to address the current agricultural crisis and protect American agriculture in future trade negotiations.

Dated: July 21, 1999.

SQUARE BUTTE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
RESOLUTION NO. 242

Whereas, American farmers are the World's most efficient and productive, but heavy farm subsidies in competing countries have put U.S. producers at an unfair advantage; and

Whereas, Senator Kent Conrad (D–ND) has introduced the Farm Income and Trade Equity Act of 1999 (''FITE'') to level the playing field between U.S. farmers and their primary competitors in Europe by matching European Union subsidies dollar-for-dollar; and

Whereas, Square Butte Electric Cooperative is sensitive to the economic crisis currently facing farmers;

Now therefore be it *Resolved*, That the Board of Directors of Square Butte Electric Cooperative hereby supports the FITE legislation and its goals to address the current agricultural crisis and protect American agriculture in future trade negotiations.

NORTH DAKOTA RURAL
DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL,
Bismarck ND, July 22, 1999.

Senator KENT CONRAD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CONRAD: The North Dakota Rural Development Council is a relatively new organization with the focal contention that the future depends most heavily upon the vitality of our communities. Hence, one of the primary objectives is to strive for the elimination of barriers which are known to hinder effective rural development efforts.

As eloquently expressed in the Overview section of the Farm Income and Trade Equity Act of 1999, the heavy farm subsidies available to commodity producers in competing foreign countries, places our farmers at a tremendous and untenable disadvantage.

Please consider this correspondence as a tangible indication of support for FITE, and, a written endorsement for the introduction of such timely and all-important farm and rural community survival and preservation legislation. Thank you for your untiring and meaningful efforts and demonstrated commitment, as further evidenced by the Farm Income and Trade Equity Act of 1999.

Sincerely,

CORNELIUS P. GRANT,
Executive Director.

NORTH DAKOTA SCHOOL
BOARDS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Bismarck, ND, July 23, 1999.

Senator KENT CONRAD,
Hart Senate Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CONRAD: The North Dakota School Boards Association is favorable to The Farm Income and Trade Equity Act of 1999. As you know our rural agriculture communities are struggling to keep their family farms going. This, of course, impacts the resources available to support their public schools.

NDSBA supports your efforts to assist the family farmers and the rural economy of North Dakota.

We would also like to thank you for your continued support of locally controlled public schools.

Sincerely,

MIKE ZIMMERMAN,
President.

54TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MIDWESTERN LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS, JULY 18–21, 1999

RESOLUTION ON FAIR MARKETS FOR AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Whereas, the U.S. stock market continues to reach record highs almost daily and the American economy experiences unprecedented expansion and growth; and

Whereas, farm commodity prices continue to plummet while agricultural production costs steadily rise, forcing American farmers and agribusiness into bankruptcy while the rest of the economy prospers; and

Whereas, American farmers and ranchers, who are recognized as the most efficient and productive in the world, are at a considerable disadvantage in competing in the world markets because of the heavy subsidies their primary competitors, the members of the European Union, receive; and

Whereas, this extreme imbalance in our economy and the unfair competition with the European Union cannot be corrected without our government's intervention; now therefore be it

Resolved, that Midwestern Legislative Conference favors legislation that would include support to American producers which would put prices received for crops on even per with those of our European Union competitors; and be it further

Resolved, that Midwestern Legislative Conference favors sensible legislation that would allow our agriculture producers to compete in the global economy while providing an abundance of reasonably priced food for our domestic market; and be it further

Resolved, that the Midwestern Legislative Conference urges the Administration and Congress to secure measures to protect American producers now and in the future from unfair competition so that the citizens of the United States can continue to enjoy the benefits of high quality food at reasonable prices.

Mr. CONRAD. We have support from the North Dakota Farmers Union, the North Dakota Association of Rural Electric Co-ops, the North Dakota NFO, the U.S. Duram Growers Association, the Milk Producers Association of North Dakota, the American Renewable Oil Association, the North Dakota Bankers Association, the Central Power Electric Cooperative Board of Directors, the Square Butte Electric Cooperative, the North Dakota Rural Development Council, and even a resolution of support from the Midwestern Legislative Conference of the Council of State Governments that, while not endorsing the specifics of this legislation, specifically endorsed the concept in which they say:

> The Midwestern Legislative Conference favors legislation that would include support to American producers which would put prices received for crops on an even par with those of our European Union competitors.

Mr. President, the Midwest Council of State Governments has it right. We simply cannot permit our farmers to be left at a competitive disadvantage. We must fight back. That is what the FITE legislation will do.

We have had an unprecedented outpouring of support in North Dakota. In addition to those who have sent written comments, the North Dakota Wheat Commission has gone on record supporting this legislation. We have many more who are considering resolutions of support. I am hopeful that this will start a ground swell that will spread across the country and send a message that the United States does not intend to give up our agricultural dominance. That would be a mistake. It would be one we would live to regret. We are very close now to these negotiations this fall. If we don't alter dramatically the negotiating environment, we are going to lose. Make no mistake about it. We are going to lose.

It doesn't have to be that way. It should not be that way. But it is in our hands. We have a choice to make. Do we fight back, or do we give up?

At a time of unprecedented economic prosperity in this country, it would be a travesty for us to have lost the world

agricultural trade battle because we were unwilling at this critical moment to respond. I hope we don't let this opportunity pass us by.

Some people watching me say: Well, why should we help farmers?

I believe farm families are the backbone of strength for this country. They are absolutely fundamental to America's success. They have long been the dominant source of our trade surpluses. Overall, we run massive trade deficits. But in agriculture, we have run trade surpluses. It has been one of two sectors of this economy that has run trade surpluses, and we are right at the brink of losing that. That would be a tragedy for this country—not just because of the dollars or just because of the economics, but because of what it would mean to the fundamental strength of this country.

In Europe, they made a decision. They decided they wanted to have people out across the land. They didn't want everybody forced into the cities, so they made it possible for people to prosper in the rural parts of Europe. Perhaps their being hungry twice before informed those decisions. But whatever the reason, you can travel through the French countryside and the German countryside and it is prosperous; they are doing well. But go through the countryside of my State and what you see is an area that is in economic decline. It is not just in North Dakota; it is all across the heartland of America.

The question is, Are we going to let it go? You know, it would be one thing if it were a fair competition. It would be one thing if it were simply the fact that our farmers weren't as competitive or as efficient as our competitors. But that is not the case. It is not the case. The fact is, our farmers are as competitive and as efficient as any in the world. What is hurting them is that other nations are willing to fight for their producers, and we have been in retreat.

We have to decide what kind of country we want to have. Do we want everybody to move to town? Or do we want people out across the land? Europe has made a decision that they want people out across the countryside, and they have made it possible economically to be there. Now the choice comes to us. The hour is late because these negotiations will start this fall, and if we don't do something to change the rules of the game, our side is going to lose. It doesn't have to be that way. It should not be that way. But we have choices to make in this Chamber, and across in the other Chamber, about what is going to be the policy of America, what is going to be our position.

I hope very much that we will decide we are going to give our farmers a fighting chance. I hope very much that we are going to make a decision that the best policy is to have people out across the land, not to have everybody come to the cities. I hope very much we are going to conclude that it is in our national interest, just as the Europeans have concluded that it is in their interest, to give farmers a fighting chance. There is no way they are going to win this battle when the odds are stacked against them: 10-to-1, 50-to-1, that is the unevenness of the fight our farmers are in now. It is in our hands; it is our decision.

I hope very much that we can start across this country a move to say: Let's fight back. Let's put our farmers on a level playing field. Let's rearm our negotiators. Let's prepare for this battle. Let's not lose. Let's win a victory that would make a difference for hundreds of thousands of farm families across America and the cities and towns that are dependent upon them and, at the end of the day, for a country that needs them.

I yield the floor.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN:

S. 1437. A bill to protect researchers from compelled disclosure of research in Federal courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THOMAS JEFFERSON RESEARCHER'S PRIVILEGE ACT OF 1999

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to introduce the Thomas Jefferson Researcher's Privilege Act. This bill protects the rights of researchers in their work. This is an issue that Professor Robert O'Neil of the University of Virginia Law School has done much to advance, and I am extremely grateful for all his assistance.

Two points, followed by a coda, if I may. The first point is that the Thomas Jefferson Act gets to the heart of the first amendment and the principles that our nation was founded on. This Act would protect researchers from the compelled disclosure of their research, studies, data, surveys, etc. Too often researchers are forced to turn over this information in open courts. This interrupts their research and makes it nearly impossible for them to finish and publish their research. If researchers are unable to publish their findings, then the flow and dissemination of information are choked off. This runs counter to the essence of the first amendment.

We need a uniform standard that protects the work of researchers. Some courts have ruled in favor of researchers while others have ruled against them. We need consistency in this field, where researchers feel comfortable to produce their research and do not have to fear that it will be taken from them. This bill will provide that consistency and comfort.

To the second point. We have reached a time in our society where we have to decide between what should be shared and what should be protected. In this case, it is very important to society as a whole to protect a researcher's notes and data before they are ready to be released. It is from these data and research that ideas and thoughts are formed, ideas that will eventually help man and society progress. If a researcher's data are released prematurely, then their ideas may never bear fruit. In the long run, protecting a researcher's data will only lead to more information and ideas in the future. This is what the first amendment is all about.

No one describes the utility of free speech and the dissemination of original ideas better than John Stuart Mill. In *On Liberty*, he argues that neither government nor a public acting informally may legitimately use coercion to stifle free expression, and the reason he gives is a utilitarian, or at least a consequentialist one. If the opinion is right, the human race is deprived of it; if wrong, they are deprived of the opportunity to reinforce—through surviving a challenge—their understanding of what is right. The quashing of opinion is therefore, a much more far-reaching evil than the mere loss of something valuable to the individual, for it deprived society at large of something of benefit. This is exactly what happens when researchers are forced to turn over their work prematurely and prevented from developing and sharing their thoughts. The Thomas Jefferson Bill would help rectify just this situation.

I conclude by saying that I could think of no better namesake for this bill than Thomas Jefferson, our third president and author of the Declaration of Independence. A philosophical statesman rather than a political philosopher, he contributed to democracy and liberalism a faith rather than a body of doctrine. By his works alone he must be adjudged one the greatest of all Americans, while the influence of this energizing faith cannot be measured.

One of Jefferson's greatest contributions to our nation was his protection and advocacy of free speech. From the Declaration of Independence to the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom to the founding of the University of Virginia, he was a passionate proponent of education, human liberty, and free thought. He wrote: "If nature has made any one thing exclusive property, it is the idea, which an individual may exclusively possess . . .; but the moment it is divulged, it forces itself into the possession of everyone . . ." Jefferson, always a step or several steps ahead of his age, understood the importance of the freedom of speech in the development of an individual and a nation.

It is only appropriate that the Thomas Jefferson Researcher's Privilege Act be introduced in the month of July, when our nation declared its independence, and be named after Thomas Jefferson, one of our greatest political thinkers and one of our greatest advocates of the free mind.

I ask unanimous consent that the Thomas Jefferson Researcher's Privilege Act be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1437

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Thomas Jefferson Researcher's Privilege Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUESTS.

Section 552(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(4)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) data, records, or information, including actual research documents, collected or produced in the conduct of or as a result of study or research on academic, commercial, scientific, or technical issues, including—

''(i) unpublished lecture notes, unpublished research notes, data, processes, results or other confidential information from research which is in progress, unpublished or not yet verified; or

''(ii) any other information related to research, the disclosure of which could affect—

''(I) the conduct or outcome of the research;

''(II) the likelihood of similar research in the future;

''(III) the ability to obtain patents or copyrights from the research; or

''(IV) any other proprietary rights any entity may have in the research or results of the research;''.

SEC. 3. FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE.

Rule 45(c)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (iv) by striking the period and inserting a comma and ''or''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(v) requires disclosure of data, records, or information, including actual research documents, collected or produced in the conduct of or as a result of study or research on academic, commercial, scientific, or technical issues, including—

''(I) unpublished lecture notes, unpublished research notes, data, processes, results or other confidential information from research which is in any progress, unpublished or not yet verified, or

''(II) any other information related to research, the disclosure of which could affect the conduct or outcome of the research, the likelihood of similar research in the future, the ability to obtain patents or copyrights from the research, or any other proprietary rights any entity may have in the research or results of the research.''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (iii) by inserting ''or'' after the comma; and

(B) by inserting after clause (iii) the following:

''(iv) requires disclosure of data, records, or information, including actual research documents, collected or produced in the conduct of or as a result of study or research on academic, commercial, scientific, or technical issues, including—

''(I) unpublished lecture notes, unpublished research notes, data, processes, results or other confidential information from research which is in any progress, unpublished or not yet verified, or

''(II) any other information related to research, the disclosure of which could affect the conduct or outcome of the research, the likelihood of similar research in the future, the ability to obtain patents or copyrights from the research, or any other proprietary rights any entity may have in the research or the results of the research.''.

SEC. 4. FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE.

Article V of the Federal Rules of Evidence is amended by adding after rule 501 the following:

''Rule 502. Privilege for research information

''A person engaged in the study or research of academic, commercial, scientific, or technical issues may claim the privilege to refuse to disclose data, records, or information, including actual research documents, concerning that study or research. Such person may refuse to disclose unpublished lecture notes, unpublished research notes, data, processes, results, or other confidential information from research which is in any progress, unpublished or not yet verified, and any other information related to research, the disclosure of which could affect the conduct or outcome of the research, the likelihood of similar research in the future, the ability to obtain patents or copyrights from the research, or any other proprietary rights any entity may have in the research or the results of the research.''.

SEC. 5. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT REGARDING DATA PRODUCED UNDER FEDERAL GRANTS AND AGREEMENTS AWARDED TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, HOSPITALS, AND OTHER NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

The fifth and sixth provisos under the subheading ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' under the heading ''OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET'' under title III of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277; 112 Stat. 2681–495) are repealed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 9

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 9, a bill to combat violent and gang-related crime in schools and on the streets, to reform the juvenile justice system, target international crime, promote effective drug and other crime prevention programs, assist crime victims, and for other purposes.

S. 10

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 10, a bill to provide health protection and needed assistance for older Americans, including access to health insurance for 55 to 65 year olds, assistance for individuals with long-term care needs, and social services for older Americans.

S. 17

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 17, a bill to increase the availability, affordability, and quality of child care.

S. 71

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 71, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a presumption of service-connection for certain veterans with Hepatitis C, and for other purposes.

S. 307

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 307, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the budget neutrality adjustment factor used in calculating the blended capitation rate for Medicare + Choice organizations.

S. 457

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 457, a bill to amend section 922(t) of title 18, United States Code, to require the reporting of information to the chief law enforcement officer of the buyer's residence and to require a minimum 72-hour waiting period before the purchase of a handgun, and for other purposes.

S. 632

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 632, a bill to provide assistance for poison prevention and to stabilize the funding of regional poison control centers.

S. 662

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 662, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide medical assistance for certain women screened and found to have breast or cervical cancer under a federally funded screening program.

S. 664

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 664, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against income tax to individuals who rehabilitate historic homes or who are the first purchasers of rehabilitated historic homes for use as a principal residence.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 666, a bill to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa.

S. 765

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 765, a bill to ensure the efficient allocation of telephone numbers.

S. 777

At the request of Mr. FITZGERALD, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD), and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 777, a bill to require the Department of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable the public to file all required paperwork electronically with the Department and to have access to public information on farm programs, quarterly trade, economic, and production reports, and other similar information.

S. 789

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 789, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of special compensation to certain severely disabled uniformed services retirees.

S. 817

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 817, a bill 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.

S. 820

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 820, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 4.3-cent motor fuel excise taxes on railroads and inland waterway transportation which remain in the general fund of the Treasury.

S. 821

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 821, a bill to provide for the collection of data on traffic stops.

S. 890

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 890, a bill to facilitate the naturalization of aliens who served with special guerrilla units or irregular forces in Laos.

S. 959

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) were added as cosponsors of S. 959, a bill to establish a National Ocean Council, a Commission on Ocean Policy, and for other purposes.

S. 984

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 984, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax credit for electricity produced from certain renewable resources.

S. 1016

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1016, a bill to provide collective bargaining for rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

S. 1020

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend chapter 1 of title 9, United States Code, to provide for greater fairness in the arbitration process relating to motor vehicle franchise contracts.

S. 1131

At the request of Mr. EDWARDS, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1131, a bill to promote research into, and the development of an ultimate cure for, the disease known as Fragile X.

S. 1133

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) were added as cosponsors of S. 1133, a bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to cover birds of the order Ratitae that are raised for use as human food.

S. 1155

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1155, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 1172

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1172, a bill to provide a patent term restoration review procedure for certain drug products.

S. 1239

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of S. 1239, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat spaceports like airports under the exempt facility bond rules.

S. 1266

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1266, a bill to allow a State to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of all its students.

S. 1268

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1268, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide support for the modernization and construction of biomedical and behavioral research facilities and laboratory instrumentation.

S. 1277

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1277, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to establish a new prospective payment system for Federally-qualified health centers and rural health clinics.

S. 1321

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1321, a bill to amend title III of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act and title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to limit the effects of domestic violence on the lives of children, and for other purposes.

S. 1327

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1327, a bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide States with more funding and greater flexibility in carrying out programs designed to help children make the transition from foster care to self-sufficiency, and for other purposes.

S. 1372

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1372, a bill to require the filing of Shippers' Export Declarations through the Automated Export System of the Department of the Treasury with respect to certain transactions of proliferation concern, and for other purposes.

S. 1400

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1400, a bill to protect women's reproductive health and constitutional right to choice, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 26

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 26, a joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the court martial conviction of the late Rear Admiral Charles Butler McVay III, and calling upon the President to award a Presidential Unit Citation to the final crew of the U.S.S. *Indianapolis*.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 34

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, a concurrent resolution relating to the observence of ''In Memory'' Day.

SENATE RESOLUTION 92

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 92, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that funding for prostate cancer research should be increased substantially.

SENATE RESOLUTION 95

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the names of the Senator from Georgia

(Mr. CLELAND), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 95, A resolution designating August 16, 1999, as ''National Airborne Day.''

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 48—RELATING TO THE ASIA-PACIFIC ECONOMIC COOPERATION FORUM

Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 48

Whereas the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Forum was created ten years ago to promote free and open trade and closer economic cooperation among its member countries, as well as to sustain economic growth and equitable development in the region for the common good of its people;

Whereas the twenty-one member countries of APEC account for 55 percent of total world income and 46 percent of global trade;

Whereas APEC Leaders are committed to intensifying regional economic interdependence by going forward with measures to expand trade and investment liberalization, pursuing sectoral cooperation and development initiatives, and increasing business facilitation and economic and technical cooperation projects;

Whereas a strong international financial system underpins the economic success of the region;

Whereas given the challenges presented by the financial crisis, APEC Leaders last year pledged to work together in improving and strengthening social safety nets, financial systems and capital markets, trade and investment flows, corporate sector restructuring, the regional scientific and technological base, human resources development, economic infrastructure, and existing business and commercial links for the purpose of supporting sustained growth into the 21st century;

Whereas the outstanding leadership of New Zealand during its year in the APEC Chair has produced a series of important themes for the annual APEC Leaders meeting in Auckland, New Zealand on September 12–14, 1999, including:

(1) expanding opportunities for private sector businesses through the reduction of tariff and non-tariff barriers;

(2) strengthening the functioning of regional markets, with a particular focus on building institutional capacity, making public and corporate economic governance arrangements more transparent, and guiding regulatory reform so that benefits of trade liberalization are maximized; and

(3) broadening support for and understanding of APEC goals to demonstrate the positive benefits of the organization's work for the entire Asia-Pacific community;

Whereas the unique and close partnership between the public and private sectors exhibited through the APEC Forum has contributed to the successful conclusion of the GATT Uruguay Round and agreement over other multilateral trade pacts involving information technology, telecommunications and financial services;

Whereas APEC member countries have provided helpful momentum, through active consideration of the Early Voluntary Sectoral Liberalization plan, to the next round of multilateral trade negotiations scheduled to begin this year at the Third WTO Ministerial Meeting in Seattle, Washington;

Whereas the APEC Leaders have resolved to achieve the ambitious goal of free and open trade and investment in the region no later than 2010 for the industrialized economies and 2020 for developing economies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress—

(1) acknowledges the importance of greater economic cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region and the key role played by the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Forum;

(2) urges the Administration fully to support the APEC Forum and work to achieve its goals of greater economic growth and stability;

(3) calls upon the Administration to continue its close cooperation with the private sector in advancing APEC goals; and

(4) expresses appreciation to the Government and people of New Zealand for their exceptional efforts in chairing the APEC Forum this year.

SECTION 2. TRANSMITTAL OF RESOLUTION.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President and the Secretary of State.

SENATE RESOLUTION 162—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY OF EMPLOYEE OF THE SENATE IN STATE OF NEW MEXICO V. FELIX LUCERO CHAVEZ

Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 162

Whereas, in the case of *State of New Mexico* v. *Felix Lucero Chavez*, No CR 4646–99, pending in the Metropolitan Court for Bernalillo County, New Mexico, a subpoena has been served on Kristen Ludecke, an employee of the Senate;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Kristen Ludecke is authorized to testify in the case of *State of New Mexico* v. *Felix Lucero Chavez*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SENATE RESOLUTION 163—TO ESTABLISH A SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE TO STUDY THE CAUSES OF FIREARMS VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

Mrs. BOXER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 163

Resolved,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) In the past eleven years, nearly 400,000 Americans have died from gunshots, and about 35,000 Americans will die in 1999 because of gun violence;

(2) Death by gunshots is the second leading cause of accidental death in the United States and is expected to become the number one cause within the next four years;

(3) Treating gunshot injuries costs the American health care system approximately $4.5 billion annually, with 80 percent of the costs paid for by the public in tax dollars or cost-shifting.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a special committee of the Senate to be known as the Special Committee on Firearms Violence (hereafter in this resolution referred to as the ''special committee'').

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the special committee is—

(1) to study the causes of firearms violence in America;

(2) to make such findings of fact as are warranted and appropriate, including the impact of firearms violence on the well-being of American children; and

(3) to explore ways to reduce firearms violence in America, including increasing controls on the sale and distribution of firearms, and to make recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as the special committee determines to be necessary and appropriate.

No proposed legislation shall be referred to the special committee, nor shall the special committee have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

(c) TREATMENT AS STANDING COMMITTEE.—For purposes of paragraphs 1, 2, 7(a)(1) and (2), and 10(a) of rule XXVI and rule XXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and section 202(i) and (j) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the special committee shall be treated as a standing committee of the Senate.

SEC. 3. MEMBERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION.

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—the special committee shall consist of 7 members of the Senate—

(A) 4 of whom shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate from the majority party of the Senate upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader of the Senate; and

(B) 3 of whom shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate from the minority party of the Senate upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(2) VACANCIES.—Vacancies in the membership of the special committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the special committee and shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments are made.

(3) SERVICE.—For the purpose of paragraph 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, service of a Senator as a member, chairman, or vice chairman of the special committee shall not be taken into account.

(b) CHAIRMAN.—The chairman of the special committee shall be selected by the Majority Leader of the Senate and the vice chairman of the special committee shall be selected by the Minority Leader of the Senate. The vice chairman shall discharge such responsibilities as the special committee or the chairman may assign.

SEC. 3. AUTHORITY OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of this resolution, the special committee is authorized, in its discretion—

(1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) to employ personnel;

(3) to hold hearings;

(4) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate;

(5) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of witnesses and the production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents;

(6) to take depositions and other testimony;

(7) to procure the services of individual consultations or organizations thereof, in accordance with the provisions of section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; and

(8) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on rules and Administration, to use on a non-reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) OATHS FOR WITNESSES.—The chairman of the special committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

(c) SUBPOENAS.—Subpoenas authorized by the special committee may be—

(1) issued over the signature of the chairman after consultation with the vice chairman, or any member of the special committee designated by the chairman after consultation with the vice chairman; and

(2) served by any person designated by the chairman or the member signing the subpoena.

(d) OTHER COMMITTEE STAFF.—The special committee may use, with the prior consent of the chairman of any other Senate committee or the chairman of any subcommittee of any committee of the Senate and on a nonreimbursable basis, the facilities or services of any members of the staff of such other Senate committee whenever the special committee or its chairman, following consultation with the vice chairman, considers that such action is necessary or appropriate to enable the special committee to make the investigation and study provided for in this resolution.

SEC. 4. REPORT AND TERMINATION.

The special committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate, to the Senate prior to December 31, 2000.

SEC. 5. FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—From the date this resolution is agreed to through December 31, 2000, the expenses of the special committee incurred under this resolution shall be paid out of the miscellaneous items account of the contingent fund of the Senate and shall not exceed $250,000 for the period beginning on the date of adoption of this resolution through March 1, 2000, and $250,000 for the period of March 1, 2000 through December 31, 2000, of which amount not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for each period for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organization thereof, as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i)).

(b) PAYMENT OF BENEFITS.—The retirement and health benefits of employees of the special committee shall be paid out of the miscellaneous items account of the contingent fund of the Senate.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

RELATING TO THE ENFORCEMENT OF RULE 16

DASCHLE AMENDMENT NO. 1343

Mr. DASCHLE proposed an amendment to the resolution (S. Res. 160) to restore enforcement of rule 16; as follows:

At the appropriate place add the following:

The presiding officer of the Senate shall apply all precedents of the Senate under Rule XXVIII in effect at the conclusion of the 103rd Congress.

JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT OF 1999

LOTT AMENDMENT NO. 1344

Mr. LOTT proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 1501) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide grants to ensure increased accountability for juvenile offenders; to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to provide quality prevention programs and accountability programs relating to juvenile delinquency; and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act of 1999''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings and purposes.
Sec. 3. Severability.

TITLE I—JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM

Sec. 101. Surrender to State authorities.
Sec. 102. Treatment of Federal juvenile offenders.
Sec. 103. Definitions.
Sec. 104. Notification after arrest.
Sec. 105. Release and detention prior to disposition.
Sec. 106. Speedy trial.
Sec. 107. Dispositional hearings.
Sec. 108. Use of juvenile records.
Sec. 109. Implementation of a sentence for juvenile offenders.
Sec. 110. Magistrate judge authority regarding juvenile defendants.
Sec. 111. Federal sentencing guidelines.
Sec. 112. Study and report on Indian tribal jurisdiction.

TITLE II—JUVENILE GANGS

Sec. 201. Solicitation or recruitment of persons in criminal street gang activity.
Sec. 202. Increased penalties for using minors to distribute drugs.
Sec. 203. Penalties for use of minors in crimes of violence.
Sec. 204. Criminal street gangs.
Sec. 205. High intensity interstate gang activity areas.
Sec. 206. Increasing the penalty for using physical force to tamper with witnesses, victims, or informants.
Sec. 207. Authority to make grants to prosecutors' offices to combat gang crime and youth violence.
Sec. 208. Increase in offense level for participation in crime as a gang member.
Sec. 209. Interstate and foreign travel or transportation in aid of criminal gangs.
Sec. 210. Prohibitions relating to firearms.
Sec. 211. Clone pagers.

TITLE III—JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

Subtitle A—Reform of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974

Sec. 301. Findings; declaration of purpose; definitions.
Sec. 302. Juvenile crime control and prevention.
Sec. 303. Runaway and homeless youth.
Sec. 304. National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.
Sec. 305. Transfer of functions and savings provisions.

Subtitle B—Accountability for Juvenile Offenders and Public Protection Incentive Grants

Sec. 321. Block grant program.
Sec. 322. Pilot program to promote replication of recent successful juvenile crime reduction strategies.
Sec. 323. Repeal of unnecessary and duplicative programs.
Sec. 324. Extension of Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.
Sec. 325. Reimbursement of States for costs of incarcerating juvenile aliens.

Subtitle C—Alternative Education and Delinquency Prevention

Sec. 331. Alternative education.

Subtitle D—Parenting as Prevention

Sec. 341. Short title.
Sec. 342. Establishment of program.
Sec. 343. National Parenting Support and Education Commission.
Sec. 344. State and local parenting support and education grant program.
Sec. 345. Grants to address the problem of violence related stress to parents and children.

TITLE IV—VOLUNTARY MEDIA AGREEMENTS FOR CHILDREN'S PROTECTION

Subtitle A—Children and the Media.

Sec. 401. Short title.
Sec. 402. Findings.
Sec. 403. Purposes; construction.
Sec. 404. Exemption of voluntary agreements on guidelines for certain entertainment material from applicability of antitrust laws.
Sec. 405. Exemption of activities to ensure compliance with ratings and labeling systems from applicability of antitrust laws.
Sec. 406. Definitions.

Subtitle B—Other Matters.

Sec. 411. Study of marketing practices of motion picture, recording, and video/personal computer game industries.

TITLE V—GENERAL FIREARM PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Special licensees; special registrations.
Sec. 502. Clarification of authority to conduct firearm transactions at gun shows.
Sec. 503. ''Instant check'' gun tax and gun owner privacy.
Sec. 504. Effective date.

TITLE VI—RESTRICTING JUVENILE ACCESS TO CERTAIN FIREARMS

Sec. 601. Penalties for unlawful acts by juveniles.
Sec. 602. Effective date.

TITLE VII—ASSAULT WEAPONS

Sec. 701. Short title.
Sec. 702. Ban on importing large capacity ammunition feeding devices.
Sec. 703. Definition of large capacity ammunition feeding device.
Sec. 704. Effective date.

TITLE VIII—EFFECTIVE GUN LAW ENFORCEMENT

Subtitle A—Criminal Use of Firearms by Felons

Sec. 801. Short title.
Sec. 802. Findings.
Sec. 803. Criminal Use of Firearms by Felons Program.
Sec. 804. Annual reports.
Sec. 805. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle B—Apprehension and Treatment of Armed Violent Criminals

Sec. 811. Apprehension and procedural treatment of armed violent criminals.

Subtitle C—Youth Crime Gun Interdiction

Sec. 821. Youth crime gun interdiction initiative.

Subtitle D—Gun Prosecution Data

Sec. 831. Collection of gun prosecution data.

Subtitle E—Firearms Possession by Violent Juvenile Offenders

Sec. 841. Prohibition on firearms possession by violent juvenile offenders.

Subtitle F—Juvenile Access to Certain Firearms

Sec. 851. Penalties for firearm violations involving juveniles.

Subtitle G—General Firearm Provisions

Sec. 861. National instant criminal background check system improvements.

TITLE IX—ENHANCED PENALTIES

Sec. 901. Straw purchases.
Sec. 902. Stolen firearms.
Sec. 903. Increase in penalties for crimes involving firearms.
Sec. 904. Increased penalties for distributing drugs to minors.
Sec. 905. Increased penalty for drug trafficking in or near a school or other protected location.

TITLE X—CHILD HANDGUN SAFETY

Sec. 1001. Short title.
Sec. 1002. Purposes.
Sec. 1003. Firearms safety.
Sec. 1004. Effective date.

TITLE XI—SCHOOL SAFETY AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION

Sec. 1101. School safety and violence prevention.
Sec. 1102. Study.
Sec. 1103. School uniforms.
Sec. 1104. Transfer of school disciplinary records.
Sec. 1105. School violence research.
Sec. 1106. National character achievement award.
Sec. 1107. National Commission on Character Development.
Sec. 1108. Juvenile access to treatment.
Sec. 1109. Background checks.
Sec. 1110. Drug tests.
Sec. 1111. Sense of the Senate.

TITLE XII—TEACHER LIABILITY PROTECTION ACT

Sec. 1201. Short title.
Sec. 1202. Findings and purpose.
Sec. 1203. Preemption and election of State nonapplicability.
Sec. 1204. Limitation on liability for teachers.
Sec. 1205. Liability for noneconomic loss.
Sec. 1206. Definitions.
Sec. 1207. Effective date.

TITLE XIII—VIOLENCE PREVENTION TRAINING FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS

Sec. 1301. Short title.
Sec. 1302. Purpose.
Sec. 1303. Findings.
Sec. 1304. Definitions.
Sec. 1305. Program authorized.
Sec. 1306. Application.
Sec. 1307. Selection priorities.
Sec. 1308. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE XIV—PREVENTING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY THROUGH CHARACTER EDUCATION

Sec. 1401. Purpose.
Sec. 1402. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 1403. School-based programs.
Sec. 1404. After school programs.
Sec. 1405. General provisions.

TITLE XV—VIOLENT OFFENDER DNA IDENTIFICATION ACT OF 1999

Sec. 1501. Short title.
Sec. 1502. Elimination of convicted offender DNA backlog.
Sec. 1503. DNA identification of Federal, District of Columbia, and military violent offenders.

TITLE XVI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—General Provisions

Sec. 1601. Prohibition on firearms possession by violent juvenile offenders.
Sec. 1602. Safe students.
Sec. 1603. Study of marketing practices of the firearms industry.
Sec. 1604. Provision of Internet filtering or screening software by certain Internet service providers.
Sec. 1605. Application of section 923 (j) and (m).
Sec. 1606. Constitutionality of memorial services and memorials at public schools.
Sec. 1607. Twenty-first Amendment enforcement.
Sec. 1608. Interstate shipment and delivery of intoxicating liquors.
Sec. 1609. Disclaimer on materials produced, procured or distributed from funding authorized by this Act.
Sec. 1610. Aimee's Law.
Sec. 1611. Drug tests and locker inspections.
Sec. 1612. Waiver for local match requirement under community policing program.
Sec. 1613. Carjacking offenses.
Sec. 1614. Special forfeiture of collateral profits of crime.
Sec. 1615. Caller identification services to elementary and secondary schools as part of universal service obligation.
Sec. 1616. Parent leadership model.
Sec. 1617. National media campaign against violence.
Sec. 1618. Victims of terrorism.
Sec. 1619. Truth-in-sentencing incentive grants.
Sec. 1620. Application of provision relating to a sentence of death for an act of animal enterprise terrorism.
Sec. 1621. Prohibitions relating to explosive materials.
Sec. 1622. District judges for districts in the States of Arizona, Florida, and Nevada.
Sec. 1623. Behavioral and social science research on youth violence.
Sec. 1624. Sense of the Senate regarding mentoring programs.
Sec. 1625. Families and Schools Together program.
Sec. 1626. Amendments relating to violent crime in Indian country and areas of exclusive Federal jurisdiction.
Sec. 1627. Federal Judiciary Protection Act of 1999.
Sec. 1628. Local enforcement of local alcohol prohibitions that reduce juvenile crime in remote Alaska villages.
Sec. 1629. Rule of Construction.
Sec. 1630. Bounty hunter accountability and quality assistance.
Sec. 1631. Assistance for unincorporated neighborhood watch programs.
Sec. 1632. Findings and sense of Congress.
Sec. 1633. Prohibition on promoting violence on Federal property.
Sec. 1634. Provisions relating to pawn shops and special licensees.
Sec. 1635. Extension of Brady background checks to gun shows.
Sec. 1636. Appropriate interventions and services; clarification of Federal law.
Sec. 1637. Safe schools.
Sec. 1638. School counseling.
Sec. 1639. Criminal prohibition on distribution of certain information relating to explosives, destructive devices, and weapons of mass destruction.

Subtitle B—James Guelff Body Armor Act

Sec. 1641. Short title.
Sec. 1642. Findings.
Sec. 1643. Definitions.
Sec. 1644. Amendment of sentencing guidelines with respect to body armor.
Sec. 1645. Prohibition of purchase, use, or possession of body armor by violent felons.
Sec. 1646. Donation of Federal surplus body armor to State and local law enforcement agencies.
Sec. 1647. Additional findings; purpose.
Sec. 1648. Matching grant programs for law enforcement bullet resistant equipment and for video cameras.
Sec. 1649. Sense of Congress.
Sec. 1650. Technology development.
Sec. 1651. Matching grant program for law enforcement armor vests.

Subtitle C—Animal Enterprise Terrorism and Ecoterrorism

Sec. 1652. Enhancement of penalties for animal enterprise terrorism.
Sec. 1653. National animal terrorism and ecoterrorism incident clearinghouse.

Subtitle D—Jail-Based Substance Abuse

Sec. 1654. Jail-based substance abuse treatment programs.

Subtitle E—Safe School Security

Sec. 1655. Short title.
Sec. 1656. Establishment of School Security Technology Center.
Sec. 1657. Grants for local school security programs.
Sec. 1658. Safe and secure school advisory report.

Subtitle F—Internet Prohibitions

Sec. 1661. Short title.
Sec. 1662. Findings; purpose.
Sec. 1663. Prohibitions on uses of the Internet.
Sec. 1664. Effective date.

Subtitle G—Partnerships for High-Risk Youth

Sec. 1671. Short title.
Sec. 1672. Findings.
Sec. 1673. Purposes.
Sec. 1674. Establishment of demonstration project.
Sec. 1675. Eligibility.
Sec. 1676. Uses of funds.
Sec. 1677. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle H—National Youth Crime Prevention

Sec. 1681. Short title.
Sec. 1682. Purposes.
Sec. 1683. Establishment of National Youth Crime Prevention Demonstration Project.
Sec. 1684. Eligibility.
Sec. 1685. Uses of funds.
Sec. 1686. Reports.
Sec. 1687. Definitions.
Sec. 1688. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle I—National Youth Violence Commission

Sec. 1691. Short title.
Sec. 1692. National Youth Violence Commission.
Sec. 1693. Duties of the Commission.
Sec. 1694. Powers of the Commission.
Sec. 1695. Commission personnel matters.
Sec. 1696. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 1697. Termination of the Commission.

Subtitle J—School Safety

Sec. 1698. Short title.
Sec. 1699. Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) at the outset of the 20th century, the States adopted a separate justice system for juvenile offenders;

(2) violent crimes committed by juveniles, such as homicide, rape, and robbery, were an unknown phenomenon then, but the rate at which juveniles commit such crimes has escalated astronomically since that time;

(3) in 1994—

(A) the number of persons arrested overall for murder in the United States decreased by 5.8 percent, but the number of persons who are less than 15 years of age arrested for murder increased by 4 percent; and

(B) the number of persons arrested for all violent crimes increased by 1.3 percent, but the number of persons who are less than 15 years of age arrested for violent crimes increased by 9.2 percent, and the number of persons less than 18 years of age arrested for such crimes increased by 6.5 percent;

(4) from 1985 to 1996, the number of persons arrested for all violent crimes increased by 52.3 percent, but the number of persons under age 18 arrested for violent crimes rose by 75 percent;

(5) the number of juvenile offenders is expected to undergo a massive increase during the first 2 decades of the twenty-first century, culminating in an unprecedented number of violent offenders who are less than 18 years of age;

(6) the rehabilitative model of sentencing for juveniles, which Congress rejected for adult offenders when Congress enacted the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, is inadequate and inappropriate for dealing with many violent and repeat juvenile offenders;

(7) the Federal Government should encourage the States to experiment with progressive solutions to the escalating problem of juveniles who commit violent crimes and who are repeat offenders, including prosecuting such offenders as adults, but should not impose specific strategies or programs on the States;

(8) an effective strategy for reducing violent juvenile crime requires greater collection of investigative data and other information, such as fingerprints and DNA evidence, as well as greater sharing of such information—

(A) among Federal, State, and local agencies, including the courts; and

(B) among the law enforcement, educational, and social service systems;

(9) data regarding violent juvenile offenders should be made available to the adult criminal justice system if recidivism by criminals is to be addressed adequately;

(10) holding juvenile proceedings in secret denies victims of crime the opportunity to attend and be heard at such proceedings, helps juvenile offenders to avoid accountability for their actions, and shields juvenile proceedings from public scrutiny and accountability;

(11) the injuries and losses suffered by the victims of violent crime are no less painful or devastating because the offender is a juvenile; and

(12) the prevention, investigation, prosecution, adjudication, and punishment of criminal offenses committed by juveniles, and the rehabilitation and correction of juvenile offenders are, and should remain, primarily the responsibility of the States, to be carried out without interference from the Federal Government.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to reform Federal juvenile justice programs and policies in order to promote the emergence of juvenile justice systems in which the paramount concerns are providing for the safety of the public and holding juvenile wrongdoers accountable for their actions, while providing the wrongdoer a genuine opportunity for self-reform;

(2) to revise the procedures in Federal court that are applicable to the prosecution of juvenile offenders; and

(3) to encourage and promote, consistent with the ideals of federalism, adoption of policies by the States to ensure that the victims of violent crimes committed by juveniles receive the same level of justice as do victims of violent crimes that are committed by adults.

SEC. 3. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, an amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions of such to any person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE I—JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM

SEC. 101. SURRENDER TO STATE AUTHORITIES.

Section 5001 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the first undesignated paragraph and inserting the following:

''Whenever any person who is less than 18 years of age is been arrested and charged with the commission of an offense (or an act of delinquency that would be an offense were it committed by an adult) punishable in any court of the United States or of the District of Columbia, the United States Attorney for the district in which such person has been arrested may forego prosecution pursuant to section 5032(a)(2) if, after investigation by the United States Attorney, it appears that—

''(1) such person has committed an act that is also an offense or an act of delinquency under the law of any State or the District of Columbia;

''(2) such State or the District of Columbia, as applicable, can and will assume jurisdiction over such juvenile and will take such juvenile into custody and deal with the juvenile in accordance with the law of such State or the District of Columbia, as applicable; and

''(3) it is in the best interests of the United States and of the juvenile offender.''.

SEC. 102. TREATMENT OF FEDERAL JUVENILE OFFENDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5032 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 5032. Delinquency proceedings in district courts; juveniles tried as adults; transfer for other criminal prosecution

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) DELINQUENCY PROCEEDINGS IN DISTRICT COURTS.—A juvenile who is alleged to have committed a Federal offense shall, except as provided in paragraph (2), be tried in the appropriate district court of the United States—

''(A) in the case of an offense described in subsection (c), and except as provided in subsection (i), if the juvenile was not less than 14 years of age at the time of the offense, as an adult at the discretion of the United States Attorney in the appropriate jurisdiction, upon certification by that United States Attorney (which certification shall not be subject to review in or by any court, except as provided in subsection (d)(2)) that—

''(i) there is a substantial Federal interest in the case or the offense to warrant the exercise of Federal jurisdiction; or

''(ii) the ends of justice otherwise so require;

''(B) in the case of a felony offense that is not described in subsection (c), and except as provided in subsection (i), if the juvenile was not less than 14 years of age at the time of the offense, as an adult, upon certification by the Attorney General (which certification shall not be subject to review in or by any court, except as provided in subsection (d)(2)) that—

''(i) there is a substantial Federal interest in the case or the offense to warrant the exercise of Federal jurisdiction; or

''(ii) the ends of justice otherwise so require;

''(C) in the case of a juvenile who has, on a prior occasion, been tried and convicted as an adult under this section, as an adult; and

''(D) in all other cases, as a juvenile.

''(2) REFERRAL BY UNITED STATES ATTORNEY; APPLICATION TO CONCURRENT JURISDICTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the United States Attorney in the appropriate jurisdiction (or in the case of an offense under paragraph (1)(B), the Attorney General), declines prosecution of an offense under this section, the matter may be referred to the appropriate legal authorities of the State or Indian tribe with jurisdiction over both the offense and the juvenile.

''(B) APPLICATION TO CONCURRENT JURISDICTION.—The United States Attorney in the appropriate jurisdiction (or, in the case of an offense under paragraph (1)(B), the Attorney General), in cases in which both the Federal Government and a State or Indian tribe have penal provisions that criminalize the conduct at issue and both have jurisdiction over the juvenile, shall exercise a presumption in favor of referral pursuant to subparagraph (A), unless the United States Attorney pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) (or the Attorney General pursuant to paragraph (1)(B)) certifies (which certification shall not be subject to review in or by any court) that—

''(i) the prosecuting authority or the juvenile court or other appropriate court of the State or Indian tribe refuses, declines, or will refuse or will decline to assume jurisdiction over the conduct or the juvenile; and

''(ii) there is a substantial Federal interest in the case or the offense to warrant the exercise of Federal jurisdiction.

''(C) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'Indian tribe' has the meaning given the term in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)).

''(b) JOINDER; LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES.—In a prosecution under this section, a juvenile may be prosecuted and convicted as an adult for any offense that is properly joined under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure with an offense described in subsection (c), and may also be convicted of a lesser included offense.

''(c) OFFENSES DESCRIBED.—An offense is described in this subsection if it is a Federal offense that—

''(1) is a serious violent felony or a serious drug offense (as those terms are defined in section 3559(c), except that section 3559(c)(3) does not apply to this subsection); or

''(2) is a conspiracy or an attempt to commit an offense described in paragraph (1).

''(d) WAIVER TO JUVENILE STATUS IN CERTAIN CASES; LIMITATIONS ON JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, a determination to approve or not to approve, or to institute or not to institute, a prosecution under subsection (a)(1) shall not be reviewable in any court.

''(2) DETERMINATION BY COURT ON TRIAL AS ADULT OF CERTAIN JUVENILE.—In any prosecution of a juvenile under subsection (a)(1)(A) if the juvenile was less than 16 years of age at the time of the offense, or under subsection (a)(1)(B), upon motion of the defendant and after a hearing, the court in which criminal charges have been filed shall determine whether to issue an order to provide for the transfer of the defendant to juvenile status for the purposes of proceeding against the defendant or for referral under subsection (a).

''(3) TIME REQUIREMENTS.—A motion by a defendant under paragraph (2) shall not be considered unless that motion is filed not later than 30 days after the date on which the defendant—

''(A) appears through counsel to answer an indictment; or

''(B) expressly waives the right to counsel and elects to proceed pro se.

''(4) PROHIBITION.—The court shall not order the transfer of a defendant to juvenile status under paragraph (2) unless the defendant establishes by a preponderance of the evidence or information that removal to juvenile status would be in the interest of justice. In making a determination under paragraph (2), the court may consider—

''(A) the nature of the alleged offense, including the extent to which the juvenile played a leadership role in an organization, or otherwise influenced other persons to take part in criminal activities;

''(B) whether prosecution of the juvenile as an adult is necessary to protect property or public safety;

''(C) the age and social background of the juvenile;

''(D) the extent and nature of the prior criminal or delinquency record of the juvenile;

''(E) the intellectual development and psychological maturity of the juvenile;

''(F) the nature of any treatment efforts and the response of the juvenile to those efforts; and

''(G) the availability of programs designed to treat any identified behavioral problems of the juvenile.

''(5) STATUS OF ORDERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An order of the court made in ruling on a motion by a defendant to transfer a defendant to juvenile status under this subsection shall not be a final order for the purpose of enabling an appeal, except that an appeal by the United States shall lie to a court of appeals pursuant to section 3731 from an order of a district court removing a defendant to juvenile status.

''(B) APPEALS.—Upon receipt of a notice of appeal of an order under this paragraph, a court of appeals shall hear and determine the appeal on an expedited basis.

''(6) INADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), no statement made by a defendant during or in connection with a hearing under this subsection shall be admissible against the defendant in any criminal prosecution.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The prohibition under subparagraph (A) shall apply, except—

''(i) for impeachment purposes; or

''(ii) in a prosecution for perjury or giving a false statement.

''(7) RULES.—The rules concerning the receipt and admissibility of evidence under this subsection shall be the same as prescribed in section 3142(f).

''(e) APPLICABLE PROCEDURES.—Any prosecution in a district court of the United States under this section—

''(1) in the case of a juvenile tried as an adult under subsection (a), shall proceed in the same manner as is required by this title and by the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure in any proceeding against an adult; and

''(2) in all other cases, shall proceed in accordance with this chapter, unless the juvenile has requested in writing, upon advice of counsel, to be proceeded against as an adult.

''(f) APPLICATION OF LAWS.—

''(1) APPLICABILITY OF SENTENCING PROVISIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, and subject to subparagraph (C) of this paragraph, in any case in which a juvenile is prosecuted in a district court of the United States as an adult, the juvenile shall be subject to the same laws, rules, and proceedings regarding sentencing (including the availability of probation, restitution, fines, forfeiture, imprisonment, and supervised release) that would be applicable in the case of an adult, except that no person shall be subject to the death penalty for an offense committed before the person attains the age of 18 years.

''(B) STATUS AS ADULT.—No juvenile sentenced to a term of imprisonment shall be released from custody on the basis that the juvenile has attained the age of 18 years.

''(C) APPLICABLE GUIDELINES.—Each juvenile tried as an adult shall be sentenced in accordance with the Federal sentencing guidelines promulgated under section 994(z) of title 28, United States Code, once such guidelines are promulgated and take effect.

''(2) APPLICABILITY OF MANDATORY RESTITUTION PROVISIONS TO CERTAIN JUVENILES.—If a juvenile is tried as an adult for any offense to which the mandatory restitution provisions of sections 3663A, 2248, 2259, 2264, and 2323 apply, those sections shall apply to that juvenile in the same manner and to the same extent as those provisions apply to adults.

''(g) OPEN PROCEEDINGS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any offense tried or adjudicated in a district court of the United States under this section shall be open to the general public, in accordance with rules 10, 26, 31(a), and 53 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, unless good cause is established by the moving party or is otherwise found by the court, for closure.

''(2) STATUS ALONE INSUFFICIENT.—The status of the defendant as a juvenile, absent other factors, shall not constitute good cause for purposes of this subsection.

''(h) AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In making a determination concerning the arrest or prosecution of a juvenile in a district court of the United States under this section, the United States Attorney of the appropriate jurisdiction, or, as appropriate, the Attorney General, shall have complete access to the prior Federal juvenile records of the subject juvenile and, to the extent permitted by State law, the prior State juvenile records of the subject juvenile.

''(2) CONSIDERATION OF ENTIRE RECORD.—In any case in which a juvenile is found guilty or adjudicated delinquent in an action under this section, the district court responsible for imposing sentence shall have complete access to the prior Federal juvenile records of the subject juvenile and, to the extent permitted under State law, the prior State juvenile records of the subject juvenile. At sentencing, the district court shall consider the entire available prior juvenile record of the subject juvenile.

''(i) APPLICATION TO INDIAN COUNTRY.—Notwithstanding sections 1152 and 1153, certification under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1) shall not be made nor granted with respect to a juvenile who is subject to the criminal jurisdiction of an Indian tribal government if the juvenile is less than 15 years of age at the time of offense and is alleged to have committed an offense for which there would be Federal jurisdiction based solely on commission of the offense in Indian country (as defined in section 1151), unless the governing body of the tribe having jurisdiction over the place where the alleged offense was committed has, before the occurrence of the alleged offense, notified the Attorney General in writing of its election that prosecution as an adult may take place under this section.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CHAPTER ANALYSIS.—The analysis for chapter 403 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 5032 and inserting the following:

''5032. Delinquency proceedings in district courts; juveniles tried as adults; transfer for other criminal prosecution.''.

(2) ADULT SENTENCING.—Section 3553 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) LIMITATION ON APPLICABILITY OF STATUTORY MINIMUMS IN CERTAIN PROSECUTIONS OF PERSONS YOUNGER THAN 16.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of a defendant convicted for conduct that occurred before the juvenile attained the age of 16 years, the court shall impose a sentence without regard to any statutory minimum sentence, if the court finds at sentencing, after affording the Government an opportunity to make a recommendation, that the juvenile has not been previously adjudicated delinquent for, or convicted of, a serious violent felony or a serious drug offense (as those terms are defined in section 3559(c)).

''(h) TREATMENT OF JUVENILE CRIMINAL HISTORY IN FEDERAL SENTENCING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) SENTENCING GUIDELINES.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, the United States Sentencing Commission (referred to in this subsection as the 'Commission') shall amend the Federal sentencing guidelines to provide that, in determining the criminal history score under the Federal sentencing guidelines for any adult offender or any juvenile offender being sentenced as an adult, prior juvenile convictions and adjudications for offenses described in paragraph (2) shall receive a score similar to that which the defendant would have received if those offenses had been committed by the defendant as an adult, if any portion of the sentence for the offense was imposed or served within 15 years after the commencement of the instant offense.

''(B) REVIEWS.—The Commission shall review the criminal history treatment of juvenile adjudications or convictions for offenses other than those described in paragraph (2) to determine whether the treatment should be adjusted as described in subparagraph (A), and make any amendments to the Federal sentencing guidelines as necessary to make whatever adjustments the Commission concludes are necessary to implement the results of the review.

''(2) OFFENSES DESCRIBED.—The offenses described in this paragraph include any—

''(A) crime of violence;

''(B) controlled substance offense;

''(C) other offense for which the defendant received a sentence or disposition of imprisonment of 1 year or more; and

''(D) other offense punishable by a term of imprisonment of more than 1 year for which the defendant was prosecuted as an adult.

''(3) DEFINITIONS.—The Federal sentencing guidelines described in paragraph (1) shall define the terms 'crime of violence' and 'controlled substance offense' in substantially the same manner as those terms are defined in Guideline Section 4B1.2 of the November 1, 1995, Guidelines Manual.

''(4) JUVENILE ADJUDICATIONS.—In carrying out this subsection, the Commission—

''(A) shall assign criminal history points for juvenile adjudications based principally on the nature of the acts committed by the juvenile; an

''(B) may provide for some adjustment of the score in light of the length of sentence the juvenile received.

''(5) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.—The Commission shall promulgate the Federal sentencing guidelines and amendments under this subsection as soon as practicable, and in any event not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act of 1999, in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 21(a) of the Sentencing Act of 1987, as though the authority under that authority had not expired, except that the Commission shall submit to Congress the emergency guidelines or amendments promulgated under this section, and shall set an effective date for those guidelines or amendments not earlier than 30 days after their submission to Congress.

''(6) CAREER OFFENDER DETERMINATION.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, the Commission shall amend the Federal sentencing guidelines to provide for inclusion, in any determination regarding whether a juvenile or adult defendant is a career offender under section 994(h) of title 28, and any computation of the sentence that any defendant found to be a career offender should receive, of any act for which the defendant was previously convicted or adjudicated delinquent as a juvenile that would be a felony covered by that section if it had been committed by the defendant as an adult.''.

SEC. 103. DEFINITIONS.

Section 5031 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 5031. Definitions

''In this chapter:

''(1) ADULT INMATE.—The term 'adult inmate' means an individual who has attained the age of 18 years and who is in custody for, awaiting trial on, or convicted of criminal charges committed while an adult or an act of juvenile delinquency committed while a juvenile.

''(2) JUVENILE.—The term 'juvenile' means—

''(A) a person who has not attained the age of 18 years; or

''(B) for the purpose of proceedings and disposition under this chapter for an alleged act of juvenile delinquency, a person who has not attained the age of 21 years.

''(3) JUVENILE DELINQUENCY.—The term 'juvenile delinquency' means the violation of a law of the United States committed by a person before the eighteenth birthday of that person, if the violation—

''(A) would have been a crime if committed by an adult; or

''(B) is a violation of section 922(x).

''(4) PROHIBITED PHYSICAL CONTACT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'prohibited physical contact' means—

''(i) any physical contact between a juvenile and an adult inmate; and

''(ii) proximity that provides an opportunity for physical contact between a juvenile and an adult inmate.

''(B) EXCLUSION.—The term does not include supervised proximity between a juvenile and an adult inmate that is brief and inadvertent, or accidental, in secure areas of a facility that are not dedicated to use by juvenile offenders and that are nonresidential, which may include dining, recreational, educational, vocational, health care, entry areas, and passageways.

''(5) SUSTAINED ORAL COMMUNICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'sustained oral communication' means the imparting or interchange of speech by or between a juvenile and an adult inmate.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—The term does not include—

''(i) communication that is accidental or incidental; or

''(ii) sounds or noises that cannot reasonably be considered to be speech.

''(6) STATE.—The term 'State' includes a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States and, with regard to an act of juvenile delinquency that would have been a misdemeanor if committed by an adult, an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 4506(e))).

''(7) VIOLENT JUVENILE.—The term 'violent juvenile' means any juvenile who is alleged to have committed, has been adjudicated delinquent for, or has been convicted of an offense that, if committed by an adult, would be a crime of violence (as defined in section 16).''.

SEC. 104. NOTIFICATION AFTER ARREST.

Section 5033 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''immediately notify the Attorney General and'' and inserting the following: ''immediately, or as soon as practicable thereafter, notify the United States Attorney of the appropriate jurisdiction and shall promptly take reasonable steps to notify''; and

(2) in the second sentence of the second undesignated paragraph, by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and the juvenile shall not be subject to detention under conditions that permit prohibited physical contact with adult inmates or in which the juvenile and an adult inmate can engage in sustained oral communication''.

SEC. 105. RELEASE AND DETENTION PRIOR TO DISPOSITION.

(a) DUTIES OF MAGISTRATE.—Section 5034 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''The magistrate shall insure'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) REPRESENTATION BY COUNSEL.—The magistrate shall ensure'';

(2) by striking ''The magistrate may appoint'' and inserting the following:

''(2) GUARDIAN AD LITEM.—The magistrate may appoint'';

(3) by striking ''If the juvenile'' and inserting the following:

''(b) RELEASE PRIOR TO DISPOSITION.—Except as provided in subsection (c), if the juvenile''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) RELEASE OF CERTAIN JUVENILES.—A juvenile who is to be tried as an adult pursuant to section 5032 shall be released pending trial only in accordance with the applicable provisions of chapter 207. The release shall be conducted in the same manner and shall be subject to the same terms, conditions, and sanctions for violation of a release condition as provided for an adult under chapter 207.

''(d) PENALTY FOR AN OFFENSE COMMITTED WHILE ON RELEASE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A juvenile alleged to have committed, while on release under this section, an offense that, if committed by an adult, would be a Federal criminal offense, shall be subject to prosecution under section 5032.

''(2) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PENALTIES.—Section 3147 shall apply to a juvenile who is to be tried as an adult pursuant to section 5032 for an offense committed while on release under this section.''.

(b) DETENTION PRIOR TO DISPOSITION.—Section 5035 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''A juvenile'' and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), a juvenile'';

(2) in subsection (a), as redesignated—

(A) in the third sentence, by striking ''regular contact'' and inserting ''prohibited physical contact or sustained oral communication''; and

(B) after the fourth sentence, by inserting the following: ''To the extent practicable, violent juveniles shall be kept separate from nonviolent juveniles.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) DETENTION OF CERTAIN JUVENILES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A juvenile who is to be tried as an adult pursuant to section 5032 shall be subject to detention in accordance with chapter 207 in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions as an adult would be subject to under that chapter.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—A juvenile shall not be detained or confined in any institution in which the juvenile has prohibited physical contact or sustained oral communication with adult inmates. To the extent practicable, violent juveniles shall be kept separate from nonviolent juveniles.''.

SEC. 106. SPEEDY TRIAL.

Section 5036 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''who is to be proceeded against as a juvenile pursuant to section 5032 and'' after ''If an alleged delinquent'';

(2) by striking ''thirty'' and inserting ''70''; and

(3) by striking ''the court,'' and all that follows through the end of the section and inserting the following: ''the court. The periods of exclusion under section 3161(h) shall apply to this section. In determining whether an information should be dismissed with or without prejudice, the court shall consider the seriousness of the alleged act of juvenile delinquency, the facts and circumstances of the case that led to the dismissal, and the impact of a reprosecution on the administration of justice.''.

SEC. 107. DISPOSITIONAL HEARINGS.

Section 5037 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) DISPOSITIONAL HEARING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In a proceeding under section 5032(a)(1)(D), if the court finds a juvenile to be a juvenile delinquent, the court shall hold a hearing concerning the appropriate disposition of the juvenile not later than 40 court days after the finding of juvenile delinquency, unless the court has ordered further study pursuant to subsection (e).

''(B) PREDISPOSITION REPORT.—A predisposition report shall be prepared by the probation officer, who shall promptly provide a copy to the juvenile, the juvenile's counsel, and the attorney for the Government. Victim impact information shall be included in the predisposition report, and victims or, in appropriate cases, their official representatives, shall be provided the opportunity to make a statement to the court in person or to present any information in relation to the disposition.

''(2) ACTIONS OF COURT AFTER HEARING.—After a dispositional hearing under paragraph (1), after considering any pertinent policy statements promulgated by the United States Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994 of title 28, and in conformance with any guidelines promulgated by the United States Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994(z)(1)(B) of title 28, the court shall—

''(A) place the juvenile on probation or commit the juvenile to official detention (including the possibility of a term of supervised release), and impose any fine that would be authorized if the juvenile had been tried and convicted as an adult; and

''(B) enter an order of restitution pursuant to section 3663.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''or supervised release'' after ''probation'';

(B) by striking ''extend—'' and all that follows through ''The provisions'' and inserting the following: ''extend, in the case of a juvenile, beyond the maximum term of probation that would be authorized by section 3561, or beyond the maximum term of supervised release authorized by section 3583, if the juvenile had been tried and convicted as an adult. The provisions dealing with supervised release set forth in section 3583 and the provisions''; and

(C) in the last sentence, by inserting ''or supervised release'' after ''on probation''; and

(3) in subsection (c), by striking ''may not extend—'' and all that follows through ''Section 3624'' and inserting the following: ''may not extend beyond the earlier of the 26th birthday of the juvenile or the termination date of the maximum term of imprisonment, exclusive of any term of supervised release, that would be authorized if the juvenile had been tried and convicted as an adult. No juvenile sentenced to a term of imprisonment shall be released from custody simply because the juvenile attains the age of 18 years. Section 3624''.

SEC. 108. USE OF JUVENILE RECORDS.

Section 5038 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 5038. Use of juvenile records

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Throughout a juvenile delinquency proceeding under section 5032 or 5037, the records of such proceeding shall be safeguarded from disclosure to unauthorized persons, and shall only be released to the extent necessary for purposes of—

''(1) compliance with section 5032(h);

''(2) docketing and processing by the court;

''(3) responding to an inquiry received from another court of law;

''(4) responding to an inquiry from an agency preparing a presentence report for another court;

''(5) responding to an inquiry from a law enforcement agency, if the request for information is related to the investigation of a crime or a position within that agency or analysis requested by the Attorney General;

''(6) responding to a written inquiry from the director of a treatment agency or the director of a facility to which the juvenile has been committed by the court;

''(7) responding to an inquiry from an agency considering the person for a position immediately and directly affecting national security;

''(8) responding to an inquiry from any victim of such juvenile delinquency or, if the victim is deceased, from a member of the immediate family of the victim, related to the final disposition of such juvenile by the court in accordance with section 5032 or 5037, as applicable; and

''(9) communicating with a victim of such juvenile delinquency or, in appropriate cases, with the official representative of a victim, in order to—

''(A) apprise the victim or representative of the status or disposition of the proceeding;

''(B) effectuate any other provision of law; or

''(C) assist in the allocution at disposition of the victim or the representative of the victim.

''(b) RECORDS OF ADJUDICATION.—

''(1) TRANSMISSION TO FBI.—Upon an adjudication of delinquency under section 5032 or 5037, the court shall transmit to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation a record of such adjudication.

''(2) MAINTAINING RECORDS.—The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall maintain, in the central repository of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in accordance with the established practices and policies relating to adult criminal history records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—

''(A) a fingerprint supported record of the Federal adjudication of delinquency of any juvenile who commits an act that, if committed by an adult, would constitute the offense of murder, armed robbery, rape (except statutory rape), or a felony offense involving sexual molestation of a child, or a conspiracy or attempt to commit any such offense, that is equivalent to, and maintained and disseminated in the same manner and for the same purposes, as are adult criminal history records for the same offenses; and

''(B) a fingerprint supported record of the Federal adjudication of delinquency of any juvenile who commits an act that, if committed by an adult, would be any felony offense (other than an offense described in subparagraph (A)) that is equivalent to, and maintained and disseminated in the same manner, as are adult criminal history records for the same offenses—

''(i) for use by and within the criminal justice system for the detection, apprehension, detention, pretrial release, post-trial release, prosecution, adjudication, sentencing, disposition, correctional supervision, or rehabilitation of an accused person, criminal offender, or juvenile delinquent; and

''(ii) for purposes of responding to an inquiry from an agency considering the subject of the record for a position or clearance immediately and directly affecting national security.

''(3) AVAILABILITY OF RECORDS TO SCHOOLS IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall make an adjudication record of a juvenile maintained pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (B) of that paragraph, or conviction record described in subsection (d), available to an official of an elementary, secondary, or post-secondary school, in appropriate circumstances (as defined by and under rules issued by the Attorney General), if—

''(A) the subject of the record is a student enrolled at the school, or a juvenile who seeks, intends, or is instructed to enroll at that school;

''(B) the school official is subject to the same standards and penalties under applicable Federal and State law relating to the handling and disclosure of information contained in juvenile adjudication records as are employees of law enforcement and juvenile justice agencies in the State; and

''(C) information contained in the record is not used for the sole purpose of denying admission.

''(c) NOTIFICATION OF RIGHTS.—A district court of the United States that exercises jurisdiction over a juvenile shall notify the juvenile, and a parent or guardian of the juvenile, in writing, and in clear and nontechnical language, of the rights of the juvenile relating to the adjudication record of the juvenile. Any juvenile may petition the court after a period of 5 years to have a record relating to such juvenile and described in this section (except a record relating to an offense described in subsection (b)(2)(A)) removed from the Federal Bureau of Investigation database if that juvenile can establish by clear and convincing evidence that the juvenile is no longer a danger to the community.

''(d) RECORDS OF JUVENILES TRIED AS ADULTS.—In any case in which a juvenile is tried as an adult in Federal court, the Federal criminal record of the juvenile shall be made available in the same manner as is applicable to the records of adult defendants.''.

SEC. 109. IMPLEMENTATION OF A SENTENCE FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5039 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 5039. Implementation of a sentence

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, the sentence for a juvenile who is adjudicated delinquent or found guilty of an offense under any proceeding in a district court of the United States under section 5032 shall be carried out in the same manner as for an adult defendant.

''(b) SENTENCES OF IMPRISONMENT, PROBATION, AND SUPERVISED RELEASE.—Subject to subsection (d), the implementation of a sentence of imprisonment is governed by subchapter C of chapter 229 and, if the sentence includes a term of probation or supervised release, by subchapter A of chapter 229.

''(c) SENTENCES OF FINES AND ORDERS OF RESTITUTION; SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A sentence of a fine, an order of restitution, or a special assessment under section 3013 shall be implemented and collected in the same manner as for an adult defendant.

''(2) PROHIBITION.—The parent, guardian, or custodian of a juvenile sentenced to pay a fine may not be made liable for such payment by any court.

''(d) SEGREGATION OF JUVENILES; CONDITIONS OF CONFINEMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No juvenile committed for incarceration, whether pursuant to an adjudication of delinquency or conviction for an offense, to the custody of the Attorney General may, before the juvenile attains the age of 18 years, be placed or retained in any jail or correctional institution in which the juvenile has prohibited physical contact with adult inmate or can engage in sustained oral communication with adult inmates. To the extent practicable, violent juveniles shall be kept separate from nonviolent juveniles.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each juvenile who is committed for incarceration shall be provided with—

''(A) adequate food, heat, light, sanitary facilities, bedding, clothing, and recreation; and

''(B) as appropriate, counseling, education, training, and medical care (including necessary psychiatric, psychological, or other care or treatment).

''(3) COMMITMENT TO FOSTER HOME OR COMMUNITY-BASED FACILITY.—Except in the case of a juvenile who is found guilty of a violent felony or who is adjudicated delinquent for an offense that would be a violent felony if the juvenile had been prosecuted as an adult, the Attorney General shall commit a juvenile to a foster home or community-based facility located in or near his home community if that commitment is—

''(A) practicable;

''(B) in the best interest of the juvenile; and

''(C) consistent with the safety of the community.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 403 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 5039 and inserting the following:

''5039. Implementation of a sentence.''.

SEC. 110. MAGISTRATE JUDGE AUTHORITY REGARDING JUVENILE DEFENDANTS.

Section 3401(g) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by inserting after ''magistrate judge may, in any'' the following: ''class A misdemeanor or any''; and

(2) in the third sentence, by striking '', except that no'' and all that follows before the period at the end of the subsection.

SEC. 111. FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES.

(a) APPLICATION OF GUIDELINES TO CERTAIN JUVENILE DEFENDANTS.—Section 994(h) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', or in which the defendant is a juvenile who is tried as an adult,'' after ''old or older''.

(b) GUIDELINES FOR JUVENILE CASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 994 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(z) GUIDELINES FOR JUVENILE CASES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act of 1999, the Commission, by affirmative vote of not less than 4 members of the Commission, and pursuant to its rules and regulations and consistent with all pertinent provisions of any Federal statute, shall promulgate and distribute to all courts of the United States and to the United States Probation System—

''(A) guidelines, as described in this section, for use by a sentencing court in determining the sentence to be imposed in a criminal case if the defendant committed the offense as a juvenile, and is tried as an adult pursuant to section 5032 of title 18, United States Code; and

''(B) guidelines, as described in this section, for use by a court in determining the sentence to be imposed on a juvenile adjudicated delinquent pursuant to section 5032 of title 18, United States Code, and sentenced pursuant to a dispositional hearing under section 5037 of title 18, United States Code.

''(2) DETERMINATIONS.—In carrying out this subsection, the Commission shall make the determinations required by subsection (a)(1) and promulgate the policy statements and guidelines required by paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a).

''(3) CONSIDERATIONS.—In addition to any other considerations required by this section, the Commission, in promulgating guidelines—

''(A) pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), shall presume the appropriateness of adult sentencing provisions, but may make such adjustments to sentence lengths and to provisions governing downward departures from the guidelines as reflect the specific interests and circumstances of juvenile defendants; and

''(B) pursuant to paragraph (1)(B), shall ensure that the guidelines—

''(i) reflect the broad range of sentencing options available to the court under section 5037 of title 18, United States Code; and

''(ii) effectuate a policy of an accountability-based juvenile justice system that provides substantial and appropriate sanctions, that are graduated to reflect the severity or repeated nature of violations, for each delinquent act, and reflect the specific interests and circumstances of juvenile defendants.

''(4) REVIEW PERIOD.—The review period specified by subsection (p) applies to guidelines promulgated pursuant to this subsection and any amendments to those guidelines.''.

(2) TECHNICAL CORRECTION TO ASSURE COMPLIANCE OF SENTENCING GUIDELINES WITH PROVISIONS OF ALL FEDERAL STATUTES.—Section 994(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking ''consistent with all pertinent provisions of this title and title 18, United States

Code,'' and inserting ''consistent with all pertinent provisions of any Federal statute''.

SEC. 112. STUDY AND REPORT ON INDIAN TRIBAL JURISDICTION.

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall conduct a study of the juvenile justice systems of Indian tribes (as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e))) and shall report to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on—

(1) the extent to which tribal governments are equipped to adjudicate felonies, misdemeanors, and acts of delinquency committed by juveniles subject to tribal jurisdiction; and

(2) the need for and benefits from expanding the jurisdiction of tribal courts and the authority to impose the same sentences that can be imposed by Federal or State courts on such juveniles.

TITLE II—JUVENILE GANGS

SEC. 201. SOLICITATION OR RECRUITMENT OF PERSONS IN CRIMINAL STREET GANG ACTIVITY.

(a) PROHIBITED ACTS.—Chapter 26 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§522. Recruitment of persons to participate in criminal street gang activity

''(a) PROHIBITED ACT.—It shall be unlawful for any person, to use any facility in, or travel in, interstate or foreign commerce, or cause another to do so, to recruit, solicit, induce, command, or cause another person to be or remain as a member of a criminal street gang, or conspire to do so, with the intent that the person being recruited, solicited, induced, commanded or caused to be or remain a member of such gang participate in an offense described in section 521(c) of this title.

''(b) PENALTIES.—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall—

''(1) if the person recruited, solicited, induced, commanded, or caused—

''(A) is a minor, be imprisoned not less than 4 years and not more than 10 years, fined in accordance with this title, or both; or

''(B) is not a minor, be imprisoned not less than 1 year and not more than 10 years, fined in accordance with this title, or both; and

''(2) be liable for any costs incurred by the Federal Government or by any State or local government for housing, maintaining, and treating the minor until the minor attains the age of 18 years.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CRIMINAL STREET GANG.—The term 'criminal street gang' has the meaning given the term in section 521.

''(2) MINOR.—The term 'minor' means a person who is younger than 18 years of age.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 26 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''522. Recruitment of persons to participate in criminal street gang activity.''.

SEC. 202. INCREASED PENALTIES FOR USING MINORS TO DISTRIBUTE DRUGS.

Section 420 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 861) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''one year'' and inserting ''3 years''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''one year'' and inserting ''5 years''.

SEC. 203. PENALTIES FOR USE OF MINORS IN CRIMES OF VIOLENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§25. Use of minors in crimes of violence

''(a) PENALTIES.—Except as otherwise provided by law, whoever, being not less than 18 years of age, knowingly and intentionally uses a minor to commit a Federal offense that is a crime of violence, or to assist in avoiding detection or apprehension for such an offense, shall—

''(1) be subject to 2 times the maximum imprisonment and 2 times the maximum fine that would otherwise be imposed for the offense; and

''(2) for second or subsequent convictions under this subsection, be subject to 3 times the maximum imprisonment and 3 times the maximum fine that would otherwise be imposed for the offense.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CRIME OF VIOLENCE.—The term 'crime of violence' has the meaning given the term in section 16 of this title.

''(2) MINOR.—The term 'minor' means a person who is less than 18 years of age.

''(3) USES.—The term 'uses' means employs, hires, persuades, induces, entices, or coerces.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 1 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''25. Use of minors in crimes of violence.''.

SEC. 204. CRIMINAL STREET GANGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 521 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the second undesignated paragraph—

(A) by striking ''5'' and inserting ''3'';

(B) by inserting '', whether formal or informal'' after ''or more persons''; and

(C) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or activities'' after ''purposes'';

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting after ''10 years'' the following: ''and such person shall be subject to the forfeiture prescribed in section 412 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 853)'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) that is a violation of section 522 (relating to the recruitment of persons to participate in criminal gang activity);

''(4) that is a violation of section 844, 875, or 876 (relating to extortion and threats), section 1084 (relating to gambling), section 1955 (relating to gambling), or chapter 73 (relating to obstruction of justice);

''(5) that is a violation of section 1956 (relating to money laundering), to the extent that the violation of such section is related to a Federal or State offense involving a controlled substance (as that term is defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802)); or

''(6) that is a violation of section 274(a)(1)(A), 277, or 278 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324(a)(1)(A), 1327, or 1328) (relating to alien smuggling); and

''(7) a conspiracy, attempt, or solicitation to commit an offense described in paragraphs (1) through (6).''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3663(c)(4) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''chapter 46'' and inserting ''section 521, chapter 46,''.

SEC. 205. HIGH INTENSITY INTERSTATE GANG ACTIVITY AREAS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) GOVERNOR.—The term ''Governor'' means a Governor of a State or the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(2) HIGH INTENSITY INTERSTATE GANG ACTIVITY AREA.—The term ''high intensity interstate gang activity area'' means an area within a State that is designated as a high intensity interstate gang activity area under subsection (b)(1).

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means a State of the United States or the District of Columbia.

(b) HIGH INTENSITY INTERSTATE GANG ACTIVITY AREAS.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—The Attorney General, upon consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Governors of appropriate States, may designate as a high intensity interstate gang activity area a specified area that is located—

(A) within a State; or

(B) in more than 1 State.

(2) ASSISTANCE.—In order to provide Federal assistance to a high intensity interstate gang activity area, the Attorney General may—

(A) facilitate the establishment of a regional task force, consisting of Federal, State, and local law enforcement authorities, for the coordinated investigation, disruption, apprehension, and prosecution of criminal activities of gangs and gang members in the high intensity interstate gang activity area; and

(B) direct the detailing from any Federal department or agency (subject to the approval of the head of that department or agency, in the case of a department or agency other than the Department of Justice) of personnel to the high intensity interstate gang activity area.

(3) CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION.—In considering an area (within a State or within more than 1 State) for designation as a high intensity interstate gang activity area under this section, the Attorney General shall consider—

(A) the extent to which gangs from the area are involved in interstate or international criminal activity;

(B) the extent to which the area is affected by the criminal activity of gang members who—

(i) are located in, or have relocated from, other States; or

(ii) are located in, or have immigrated (legally or illegally) from, foreign countries;

(C) the extent to which the area is affected by the criminal activity of gangs that originated in other States or foreign countries;

(D) the extent to which State and local law enforcement agencies have committed resources to respond to the problem of criminal gang activity in the area, as an indication of their determination to respond aggressively to the problem;

(E) the extent to which a significant increase in the allocation of Federal resources would enhance local response to gang-related criminal activities in the area; and

(F) any other criteria that the Attorney General considers to be appropriate.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2004, to be used in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Of amounts made available under paragraph (1) in each fiscal year—

(A) 60 percent shall be used to carry out subsection (b)(2); and

(B) 40 percent shall be used to make grants for community-based programs to provide crime prevention and intervention services that are designed for gang members and at-risk youth in areas designated pursuant to this section as high intensity interstate gang activity areas.

(3) REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall ensure that not less than 10 percent of amounts made available under paragraph (1) in each fiscal year are used to assist rural States affected as described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (b)(3).

(B) DEFINITION OF RURAL STATE.—In this paragraph, the term ''rural State'' has the meaning given the term in section 1501(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796bb(b)).

SEC. 206. INCREASING THE PENALTY FOR USING PHYSICAL FORCE TO TAMPER WITH WITNESSES, VICTIMS, OR INFORMANTS.

Section 1512 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''as provided in paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''as provided in paragraph (3)'';

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) USE OF PHYSICAL FORCE TO TAMPER WITH WITNESSES, VICTIMS, OR INFORMANTS.—Whoever uses physical force or the threat of physical force against any person, or attempts to do so, with intent to—

''(A) influence, delay, or prevent the testimony of any person in an official proceeding;

''(B) cause or induce any person to—

''(i) withhold testimony, or withhold a record, document, or other object, from an official proceeding;

''(ii) alter, destroy, mutilate, or conceal an object with intent to impair the object's integrity or availability for use in an official proceeding;

''(iii) evade legal process summoning that person to appear as a witness, or to produce a record, document, or other object, in an official proceeding; or

''(iv) be absent from an official proceeding to which such person has been summoned by legal process; or

''(C) hinder, delay, or prevent the communication to a law enforcement officer or judge of the United States of information relating to the commission or possible commission of a Federal offense or a violation of conditions of probation, parole, or release pending judicial proceedings;

shall be punished as provided in paragraph (3).''; and

(D) in paragraph (3), as redesignated, by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) in the case of—

''(i) an attempt to murder; or

''(ii) the use of physical force against any person;

imprisonment for not more than 20 years.'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''or physical force''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(j) CONSPIRACY.—Whoever conspires to commit any offense under this section or section 1513 shall be subject to the same penalties as those prescribed for the offense the commission of which was the object of the conspiracy.''.

SEC. 207. AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS TO PROSECUTORS' OFFICES TO COMBAT GANG CRIME AND YOUTH VIOLENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 31702 of subtitle Q of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13862) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) to allow the hiring of additional prosecutors, so that more cases can be prosecuted and backlogs reduced;

''(6) to provide funding to enable prosecutors to address drug, gang, and youth violence problems more effectively;

''(7) to provide funding to assist prosecutors with funding for technology, equipment, and training to assist prosecutors in reducing the incidence of, and increase the successful identification and speed of prosecution of young violent offenders; and

''(8) to provide funding to assist prosecutors in their efforts to engage in community prosecution, problem solving, and conflict resolution techniques through collaborative efforts with police, school officials, probation officers, social service agencies, and community organizations.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 31707 of subtitle Q of title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13867) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 31707. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle, $50,000,000 for 2000 through 2004.''.

SEC. 208. INCREASE IN OFFENSE LEVEL FOR PARTICIPATION IN CRIME AS A GANG MEMBER.

(a) DEFINITION OF CRIMINAL STREET GANG.—In this section, the term ''criminal street gang'' has the meaning given that term in section 521(a) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 204 of this Act.

(b) AMENDMENT OF SENTENCING GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994(p) of title 28, United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission shall amend the Federal Sentencing Guidelines to provide an appropriate enhancement for any Federal offense described in section 521(c) of title 18, United States Code as amended by section 204 of this Act, if the offense was both committed in connection with, or in furtherance of, the activities of a criminal street gang and the defendant was a member of the criminal street gang at the time of the offense.

(2) FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED.—In determining an appropriate enhancement under this section, the United States Sentencing Commission shall give great weight to the seriousness of the offense, the offender's relative position in the criminal gang, and the risk of death or serious bodily injury to any person posed by the offense.

(c) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER GUIDELINES.—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall provide that the increase in the offense level shall be in addition to any other adjustment under chapter 3 of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines.

SEC. 209. INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN TRAVEL OR TRANSPORTATION IN AID OF CRIMINAL GANGS.

(a) TRAVEL ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 1952 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1952. Interstate and foreign travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises

''(a) PROHIBITED CONDUCT AND PENALTIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever—

''(A) travels in interstate or foreign commerce or uses the mail or any facility in interstate or foreign commerce, with intent to—

''(i) distribute the proceeds of any unlawful activity; or

''(ii) otherwise promote, manage, establish, carry on, or facilitate the promotion, management, establishment, or carrying on, of any unlawful activity; and

''(B) after travel or use of the mail or any facility in interstate or foreign commerce described in subparagraph (A), performs, attempts to perform, or conspires to perform an act described in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A);

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

''(2) CRIMES OF VIOLENCE.—Whoever—

''(A) travels in interstate or foreign commerce or uses the mail or any facility in interstate or foreign commerce, with intent to commit any crime of violence to further any unlawful activity; and

''(B) after travel or use of the mail or any facility in interstate or foreign commerce described in subparagraph (A), commits, attempts to commit, or conspires to commit any crime of violence to further any unlawful activity;

shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 20 years, or both, and if death results shall be sentenced to death or be imprisoned for any term of years or for life.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE.—The term 'controlled substance' has the meaning given that term in section 102(6) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(6)).

''(2) STATE.—The term 'State' includes a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

''(3) UNLAWFUL ACTIVITY.—The term 'unlawful activity' means—

''(A) any business enterprise involving gambling, liquor on which the Federal excise tax has not been paid, narcotics or controlled substances, or prostitution offenses in violation of the laws of the State in which the offense is committed or of the United States;

''(B) extortion, bribery, arson, burglary if the offense involves property valued at not less than $10,000, assault with a deadly weapon, assault resulting in bodily injury, shooting at an occupied dwelling or motor vehicle, or retaliation against or intimidation of witnesses, victims, jurors, or informants, in violation of the laws of the State in which the offense is committed or of the United States;

''(C) the use of bribery, force, intimidation, or threat, directed against any person, to delay or influence the testimony of or prevent from testifying a witness in a State criminal proceeding or by any such means to cause any person to destroy, alter, or conceal a record, document, or other object, with intent to impair the object's integrity or availability for use in such a proceeding; or

''(D) any act that is indictable under section 1956 or 1957 of this title or under subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31.''.

(b) AMENDMENT OF SENTENCING GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994(p) of title 28, United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission shall amend chapter 2 of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines to provide an appropriate increase in the offense levels for traveling in interstate or foreign commerce in aid of unlawful activity.

(2) UNLAWFUL ACTIVITY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''unlawful activity'' has the meaning given that term in section 1952(b) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this section.

(3) SENTENCING ENHANCEMENT FOR RECRUITMENT ACROSS STATE LINES.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994(p) of title 28, United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission shall amend the Federal Sentencing Guidelines to provide an appropriate enhancement for a person who, in violating section 522 of title 18, United States Code (as added by section 201 of this Act), recruits, solicits, induces, commands, or causes another person residing in another State to be or to remain a member of a criminal street gang, or crosses a State line with the intent to recruit, solicit, induce, command, or cause another person to be or to remain a member of a criminal street gang.

SEC. 210. PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO FIREARMS.

(a) SERIOUS JUVENILE DRUG OFFENSES AS ARMED CAREER CRIMINAL PREDICATES.—Section 924(e)(2)(A) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by adding ''or'' at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) any act of juvenile delinquency that, if committed by an adult, would be an offense described in clause (i) or (ii);''.

(b) TRANSFER OF FIREARMS TO MINORS FOR USE IN CRIME.—Section 924(h) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''and if the transferee is a person who is under 18 years of age, imprisoned not less than 3 years,'' after ''10 years,''.

SEC. 211. CLONE PAGERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2511(2)(h) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

''(i) to use a pen register, trap and trace device, or clone pager, as those terms are defined in chapter 206 of this title (relating to pen registers, trap and trace devices, and clone pagers); or'';

(b) EXCEPTION.—Section 3121 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this section, no person may install or use a pen register, trap and trace device, or clone pager without first obtaining a court order under section 3123 or 3129 of this title, or under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''a pen register or a trap and trace device'' and inserting ''a pen register, trap and trace device, or clone pager''; and

(3) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

''§ 3121. General prohibition on pen register, trap and trace device, and clone pager use; exception''.

(c) ASSISTANCE.—Section 3124 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (f) as subsections (d) through (g), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) CLONE PAGER.—Upon the request of an attorney for the Government or an officer of a law enforcement agency authorized to use a clone pager under this chapter, a provider of electronic communication service shall furnish to such investigative or law enforcement officer all information, facilities, and technical assistance necessary to accomplish the use of the clone pager unobtrusively and with a minimum of interference with the services that the person so ordered by the court provides to the subscriber, if such assistance is directed by a court order, as provided in section 3129(b)(2) of this title.''; and

(3) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

''§ 3124. Assistance in installation and use of a pen register, trap and trace device, or clone pager''.

(d) EMERGENCY INSTALLATIONS.—Section 3125 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''pen register or a trap and trace device'' and ''pen register or trap and trace device'' each place they appear and inserting ''pen register, trap and trace device, or clone pager'';

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''an order approving the installation or use is issued in accordance with section 3123 of this title'' and inserting ''an application is made for an order approving the installation or use in accordance with section 3122 or section 3128 of this title'';

(3) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following: ''If such application for the use of a clone pager is denied, or in any other case in which the use of the clone pager is terminated without an order having been issued, an inventory shall be served as provided for in section 3129(e) of this title.''; and

(4) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

''§ 3125. Emergency installation and use of pen register, trap and trace device, and clone pager''.

(e) REPORTS.—Section 3126 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''pen register orders and orders for trap and trace devices'' and inserting ''orders for pen registers, trap and trace devices, and clone pagers''; and

(2) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

''§ 3126. Reports concerning pen registers, trap and trace devices, and clone pagers''.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3127 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or'' at the end; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) with respect to an application for the use of a pen register or trap and trace device, a court of general criminal jurisdiction of a State authorized by the law of that State to enter orders authorizing the use of a pen register or a trap and trace device; or

''(C) with respect to an application for the use of a clone pager, a court of general criminal jurisdiction of a State authorized by the law of that State to issue orders authorizing the use of a clone pager;'';

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(3) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) the term 'clone pager' means a numeric display device that receives communications intended for another numeric display paging device.''.

(g) APPLICATIONS.—Chapter 206 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 3128. Application for an order for use of a clone pager

''(a) APPLICATION.—

''(1) FEDERAL REPRESENTATIVES.—Any attorney for the Government may apply to a court of competent jurisdiction for an order or an extension of an order under section 3129 of this title authorizing the use of a clone pager.

''(2) STATE REPRESENTATIVES.—A State investigative or law enforcement officer may, if authorized by a State statute, apply to a court of competent jurisdiction of such State for an order or an extension of an order under section 3129 of this title authorizing the use of a clone pager.

''(b) CONTENTS OF APPLICATION.—An application under subsection (a) of this section shall include—

''(1) the identity of the attorney for the Government or the State law enforcement or investigative officer making the application and the identity of the law enforcement agency conducting the investigation;

''(2) the identity, if known, of the individual or individuals using the numeric display paging device to be cloned;

''(3) a description of the numeric display paging device to be cloned;

''(4) a description of the offense to which the information likely to be obtained by the clone pager relates;

''(5) the identity, if known, of the person who is subject of the criminal investigation; and

''(6) an affidavit or affidavits, sworn to before the court of competent jurisdiction, establishing probable cause to believe that information relevant to an ongoing criminal investigation being conducted by that agency will be obtained through use of the clone pager.

''§ 3129. Issuance of an order for use of a clone pager

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon an application made under section 3128 of this title, the court shall enter an ex parte order authorizing the use of a clone pager within the jurisdiction of the court if the court finds that the application has established probable cause to believe that information relevant to an ongoing criminal investigation being conducted by that agency will be obtained through use of the clone pager.

''(b) CONTENTS OF AN ORDER.—An order issued under this section—

''(1) shall specify—

''(A) the identity, if known, of the individual or individuals using the numeric display paging device to be cloned;

''(B) the numeric display paging device to be cloned;

''(C) the identity, if known, of the subscriber to the pager service; and

''(D) the offense to which the information likely to be obtained by the clone pager relates; and

''(2) shall direct, upon the request of the applicant, the furnishing of information, facilities, and technical assistance necessary to use the clone pager under section 3124 of this title.

''(c) TIME PERIOD AND EXTENSIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An order issued under this section shall authorize the use of a clone pager for a period not to exceed 30 days. Such 30-day period shall begin on the earlier of the day on which the investigative or law enforcement officer first begins use of the clone pager under the order or the tenth day after the order is entered.

''(2) EXTENSIONS.—Extensions of an order issued under this section may be granted, but only upon an application for an order under section 3128 of this title and upon the judicial finding required by subsection (a). An extension under this paragraph shall be for a period not to exceed 30 days.

''(3) REPORT.—Within a reasonable time after the termination of the period of a clone pager order or any extensions thereof under this subsection, the applicant shall report to the issuing court the number of numeric pager messages acquired through the use of the clone pager during such period.

''(d) NONDISCLOSURE OF EXISTENCE OF CLONE PAGER.—An order authorizing the use of a clone pager shall direct that—

''(1) the order shall be sealed until otherwise ordered by the court; and

''(2) the person who has been ordered by the court to provide assistance to the applicant may not disclose the existence of the clone pager or the existence of the investigation to the listed subscriber, or to any other person, until otherwise ordered by the court.

''(e) NOTIFICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Within a reasonable time, not later than 90 days after the date of termination of the period of a clone pager order or any extensions thereof, the issuing judge shall cause to be served, on the individual or individuals using the numeric display paging device that was cloned, an inventory including notice of—

''(A) the fact of the entry of the order or the application;

''(B) the date of the entry and the period of clone pager use authorized, or the denial of the application; and

''(C) whether or not information was obtained through the use of the clone pager.

''(2) POSTPONEMENT.—Upon an ex-parte showing of good cause, a court of competent jurisdiction may in its discretion postpone the serving of the notice required by this subsection.''.

(h) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections for chapter 206 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to section 3121 and inserting the following:

''3121. General prohibition on pen register, trap and trace device, and clone pager use; exception.'';

(2) by striking the items relating to sections 3124, 3125, and 3126 and inserting the following:

''3124. Assistance in installation and use of a pen register, trap and trace device, or clone pager.

''3125. Emergency installation and use of pen register, trap and trace device, and clone pager.

''3126. Reports concerning pen registers, trap and trace devices, and clone pagers.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''3128. Application for an order for use of a clone pager.

''3129. Issuance of an order for use of a clone pager''.

(i) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 704(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 605(a)) is amended by striking ''chapter 119,'' and inserting ''chapters 119 and 206 of''.

TITLE III—JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

Subtitle A—Reform of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974

SEC. 301. FINDINGS; DECLARATION OF PURPOSE; DEFINITIONS.

Title I of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE I—FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

''Congress makes the following findings:

''(1) During the past decade, the United States has experienced an alarming increase in arrests of adolescents for murder, assault, and weapons offenses.

''(2) In 1994, juveniles accounted for 1 in 5 arrests for violent crimes, including murder, robbery, aggravated assault, and rape, including 514 such arrests per 100,000 juveniles 10 through 17 years of age.

''(3) Understaffed and overcrowded juvenile courts, prosecutorial and public defender offices, probation services, and correctional facilities no longer adequately address the changing nature of juvenile crime, protect the public, or correct youth offenders.

''(4) The juvenile justice system has proven inadequate to meet the needs of society and the needs of children who may be at risk of becoming delinquents are not being met.

''(5) Existing programs and policies have not adequately responded to the particular threats that drugs, alcohol abuse, violence, and gangs pose to the youth of the Nation.

''(6) Projected demographic increases in the number of youth offenders require reexamination of current prosecution and incarceration policies for serious violent youth offenders and crime prevention policies.

''(7) State and local communities require assistance to deal comprehensively with the problems of juvenile delinquency.

''(8) Existing Federal programs have not provided the States with necessary flexibility, nor have these programs provided the coordination, resources, and leadership required to meet the crisis of youth violence.

''(9) Overlapping and uncoordinated Federal programs have created a multitude of Federal funding streams to States and units of local government, that have become a barrier to effective program coordination, responsive public safety initiatives, and the provision of comprehensive services for children and youth.

''(10) Violent crime by juveniles constitutes a growing threat to the national welfare that requires an immediate and comprehensive governmental response, combining flexibility and coordinated evaluation.

''(11) The role of the Federal Government should be to encourage and empower communities to develop and implement policies to protect adequately the public from serious juvenile crime as well as implement quality prevention programs that work with at-risk juveniles, their families, local public agencies, and community-based organizations.

''(12) A strong partnership among law enforcement, local government, juvenile and family courts, schools, public recreation agencies, businesses, philanthropic organizations, families, and the religious community, can create a community environment that supports the youth of the Nation in reaching their highest potential and reduces the destructive trend of juvenile crime.

"SEC. 102. PURPOSE AND STATEMENT OF POLICY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The purposes of this Act are to—

''(1) empower States and communities to develop and implement comprehensive programs that support families, reduce risk factors, and prevent serious youth crime and juvenile delinquency;

''(2) protect the public and to hold juveniles accountable for their acts;

''(3) encourage and promote, consistent with the ideals of federalism, the adoption by the States of policies recognizing the rights of victims in the juvenile justice system, and ensuring that the victims of violent crimes committed by juveniles receive the same level of justice as do the victims of violent crimes committed by adults;

''(4) provide for the thorough and ongoing evaluation of all federally funded programs addressing juvenile crime and delinquency;

''(5) provide technical assistance to public and private nonprofit entities that protect public safety, administer justice and corrections to delinquent youth, or provide services to youth at risk of delinquency, and their families;

''(6) establish a centralized research effort on the problems of youth crime and juvenile delinquency, including the dissemination of the findings of such research and all related data;

''(7) establish a Federal assistance program to deal with the problems of runaway and homeless youth;

''(8) assist States and units of local government in improving the administration of justice for juveniles;

''(9) assist the States and units of local government in reducing the level of youth violence and juvenile delinquency;

''(10) assist States and units of local government in promoting public safety by supporting juvenile delinquency prevention and control activities;

''(11) encourage and promote programs designed to keep in school juvenile delinquents expelled or suspended for disciplinary reasons;

''(12) assist States and units of local government in promoting public safety by encouraging accountability for acts of juvenile delinquency;

''(13) assist States and units of local government in promoting public safety by improving the extent, accuracy, availability and usefulness of juvenile court and law enforcement records and the openness of the juvenile justice system;

''(14) assist States and units of local government in promoting public safety by encouraging the identification of violent and hardcore juveniles;

''(15) assist States and units of local government in promoting public safety by providing resources to States to build or expand juvenile detention facilities;

''(16) provide for the evaluation of federally assisted juvenile crime control programs, and the training necessary for the establishment and operation of such programs;

''(17) ensure the dissemination of information regarding juvenile crime control programs by providing a national clearinghouse; and

''(18) provide technical assistance to public and private nonprofit juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs.

''(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of Congress to provide resources, leadership, and coordination to—

''(1) combat youth violence and to prosecute and punish effectively violent juvenile offenders;

''(2) enhance efforts to prevent juvenile crime and delinquency; and

''(3) improve the quality of juvenile justice in the United States.

"SEC. 103. DEFINITIONS.

''In this Act:

''(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention, appointed in accordance with section 201.

''(2) ADULT INMATE.—The term 'adult inmate' means an individual who—

''(A) has reached the age of full criminal responsibility under applicable State law; and

''(B) has been arrested and is in custody for, awaiting trial on, or convicted of criminal charges.

''(3) BOOT CAMP.—The term 'boot camp' means a residential facility (excluding a private residence) at which there are provided—

''(A) a highly regimented schedule of discipline, physical training, work, drill, and ceremony characteristic of military basic training;

''(B) regular, remedial, special, and vocational education;

''(C) counseling and treatment for substance abuse and other health and mental health problems;

''(D) supervision by properly screened staff, who are trained and experienced in working with juveniles or young adults, in highly structured, disciplined surroundings, characteristic of a military environment; and

''(E) participation in community service programs, such as counseling sessions, mentoring, community service, or restitution projects, and a comprehensive aftercare plan developed through close coordination with Federal, State, and local agencies, and in cooperation with business and private organizations, as appropriate.

''(4) BUREAU OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE.—The term 'Bureau of Justice Assistance' means the bureau established by section 401 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3741).

''(5) BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS.—The term 'Bureau of Justice Statistics' means the bureau established by section 302(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3732).

''(6) COLLOCATED FACILITIES.—The term 'collocated facilities' means facilities that are located in the same building, or are part of a related complex of buildings located on the same grounds.

''(7) COMBINATION.—The term 'combination' as applied to States or units of local government means any grouping or joining together of such States or units for the purpose of preparing, developing, or implementing a juvenile crime control and delinquency prevention plan.

''(8) COMMUNITY-BASED.—The term 'community-based' facility, program, or service means a small, open group home or other suitable place located near the juvenile's home or family and programs of community supervision and service that maintain community and consumer participation in the planning operation, and evaluation of their programs which may include, medical, educational, vocational, social, and psychological guidance, training, special education, counseling, alcoholism treatment, drug treatment, and other rehabilitative services.

''(9) COMPREHENSIVE AND COORDINATED SYSTEM OF SERVICES.—The term 'comprehensive and coordinated system of services' means a system that—

''(A) ensures that services and funding for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency are consistent with policy goals of preserving families and providing appropriate services in the least restrictive environment so as to simultaneously protect juveniles and maintain public safety;

''(B) identifies, and intervenes early for the benefit of, young children who are at risk of developing emotional or behavioral problems because of physical or mental stress or abuse, and for the benefit of their families;

''(C) increases interagency collaboration and family involvement in the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency; and

''(D) encourages private and public partnerships in the delivery of services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

''(10) CONSTRUCTION.—The term 'construction' means erection of new buildings or acquisition, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and initial equipment of any such buildings, or any combination of such activities (including architects' fees but not the cost of acquisition of land for buildings).

''(11) FEDERAL JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL, PREVENTION, AND JUVENILE OFFENDER ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM.—The term 'Federal juvenile

crime control, prevention, and juvenile offender accountability program' means any Federal program a primary objective of which is the prevention of juvenile crime or reduction of the incidence of arrest, the commission of criminal acts or acts of delinquency, violence, the use of alcohol or illegal drugs, or the involvement in gangs among juveniles.

''(12) GENDER-SPECIFIC SERVICES.—The term 'gender-specific services' means services designed to address needs unique to the gender of the individual to whom such services are provided.

''(13) GRADUATED SANCTIONS.—The term 'graduated sanctions' means an accountability-based juvenile justice system that protects the public, and holds juvenile delinquents accountable for acts of delinquency by providing substantial and appropriate sanctions that are graduated in such a manner as to reflect (for each act of delinquency or offense) the severity or repeated nature of that act or offense, and in which there is sufficient flexibility to allow for individualized sanctions and services suited to the individual juvenile offender.

''(14) HOME-BASED ALTERNATIVE SERVICES.—The term 'home-based alternative services' means services provided to a juvenile in the home of the juvenile as an alternative to incarcerating the juvenile, and includes home detention.

''(15) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian tribe' means any Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community, including any Alaska Native village or regional or village corporation as defined in or established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), that is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.

''(16) JUVENILE.—The term 'juvenile' means a person who has not attained the age of 18 years who is subject to delinquency proceedings under applicable State law.

''(17) JUVENILE POPULATION.—The term 'juvenile population' means the population of a State under 18 years of age.

''(18) JAIL OR LOCKUP FOR ADULTS.—The term 'jail or lockup for adults' means a locked facility that is used by a State, unit of local government, or any law enforcement authority to detain or confine adults—

''(A) pending the filing of a charge of violating a criminal law;

''(B) awaiting trial on a criminal charge; or

''(C) convicted of violating a criminal law.

''(19) JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PROGRAM.—The term 'juvenile delinquency program' means any program or activity related to juvenile delinquency prevention, control, diversion, treatment, rehabilitation, planning, education, training, and research, including—

''(A) drug and alcohol abuse programs;

''(B) the improvement of the juvenile justice system; and

''(C) any program or activity that is designed to reduce known risk factors for juvenile delinquent behavior, by providing activities that build on protective factors for, and develop competencies in, juveniles to prevent and reduce the rate of delinquent juvenile behavior.

''(20) LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE.—The term 'law enforcement and criminal justice' means any activity pertaining to crime prevention, control, or reduction or the enforcement of the criminal law, including, but not limited to police efforts to prevent, control, or reduce crime or to apprehend criminals, activities of courts having criminal jurisdiction and related agencies (including prosecutorial and defender services), activities of corrections, probation, or parole authorities, and programs relating to the prevention, control, or reduction of juvenile delinquency or narcotic addiction.

''(21) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE.—The term 'National Institute of Justice' means the institute established by section 202(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3721).

''(22) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.—The term 'nonprofit organization' means an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(23) OFFICE.—The term 'Office' means the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention established under section 201.

''(24) OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS.—The term 'Office of Justice Programs' means the office established by section 101 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711).

''(25) OUTCOME OBJECTIVE.—The term 'outcome objective' means an objective that relates to the impact of a program or initiative, that measures the reduction of high risk behaviors, such as incidence of arrest, the commission of criminal acts or acts of delinquency, failure in school, violence, the use of alcohol or illegal drugs, involvement of youth gangs, violent and unlawful acts of animal cruelty, and teenage pregnancy, among youth in the community.

''(26) PROCESS OBJECTIVE.—The term 'process objective' means an objective that relates to the manner in which a program or initiative is carried out, including—

''(A) an objective relating to the degree to which the program or initiative is reaching the target population; and

''(B) an objective relating to the degree to which the program or initiative addresses known risk factors for youth problem behaviors and incorporates activities that inhibit the behaviors and that build on protective factors for youth.

''(27) PROHIBITED PHYSICAL CONTACT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'prohibited physical contact' means—

''(i) any physical contact between a juvenile and an adult inmate; and

''(ii) proximity that provides an opportunity for physical contact between a juvenile and an adult inmate.

''(B) EXCLUSION.—The term does not include supervised proximity between a juvenile and an adult inmate that is brief and inadvertent, or accidental, in secure areas of a facility that are not dedicated to use by juvenile offenders and that are nonresidential, which may include dining, recreational, educational, vocational, health care, entry areas, and passageways.

''(28) RELATED COMPLEX OF BUILDINGS.—The term 'related complex of buildings' means 2 or more buildings that share—

''(A) physical features, such as walls and fences, or services beyond mechanical services (heating, air conditioning, water and sewer); or

''(B) the specialized services that are allowable under section 31.303(e)(3)(i)(C)(3) of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on December 10, 1996.

''(29) SECURE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY.—The term 'secure correctional facility' means any public or private residential facility that—

''(A) includes construction fixtures designed to physically restrict the movements and activities of juveniles or other individuals held in lawful custody in such facility; and

''(B) is used for the placement, after adjudication and disposition, of any juvenile who has been adjudicated as having committed an offense or any other individual convicted of a criminal offense.

''(30) SECURE DETENTION FACILITY.—The term 'secure detention facility' means any public or private residential facility that—

''(A) includes construction fixtures designed to physically restrict the movements and activities of juveniles or other individuals held in lawful custody in such facility; and

''(B) is used for the temporary placement of any juvenile who is accused of having committed an offense or of any other individual accused of having committed a criminal offense.

''(31) SERIOUS CRIME.—The term 'serious crime' means criminal homicide, rape or other sex offenses punishable as a felony, mayhem, kidnapping, aggravated assault, drug trafficking, robbery, larceny or theft punishable as a felony, motor vehicle theft, burglary or breaking and entering, extortion accompanied by threats of violence, and arson punishable as a felony.

''(32) STATE.—The term 'State' means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

''(33) STATE OFFICE.—The term 'State office' means an office designated by the chief executive officer of a State to carry out this title, as provided in section 507 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3757).

''(34) SUSTAINED ORAL COMMUNICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'sustained oral communication' means the imparting or interchange of speech by or between an adult inmate and a juvenile.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—The term does not include—

''(i) communication that is accidental or incidental; or

''(ii) sounds or noises that cannot reasonably be considered to be speech.

''(35) TREATMENT.—The term 'treatment' includes medical and other rehabilitative services designed to protect the public, including any services designed to benefit addicts and other users by—

''(A) eliminating their dependence on alcohol or other addictive or nonaddictive drugs; or

''(B) controlling or reducing their dependence and susceptibility to addiction or use.

''(36) UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term 'unit of local government' means—

''(A) any city, county, township, town, borough, parish, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State;

''(B) any law enforcement district or judicial enforcement district that—

''(i) is established under applicable State law; and

''(ii) has the authority to, in a manner independent of other State entities, establish a budget and raise revenues;

''(C) an Indian tribe that performs law enforcement functions, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior; or

''(D) for the purposes of assistance eligibility, any agency of the government of the District of Columbia or the Federal Government that performs law enforcement functions in and for—

''(i) the District of Columbia; or

''(ii) any Trust Territory of the United States.

''(37) VALID COURT ORDER.—The term 'valid court order' means a court order given by a juvenile court judge to a juvenile—

''(A) who was brought before the court and made subject to such order; and

''(B) who received, before the issuance of such order, the full due process rights guaranteed to such juvenile by the Constitution of the United States.

''(38) VIOLENT CRIME.—The term 'violent crime' means—

''(A) murder or nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, or robbery; or

''(B) aggravated assault committed with the use of a firearm.

''(39) YOUTH.—The term 'youth' means an individual who is not less than 6 years of age and not more than 17 years of age.''.

SEC. 302. JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND PREVENTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5611 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND PREVENTION

''PART A—OFFICE OF JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND PREVENTION

"SEC. 201. ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Department of Justice, under the general authority of the Attorney General, an Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention.

''(b) ADMINISTRATOR.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Office shall be headed by an Administrator, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among individuals who have had experience in juvenile delinquency prevention and crime control programs.

''(2) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator may prescribe regulations consistent with this Act to award, administer, modify, extend, terminate, monitor, evaluate, reject, or deny all grants and contracts from, and applications for, amounts made available under this title.

''(3) RELATIONSHIP TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Administrator shall have the same reporting relationship with the Attorney General as the directors of other offices and bureaus within the Office of Justice Programs have with the Attorney General.

''(c) DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR.—There shall be in the Office a Deputy Administrator, who shall be appointed by the Attorney General. The Deputy Administrator shall perform such functions as the Administrator may assign or delegate and shall act as the Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator.

''(d) ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be in the Office an Associate Administrator, who shall be appointed by the Administrator, and who shall be treated as a career reserved position within the meaning of section 3132 of title 5, United States Code.

''(2) DUTIES.—The duties of the Associate Administrator shall include keeping Congress, other Federal agencies, outside organizations, and State and local government officials informed about activities carried out by the Office.

''(e) DELEGATION AND ASSIGNMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise expressly prohibited by law or otherwise provided by this title, the Administrator may—

''(A) delegate any of the functions of the Administrator, and any function transferred or granted to the Administrator after the date of enactment of the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act of 1999, to such officers and employees of the Office as the Administrator may designate; and

''(B) authorize successive redelegations of such functions as may be necessary or appropriate.

''(2) RESPONSIBILITY.—No delegation of functions by the Administrator under this subsection or under any other provision of this title shall relieve the Administrator of responsibility for the administration of such functions.

''(f) REORGANIZATION.—The Administrator may allocate or reallocate any function transferred among the officers of the Office, and establish, consolidate, alter, or discontinue such organizational entities in that Office as may be necessary or appropriate.

"SEC. 202. PERSONNEL, SPECIAL PERSONNEL, EXPERTS, AND CONSULTANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, including attorneys, as are necessary to perform the functions vested in the Administrator and to prescribe their functions.

''(b) OFFICERS.—The Administrator may select, appoint, and employ not to exceed 4 officers and to fix their compensation at rates not to exceed the maximum rate payable under section 5376 of title 5, United States Code.

''(c) DETAIL OF FEDERAL PERSONNEL.—Upon the request of the Administrator, the head of any Federal agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of its personnel to the Administrator to assist the Administrator in carrying out the functions of the Administrator under this title.

''(d) SERVICES.—The Administrator may obtain services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not to exceed the rate now or hereafter payable under section 5376 of title 5, United States Code.

"SEC. 203. VOLUNTARY SERVICE.

''The Administrator may accept and employ, in carrying out the provisions of this Act, voluntary and uncompensated services notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679(b) of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665(b)).

"SEC. 204. NATIONAL PROGRAM.

''(a) NATIONAL JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL, PREVENTION, AND JUVENILE OFFENDER ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the general authority of the Attorney General, the Administrator shall develop objectives, priorities, and short- and long-term plans, and shall implement overall policy and a strategy to carry out such plan, for all Federal juvenile crime control, prevention, and juvenile offender accountability programs and activities relating to improving juvenile crime control, the rehabilitation of juvenile offenders, the prevention of juvenile crime, and the enhancement of accountability by offenders within the juvenile justice system in the United States.

''(2) CONTENTS OF PLANS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each plan described in paragraph (1) shall—

''(i) contain specific, measurable goals and criteria for reducing the incidence of crime and delinquency among juveniles, improving juvenile crime control, and ensuring accountability by offenders within the juvenile justice system in the United States, and shall include criteria for any discretionary grants and contracts, for conducting research, and for carrying out other activities under this title;

''(ii) provide for coordinating the administration of programs and activities under this title with the administration of all other Federal juvenile crime control, prevention, and juvenile offender accountability programs and activities, including proposals for joint funding to be coordinated by the Administrator;

''(iii) provide a detailed summary and analysis of the most recent data available regarding the number of juveniles taken into custody, the rate at which juveniles are taken into custody, the time served by juveniles in custody, and the trends demonstrated by such data;

''(iv) provide a description of the activities for which amounts are expended under this title;

''(v) provide specific information relating to the attainment of goals set forth in the plan, including specific, measurable standards for assessing progress toward national juvenile crime reduction and juvenile offender accountability goals; and

''(vi) provide for the coordination of Federal, State, and local initiatives for the reduction of youth crime, preventing delinquency, and ensuring accountability for juvenile offenders.

''(B) SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS.—Each summary and analysis under subparagraph (A)(iii) shall set out the information required by clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of this subparagraph separately for juvenile nonoffenders, juvenile status offenders, and other juvenile offenders. Such summary and analysis shall separately address with respect to each category of juveniles specified in the preceding sentence—

''(i) the types of offenses with which the juveniles are charged;

''(ii) the ages of the juveniles;

''(iii) the types of facilities used to hold the juveniles (including juveniles treated as adults for purposes of prosecution) in custody, including secure detention facilities, secure correctional facilities, jails, and lockups;

''(iv) the length of time served by juveniles in custody; and

''(v) the number of juveniles who died or who suffered serious bodily injury while in custody and the circumstances under which each juvenile died or suffered such injury.

''(C) DEFINITION OF SERIOUS BODILY INJURY.—In this paragraph, the term 'serious bodily injury' means bodily injury involving extreme physical pain or the impairment of a function of a bodily member, organ, or mental faculty that requires medical intervention such as surgery, hospitalization, or physical rehabilitation.

''(3) ANNUAL REVIEW.—The Administrator shall annually—

''(A) review each plan submitted under this subsection;

''(B) revise the plans, as the Administrator considers appropriate; and

''(C) not later than March 1 of each year, present the plans to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives.

''(b) DUTIES OF ADMINISTRATOR.—In carrying out this title, the Administrator shall—

''(1) advise the President through the Attorney General as to all matters relating to federally assisted juvenile crime control, prevention, and juvenile offender accountability programs, and Federal policies regarding juvenile crime and justice, including policies relating to juveniles prosecuted or adjudicated in the Federal courts;

''(2) implement and coordinate Federal juvenile crime control, prevention, and juvenile offender accountability programs and activities among Federal departments and agencies and between such programs and activities and other Federal programs and activities that the Administrator determines may have an important bearing on the success of the entire national juvenile crime control, prevention, and juvenile offender accountability effort including, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget listing annually those programs to be considered Federal juvenile crime control, prevention, and juvenile accountability programs for the following fiscal year;

''(3) serve as a single point of contact for States, units of local government, and private entities to apply for and coordinate the use of and access to all Federal juvenile crime control, prevention, and juvenile offender accountability programs;

''(4) provide for the auditing of grants provided pursuant to this title;

''(5) collect, prepare, and disseminate useful data regarding the prevention, correction, and control of juvenile crime and delinquency, and issue, not less frequently than once each calendar year, a report on successful programs and juvenile crime reduction methods utilized by States, localities, and private entities;

''(6) ensure the performance of comprehensive rigorous independent scientific evaluations, each of which shall—

''(A) be independent in nature, and shall employ rigorous and scientifically valid standards and methodologies; and

''(B) include measures of outcome and process objectives, such as reductions in juvenile crime, youth gang activity, youth substance abuse, and other high risk factors, as well as increases in protective factors that reduce the likelihood of delinquency and criminal behavior;

''(7) involve consultation with appropriate authorities in the States and with appropriate private entities in the development, review, and revision of the plans required by subsection (a) and in the development of policies relating to juveniles prosecuted or adjudicated in the Federal courts;

''(8) provide technical assistance to the States, units of local government, and private entities in implementing programs funded by grants under this title;

''(9) provide technical and financial assistance to an organization composed of member

representatives of the State advisory groups appointed under section 222(b)(2) to carry out activities under this paragraph, if such an organization agrees to carry out activities that include—

''(A) conducting an annual conference of such member representatives for purposes relating to the activities of such State advisory groups;

''(B) disseminating information, data, standards, advanced techniques, and programs models developed through the Institute and through programs funded under section 261; and

''(C) advising the Administrator with respect to particular functions or aspects of the work of the Office; and

''(10) provide technical and financial assistance to an eligible organization composed of member representatives of the State advisory groups appointed under section 222(b)(2) to assist such organization to carry out the functions specified under subparagraph (A).

''(A) To be eligible to receive such assistance such organization shall agree to carry out activities that include—

''(i) conducting an annual conference of such member representatives for purposes relating to the activities of such State advisory groups; and

''(ii) disseminating information, data, standards, advanced techniques, and program models developed through the Institute and through programs funded under section 261.

''(c) INFORMATION, REPORTS, STUDIES, AND SURVEYS FROM OTHER AGENCIES.—The Administrator through the general authority of the Attorney General, may require, through appropriate authority, Federal departments and agencies engaged in any activity involving any Federal juvenile crime control, prevention, and juvenile offender accountability program to provide the Administrator with such information and reports, and to conduct such studies and surveys, as the Administrator determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

''(d) UTILIZATION OF SERVICES AND FACILITIES OF OTHER AGENCIES; REIMBURSEMENT.—The Administrator, through the general authority of the Attorney General, may utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement as may be agreed upon.

''(e) COORDINATION OF FUNCTIONS OF ADMINISTRATOR AND SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—All functions of the Administrator shall be coordinated as appropriate with the functions of the Secretary of Health and Human Services under title III.

''(f) ANNUAL JUVENILE DELINQUENCY DEVELOPMENT STATEMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal agency that administers a Federal juvenile crime control, prevention, and juvenile offender accountability program shall annually submit to the Administrator a juvenile crime control, prevention, and juvenile offender accountability development statement.

''(2) CONTENTS.—Each development statement submitted under paragraph (1) shall contain such information, data, and analyses as the Administrator may require. Such analyses shall include an analysis of the extent to which the program of the Federal agency submitting such development statement conforms with and furthers Federal juvenile crime control, prevention, and juvenile offender accountability, prevention, and treatment goals and policies.

''(3) REVIEW AND COMMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall review and comment upon each juvenile crime control, prevention, and juvenile offender accountability development statement transmitted to the Administrator under paragraph (1).

''(B) INCLUSION IN OTHER DOCUMENTATION.—The development statement transmitted under paragraph (1), together with the comments of the Administrator under subparagraph (A), shall be—

''(i) included by the Federal agency involved in every recommendation or request made by such agency for Federal legislation that significantly affects juvenile crime control, prevention, and juvenile offender accountability; and

''(ii) made available for promulgation to and use by State and local government officials, and by nonprofit organizations involved in delinquency prevention programs.

''(g) JOINT FUNDING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if funds are made available by more than 1 Federal agency to be used by any agency, organization, institution, or individual to carry out a Federal juvenile crime control, prevention, or juvenile offender accountability program or activity—

''(1) any 1 of the Federal agencies providing funds may be requested by the Administrator to act for all in administering the funds advanced; and

''(2) in such a case, a single non-Federal share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each Federal agency, and the Administrator may order any such agency to waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined in those regulations) that is inconsistent with the similar requirement of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose.

''SEC. 205. JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION CHALLENGE GRANT PROGRAM.

''(a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.—The Administrator may make grants to eligible States in accordance with this part for the purpose of providing financial assistance to eligible entities to carry out projects designed to prevent juvenile delinquency, including—

''(1) educational projects or supportive services for delinquent or other juveniles—

''(A) to encourage juveniles to remain in elementary and secondary schools or in alternative learning situations in educational settings;

''(B) to provide services to assist juveniles in making the transition to the world of work and self-sufficiency;

''(C) to assist in identifying learning difficulties (including learning disabilities);

''(D) to prevent unwarranted and arbitrary suspensions and expulsions;

''(E) to encourage new approaches and techniques with respect to the prevention of school violence and vandalism;

''(F) that assist law enforcement personnel and juvenile justice personnel to more effectively recognize and provide for learning-disabled and other disabled juveniles;

''(G) that develop locally coordinated policies and programs among education, juvenile justice, public recreation, and social service agencies; or

''(H) to provide services to juveniles with serious mental and emotional disturbances (SED) who are in need of mental health services;

''(2) projects that provide support and treatment to—

''(A) juveniles who are at risk of delinquency because they are the victims of child abuse or neglect; and

''(B) juvenile offenders who are victims of child abuse or neglect and to their families, in order to reduce the likelihood that such juvenile offenders will commit subsequent violations of law;

''(3) to develop, implement or operate projects for the prevention or reduction of truancy through partnerships between local education agencies, local law enforcement, and, as appropriate, other community groups;

''(4) projects that support State and local programs to prevent juvenile delinquency by providing for—

''(A) assessments by qualified mental health professionals of incarcerated juveniles who are suspected of being in need of mental health services;

''(B) the development of individualized treatment plans for juveniles determined to be in need of mental health services pursuant to assessments under subparagraph (A);

''(C) the inclusion of discharge plans for incarcerated juveniles determined to be in need of mental health services; and

''(D) requirements that all juveniles receiving psychotropic medication be under the care of a licensed mental health professional;

''(5) one-on-one mentoring projects that are designed to link at-risk juveniles and juvenile offenders who did not commit serious crime, particularly juveniles residing in high-crime areas and juveniles experiencing educational failure, with responsible adults (such as law enforcement officers, adults working with local businesses, public recreation staff, and adults working for community-based organizations and agencies) who are properly screened and trained and that—

''(A) the State establish criteria to assess the quality of those one-on-one mentoring projects;

''(B) the Administrator develop an annual report on the best mentoring practices in those projects; and

''(C) the State choose exemplary projects, designated Gold Star Mentoring Projects, to receive preferential access to funding;

''(6) community-based projects and services (including literacy and social service programs) that work with juvenile offenders, including those from families with limited English-speaking proficiency, their parents, their siblings, and other family members during and after incarceration of the juvenile offenders, in order to strengthen families, to allow juvenile offenders to remain in their homes, and to prevent the involvement of other juvenile family members in delinquent activities;

''(7) projects designed to provide for the treatment of juveniles for dependence on or abuse of alcohol, drugs, or other harmful substances, giving priority to juveniles who have been arrested for an alleged act of juvenile delinquency or adjudicated delinquent;

''(8) projects that leverage funds to provide scholarships for postsecondary education and training for low-income juveniles who reside in neighborhoods with high rates of poverty, violence, and drug-related crimes;

''(9) projects (including school- or community-based projects) that are designed to prevent, and reduce the rate of, the participation of juveniles in gangs that commit crimes (particularly violent crimes), that unlawfully use firearms and other weapons, or that unlawfully traffic in drugs and that involve, to the extent practicable, families and other community members (including law enforcement personnel and members of the business community) in the activities conducted under such projects, including youth violence courts targeted to juveniles aged 14 and younger;

''(10) comprehensive juvenile justice and delinquency prevention projects that meet the needs of juveniles through the collaboration of the many local service systems juveniles encounter, including schools, child abuse and neglect courts, courts, law enforcement agencies, child protection agencies, mental health agencies, welfare services, health care agencies, public recreation agencies, and private nonprofit agencies offering services to juveniles;

''(11) to develop, implement, and support, in conjunction with public and private agencies, organizations, and businesses, projects for the employment of juveniles and referral to job training programs (including referral to Federal job training programs);

''(12) delinquency prevention activities that involve youth clubs, sports, recreation and parks, peer counseling and teaching, the arts, leadership development, community service, volunteer service, before- and after-school programs, violence prevention activities, mediation skills training, camping, environmental education, ethnic or cultural enrichment, tutoring, and academic enrichment;

''(13) to establish policies and systems to incorporate relevant child protective services records into juvenile justice records for purposes

of establishing treatment plans for juvenile offenders;

''(14) family strengthening activities, such as mutual support groups for parents and their children and postadoption services for families who adopt children with special needs;

''(15) adoptive parent recruitment activities targeted at recruiting permanent adoptive families for older children and children with special needs in the foster care system who are at risk of entering the juvenile justice system;

''(16) projects to coordinate the delivery of adolescent mental health and substance abuse services to children at risk by coordinating councils composed of public and private service providers;

''(17) partnerships between State educational agencies and local educational agencies for the design and implementation of character education and training programs that incorporate the following elements of character: Caring, citizenship, fairness, respect, responsibility and trustworthiness;

''(18) programs for positive youth development that provide youth at risk of delinquency with—

''(A) an ongoing relationship with a caring adult (for example, mentor, tutor, coach, or shelter youth worker);

''(B) safe places and structured activities during nonschool hours;

''(C) a healthy start;

''(D) a marketable skill through effective education; and

''(E) an opportunity to give back through community service;

''(19) projects that use neighborhood courts or panels that increase victim satisfaction and require juveniles to make restitution, or perform community service, for the damage caused by their delinquent acts;

''(20) programs designed and operated to provide eligible offenders with an alternative to adjudication that emphasizes restorative justice;

''(21) projects that expand the use of probation officers—

''(A) particularly for the purpose of permitting nonviolent juvenile offenders, including status offenders, to remain at home with their families as an alternative to detention; and

''(B) to ensure that juveniles follow the terms of their probation; and

''(22) projects that provide for initial intake screening, which may include drug testing, of each juvenile taken into custody—

''(A) to determine the likelihood that such juvenile will commit a subsequent offense; and

''(B) to provide appropriate interventions to prevent such juvenile from committing subsequent offenses.

''(b) ELIGIBILITY OF STATES.—

''(1) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a), a State shall submit to the Administrator an application that contains the following:

''(A) An assurance that the State will use—

''(i) not more than 5 percent of such grant, in the aggregate, for—

''(I) the costs incurred by the State to carry out this part; and

''(II) to evaluate, and provide technical assistance relating to, projects and activities carried out with funds provided under this part; and

''(ii) the remainder of such grant to make grants under subsection (c).

''(B) An assurance that, and a detailed description of how, such grant will support, and not supplant State and local efforts to prevent juvenile delinquency.

''(C) An assurance that such application was prepared after consultation with and participation by—

''(i) community-based organizations that carry out programs, projects, or activities to prevent juvenile delinquency; and

''(ii) police, sheriff, prosecutors, State or local probation services, juvenile courts, schools, public recreation agencies, businesses, and religious affiliated fraternal, nonprofit, and social service organizations involved in crime prevention.

''(D) An assurance that each eligible entity described in subsection (c)(1) that receives an initial grant under subsection (c) to carry out a project or activity shall also receive an assurance from the State that such entity will receive from the State, for the subsequent fiscal year to carry out such project or activity, a grant under such section in an amount that is proportional, based on such initial grant and on the amount of the grant received under subsection (a) by the State for such subsequent fiscal year, but that does not exceed the amount specified for such subsequent fiscal year in such application as approved by the State.

''(E) An assurance that each eligible entity described in subsection (c)(1) that receives a grant to carry out a project or activity under subsection (c) has agreed to provide a 50 percent match of the amount of the grant, including the value of in-kind contributions to fund the project or activity, except that the Administrator may for good cause reduce the matching requirement to 33⅓ percent for economically disadvantaged communities.

''(F) An assurance that projects or activities funded by a grant under subsection (a) shall be carried out through or in coordination with a court with a juvenile crime or delinquency docket.

''(G) An assurance that of the grant funds remaining after administrative costs are deducted consistent with subparagraph (A)—

''(i) not less than 80 percent shall be used for the purposes designated in paragraphs (1) through (18) of subsection (a); and

''(ii) not less than 20 percent shall be used for the purposes in paragraphs (19) through (22) of subsection (a).

''(H) Such other information as the Administrator may reasonably require by rule.

''(2) APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.—

''(A) APPROVAL REQUIRED.—Subject to subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall approve an application, and amendments to such application submitted in subsequent fiscal years, that satisfy the requirements of paragraph (1).

''(B) LIMITATION.—The Administrator may not approve such application (including amendments to such application) for a fiscal year unless—

''(i)(I) the State submitted a plan under section 222 for such fiscal year; and

''(II) such plan is approved by the Administrator for such fiscal year; or

''(ii) the Administrator waives the application of clause (i) to such State for such fiscal year, after finding good cause for such a waiver.

''(c) GRANTS FOR LOCAL PROJECTS.—

''(1) SELECTION FROM AMONG APPLICATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Using a grant received under subsection (a), a State may make grants to eligible entities whose applications are received by the State in accordance with paragraph (2) to carry out projects and activities described in subsection (a).

''(B) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—For purposes of making such grants, the State shall give special consideration to eligible entities that—

''(i) propose to carry out such projects in geographical areas in which there is—

''(I) a disproportionately high level of serious crime committed by juveniles; or

''(II) a recent rapid increase in the number of nonstatus offenses committed by juveniles;

''(ii)(I) agree to carry out such projects or activities that are multidisciplinary and involve 2 or more eligible entities; or

''(II) represent communities that have a comprehensive plan designed to identify at-risk juveniles and to prevent or reduce the rate of juvenile delinquency, and that involve other entities operated by individuals who have a demonstrated history of involvement in activities designed to prevent juvenile delinquency; and

''(iii) state the amount of resources (in cash or in kind) such entities will provide to carry out such projects and activities.

''(2) RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), a unit of local government shall submit to the State simultaneously all applications that are—

''(i) timely received by such unit from eligible entities; and

''(ii) determined by such unit to be consistent with a current plan formulated by such unit for the purpose of preventing, and reducing the rate of, juvenile delinquency in the geographical area under the jurisdiction of such unit.

''(B) DIRECT SUBMISSION.—If an application submitted to such unit by an eligible entity satisfies the requirements specified in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A), such entity may submit such application directly to the State.

''(d) ELIGIBILITY OF ENTITIES.—

''(1) ELIGIBILITY.—Subject to paragraph (2) and except as provided in paragraph (3), to be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (c), a community-based organization, local juvenile justice system officials (including prosecutors, police officers, judges, probation officers, parole officers, and public defenders), local education authority (as defined in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and including a school within such authority), local recreation agency, nonprofit private organization (including a faith-based organization), unit of local government, or social service provider, and/or other entity with a demonstrated history of involvement in the prevention of juvenile delinquency, shall submit to a unit of local government an application that contains the following:

''(A) An assurance that such applicant will use such grant, and each such grant received for the subsequent fiscal year, to carry out throughout a 2-year period a project or activity described in reasonable detail, and of a kind described in 1 or more of paragraphs (1) through (22) of subsection (a) as specified in, such application.

''(B) A statement of the particular goals such project or activity is designed to achieve, and the methods such entity will use to achieve, and assess the achievement of, each of such goals.

''(C) A statement identifying the research (if any) such entity relied on in preparing such application.

''(2) REVIEW AND SUBMISSION OF APPLICATIONS.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), an entity shall not be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (c) unless—

''(A) such entity submits to a unit of local government an application that—

''(i) satisfies the requirements specified in subsection (a); and

''(ii) describes a project or activity to be carried out in the geographical area under the jurisdiction of such unit; and

''(B) such unit determines that such project or activity is consistent with a current plan formulated by such unit for the purpose of preventing, and reducing the rate of, juvenile delinquency in the geographical area under the jurisdiction of such unit.

''(3) LIMITATION.—If an entity that receives a grant under subsection (c) to carry out a project or activity for a 2-year period, and receives technical assistance from the State or the Administrator after requesting such technical assistance (if any), fails to demonstrate, before the expiration of such 2-year period, that such project or such activity has achieved substantial success in achieving the goals specified in the application submitted by such entity to receive such grants, then such entity shall not be eligible to receive any subsequent grant under such section to continue to carry out such project or activity.

''(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the last day of each fiscal year, the Administrator shall submit to the Chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report, which shall—

''(1) describe activities and accomplishments of grant activities funded under this section;

''(2) describe procedures followed to disseminate grant activity products and research findings;

''(3) describe activities conducted to develop policy and to coordinate Federal agency and interagency efforts related to delinquency prevention;

''(4) identify successful approaches and making the recommendations for future activities to be conducted under this section; and

''(5) describe, on a State-by-State basis, the total amount of matching contributions made by States and eligible entities for activities funded under this section.

''(f) RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), of the amount made available to carry out this section in each fiscal year, the Administrator shall use the lesser of 5 percent or $5,000,000 for research, statistics, and evaluation activities carried out in conjunction with the grant programs under this section.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—No amount shall be available as provided in paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, if amounts are made available for that fiscal year for the National Institute of Justice for evaluation research of juvenile delinquency programs pursuant to subsection (b)(6) or (c)(6) of section 313.

''SEC. 206. GRANTS TO YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS.

''(a) GRANT PROGRAM.—The Administrator may make grants to Indian tribes (as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act) and national, Statewide, or community-based, nonprofit organizations in crime prone areas, (such as Boys and Girls Clubs, Police Athletic Leagues, 4–H Clubs, YWCA, YMCA, Big Brothers and Big Sisters, and Kids 'N Kops programs) for the purposes of—

''(1) providing constructive activities to youth during after school hours, weekends, and school vacations;

''(2) providing supervised activities in safe environments to youth in those areas, including activities through parks and other recreation areas; and

''(3) providing anti-alcohol and other drug education to prevent alcohol and other drug abuse among youth.

''(b) APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) ELIGIBILITY.—In order to be eligible to receive a grant under this section, the governing body of the Indian tribe or the chief operating officer of a national, Statewide, or community-based nonprofit organization shall submit an application to the Administrator, in such form and containing such information as the Administrator may reasonably require.

''(2) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Each application submitted in accordance with paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) a request for a grant to be used for the purposes of this section;

''(B) a description of the communities to be served by the grant, including the nature of juvenile crime, violence, and drug use in the communities;

''(C) written assurances that Federal funds received under this section will be used to supplement and not supplant, non-Federal funds that would otherwise be available for activities funded under this section;

''(D) written assurances that all activities funded under this section will be supervised by an appropriate number of responsible adults;

''(E) a plan for assuring that program activities will take place in a secure environment that is free of crime and drugs; and

''(F) any additional statistical or financial information that the Administrator may reasonably require.

''(c) GRANT AWARDS.—In awarding grants under this section, the Administrator shall consider—

''(1) the ability of the applicant to provide the intended services;

''(2) the history and establishment of the applicant in providing youth activities; and

''(3) the extent to which services will be provided in crime prone areas, including efforts to achieve an equitable geographic distribution of the grant awards.

''(d) ALLOCATION.—Of the amounts made available to carry out this section—

''(1) 20 percent shall be for grants to national or Statewide nonprofit organizations; and

''(2) 80 percent shall be for grants to community-based, nonprofit organizations.

''(e) CONTINUED AVAILABILITY.—Amounts made available under this section shall remain available until expended.

''SEC. 207. GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—From the amount reserved under section 208(b) in each fiscal year, the Administrator shall make grants to Indian tribes for programs pursuant to the permissible purposes under section 205 and part B.

''(b) APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an Indian tribe shall submit to the Administrator an application in such form and containing such information as the Administrator may by regulation require.

''(2) PLANS.—Each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall include a plan for conducting projects described in section 205(a), which plan shall—

''(A) provide evidence that the Indian tribe performs law enforcement functions (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior);

''(B) identify the juvenile justice and delinquency problems and juvenile delinquency prevention needs to be addressed by activities conducted by the Indian tribe in the area under the jurisdiction of the Indian tribe with assistance provided by the grant;

''(C) provide for fiscal control and accounting procedures that—

''(i) are necessary to ensure the prudent use, proper disbursement, and accounting of funds received under this section; and

''(ii) are consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (B); and

''(D) comply with the requirements of section 222(a) (except that such subsection relates to consultation with a State advisory group) and with the requirements of section 222(c); and

''(E) contain such other information, and be subject to such additional requirements, as the Administrator may reasonably prescribe to ensure the effectiveness of the grant program under this section.

''(c) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In awarding grants under this section, the Administrator shall consider—

''(1) the resources that are available to each applicant that will assist, and be coordinated with, the overall juvenile justice system of the Indian tribe; and

''(2) for each Indian tribe that receives assistance under such a grant—

''(A) the relative juvenile population; and

''(B) who will be served by the assistance provided by the grant.

''(d) GRANT AWARDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) COMPETITIVE AWARDS.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Administrator shall annually award grants under this section on a competitive basis. The Administrator shall enter into a grant agreement with each grant recipient under this section that specifies the terms and conditions of the grant.

''(B) PERIOD OF GRANT.—The period of each grant awarded under this section shall be 2 years.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—In any case in which the Administrator determines that a grant recipient under this section has performed satisfactorily during the preceding year in accordance with an applicable grant agreement, the Administrator may—

''(A) waive the requirement that the recipient be subject to the competitive award process described in paragraph (1)(A); and

''(B) renew the grant for an additional grant period (as specified in paragraph (1)(B)).

''(3) MODIFICATIONS OF PROCESSES.—The Administrator may prescribe requirements to provide for appropriate modifications to the plan preparation and application process specified in subsection (b) for an application for a renewal grant under paragraph (2)(B).

''(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Each Indian tribe that receives a grant under this section shall be subject to the fiscal accountability provisions of section 5(f)(1) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450c(f)(1)), relating to the submission of a single-agency audit report required by chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code.

''(f) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—Funds appropriated by Congress for the activities of any agency of an Indian tribal government or the Bureau of Indian Affairs performing law enforcement functions on any Indian lands may be used to provide the non-Federal share of any program or project with a matching requirement funded under this section.

''(g) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—From the amount reserved under section 208(b) in each fiscal year, the Administrator may reserve 1 percent for the purpose of providing technical assistance to recipients of grants under this section.

''SEC. 208. ALLOCATION OF GRANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b), (c), and (d), the amount allocated under section 291 to carry out section 205 in each fiscal year shall be allocated to the States as follows:

''(1) 0.5 percent shall be allocated to each eligible State.

''(2) The amount remaining after the allocation under subparagraph (A) shall be allocated among eligible States as follows:

''(A) 50 percent of such amount shall be allocated proportionately based on the juvenile population in the eligible States.

''(B) 50 percent of such amount shall be allocated proportionately based on the annual average number of arrests for serious crimes committed in the eligible States by juveniles during the then most recently completed period of 3 consecutive calendar years for which sufficient information is available to the Administrator.

''(b) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, from the amounts allocated under section 291 to carry out section 205 and part B in each fiscal year—

''(1) the Administrator shall reserve an amount equal to the amount which all Indian tribes that qualify for a grant under section 207 would collectively be entitled, if such tribes were collectively treated as a State for purposes of subsection (a); and

''(2) the Administrator shall reserve 5 percent to make grants to States under section 209.

''(c) EXCEPTION.—The amount allocated to the Virgin Islands of the United States, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands shall be not less than $75,000 and not more than $100,000.

''(d) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—A State, unit of local government, or eligible unit that receives funds under this part may not use more than 5 percent of those funds to pay for administrative costs.

''SEC. 209. CONFIDENTIAL REPORTING OF INDIVIDUALS SUSPECTED OF IMMINENT SCHOOL VIOLENCE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Grants under this section shall be known as 'CRISIS Grants'.

''(b) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.—From the amounts reserved by the Administrator under section 208(b)(2), the Administrator shall make a grant to each State in an amount determined under subsection (d), for use in accordance with subsection (c).

''(c) USE OF GRANT AMOUNTS.—Amounts made available to a State under a grant under this section may be used by the State—

''(1) to support the independent State development and operation of confidential, toll-free telephone hotlines that will operate 7 days per week, 24 hours per day, in order to provide students, school officials, and other individuals with the opportunity to report specific threats of imminent school violence or to report other suspicious or criminal conduct by juveniles to appropriate State and local law enforcement entities for investigation;

''(2) to ensure proper State training of personnel who answer and respond to telephone calls to hotlines described in paragraph (1);

''(3) to assist in the acquisition of technology necessary to enhance the effectiveness of hotlines described in paragraph (1), including the utilization of Internet web-pages or resources;

''(4) to enhance State efforts to offer appropriate counseling services to individuals who call a hotline described in paragraph (1) threatening to do harm to themselves or others; and

''(5) to further State efforts to publicize the services offered by the hotlines described in paragraph (1) and to encourage individuals to utilize those services.

''(d) ALLOCATION TO STATES.—The total amount reserved to carry out this section in each fiscal year shall be allocated to each State based on the proportion of the population of the State that is less than 18 years of age.

''PART B—FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

''SEC. 221. AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may make grants to States and units of local government, or combinations thereof, to assist them in planning, establishing, operating, coordinating, and evaluating projects directly or through grants and contracts with public and private agencies for the development of more effective education, training, research, prevention, diversion, treatment, and rehabilitation programs in the area of juvenile delinquency and programs to improve the juvenile justice system.

''(b) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—With not to exceed 2 percent of the funds available in a fiscal year to carry out this part, the Administrator shall make grants to and enter into contracts with public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals to provide training and technical assistance to States, units of local governments (and combinations thereof), and local private agencies to facilitate compliance with section 222 and implementation of the State plan approved under section 222(c).

''(2) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS.—Grants may be made and contracts may be entered into under paragraph (1) only to public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals that have experience in providing such training and technical assistance. In providing such training and technical assistance, the recipient of a grant or contract under this subsection shall coordinate its activities with the State agency described in section 222(a)(1).

''SEC. 222. STATE PLANS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to receive formula grants under this part, a State shall submit a plan, developed in consultation with the State Advisory Group established by the State under subsection (b)(2)(A), for carrying out its purposes applicable to a 3-year period. A portion of any allocation of formula grants to a State shall be available to develop a State plan or for other activities associated with such State plan which are necessary for efficient administration, including monitoring, evaluation, and one full-time staff position. The State shall submit annual performance reports to the Administrator, each of which shall describe progress in implementing programs contained in the original plan, and amendments necessary to update the plan, and shall describe the status of compliance with State plan requirements. In accordance with regulations that the Administrator shall prescribe, such plan shall—

''(1) designate a State agency as the sole agency for supervising the preparation and administration of the plan;

''(2) contain satisfactory evidence that the State agency designated in accordance with paragraph (1) has or will have authority, by legislation if necessary, to implement such plan in conformity with this part;

''(3) provide for the active consultation with and participation of units of local government, or combinations thereof, in the development of a State plan that adequately takes into account the needs and requests of units of local government, except that nothing in the plan requirements, or any regulations promulgated to carry out such requirements, shall be construed to prohibit or impede the State from making grants to, or entering into contracts with, local private agencies, including religious organizations;

''(4) to the extent feasible and consistent with paragraph (5), provide for an equitable distribution of the assistance received with the State, including rural areas;

''(5) require that the State or unit of local government that is a recipient of amounts under this part distributes those amounts intended to be used for the prevention of juvenile delinquency and reduction of incarceration, to the extent feasible, in proportion to the amount of juvenile crime committed within those regions and communities;

''(6) provide assurances that youth coming into contact with the juvenile justice system are treated equitably on the basis of gender, race, family income, and disability;

''(7)(A) provide for—

''(i) an analysis of juvenile crime and delinquency problems (including the joining of gangs that commit crimes) and juvenile justice and delinquency prevention needs (including educational needs) of the State (including any geographical area in which an Indian tribe performs law enforcement functions), a description of the services to be provided, and a description of performance goals and priorities, including a specific statement of the manner in which programs are expected to meet the identified juvenile crime problems (including the joining of gangs that commit crimes) and juvenile justice and delinquency prevention needs (including educational needs) of the State;

''(ii) an indication of the manner in which the programs relate to other similar State or local programs that are intended to address the same or similar problems; and

''(iii) a plan for the concentration of State efforts, which shall coordinate all State juvenile crime control, prevention, and delinquency programs with respect to overall policy and development of objectives and priorities for all State juvenile crime control and delinquency programs and activities, including provision for regular meetings of State officials with responsibility in the area of juvenile justice and delinquency prevention;

''(B) contain—

''(i) a plan for providing needed gender-specific services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

''(ii) a plan for providing needed services for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency in rural areas; and

''(iii) a plan for providing needed mental health services to juveniles in the juvenile justice system;

''(8) provide for the coordination and maximum utilization of existing juvenile delinquency programs, programs operated by public and private agencies and organizations, and other related programs (such as education, special education, recreation, health, and welfare programs) in the State;

''(9) provide for the development of an adequate research, training, and evaluation capacity within the State;

''(10) provide that not less than 75 percent of the funds available to the State under section 221, other than funds made available to the State advisory group under this section, whether expended directly by the State, by the unit of local government, or by a combination thereof, or through grants and contracts with public or private nonprofit agencies, shall be used for—

''(A) community-based alternatives (including home-based alternatives) to incarceration and institutionalization, including—

''(i) for youth who need temporary placement: crisis intervention, shelter, and after-care; and

''(ii) for youth who need residential placement: a continuum of foster care or group home alternatives that provide access to a comprehensive array of services;

''(B) programs that assist in holding juveniles accountable for their actions, including the use of graduated sanctions and of neighborhood courts or panels that increase victim satisfaction and require juveniles to make restitution for the damage caused by their delinquent behavior;

''(C) comprehensive juvenile crime control and delinquency prevention programs that meet the needs of youth through the collaboration of the many local systems before which a youth may appear, including schools, courts, law enforcement agencies, child protection agencies, mental health agencies, welfare services, health care agencies, public recreation agencies, and private nonprofit agencies offering youth services;

''(D) programs that provide treatment to juvenile offenders who are victims of child abuse or neglect, and to their families, in order to reduce the likelihood that such juvenile offenders will commit subsequent violations of law;

''(E) educational programs or supportive services for delinquent or other juveniles—

''(i) to encourage juveniles to remain in elementary and secondary schools or in alternative learning situations;

''(ii) to provide services to assist juveniles in making the transition to the world of work and self-sufficiency; and

''(iii) enhance coordination with the local schools that such juveniles would otherwise attend, to ensure that—

''(I) the instruction that juveniles receive outside school is closely aligned with the instruction provided in school; and

''(II) information regarding any learning problems identified in such alternative learning situations are communicated to the schools;

''(F) expanding the use of probation officers—

''(i) particularly for the purpose of permitting nonviolent juvenile offenders (including status offenders) to remain at home with their families as an alternative to incarceration or institutionalization; and

''(ii) to ensure that juveniles follow the terms of their probation;

''(G) one-on-one mentoring programs that are designed to link at-risk juveniles and juvenile offenders, particularly juveniles residing in high-crime areas and juveniles experiencing educational failure, with responsible adults (such as law enforcement officers, adults working with local businesses, and adults working with community-based organizations and agencies) who are properly screened and trained;

''(H) programs designed to develop and implement projects relating to juvenile delinquency and learning disabilities, including on-the-job training programs to assist community services, law enforcement, and juvenile justice personnel to more effectively recognize and provide for learning disabled and other juveniles with disabilities;

''(I) projects designed both to deter involvement in illegal activities and to promote involvement in lawful activities on the part of gangs whose membership is substantially composed of youth;

''(J) programs and projects designed to provide for the treatment of youths' dependence on or abuse of alcohol or other addictive or non-addictive drugs;

''(K) boot camps for juvenile offenders;

''(L) community-based programs and services to work with juveniles, their parents, and other family members during and after incarceration in order to strengthen families so that such juveniles may be retained in their homes;

''(M) other activities (such as court-appointed advocates) that the State determines will hold juveniles accountable for their acts and decrease juvenile involvement in delinquent activities;

''(N) establishing policies and systems to incorporate relevant child protective services records into juvenile justice records for purposes of establishing treatment plans for juvenile offenders;

''(O) programs (including referral to literacy programs and social service programs) to assist families with limited English-speaking ability that include delinquent juveniles to overcome language and other barriers that may prevent the complete treatment of such juveniles and the preservation of their families;

''(P) programs that utilize multidisciplinary interagency case management and information sharing, that enable the juvenile justice and law enforcement agencies, schools, and social service agencies to make more informed decisions regarding early identification, control, supervision, and treatment of juveniles who repeatedly commit violent or serious delinquent acts;

''(Q) programs designed to prevent and reduce hate crimes committed by juveniles;

''(R) court supervised initiatives that address the illegal possession of firearms by juveniles; and

''(S) programs for positive youth development that provide delinquent youth and youth at-risk of delinquency with—

''(i) an ongoing relationship with a caring adult (for example, mentor, tutor, coach, or shelter youth worker);

''(ii) safe places and structured activities during nonschool hours;

''(iii) a healthy start;

''(iv) a marketable skill through effective education; and

''(v) an opportunity to give back through community service;

''(11) shall provide that—

''(A) juveniles who are charged with or who have committed an offense that would not be criminal if committed by an adult, excluding—

''(i) juveniles who are charged with or who have committed a violation of section 922(x)(2) of title 18, United States Code, or of a similar State law;

''(ii) juveniles who are charged with or who have committed a violation of a valid court order; and

''(iii) juveniles who are held in accordance with the Interstate Compact on Juveniles as enacted by the State;

shall not be placed in secure detention facilities or secure correctional facilities; and

''(B) juveniles—

''(i) who are not charged with any offense; and

''(ii) who are—

''(I) aliens; or

''(II) alleged to be dependent, neglected, or abused;

shall not be placed in secure detention facilities or secure correctional facilities;

''(12) provide that—

''(A) juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent or juveniles within the purview of paragraph (11) will not be detained or confined in any institution in which they have prohibited physical contact or sustained oral communication with adult inmates; and

''(B) there is in effect in the State a policy that requires individuals who work with both such juveniles and such adult inmates, including in collocated facilities, have been trained and certified to work with juveniles;

''(13) provide that no juvenile will be detained or confined in any jail or lockup for adults except—

''(A) juveniles who are accused of nonstatus offenses and who are detained in such jail or lockup for a period not to exceed 6 hours—

''(i) for processing or release;

''(ii) while awaiting transfer to a juvenile facility; or

''(iii) in which period such juveniles make a court appearance;

''(B) juveniles who are accused of nonstatus offenses, who are awaiting an initial court appearance that will occur within 48 hours after being taken into custody (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays), and who are detained or confined in a jail or lockup—

''(i) in which—

''(I) such juveniles do not have prohibited physical contact or sustained oral communication with adult inmates; and

''(II) there is in effect in the State a policy that requires individuals who work with both such juveniles and such adult inmates, including in collocated facilities, have been trained and certified to work with juveniles; and

''(ii) that—

''(I) is located outside a metropolitan statistical area (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget) and has no existing acceptable alternative placement available;

''(II) is located where conditions of distance to be traveled or the lack of highway, road, or transportation do not allow for court appearances within 48 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) so that a brief (not to exceed an additional 48 hours) delay is excusable; or

''(III) is located where conditions of safety exist (such as severe adverse, life-threatening weather conditions that do not allow for reasonably safe travel), in which case the time for an appearance may be delayed until 24 hours after the time that such conditions allow for reasonable safe travel;

''(C) juveniles who are accused of nonstatus offenses and who are detained or confined in a jail or lockup that satisfies the requirements of subparagraph (B)(i) if—

''(i) such jail or lockup—

''(I) is located outside a metropolitan statistical area (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget); and

''(II) has no existing acceptable alternative placement available;

''(ii) a parent or other legal guardian (or guardian ad litem) of the juvenile involved consents to detaining or confining such juvenile in accordance with this subparagraph and the parent has the right to revoke such consent at any time;

''(iii) the juvenile has counsel, and the counsel representing such juvenile has an opportunity to present the juvenile's position regarding the detention or confinement involved to the court before the court finds that such detention or confinement is in the best interest of such juvenile and approves such detention or confinement; and

''(iv) detaining or confining such juvenile in accordance with this subparagraph is—

''(I) approved in advance by a court with competent jurisdiction;

''(II) required to be reviewed periodically, at intervals of not more than 5 days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays), by such court for the duration of detention or confinement, which review may be in the presence of the juvenile; and

''(III) for a period preceding the sentencing (if any) of such juvenile;

''(14) provide assurances that consideration will be given to and that assistance will be available for approaches designed to strengthen the families of delinquent and other youth to prevent juvenile delinquency (which approaches should include the involvement of grandparents or other extended family members, when possible, and appropriate and the provision of family counseling during the incarceration of juvenile family members and coordination of family services when appropriate and feasible);

''(15) provide for procedures to be established for protecting the rights of recipients of services and for assuring appropriate privacy with regard to records relating to such services provided to any individual under the State plan;

''(16) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures necessary to assure prudent use, proper disbursement, and accurate accounting of funds received under this title;

''(17) provide reasonable assurances that Federal funds made available under this part for any period shall be so used as to supplement and increase (but not supplant) the level of the State, local, and other non-Federal funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the programs described in this part, and shall in no event replace such State, local, and other non-Federal funds;

''(18) provide that the State agency designated under paragraph (1) will, not less often than annually, review its plan and submit to the Administrator an analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the programs and activities carried out under the plan, and any modifications in the plan, including the survey of State and local needs, that the agency considers necessary;

''(19) provide assurances that the State or each unit of local government that is a recipient of amounts under this part require that any person convicted of a sexual act or sexual contact involving any other person who has not attained the age of 18 years, and who is not less than 4 years younger than such convicted person, be tested for the presence of any sexually transmitted disease and that the results of such test be provided to the victim or to the family of the victim as well as to any court or other government agency with primary authority for sentencing the person convicted for the commission of the sexual act or sexual contact (as those terms are defined in paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively, of section 2246 of title 18, United States Code) involving a person not having attained the age of 18 years;

''(20) provide that if a juvenile is taken into custody for violating a valid court order issued for committing a status offense—

''(A) an appropriate public agency shall be promptly notified that such juvenile is held in custody for violating such order;

''(B) not later than 24 hours during which such juvenile is so held, an authorized representative of such agency shall interview, in person, such juvenile; and

''(C) not later than 48 hours during which such juvenile is so held—

''(i) such representative shall submit an assessment to the court that issued such order, regarding the immediate needs of such juvenile; and

''(ii) such court shall conduct a hearing to determine—

''(I) whether there is reasonable cause to believe that such juvenile violated such order; and

''(II) the appropriate placement of such juvenile pending disposition of the violation alleged;

''(21) specify a percentage, if any, of funds received by the State under section 221 that the State will reserve for expenditure by the State to provide incentive grants to units of local government that reduce the case load of probation officers within such units;

''(22) provide that the State, to the maximum extent practicable, will implement a system to ensure that if a juvenile is before a court in the juvenile justice system, public child welfare records (including child protective services records) relating to such juvenile that are on file in the geographical area under the jurisdiction of such court will be made known to such court;

''(23) unless the provisions of this paragraph are waived at the discretion of the Administrator for any State in which the services for delinquent or other youth are organized primarily on a statewide basis, provide that at least 50 percent of funds received by the State under this section, other than funds made available to the State advisory group, shall be expended—

''(A) through programs of units of general local government or combinations thereof, to the extent such programs are consistent with the State plan; and

''(B) through programs of local private agencies, to the extent such programs are consistent with the State plan, except that direct funding of any local private agency by a State shall be permitted only if such agency requests such funding after it has applied for and been denied funding by any unit of general local government or combination thereof;

''(24) provide for the establishment of youth tribunals and peer 'juries' in school districts in the State to promote zero tolerance policies with respect to misdemeanor offenses, acts of juvenile delinquency, and other antisocial behavior occurring on school grounds, including truancy, vandalism, underage drinking, and underage tobacco use;

''(25) provide for projects to coordinate the delivery of adolescent mental health and substance abuse services to children at risk by coordinating councils composed of public and private service providers;

''(26) provide assurances that—

''(A) any assistance provided under this Act will not cause the displacement (including a partial displacement, such as a reduction in the hours of nonovertime work, wages, or employment benefits) of any currently employed employee;

''(B) activities assisted under this Act will not impair an existing collective bargaining relationship, contract for services, or collective bargaining agreement; and

''(C) no such activity that would be inconsistent with the terms of a collective bargaining agreement shall be undertaken without the written concurrence of the labor organization involved;

''(27) to the extent that segments of the juvenile population are shown to be 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 individual; and

''(28) demonstrate that the State has in effect a policy or practice that requires State or local law enforcement agencies to—

''(A) present before a judicial officer any juvenile who unlawfully possesses a firearm in a school; and

''(B) detain such juvenile in an appropriate juvenile facility or secure community-based placement for not less than 24 hours for appropriate evaluation, upon a finding by the judicial officer that the juvenile may be a danger to himself or herself, to other individuals, or to the community in which that juvenile resides.

''(b) APPROVAL BY STATE AGENCY.—

''(1) STATE AGENCY.—The State agency designated under subsection (a)(1) shall approve the State plan and any modification thereof prior to submission of the plan to the Administrator.

''(2) STATE ADVISORY GROUP.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The State advisory group referred to in subsection (a) shall be known as the 'State Advisory Group'. The State Advisory Group shall consist of representatives from both the private and public sector, each of whom shall be appointed for a term of not more than 6 years. The State shall ensure that members of the State Advisory Group shall have experience in the area of juvenile delinquency prevention, the prosecution of juvenile offenders, the treatment of juvenile delinquency, the investigation of juvenile crimes, or the administration of juvenile justice programs, and shall include not less than 1 prosecutor and not less than 1 judge from a court with a juvenile crime or delinquency docket. The chairperson of the State Advisory Group shall not be a full-time employee of the Federal Government or the State government.

''(B) CONSULTATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The State Advisory Group established under subparagraph (A) shall—

''(I) participate in the development and review of the State plan under this section before submission to the supervisory agency for final action; and

''(II) be afforded an opportunity to review and comment, not later than 30 days after the submission to the State Advisory Group, on all juvenile justice and delinquency prevention grant applications submitted to the State agency designated under subsection (a)(1).

''(ii) AUTHORITY.—The State Advisory Group shall report to the chief executive officer and the legislature of the State on an annual basis regarding recommendations related to the State's compliance under this section.

''(C) FUNDING.—From amounts reserved for administrative costs, the State may make available to the State Advisory Group such sums as may be necessary to assist the State Advisory Group in adequately performing its duties under this paragraph.

''(c) COMPLIANCE WITH STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If a State fails to comply with any of the applicable requirements of paragraph (11), (12), (13), (27), or (28) of subsection (a) in any fiscal year beginning after September 30, 2000, the amount allocated to such State for the subsequent fiscal year shall be reduced by not to exceed 10 percent for each such paragraph with respect to which the failure occurs, unless the Administrator determines that the State—

''(A) has achieved substantial compliance with such applicable requirements with respect to which the State was not in compliance; and

''(B) has made, through appropriate executive or legislative action, an unequivocal commitment to achieving full compliance with such applicable requirements within a reasonable time.

''(2) WAIVER.—The Administrator may, upon request by a State showing good cause, waive the application of this subsection with respect to such State.

''SEC. 223. ALLOCATION OF GRANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b), (c), and (d), the amount allocated under section 291 to carry out this part in each fiscal year that remains after reservation under section 208(b) for that fiscal year shall be allocated to the States as follows:

''(1) 0.5 percent shall be allocated to each eligible State.

''(2) The amount remaining after the allocation under clause (i) shall be allocated proportionately based on the juvenile population in the eligible States.

''(b) SYSTEM SUPPORT GRANTS.—Of the amount allocated under section 291 to carry out this part in each fiscal year that remains after reservation under section 208(b) for that fiscal year, up to 10 percent may be available for use by the Administrator to provide—

''(1) training and technical assistance consistent with the purposes authorized under sections 204, 205, and 221;

''(2) direct grant awards and other support to develop, test, and demonstrate new approaches to improving the juvenile justice system and reducing, preventing, and abating delinquent behavior, juvenile crime, and youth violence;

''(3) for research and evaluation efforts to discover and test methods and practices to improve the juvenile justice system and reduce, prevent, and abate delinquent behavior, juvenile crime, and youth violence; and

''(4) information, including information on best practices, consistent with purposes authorized under sections 204, 205, and 221.

''(c) EXCEPTION.—The amount allocated to the Virgin Islands of the United States, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands shall be not less than $75,000 and not more than $100,000.

''(d) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—A State, unit of local government, or eligible unit that receives funds under this part may not use more than 5 percent of those funds to pay for administrative costs.

''PART C—NATIONAL PROGRAMS

''SEC. 241. ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established within the National Institute of Justice a National Institute for Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention, the purpose of which shall be to provide—

''(1) through the National Institute of Justice, for the rigorous and independent evaluation of the delinquency and youth violence prevention programs funded under this title; and

''(2) funding for new research, through the National Institute of Justice, on the nature, causes, and prevention of juvenile violence and juvenile delinquency.

''(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The National Institute for Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention shall be under the supervision and direction of the Director of the National Institute of Justice (referred to in this part as the 'Director'), in consultation with the Administrator.

''(c) COORDINATION.—The activities of the National Institute for Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention shall be coordinated with the activities of the National Institute of Justice.

''(d) DUTIES OF THE INSTITUTE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall transfer appropriated amounts to the National Institute of Justice, or to other Federal agencies, for the purposes of new research and evaluation projects funded by the National Institute for Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention, and for evaluation of discretionary programs of the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each evaluation and research study funded with amounts transferred under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) be independent in nature;

''(B) be awarded competitively; and

''(C) employ rigorous and scientifically recognized standards and methodologies, including peer review by nonapplicants.

''(e) POWERS OF THE INSTITUTE.—In addition to the other powers, express and implied, the National Institute for Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention may—

''(1) request any Federal agency to supply such statistics, data, program reports, and other material as the National Institute for Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention deems necessary to carry out its functions;

''(2) arrange with and reimburse the heads of Federal agencies for the use of personnel or facilities or equipment of such agencies;

''(3) confer with and avail itself of the cooperation, services, records, and facilities of State, municipal, or other public or private local agencies;

''(4) make grants and enter into contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, or individuals for the partial performance of any functions of the National Institute for Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention; and

''(5) compensate consultants and members of technical advisory councils who are not in the regular full-time employ of the United States, at a rate now or hereafter payable under section 5376 of title 5, United States Code, and while away from home, or regular place of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for

persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

''(f) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—A Federal agency that receives a request from the National Institute for Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention under subsection (e)(1) may cooperate with the National Institute for Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention and shall, to the maximum extent practicable, consult with and furnish information and advice to the National Institute for Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention.

"SEC. 242. INFORMATION FUNCTION.

''The Administrator, in consultation with the Director, shall—

''(1) on a continuing basis, review reports, data, and standards relating to the juvenile justice system in the United States;

''(2) serve as an information bank by collecting systematically and synthesizing the knowledge obtained from studies and research by public and private agencies, institutions, or individuals concerning all aspects of juvenile delinquency, including the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency; and

''(3) serve as a clearinghouse and information center for the preparation, publication, and dissemination of all information regarding juvenile delinquency, including State and local juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment programs (including drug and alcohol programs and gender-specific programs) and plans, availability of resources, training and educational programs, statistics, and other pertinent data and information.

"SEC. 242A. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS.

''The Administrator, under the supervision of the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs, and in consultation with the Director, may—

''(1) transfer funds to and enter into agreements with the Bureau of Justice Statistics or, subject to the approval of the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs, to another Federal agency authorized by law to undertake statistical work in juvenile justice matters, for the purpose of providing for the collection, analysis, and dissemination of statistical data and information relating to juvenile crime, the juvenile justice system, and youth violence, and for other purposes, consistent with the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability Act of 1999; and

''(2) plan and identify, in consultation with the Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the purposes and goals of each grant made or contract or other agreement entered into under this title.

"SEC. 243. RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND EVALUATION FUNCTIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, acting through the National Institute for Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention, as appropriate, may—

''(1) conduct, encourage, and coordinate research and evaluation into any aspect of juvenile delinquency, particularly with regard to new programs and methods that show promise of making a contribution toward the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

''(2) encourage the development of demonstration projects in new, innovative techniques and methods to prevent and treat juvenile delinquency;

''(3) establish or expand programs that, in recognition of varying degrees of the seriousness of delinquent behavior and the corresponding gradations in the responses of the juvenile justice system in response to that behavior, are designed to—

''(A) encourage courts to develop and implement a continuum of post-adjudication restraints that bridge the gap between traditional probation and confinement in a correctional setting (including expanded use of probation, mediation, restitution, community service, treatment, home detention, intensive supervision, electronic monitoring, boot camps and similar programs, and secure community-based treatment facilities linked to other support services such as health, mental health, education (remedial and special), job training, and recreation); and

''(B) assist in the provision by the Administrator of best practices of information and technical assistance, including technology transfer, to States in the design and utilization of risk assessment mechanisms to aid juvenile justice personnel in determining appropriate sanctions for delinquent behavior;

''(4) encourage the development of programs that, in addition to helping youth take responsibility for their behavior, through control and incarceration, if necessary, provide therapeutic intervention such as providing skills;

''(5) encourage the development and establishment of programs to enhance the States' ability to identify chronic serious and violent juvenile offenders who commit crimes such as rape, murder, firearms offenses, gang-related crimes, violent felonies, and serious drug offenses;

''(6) prepare, in cooperation with education institutions, with Federal, State, and local agencies, and with appropriate individuals and private agencies, such studies as it considers to be necessary with respect to prevention of and intervention with juvenile violence and delinquency and the improvement of juvenile justice systems, including—

''(A) evaluations of programs and interventions designed to prevent youth violence and juvenile delinquency;

''(B) assessments and evaluations of the methodological approaches to evaluating the effectiveness of interventions and programs designed to prevent youth violence and juvenile delinquency;

''(C) studies of the extent, nature, risk, and protective factors, and causes of youth violence and juvenile delinquency;

''(D) comparisons of youth adjudicated and treated by the juvenile justice system compared to juveniles waived to and adjudicated by the adult criminal justice system (including incarcerated in adult, secure correctional facilities);

''(E) recommendations with respect to effective and ineffective primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention interventions, including for which juveniles, and under what circumstances (including circumstances connected with the staffing of the intervention), prevention efforts are effective and ineffective; and

''(F) assessments of risk prediction systems of juveniles used in making decisions regarding pretrial detention;

''(7) disseminate the results of such evaluations and research and demonstration activities particularly to persons actively working in the field of juvenile delinquency;

''(8) disseminate pertinent data and studies to individuals, agencies, and organizations concerned with the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency; and

''(9) routinely collect, analyze, compile, publish, and disseminate uniform national statistics concerning—

''(A) all aspects of juveniles as victims and offenders;

''(B) the processing and treatment, in the juvenile justice system, of juveniles who are status offenders, delinquent, neglected, or abused; and

''(C) the processing and treatment of such juveniles who are treated as adults for purposes of the criminal justice system.

''(b) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—The Administrator or the Director, as appropriate, shall make available to the public—

''(1) the results of research, demonstration, and evaluation activities referred to in subsection (a)(8);

''(2) the data and studies referred to in subsection (a)(9); and

''(3) regular reports regarding each State's objective measurements of youth violence, such as the number, rate, and trend of homicides committed by youths.

"SEC. 244. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING FUNCTIONS.

''The Administrator may—

''(1) provide technical assistance and training assistance to Federal, State, and local governments and to courts, public and private agencies, institutions, and individuals in the planning, establishment, funding, operation, and evaluation of juvenile delinquency programs;

''(2) develop, conduct, and provide for training programs for the training of professional, paraprofessional, and volunteer personnel, and other persons who are working with or preparing to work with juveniles, juvenile offenders (including juveniles who commit hate crimes), and their families;

''(3) develop, conduct, and provide for seminars, workshops, and training programs in the latest proven effective techniques and methods of preventing and treating juvenile delinquency for law enforcement officers, juvenile judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys, and other court personnel, probation officers, correctional personnel, and other Federal, State, and local government personnel who are engaged in work relating to juvenile delinquency;

''(4) develop technical training teams to aid in the development of training programs in the States and to assist State and local agencies that work directly with juveniles and juvenile offenders; and

''(5) provide technical assistance and training to assist States and units of general local government.

"SEC. 245. ESTABLISHMENT OF TRAINING PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish a training program designed to train enrollees with respect to methods and techniques for the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency, including methods and techniques specifically designed to prevent and reduce the incidence of hate crimes committed by juveniles. In carrying out this program the Administrator may make use of available State and local services, equipment, personnel, facilities, and the like.

''(b) QUALIFICATIONS FOR ENROLLMENT.—Enrollees in the training program established under this section shall be drawn from law enforcement and correctional personnel (including volunteer lay personnel), teachers and special education personnel, family counselors, child welfare workers, juvenile judges and judicial personnel, persons associated with law-related education, public recreation personnel, youth workers, and representatives of private agencies and organizations with specific experience in the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

"SEC. 246. REPORT ON STATUS OFFENDERS.

''Not later than September 1, 2002, the Administrator, through the National Institute of Justice, shall—

''(1) conduct a study on the effect of incarceration on status offenders compared to similarly situated individuals who are not placed in secure detention in terms of the continuation of their inappropriate or illegal conduct, delinquency, or future criminal behavior, and evaluating the safety of status offenders placed in secure detention; and

''(2) submit to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives a report on the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

"SEC. 247. CONSIDERATIONS FOR APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Any agency, institution, or individual seeking to receive a grant, or enter into a contract, under section 243, 244, or 245 shall submit an application at such time, in

such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Administrator or the Director, as appropriate, may prescribe.

''(b) APPLICATION CONTENTS.—In accordance with guidelines established by the Administrator or the Director, as appropriate, each application for assistance under section 243, 244, or 245 shall—

''(1) set forth a program for carrying out 1 or more of the purposes set forth in section 243, 244, or 245, and specifically identify each such purpose such program is designed to carry out;

''(2) provide that such program shall be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

''(3) provide for the proper and efficient administration of such program;

''(4) provide for regular evaluation of such program; and

''(5) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to ensure prudent use, proper disbursement, and accurate accounting of funds received under this title.

''(c) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In determining whether or not to approve applications for grants and for contracts under this part, the Administrator or the Director, as appropriate, shall consider—

''(1) whether the project uses appropriate and rigorous methodology, including appropriate samples, control groups, psychometrically sound measurement, and appropriate data analysis techniques;

''(2) the experience of the principal and co-principal investigators in the area of youth violence and juvenile delinquency;

''(3) the protection offered human subjects in the study, including informed consent procedures; and

''(4) the cost-effectiveness of the proposed project.

''(d) SELECTION PROCESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) COMPETITIVE PROCESS.—Subject to subparagraph (B), programs selected for assistance through grants or contracts under section 243, 244, or 245 shall be selected through a competitive process, which shall be established by the Administrator or the Director, as appropriate, by rule. As part of such a process, the Administrator or the Director, as appropriate, shall announce in the Federal Register—

''(i) the availability of funds for such assistance;

''(ii) the general criteria applicable to the selection of applicants to receive such assistance; and

''(iii) a description of the procedures applicable to submitting and reviewing applications for such assistance.

''(B) WAIVER.—The competitive process described in subparagraph (A) shall not be required if the Administrator or the Director, as appropriate, makes a written determination waiving the competitive process with respect to a program to be carried out in an area with respect to which the President declares under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) that a major disaster or emergency exists.

''(2) REVIEW PROCESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Programs selected for assistance through grants and contracts under this part shall be selected after a competitive process that provides potential grantees and contractors with not less than 90 days to submit applications for funds. Applications for funds shall be reviewed through a formal peer review process by qualified scientists with expertise in the fields of criminology, juvenile delinquency, sociology, psychology, research methodology, evaluation research, statistics, and related areas. The peer review process shall conform to the process used by the National Institutes of Health, the National Institute of Justice, or the National Science Foundation.

''(B) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROCESS.—Such process shall be established by the Administrator or the Director, as appropriate, in consultation with the Directors and other appropriate officials of the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Mental Health. Before implementation of such process, the Administrator or the Director, as appropriate, shall submit such process to such Directors, each of whom shall prepare and furnish to the Chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a final report containing their comments on such process as proposed to be established.

''(3) EMERGENCY EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—In establishing the process required under paragraphs (1) and (2), the Administrator or the Director, as appropriate, shall provide for emergency expedited consideration of a proposed program if the Administrator or the Director, as appropriate, determines such action to be necessary in order to avoid a delay that would preclude carrying out the program.

''(e) EFFECT OF POPULATION.—A city shall not be denied assistance under section 243, 244, or 245 solely on the basis of its population.

''(f) NOTIFICATION PROCESS.—Notification of grants and contracts made under sections 243, 244, and 245 (and the applications submitted for such grants and contracts) shall, upon being made, be transmitted by the Administrator or the Director, as appropriate, to the Chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

"SEC. 248. STUDY OF VIOLENT ENTERTAINMENT.

''(a) REQUIREMENT.—The National Institutes of Health shall conduct a study of the effects of violent video games and music on child development and youth violence.

''(b) ELEMENTS.—The study under subsection (a) shall address—

''(1) whether, and to what extent, violence in video games and music adversely affects the emotional and psychological development of juveniles; and

''(2) whether violence in video games and music contributes to juvenile delinquency and youth violence.

"PART D—GANG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES; COMMUNITY-BASED GANG INTERVENTION

"SEC. 251. DEFINITION OF JUVENILE.

''In this part, the term 'juvenile' means an individual who has not attained the age of 22 years.

"SEC. 252. GANG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) The Administrator shall make grants to or enter into contracts with public agencies (including local educational agencies) and private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions to establish and support programs and activities that involve families and communities and that are designed to carry out any of the following purposes:

''(A) To prevent and to reduce the participation of juveniles in the activities of gangs that commit crimes. Such programs and activities may include—

''(i) individual, peer, family, and group counseling, including the provision of life skills training and preparation for living independently, which shall include cooperation with social services, welfare, and health care programs;

''(ii) education, recreation, and social services designed to address the social and developmental needs of juveniles that such juveniles would otherwise seek to have met through membership in gangs;

''(iii) crisis intervention and counseling to juveniles, who are particularly at risk of gang involvement, and their families, including assistance from social service, welfare, health care, mental health, and substance abuse prevention and treatment agencies where necessary;

''(iv) the organization of neighborhood and community groups to work closely with parents, schools, law enforcement, and other public and private agencies in the community; and

''(v) training and assistance to adults who have significant relationships with juveniles who are or may become members of gangs, to assist such adults in providing constructive alternatives to participating in the activities of gangs.

''(B) To develop within the juvenile adjudicatory and correctional systems new and innovative means to address the problems of juveniles convicted of serious drug-related and gang-related offenses.

''(C) To target elementary school students, with the purpose of steering students away from gang involvement.

''(D) To provide treatment to juveniles who are members of such gangs, including members who are accused of committing a serious crime and members who have been adjudicated as being delinquent.

''(E) To promote the involvement of juveniles in lawful activities in geographical areas in which gangs commit crimes.

''(F) To promote and support, with the cooperation of community-based organizations experienced in providing services to juveniles engaged in gang-related activities and the cooperation of local law enforcement agencies, the development of policies and activities in public elementary and secondary schools that will assist such schools in maintaining a safe environment conducive to learning.

''(G) To assist juveniles who are or may become members of gangs to obtain appropriate educational instruction, in or outside a regular school program, including the provision of counseling and other services to promote and support the continued participation of such juveniles in such instructional programs.

''(H) To expand the availability of prevention and treatment services relating to the illegal use of controlled substances and controlled substance analogues (as defined in paragraphs (6) and (32) of section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802)) by juveniles, provided through State and local health and social services agencies.

''(I) To provide services to prevent juveniles from coming into contact with the juvenile justice system again as a result of gang-related activity.

''(J) To provide services authorized in this section at a special location in a school or housing project or other appropriate site.

''(K) To support activities to inform juveniles of the availability of treatment and services for which financial assistance is available under this section.

''(2) From not more than 15 percent of the total amount appropriated to carry out this part in each fiscal year, the Administrator may make grants to and enter into contracts with public agencies and private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions—

''(A) to conduct research on issues related to juvenile gangs;

''(B) to evaluate the effectiveness of programs and activities funded under paragraph (1); and

''(C) to increase the knowledge of the public (including public and private agencies that operate or desire to operate gang prevention and intervention programs) by disseminating information on research and on effective programs and activities funded under this section.

''(b) APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any agency, organization, or institution seeking to receive a grant, or to enter into a contract, under this section shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Administrator may prescribe.

''(2) APPLICATION CONTENTS.—In accordance with guidelines established by the Administrator, each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) set forth a program or activity for carrying out 1 or more of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and specifically identify each such purpose such program or activity is designed to carry out;

''(B) provide that such program or activity shall be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

''(C) provide for the proper and efficient administration of such program or activity;

''(D) provide for regular evaluation of such program or activity;

''(E) provide an assurance that the proposed program or activity will supplement, not supplant, similar programs and activities already available in the community;

''(F) describe how such program or activity is coordinated with programs, activities, and services available locally under part B or C of this title, and under chapter 1 of subtitle B of title III of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 11801–11805);

''(G) certify that the applicant has requested the State planning agency to review and comment on such application and summarize the responses of such State planning agency to such request;

''(H) provide that regular reports on such program or activity shall be sent to the Administrator and to such State planning agency; and

''(I) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to ensure prudent use, proper disbursement, and accurate accounting of funds received under this section.

''(3) PRIORITY.—In reviewing applications for grants and contracts under this section, the Administrator shall give priority to applications—

''(A) submitted by, or substantially involving, local educational agencies (as defined in section 1471 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 2891));

''(B) based on the incidence and severity of crimes committed by gangs whose membership is composed primarily of juveniles in the geographical area in which the applicants propose to carry out the programs and activities for which such grants and contracts are requested; and

''(C) for assistance for programs and activities that—

''(i) are broadly supported by public and private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions located in such geographical area; and

''(ii) will substantially involve the families of juvenile gang members in carrying out such programs or activities.

"SEC. 253. COMMUNITY-BASED GANG INTERVENTION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall make grants to or enter into contracts with public and private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions to carry out programs and activities—

''(1) to reduce the participation of juveniles in the illegal activities of gangs;

''(2) to develop regional task forces involving State, local, and community-based organizations to coordinate the disruption of gangs and the prosecution of juvenile gang members and to curtail interstate activities of gangs; and

''(3) to facilitate coordination and cooperation among—

''(A) local education, juvenile justice, employment, recreation, and social service agencies; and

''(B) community-based programs with a proven record of effectively providing intervention services to juvenile gang members for the purpose of reducing the participation of juveniles in illegal gang activities; and

''(4) to support programs that, in recognition of varying degrees of the seriousness of delinquent behavior and the corresponding gradations in the responses of the juvenile justice system in response to that behavior, are designed to—

''(A) encourage courts to develop and implement a continuum of post-adjudication restraints that bridge the gap between traditional probation and confinement in a correctional setting (including expanded use of probation, mediation, restitution, community service, treatment, home detention, intensive supervision, electronic monitoring, boot camps and similar programs, and secure community-based treatment facilities linked to other support services such as health, mental health, education (remedial and special), job training, and recreation); and

''(B) assist in the provision by the Administrator of information and technical assistance, including technology transfer, to States in the design and utilization of risk assessment mechanisms to aid juvenile justice personnel in determining appropriate sanctions for delinquent behavior.

''(b) ELIGIBLE PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—Programs and activities for which grants and contracts are to be made under this section may include—

''(1) the hiring of additional State and local prosecutors, and the establishment and operation of programs, including multijurisdictional task forces, for the disruption of gangs and the prosecution of gang members;

''(2) developing within the juvenile adjudicatory and correctional systems new and innovative means to address the problems of juveniles convicted of serious drug-related and gang-related offenses;

''(3) providing treatment to juveniles who are members of such gangs, including members who are accused of committing a serious crime and members who have been adjudicated as being delinquent;

''(4) promoting the involvement of juveniles in lawful activities in geographical areas in which gangs commit crimes;

''(5) expanding the availability of prevention and treatment services relating to the illegal use of controlled substances and controlled substances analogues (as defined in paragraphs (6) and (32) of section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802)), by juveniles, provided through State and local health and social services agencies;

''(6) providing services to prevent juveniles from coming into contact with the juvenile justice system again as a result of gang-related activity; or

''(7) supporting activities to inform juveniles of the availability of treatment and services for which financial assistance is available under this section.

''(c) APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any agency, organization, or institution desiring to receive a grant, or to enter into a contract, under this section shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Administrator may prescribe.

''(2) APPLICATION CONTENTS.—In accordance with guidelines established by the Administrator, each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) set forth a program or activity for carrying out 1 or more of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and specifically identify each such purpose such program or activity is designed to carry out;

''(B) provide that such program or activity shall be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

''(C) provide for the proper and efficient administration of such program or activity;

''(D) provide for regular evaluation of such program or activity;

''(E) provide an assurance that the proposed program or activity will supplement, not supplant, similar programs and activities already available in the community;

''(F) describe how such program or activity is coordinated with programs, activities, and services available locally under part B of this title and under chapter 1 of subtitle B of title III of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 11801–11805);

''(G) certify that the applicant has requested the State planning agency to review and comment on such application and summarize the responses of such State planning agency to such request;

''(H) provide that regular reports on such program or activity shall be sent to the Administrator and to such State planning agency; and

''(I) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to ensure prudent use, proper disbursement, and accurate accounting of funds received under this section.

''(3) PRIORITY.—In reviewing applications for grants and contracts under subsection (a), the Administrator shall give priority to applications—

''(A) submitted by, or substantially involving, community-based organizations experienced in providing services to juveniles;

''(B) based on the incidence and severity of crimes committed by gangs whose membership is composed primarily of juveniles in the geographical area in which the applicants propose to carry out the programs and activities for which such grants and contracts are requested; and

''(C) for assistance for programs and activities that—

''(i) are broadly supported by public and private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions located in such geographical area; and

''(ii) will substantially involve the families of juvenile gang members in carrying out such programs or activities.

"SEC. 254. PRIORITY.

''In making grants under this part, the Administrator shall give priority to funding programs and activities described in subsections (a)(2) and (b)(1) of section 253.

"PART E—DEVELOPING, TESTING, AND DEMONSTRATING PROMISING NEW INITIATIVES AND PROGRAMS

"SEC. 261. GRANTS AND PROJECTS.

''(a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.—The Administrator may make grants to, and enter into contracts with, States, units of local government, Indian tribal governments, public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals, or combinations thereof, to carry out projects for the development, testing, and demonstration of promising initiatives and programs for the prevention, control, or reduction of juvenile delinquency. The Administrator shall ensure that, to the extent reasonable and practicable, such grants are made to achieve an equitable geographical distribution of such projects throughout the United States.

''(b) USE OF GRANTS.—A grant made under subsection (a) may be used to pay all or part of the cost of the project for which such grant is made.

"SEC. 262. GRANTS FOR TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

''The Administrator may make grants to, and enter into contracts with, public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals to provide training and technical assistance to States, units of local government, Indian tribal governments, local private entities or agencies, or any combination thereof, to carry out the projects for which grants are made under section 261.

"SEC. 263. ELIGIBILITY.

''To be eligible to receive assistance pursuant to a grant or contract under this part, a public or private agency, Indian tribal government, organization, institution, individual, or combination thereof, shall submit an application to the Administrator at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Administrator may reasonably require by rule.

"SEC. 264. REPORTS.

''Each recipient of assistance pursuant to a grant or contract under this part shall submit to

the Administrator such reports as may be reasonably requested by the Administrator to describe progress achieved in carrying the projects for which the assistance was provided.

"PART F—MENTORING

"SEC. 271. MENTORING.

''The purposes of this part are to, through the use of mentors for at-risk youth—

''(1) reduce juvenile delinquency and gang participation;

''(2) improve academic performance; and

''(3) reduce the dropout rate.

"SEC. 272. DEFINITIONS.

''In this part—

''(1) the term 'at-risk youth' means a youth at risk of educational failure, dropping out of school, or involvement in criminal or delinquent activities; and

''(2) the term 'mentor' means a person who works with an at-risk youth on a one-to-one basis, providing a positive role model for the youth, establishing a supportive relationship with the youth, and providing the youth with academic assistance and exposure to new experiences and examples of opportunity that enhance the ability of the youth to become a responsible adult.

"SEC. 273. GRANTS.

''(a) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL GRANTS.—The Administrator shall make grants to local education agencies and nonprofit organizations to establish and support programs and activities for the purpose of implementing mentoring programs that—

''(1) are designed to link at-risk children, particularly children living in high crime areas and children experiencing educational failure, with responsible adults such as law enforcement officers, persons working with local businesses, elders in Alaska Native villages, and adults working for community-based organizations and agencies; and

''(2) are intended to achieve 1 or more of the following goals:

''(A) Provide general guidance to at-risk youth.

''(B) Promote personal and social responsibility among at-risk youth.

''(C) Increase at-risk youth's participation in and enhance their ability to benefit from elementary and secondary education.

''(D) Discourage at-risk youth's use of illegal drugs, violence, and dangerous weapons, and other criminal activity.

''(E) Discourage involvement of at-risk youth in gangs.

''(F) Encourage at-risk youth's participation in community service and community activities.

''(b) FAMILY-TO-FAMILY MENTORING GRANTS.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) FAMILY-TO-FAMILY MENTORING PROGRAM.—The term 'family-to-family mentoring program' means a mentoring program that—

''(i) utilizes a 2-tier mentoring approach that matches volunteer families with at-risk families allowing parents to directly work with parents and children to work directly with children; and

''(ii) has an afterschool program for volunteer and at-risk families.

''(B) POSITIVE ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM.—The term 'positive alternatives program' means a positive youth development and family-to-family mentoring program that emphasizes drug and gang prevention components.

''(C) QUALIFIED POSITIVE ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM.—The term 'qualified positive alternatives program' means a positive alternatives program that has established a family-to-family mentoring program, as of the date of enactment of the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act of 1999.

''(2) AUTHORITY.—The Administrator shall make and enter into contracts with a qualified positive alternatives program.

"SEC. 274. REGULATIONS AND GUIDELINES.

''(a) PROGRAM GUIDELINES.—The Administrator shall issue program guidelines to implement this part. The program guidelines shall be effective only after a period for public notice and comment.

''(b) MODEL SCREENING GUIDELINES.—The Administrator shall develop and distribute to program participants specific model guidelines for the screening of prospective program mentors.

"SEC. 275. USE OF GRANTS.

''(a) PERMITTED USES.—Grants awarded under this part shall be used to implement mentoring programs, including—

''(1) hiring of mentoring coordinators and support staff;

''(2) recruitment, screening, and training of adult mentors;

''(3) reimbursement of mentors for reasonable incidental expenditures such as transportation that are directly associated with mentoring; and

''(4) such other purposes as the Administrator may reasonably prescribe by regulation.

''(b) PROHIBITED USES.—Grants awarded pursuant to this part shall not be used—

''(1) to directly compensate mentors, except as provided pursuant to subsection (a)(3);

''(2) to obtain educational or other materials or equipment that would otherwise be used in the ordinary course of the grantee's operations;

''(3) to support litigation of any kind; or

''(4) for any other purpose reasonably prohibited by the Administrator by regulation.

"SEC. 276. PRIORITY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In making grants under this part, the Administrator shall give priority for awarding grants to applicants that—

''(1) serve at-risk youth in high crime areas;

''(2) have 60 percent or more of their youth eligible to receive funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; and

''(3) have a considerable number of youths who drop out of school each year.

''(b) OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.—In making grants under this part, the Administrator shall give consideration to—

''(1) the geographic distribution (urban and rural) of applications;

''(2) the quality of a mentoring plan, including—

''(A) the resources, if any, that will be dedicated to providing participating youth with opportunities for job training or postsecondary education; and

''(B) the degree to which parents, teachers, community-based organizations, and the local community participate in the design and implementation of the mentoring plan; and

''(3) the capability of the applicant to effectively implement the mentoring plan.

"SEC. 277. APPLICATIONS.

''An application for assistance under this part shall include—

''(1) information on the youth expected to be served by the program;

''(2) a provision for a mechanism for matching youth with mentors based on the needs of the youth;

''(3) An assurance that no mentor or mentoring family will be assigned a number of youths that would undermine their ability to be an effective mentor and ensure a one-to-one relationship with mentored youths;

''(4) an assurance that projects operated in secondary schools will provide youth with a variety of experiences and support, including—

''(A) an opportunity to spend time in a work environment and, when possible, participate in the work environment;

''(B) an opportunity to witness the job skills that will be required for youth to obtain employment upon graduation;

''(C) assistance with homework assignments; and

''(D) exposure to experiences that youth might not otherwise encounter;

''(5) an assurance that projects operated in elementary schools will provide youth with—

''(A) academic assistance;

''(B) exposure to new experiences and activities that youth might not encounter on their own; and

''(C) emotional support;

''(6) an assurance that projects will be monitored to ensure that each youth benefits from a mentor relationship, with provision for a new mentor assignment if the relationship is not beneficial to the youth;

''(7) the method by which mentors and youth will be recruited to the project;

''(8) the method by which prospective mentors will be screened; and

''(9) the training that will be provided to mentors.

"SEC. 278. GRANT CYCLES.

''Each grant under this part shall be made for a 3-year period.

"SEC. 279. FAMILY MENTORING PROGRAM.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'cooperative extension services' has the meaning given that term in section 1404 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103);

''(2) the term 'family mentoring program' means a mentoring program that—

''(A) utilizes a 2-tier mentoring approach that uses college age or young adult mentors working directly with at-risk youth and uses retirement-age couples working with the parents and siblings of at-risk youth; and

''(B) has a local advisory board to provide direction and advice to program administrators; and

''(3) the term 'qualified cooperative extension service' means a cooperative extension service that has established a family mentoring program, as of the date of enactment of the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act of 1999.

''(b) MODEL PROGRAM.—The Administrator, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall make a grant to a qualified cooperative extension service for the purpose of expanding and replicating family mentoring programs to reduce the incidence of juvenile crime and delinquency among at-risk youth.

''(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW FAMILY MENTORING PROGRAMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, may make 1 or more grants to cooperative extension services for the purpose of establishing family mentoring programs to reduce the incidence of juvenile crime and delinquency among at-risk youth.

''(2) MATCHING REQUIREMENT AND SOURCE OF MATCHING FUNDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount of a grant under this subsection may not exceed 35 percent of the total costs of the program funded by the grant.

''(B) SOURCE OF MATCH.—Matching funds for grants under this subsection may be derived from amounts made available to a State under subsections (b) and (c) of section 3 of the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343), except that the total amount derived from Federal sources may not exceed 70 percent of the total cost of the program funded by the grant.

"SEC. 280. CAPACITY BUILDING.

''(a) MODEL PROGRAM.—The Administrator may make a grant to a qualified national organization with a proven history of providing one-to-one services for the purpose of expanding and replicating capacity building programs to reduce the incidence of juvenile crime and delinquency among at-risk youth.

''(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW CAPACITY BUILDING PROGRAMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may make one or more grants to national organizations with proven histories of providing one-to-one services for the purpose of expanding and replicating capacity building programs to reduce the incidence of juvenile crime and delinquency among at-risk youth.

''(2) MATCHING REQUIREMENT AND SOURCE OF MATCHING FUNDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount of a grant under this subsection may not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of the programs funded by the grant.

''(B) SOURCE OF MATCH.—Matching funds for grants under this subsection must be derived from a private agency, institution or business.

"PART G—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 291. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title, and to carry out part R of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796 et seq.), $1,100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2004.

''(b) ALLOCATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of the amount made available under subsection (a) for each fiscal year—

''(1) $500,000,000 shall be for programs under sections 1801 and 1803 of part R of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796 et seq.), of which $50,000,000 shall be for programs under section 1803;

''(2) $75,000,000 shall be for grants for juvenile criminal history records upgrades pursuant to section 1802 of part R of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796 et seq.);

''(3) $200,000,000 shall be for programs under section 205 of part A of this title;

''(4) $200,000,000 shall be for programs under part B of this title;

''(5) $40,000,000 shall be for prevention programs under part C of this title—

''(A) of which $20,000,000 shall be for evaluation research of primary, secondary, and tertiary juvenile delinquency programs; and

''(B) $2,000,000 shall be for the study required by section 248;

''(6) $20,000,000 shall be for programs under parts D and E of this title; and

''(7) $20,000,000 shall be for programs under part F of this title, of which $3,000,000 shall be for programs under section 279 and $3,000,000 for programs under section 280.

''(c) SOURCE OF SUMS.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section may be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

''(d) ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the administration and operation of the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2004.

''(e) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available pursuant to this section and allocated in accordance with this title in any fiscal year shall remain available until expended.

"SEC. 292. RELIGIOUS NONDISCRIMINATION; RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF AMOUNTS; PENALTIES.

''(a) RELIGIOUS NONDISCRIMINATION.—The provisions of section 104 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 604a) shall apply to a State or local government exercising its authority to distribute grants to applicants under this title.

''(b) RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF AMOUNTS.—

''(1) EXPERIMENTATION ON INDIVIDUALS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No amounts made available to carry out this title may be used for any biomedical or behavior control experimentation on individuals or any research involving such experimentation.

''(B) DEFINITION OF BEHAVIOR CONTROL.—In this paragraph, the term 'behavior control'—

''(i) means any experimentation or research employing methods that—

''(I) involve a substantial risk of physical or psychological harm to the individual subject; and

''(II) are intended to modify or alter criminal and other antisocial behavior, including aversive conditioning therapy, drug therapy, chemotherapy (except as part of routine clinical care), physical therapy of mental disorders, electroconvulsive therapy, or physical punishment; and

''(ii) does not include a limited class of programs generally recognized as involving no such risk, including methadone maintenance and certain substance abuse treatment programs, psychological counseling, parent training, behavior contracting, survival skills training, restitution, or community service, if safeguards are established for the informed consent of subjects (including parents or guardians of minors).

''(2) PROHIBITION AGAINST PRIVATE AGENCY USE OF AMOUNTS IN CONSTRUCTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No amount made available to any private agency or institution, or to any individual, under this title (either directly or through a State office) may be used for construction.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—The restriction in clause (i) shall not apply to any juvenile program in which training or experience in construction or renovation is used as a method of juvenile accountability or rehabilitation.

''(3) LOBBYING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), no amount made available under this title to any public or private agency, organization or institution, or to any individual shall be used to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone communication, letter, printed or written matter, or other device intended or designed to influence a Member of Congress or any other Federal, State, or local elected official to favor or oppose any Act, bill, resolution, or other legislation, or any referendum, initiative, constitutional amendment, or any other procedure of Congress, any State legislature, any local council, or any similar governing body.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—This paragraph does not preclude the use of amounts made available under this title in connection with communications to Federal, State, or local elected officials, upon the request of such officials through proper official channels, pertaining to authorization, appropriation, or oversight measures directly affecting the operation of the program involved.

''(4) LEGAL ACTION.—No amounts made available under this title to any public or private agency, organization, institution, or to any individual, shall be used in any way directly or indirectly to file an action or otherwise take any legal action against any Federal, State, or local agency, institution, or employee.

''(c) PENALTIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If any amounts are used for the purposes prohibited in either paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (b), or in violation of subsection (a)—

''(A) funding for the agency, organization, institution, or individual at issue shall be immediately discontinued in whole or in part; and

''(B) the agency, organization, institution, or individual using amounts for the purpose prohibited in paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (b), or in violation of subsection (a), shall be liable for reimbursement of all amounts granted to the individual or entity for the fiscal year for which the amounts were granted.

''(2) LIABILITY FOR EXPENSES AND DAMAGES.—In relation to a violation of subsection (b)(4), the individual filing the lawsuit or responsible for taking the legal action against the Federal, State, or local agency or institution, or individual working for the Government, shall be individually liable for all legal expenses and any other expenses of the Government agency, institution, or individual working for the Government, including damages assessed by the jury against the Government agency, institution, or individual working for the Government, and any punitive damages.

"SEC. 293. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

''(a) AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR.—The Office shall be administered by the Administrator under the general authority of the Attorney General.

''(b) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CRIME CONTROL PROVISIONS.—Sections 809(c), 811(a), 811(b), 811(c), 812(a), 812(b), and 812(d) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3789d(c), 3789f(a), 3789f(b), 3789f(c), 3789g(a), 3789g(b), 3789g(d)) shall apply with respect to the administration of and compliance with this title, except that for purposes of this Act—

''(1) any reference to the Office of Justice Programs in such sections shall be considered to be a reference to the Assistant Attorney General who heads the Office of Justice Programs; and

''(2) the term 'this title' as it appears in such sections shall be considered to be a reference to this title.

''(c) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN OTHER CRIME CONTROL PROVISIONS.—Sections 801(a), 801(c), and 806 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711(a), 3711(c), and 3787) shall apply with respect to the administration of and compliance with this title, except that, for purposes of this title—

''(1) any reference to the Attorney General, the Assistant Attorney General who heads the Office of Justice Programs, the Director of the National Institute of Justice, the Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, or the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance shall be considered to be a reference to the Administrator;

''(2) any reference to the Office of Justice Programs, the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the National Institute of Justice, or the Bureau of Justice Statistics shall be considered to be a reference to the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention; and

''(3) the term 'this title' as it appears in those sections shall be considered to be a reference to this title.

''(d) RULES, REGULATIONS, AND PROCEDURES.—The Administrator may, after appropriate consultation with representatives of States and units of local government, and an opportunity for notice and comment in accordance with subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as are necessary for the exercise of the functions of the Office and as are consistent with the purpose of this Act.

''(e) WITHHOLDING.—The Administrator shall initiate such proceedings as the Administrator determines to be appropriate if the Administrator, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a recipient of financial assistance under this title, finds that—

''(1) the program or activity for which the grant or contract involved was made has been so changed that the program or activity no longer complies with this title; or

''(2) in the operation of such program or activity there is failure to comply substantially with any provision of this title.''.

(b) REPEAL.—Title V of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5781 et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 303. RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 302 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking ''accurate reporting of the problem nationally and to develop'' and inserting ''an accurate national reporting system to report the problem, and to assist in the development of''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following:

''(8) services for runaway and homeless youth are needed in urban, suburban, and rural areas;''.

(b) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS FOR CENTERS AND SERVICES.—Section 311 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5711) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) GRANTS FOR CENTERS AND SERVICES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make grants to public and nonprofit private entities

(and combinations of such entities) to establish and operate (including renovation) local centers to provide services for runaway and homeless youth and for the families of such youth.

''(2) SERVICES PROVIDED.—Services provided under paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall be provided as an alternative to involving runaway and homeless youth in the law enforcement, child welfare, mental health, and juvenile justice systems;

''(B) shall include—

''(i) safe and appropriate shelter; and

''(ii) individual, family, and group counseling, as appropriate; and

''(C) may include—

''(i) street-based services;

''(ii) home-based services for families with youth at risk of separation from the family; and

''(iii) drug abuse education and prevention services.'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,''; and

(3) by striking subsections (c) and (d).

(c) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 312 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5712) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking ''paragraph (6)'' and inserting ''paragraph (7)'';

(B) in paragraph (10), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) in paragraph (11), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(12) shall submit to the Secretary an annual report that includes, with respect to the year for which the report is submitted—

''(A) information regarding the activities carried out under this part;

''(B) the achievements of the project under this part carried out by the applicant; and

''(C) statistical summaries describing—

''(i) the number and the characteristics of the runaway and homeless youth, and youth at risk of family separation, who participate in the project; and

''(ii) the services provided to such youth by the project.''; and

(2) by striking subsections (c) and (d) and inserting the following:

''(c) APPLICANTS PROVIDING STREET-BASED SERVICES.—To be eligible to use assistance under section 311(a)(2)(C)(i) to provide street-based services, the applicant shall include in the plan required by subsection (b) assurances that in providing such services the applicant will—

''(1) provide qualified supervision of staff, including on-street supervision by appropriately trained staff;

''(2) provide backup personnel for on-street staff;

''(3) provide initial and periodic training of staff who provide such services; and

''(4) conduct outreach activities for runaway and homeless youth, and street youth.

''(d) APPLICANTS PROVIDING HOME-BASED SERVICES.—To be eligible to use assistance under section 311(a) to provide home-based services described in section 311(a)(2)(C)(ii), an applicant shall include in the plan required by subsection (b) assurances that in providing such services the applicant will—

''(1) provide counseling and information to youth and the families (including unrelated individuals in the family households) of such youth, including services relating to basic life skills, interpersonal skill building, educational advancement, job attainment skills, mental and physical health care, parenting skills, financial planning, and referral to sources of other needed services;

''(2) provide directly, or through an arrangement made by the applicant, 24-hour service to respond to family crises (including immediate access to temporary shelter for runaway and homeless youth, and youth at risk of separation from the family);

''(3) establish, in partnership with the families of runaway and homeless youth, and youth at risk of separation from the family, objectives and measures of success to be achieved as a result of receiving home-based services;

''(4) provide initial and periodic training of staff who provide home-based services; and

''(5) ensure that—

''(A) caseloads will remain sufficiently low to allow for intensive (5 to 20 hours per week) involvement with each family receiving such services; and

''(B) staff providing such services will receive qualified supervision.

''(e) APPLICANTS PROVIDING DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION AND PREVENTION SERVICES.—To be eligible to use assistance under section 311(a)(2)(C)(iii) to provide drug abuse education and prevention services, an applicant shall include in the plan required by subsection (b)—

''(1) a description of—

''(A) the types of such services that the applicant proposes to provide;

''(B) the objectives of such services; and

''(C) the types of information and training to be provided to individuals providing such services to runaway and homeless youth; and

''(2) an assurance that in providing such services the applicant shall conduct outreach activities for runaway and homeless youth.''.

(d) APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.—Section 313 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5713) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 313. APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—An application by a public or private entity for a grant under section 311(a) may be approved by the Secretary after taking into consideration, with respect to the State in which such entity proposes to provide services under this part—

''(1) the geographical distribution in such State of the proposed services under this part for which all grant applicants request approval; and

''(2) which areas of such State have the greatest need for such services.

''(b) PRIORITY.—In selecting applications for grants under section 311(a), the Secretary shall give priority to—

''(1) eligible applicants who have demonstrated experience in providing services to runaway and homeless youth; and

''(2) eligible applicants that request grants of less than $200,000.''.

(e) AUTHORITY FOR TRANSITIONAL LIVING GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 321 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714–1) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''PURPOSE AND'';

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''(a)''; and

(3) by striking subsection (b).

(f) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 322(a)(9) of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714–2(a)(9)) is amended by inserting '', and the services provided to such youth by such project,'' after ''such project''.

(g) COORDINATION.—Section 341 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714–21) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 341. COORDINATION.

''With respect to matters relating to the health, education, employment, and housing of runaway and homeless youth, the Secretary—

''(1) in conjunction with the Attorney General, shall coordinate the activities of agencies of the Department of Health and Human Services with activities under any other Federal juvenile crime control, prevention, and juvenile offender accountability program and with the activities of other Federal entities; and

''(2) shall coordinate the activities of agencies of the Department of Health and Human Services with the activities of other Federal entities and with the activities of entities that are eligible to receive grants under this title.''.

(h) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS FOR RESEARCH, EVALUATION, DEMONSTRATION, AND SERVICE PROJECTS.—Section 343 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714–23) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''EVALUATION,'' after ''RESEARCH,'';

(2) in subsection (a), by inserting ''evaluation,'' after ''research,''; and

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (10) as paragraphs (2) through (9), respectively.

(i) ASSISTANCE TO POTENTIAL GRANTEES.—Section 371 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714a) is amended by striking the last sentence.

(j) REPORTS.—Section 381 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5715) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 381. REPORTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 1, 2000, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary shall submit, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, a report on the status, activities, and accomplishments of entities that receive grants under parts A, B, C, D, and E, with particular attention to—

''(1) in the case of centers funded under part A, the ability or effectiveness of such centers in—

''(A) alleviating the problems of runaway and homeless youth;

''(B) if applicable or appropriate, reuniting such youth with their families and encouraging the resolution of intrafamily problems through counseling and other services;

''(C) strengthening family relationships and encouraging stable living conditions for such youth; and

''(D) assisting such youth to decide upon a future course of action; and

''(2) in the case of projects funded under part B—

''(A) the number and characteristics of homeless youth served by such projects;

''(B) the types of activities carried out by such projects;

''(C) the effectiveness of such projects in alleviating the problems of homeless youth;

''(D) the effectiveness of such projects in preparing homeless youth for self-sufficiency;

''(E) the effectiveness of such projects in assisting homeless youth to decide upon future education, employment, and independent living;

''(F) the ability of such projects to encourage the resolution of intrafamily problems through counseling and development of self-sufficient living skills; and

''(G) activities and programs planned by such projects for the following fiscal year.

''(b) CONTENTS OF REPORTS.—The Secretary shall include in each report submitted under subsection (a), summaries of—

''(1) the evaluations performed by the Secretary under section 386; and

''(2) descriptions of the qualifications of, and training provided to, individuals involved in carrying out such evaluations.''.

(k) EVALUATION.—Section 384 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5732) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 386. EVALUATION AND INFORMATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—If a grantee receives grants for 3 consecutive fiscal years under part A, B, C, D, or E (in the alternative), then the Secretary shall evaluate such grantee on-site, not less frequently than once in the period of such 3 consecutive fiscal years, for purposes of—

''(1) determining whether such grants are being used for the purposes for which such grants are made by the Secretary;

''(2) collecting additional information for the report required by section 383; and

''(3) providing such information and assistance to such grantee as will enable such grantee to improve the operation of the centers, projects, and activities for which such grants are made.

''(b) COOPERATION.—Recipients of grants under this title shall cooperate with the Secretary's efforts to carry out evaluations, and to collect information, under this title.''.

(l) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 385 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5751) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 388. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) AUTHORIZATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title (other than part E) such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004.

''(2) ALLOCATION.—

''(A) PARTS A AND B.—From the amount appropriated under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve not less than 90 percent to carry out parts A and B.

''(B) PART B.—Of the amount reserved under subparagraph (A), not less than 20 percent, and not more than 30 percent, shall be reserved to carry out part B.

''(3) PARTS C AND D.—In each fiscal year, after reserving the amounts required by paragraph (2), the Secretary shall use the remaining amount (if any) to carry out parts C and D.

''(b) SEPARATE IDENTIFICATION REQUIRED.—No funds appropriated to carry out this title may be combined with funds appropriated under any other Act if the purpose of combining such funds is to make a single discretionary grant, or a single discretionary payment, unless such funds are separately identified in all grants and contracts and are used for the purposes specified in this title.''.

(m) SEXUAL ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM.—

(1) AUTHORITY FOR PROGRAM.—The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by striking the heading for part F;

(B) by redesignating part E as part F; and

(C) by inserting after part D the following:

''PART E—SEXUAL ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM

''SEC. 351. AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to nonprofit private agencies for the purpose of providing street-based services to runaway and homeless, and street youth, who have been subjected to, or are at risk of being subjected to, sexual abuse, prostitution, or sexual exploitation.

''(b) PRIORITY.—In selecting applicants to receive grants under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to nonprofit private agencies that have experience in providing services to runaway and homeless, and street youth.''.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 388(a) of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5751), as amended by subsection (l) of this section, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) PART E.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out part E such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004.''.

(n) DEFINITIONS.—The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 386, as amended by subsection (k) of this section, the following:

''SEC. 387. DEFINITIONS.

''In this title:

''(1) DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION AND PREVENTION SERVICES.—The term 'drug abuse education and prevention services'—

''(A) means services to runaway and homeless youth to prevent or reduce the illicit use of drugs by such youth; and

''(B) may include—

''(i) individual, family, group, and peer counseling;

''(ii) drop-in services;

''(iii) assistance to runaway and homeless youth in rural areas (including the development of community support groups);

''(iv) information and training relating to the illicit use of drugs by runaway and homeless youth, to individuals involved in providing services to such youth; and

''(v) activities to improve the availability of local drug abuse prevention services to runaway and homeless youth.

''(2) HOME-BASED SERVICES.—The term 'home-based services'—

''(A) means services provided to youth and their families for the purpose of—

''(i) preventing such youth from running away, or otherwise becoming separated, from their families; and

''(ii) assisting runaway youth to return to their families; and

''(B) includes services that are provided in the residences of families (to the extent practicable), including—

''(i) intensive individual and family counseling; and

''(ii) training relating to life skills and parenting.

''(3) HOMELESS YOUTH.—The term 'homeless youth' means an individual—

''(A) who is—

''(i) not more than 21 years of age; and

''(ii) for the purposes of part B, not less than 16 years of age;

''(B) for whom it is not possible to live in a safe environment with a relative; and

''(C) who has no other safe alternative living arrangement.

''(4) STREET-BASED SERVICES.—The term 'street-based services'—

''(A) means services provided to runaway and homeless youth, and street youth, in areas where they congregate, designed to assist such youth in making healthy personal choices regarding where they live and how they behave; and

''(B) may include—

''(i) identification of and outreach to runaway and homeless youth, and street youth;

''(ii) crisis intervention and counseling;

''(iii) information and referral for housing;

''(iv) information and referral for transitional living and health care services;

''(v) advocacy, education, and prevention services related to—

''(I) alcohol and drug abuse;

''(II) sexual exploitation;

''(III) sexually transmitted diseases, including human immunodeficiency virus (HIV); and

''(IV) physical and sexual assault.

''(5) STREET YOUTH.—The term 'street youth' means an individual who—

''(A) is—

''(i) a runaway youth; or

''(ii) indefinitely or intermittently a homeless youth; and

''(B) spends a significant amount of time on the street or in other areas that increase the risk to such youth for sexual abuse, sexual exploitation, prostitution, or drug abuse.

''(6) TRANSITIONAL LIVING YOUTH PROJECT.—The term 'transitional living youth project' means a project that provides shelter and services designed to promote a transition to self-sufficient living and to prevent long-term dependency on social services.

''(7) YOUTH AT RISK OF SEPARATION FROM THE FAMILY.—The term 'youth at risk of separation from the family' means an individual—

''(A) who is less than 18 years of age; and

''(B)(i) who has a history of running away from the family of such individual;

''(ii) whose parent, guardian, or custodian is not willing to provide for the basic needs of such individual; or

''(iii) who is at risk of entering the child welfare system or juvenile justice system as a result of the lack of services available to the family to meet such needs.''.

(o) REDESIGNATION OF SECTIONS.—Sections 371, 372, 381, 382, and 383 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714b–5851 et seq.), as amended by this title, are redesignated as sections 381, 382, 383, 384, and 385, respectively.

(p) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 331, in the first sentence, by striking ''With'' and all that follows through ''the Secretary'', and inserting ''The Secretary''; and

(2) in section 344(a)(1), by striking ''With'' and all that follows through ''the Secretary'', and inserting ''The Secretary''.

SEC. 304. NATIONAL CENTER FOR MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 402 of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5771) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(9) for 14 years, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children has—

''(A) served as the national resource center and clearinghouse congressionally mandated under the provisions of the Missing Children's Assistance Act of 1984; and

''(B) worked in partnership with the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of State, and many other agencies in the effort to find missing children and prevent child victimization;

''(10) Congress has given the Center, which is a private non-profit corporation, access to the National Crime Information Center of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System;

''(11) since 1987, the Center has operated the National Child Pornography Tipline, in conjunction with the United States Customs Service and the United States Postal Inspection Service and, beginning this year, the Center established a new CyberTipline on child exploitation, thus becoming 'the 911 for the Internet';

''(12) in light of statistics that time is of the essence in cases of child abduction, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in February of 1997 created a new NCIC child abduction ('CA') flag to provide the Center immediate notification in the most serious cases, resulting in 642 'CA' notifications to the Center and helping the Center to have its highest recovery rate in history;

''(13) the Center has established a national and increasingly worldwide network, linking the Center online with each of the missing children clearinghouses operated by the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, as well as with Scotland Yard in the United Kingdom, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, INTERPOL headquarters in Lyon, France, and others, which has enabled the Center to transmit images and information regarding missing children to law enforcement across the United States and around the world instantly;

''(14) from its inception in 1984 through March 31, 1998, the Center has—

''(A) handled 1,203,974 calls through its 24-hour toll-free hotline (1–800–THE–LOST) and currently averages 700 calls per day;

''(B) trained 146,284 law enforcement, criminal and juvenile justice, and healthcare professionals in child sexual exploitation and missing child case detection, identification, investigation, and prevention;

''(C) disseminated 15,491,344 free publications to citizens and professionals; and

''(D) worked with law enforcement on the cases of 59,481 missing children, resulting in the recovery of 40,180 children;

''(15) the demand for the services of the Center is growing dramatically, as evidenced by the fact that in 1997, the Center handled 129,100 calls, an all-time record, and by the fact that its new Internet website (www.missingkids.com) receives 1,500,000 'hits' every day, and is linked with hundreds of other websites to provide real-time images of breaking cases of missing children;

''(16) in 1997, the Center provided policy training to 256 police chiefs and sheriffs from 50 States and Guam at its new Jimmy Ryce Law Enforcement Training Center;

''(17) the programs of the Center have had a remarkable impact, such as in the fight against infant abductions in partnership with the healthcare industry, during which the Center has performed 668 onsite hospital walk-throughs and inspections, and trained 45,065 hospital administrators, nurses, and security personnel, and thereby helped to reduce infant abductions in the United States by 82 percent;

''(18) the Center is now playing a significant role in international child abduction cases, serving as a representative of the Department of State at cases under The Hague Convention, and successfully resolving the cases of 343 international child abductions, and providing greater support to parents in the United States;

''(19) the Center is a model of public/private partnership, raising private sector funds to match congressional appropriations and receiving extensive private in-kind support, including advanced technology provided by the computer industry such as imaging technology used to age the photographs of long-term missing children and to reconstruct facial images of unidentified deceased children;

''(20) the Center was 1 of only 10 of 300 major national charities given an A+ grade in 1997 by the American Institute of Philanthropy; and

''(21) the Center has been redesignated as the Nation's missing children clearinghouse and resource center once every 3 years through a competitive selection process conducted by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice, and has received grants from that Office to conduct the crucial purposes of the Center.''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 403 of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5772) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) the term 'Center' means the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.''.

(c) DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR.—Section 404 of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5773) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) ANNUAL GRANT TO NATIONAL CENTER FOR MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall annually make a grant to the Center, which shall be used to—

''(A)(i) operate a national 24-hour toll-free telephone line by which individuals may report information regarding the location of any missing child, or other child 13 years of age or younger whose whereabouts are unknown to such child's legal custodian, and request information pertaining to procedures necessary to reunite such child with such child's legal custodian; and

''(ii) coordinate the operation of such telephone line with the operation of the national communications system referred to in part C of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714–11);

''(B) operate the official national resource center and information clearinghouse for missing and exploited children;

''(C) provide to State and local governments, public and private nonprofit agencies, and individuals, information regarding—

''(i) free or low-cost legal, restaurant, lodging, and transportation services that are available for the benefit of missing and exploited children and their families; and

''(ii) the existence and nature of programs being carried out by Federal agencies to assist missing and exploited children and their families;

''(D) coordinate public and private programs that locate, recover, or reunite missing children with their families;

''(E) disseminate, on a national basis, information relating to innovative and model programs, services, and legislation that benefit missing and exploited children;

''(F) provide technical assistance and training to law enforcement agencies, State and local governments, elements of the criminal justice system, public and private nonprofit agencies, and individuals in the prevention, investigation, prosecution, and treatment of cases involving missing and exploited children; and

''(G) provide assistance to families and law enforcement agencies in locating and recovering missing and exploited children, both nationally and internationally.

''(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out this subsection, $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004.

''(c) NATIONAL INCIDENCE STUDIES.—The Administrator, either by making grants to or entering into contracts with public agencies or nonprofit private agencies, shall—

''(1) periodically conduct national incidence studies to determine for a given year the actual number of children reported missing each year, the number of children who are victims of abduction by strangers, the number of children who are the victims of parental kidnapings, and the number of children who are recovered each year; and

''(2) provide to State and local governments, public and private nonprofit agencies, and individuals information to facilitate the lawful use of school records and birth certificates to identify and locate missing children.''.

(d) NATIONAL CENTER FOR MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN.—Section 405(a) of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5775(a)) is amended by inserting ''the Center and with'' before ''public agencies''.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 408 of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5777) is amended by striking ''1997 through 2001'' and inserting ''2000 through 2004''.

SEC. 305. TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS AND SAVINGS PROVISIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, unless otherwise provided or indicated by the context:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention established by operation of subsection (b).

(2) ADMINISTRATOR OF THE OFFICE.—The term ''Administrator of the Office'' means the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

(3) BUREAU OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE.—The term ''Bureau of Justice Assistance'' means the bureau established under section 401 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

(4) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term ''Federal agency'' has the meaning given the term ''agency'' by section 551(1) of title 5, United States Code.

(5) FUNCTION.—The term ''function'' means any duty, obligation, power, authority, responsibility, right, privilege, activity, or program.

(6) OFFICE OF JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND PREVENTION.—The term ''Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention'' means the office established by operation of subsection (b).

(7) OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION.—The term ''Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' means the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice, established by section 201 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(8) OFFICE.—The term ''office'' includes any office, administration, agency, institute, unit, organizational entity, or component thereof.

(b) TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS.—There are transferred to the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention all functions that the Administrator of the Office exercised before the date of enactment of this Act (including all related functions of any officer or employee of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention), and authorized after the date of enactment of this Act, relating to carrying out the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.

(c) TRANSFER AND ALLOCATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS AND PERSONNEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the personnel employed in connection with, and the assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, and other amounts employed, used, held, arising from, available to, or to be made available in connection with the functions transferred by this section, subject to section 1531 of title 31, United States Code, shall be transferred to the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention.

(2) UNEXPENDED AMOUNTS.—Any unexpended amounts transferred pursuant to this subsection shall be used only for the purposes for which the amounts were originally authorized and appropriated.

(d) INCIDENTAL TRANSFERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, at such time or times as the Director of that Office shall provide, may make such determinations as may be necessary with regard to the functions transferred by this section, and to make such additional incidental dispositions of personnel, assets, liabilities, grants, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, and other amounts held, used, arising from, available to, or to be made available in connection with such functions, as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(2) TERMINATION OF AFFAIRS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall provide for the termination of the affairs of all entities terminated by this section and for such further measures and dispositions as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this section.

(e) EFFECT ON PERSONNEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by this section, the transfer pursuant to this section of full-time personnel (except special Government employees) and part-time personnel holding permanent positions shall not cause any such employee to be separated or reduced in grade or compensation for 1 year after the date of transfer of such employee under this section.

(2) EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE POSITIONS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, any person who, on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, held a position compensated in accordance with the Executive Schedule prescribed in chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, and who, without a break in service, is appointed in the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention to a position having duties comparable to the duties performed immediately preceding such appointment shall continue to be compensated in such new position at not less than the rate provided for such previous position, for the duration of the service of such person in such new position.

(3) TRANSITION RULE.—The incumbent Administrator of the Office as of the date immediately preceding the date of enactment of this Act shall continue to serve as Administrator after the date of enactment of this Act until such time as the incumbent resigns, is relieved of duty by the President, or an Administrator is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(f) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—

(1) CONTINUING EFFECT OF LEGAL DOCUMENTS.—All orders, determinations, rules, regulations, permits, agreements, grants, contracts, certificates, licenses, registrations, privileges, and other administrative actions—

(A) that have been issued, made, granted, or allowed to become effective by the President, any Federal agency or official thereof, or by a court of competent jurisdiction, in the performance of functions that are transferred under this section; and

(B) that are in effect at the time this section takes effect, or were final before the date of enactment of this Act and are to become effective on or after the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue in effect according to their terms until modified, terminated, superseded, set aside, or revoked in accordance with law by the President, the Administrator, or other authorized official, a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(2) PROCEEDINGS NOT AFFECTED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not affect any proceedings, including notices of proposed rulemaking, or any application for any license, permit, certificate, or financial assistance pending before the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention on the date on which this section takes effect, with respect to functions transferred by this section but such proceedings and applications shall be continued.

(B) ORDERS; APPEALS; PAYMENTS.—Orders shall be issued in such proceedings, appeals shall be taken therefrom, and payments shall be made pursuant to such orders, as if this section had not been enacted, and orders issued in any such proceedings shall continue in effect until modified, terminated, superseded, or revoked by a duly authorized official, by a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(C) DISCONTINUANCE OR MODIFICATION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prohibit the discontinuance or modification of any such proceeding under the same terms and conditions and to the same extent that such proceeding could have been discontinued or modified if this paragraph had not been enacted.

(3) SUITS NOT AFFECTED.—This section shall not affect suits commenced before the date of enactment of this Act, and in all such suits, proceedings shall be had, appeals taken, and judgments rendered in the same manner and with the same effect as if this section had not been enacted.

(4) NONABATEMENT OF ACTIONS.—No suit, action, or other proceeding commenced by or against the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, or by or against any individual in the official capacity of such individual as an officer of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, shall abate by reason of the enactment of this section.

(5) ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS RELATING TO PROMULGATION OF REGULATIONS.—Any administrative action relating to the preparation or promulgation of a regulation by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention relating to a function transferred under this section may be continued, to the extent authorized by this section, by the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention with the same effect as if this section had not been enacted.

(6) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to affect the authority under section 242A or 243 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended by this Act.

(g) TRANSITION.—The Administrator may utilize—

(1) the services of such officers, employees, and other personnel of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention with respect to functions transferred to the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention by this section; and

(2) amounts appropriated to such functions for such period of time as may reasonably be needed to facilitate the orderly implementation of this section.

(h) REFERENCES.—Reference in any other Federal law, Executive order, rule, regulation, or delegation of authority, or any document of or relating to—

(1) the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention with regard to functions transferred by operation of subsection (b), shall be considered to refer to the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention; and

(2) the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention with regard to functions transferred by operation of subsection (b), shall be considered to refer to the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention.

(i) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' and inserting ''Administrator, Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention''.

(2) Section 4351(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' and inserting ''Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention''.

(3) Subsections (a)(1) and (c) of section 3220 of title 39, United States Code, are each amended by striking ''Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' each place it appears and inserting ''Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention''.

(4) Section 463(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 663(f)) is amended by striking ''Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' and inserting ''Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention''.

(5) Sections 801(a), 804, 805, and 813 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3712(a), 3782, 3785, 3786, 3789i) are amended by striking ''Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' each place it appears and inserting ''Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention''.

(6) The Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 214(b)(1) by striking ''262, 293, and 296 of subpart II of title II'' and inserting ''299B and 299E'';

(B) in section 214A(c)(1) by striking ''262, 293, and 296 of subpart II of title II'' and inserting ''299B and 299E'';

(C) in sections 217 and 222 by striking ''Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' each place it appears and inserting ''Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention''; and

(D) in section 223(c) by striking ''section 262, 293, and 296'' and inserting ''sections 262, 299B, and 299E''.

(7) The Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5771 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 403(2) by striking ''Justice and Delinquency Prevention'' and inserting ''Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention''; and

(B) in subsections (a)(5)(E) and (b)(1)(B) of section 404 by striking ''section 313'' and inserting ''section 331''.

(8) The Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 217(c)(1) by striking ''sections 262, 293, and 296 of subpart II of title II'' and inserting ''sections 299B and 299E''; and

(B) in section 223(c) by striking ''section 262, 293, and 296 of title II'' and inserting ''sections 299B and 299E''.

(j) REFERENCES.—In any Federal law (excluding this Act and the Acts amended by this Act), Executive order, rule, regulation, order, delegation of authority, grant, contract, suit, or document a reference to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention shall be deemed to include a reference to the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention.

Subtitle B—Accountability for Juvenile Offenders and Public Protection Incentive Grants

SEC. 321. BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part R of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"PART R—JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY BLOCK GRANTS

"SEC. 1801. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall make, subject to the availability of appropriations, grants to States for use by States and units of local government in planning, establishing, operating, coordinating, and evaluating projects, directly or through grants and contracts with public and private agencies, for the development of more effective investigation, prosecution, and punishment (including the imposition of graduated sanctions) of crimes or acts of delinquency committed by juveniles, programs to improve the administration of justice for and ensure accountability by juvenile offenders, and programs to reduce the risk factors (such as truancy, drug or alcohol use, and gang involvement) associated with juvenile crime or delinquency.

''(b) USE OF GRANTS.—Grants under this section may be used by States and units of local government—

''(1) for programs to enhance the identification, investigation, prosecution, and punishment of juvenile offenders, such as—

''(A) the utilization of graduated sanctions;

''(B) the utilization of short-term confinement of juvenile offenders;

''(C) the incarceration of violent juvenile offenders for extended periods of time;

''(D) the hiring of juvenile public defenders, juvenile judges, juvenile probation officers, and juvenile correctional officers to implement policies to control juvenile crime and violence and ensure accountability of juvenile offenders; and

''(E) the development and implementation of coordinated, multi-agency systems for—

''(i) the comprehensive and coordinated booking, identification, and assessment of juveniles arrested or detained by law enforcement agencies, including the utilization of multi-agency facilities such as juvenile assessment centers; and

''(ii) the coordinated delivery of support services for juveniles who have had or are at risk for contact with the juvenile or criminal systems, including utilization of court-established local service delivery councils;

''(2) for programs that require juvenile offenders to make restitution to the victims of offenses committed by those juvenile offenders, including programs designed and operated to further the goal of providing eligible offenders with an alternative to adjudication that emphasizes restorative justice;

''(3) for programs that require juvenile offenders to attend and successfully complete school or vocational training as part of a sentence imposed by a court;

''(4) for programs that require juvenile offenders who are parents to demonstrate parental responsibility by working and paying child support;

''(5) for programs that seek to curb or punish truancy;

''(6) for programs designed to collect, record, retain, and disseminate information useful in the identification, prosecution, and sentencing of juvenile offenders, such as criminal history information, fingerprints, DNA tests, and ballistics tests;

''(7) for the development and implementation of coordinated multijurisdictional or multi-agency programs for the identification, control, supervision, prevention, investigation, and treatment of the most serious juvenile offenses and offenders, popularly known as a 'SHOCAP Program' (Serious Habitual Offenders Comprehensive Action Program);

''(8) for the development and implementation of coordinated multijurisdictional or multiagency programs for the identification, control, supervision, prevention, investigation, and disruption of youth gangs;

''(9) for the construction or remodeling of short- and long-term facilities for juvenile offenders;

''(10) for the development and implementation of technology, equipment, training programs for juvenile crime control, for law enforcement officers, judges, prosecutors, probation officers, and other court personnel who are employed by State and local governments, in furtherance of the purposes identified in this section;

''(11) for partnerships between State educational agencies and local educational agencies for the design and implementation of character education and training programs that incorporate the following elements of character: Caring, citizenship, fairness, respect, responsibility and trustworthiness;

''(12) for programs to seek to target, curb and punish adults who knowingly and intentionally use a juvenile during the commission or attempted commission of a crime, including programs that specifically provide for additional punishments or sentence enhancements for adults who knowingly and intentionally use a juvenile during the commission or attempted commission of a crime;

''(13) for juvenile prevention programs (including curfews, youth organizations, anti-drug, and anti-alcohol programs, anti-gang programs, and after school programs and activities);

''(14) for juvenile drug and alcohol treatment programs;

''(15) for school counseling and other school-base prevention programs;

''(16) for programs that drug test juveniles who are arrested, including follow-up testings; and

''(17) for programs for—

''(A) providing cross-training, jointly with the public mental health system, for State juvenile court judges, public defenders, prosecutors, and mental health and substance abuse agency representatives with respect to the appropriate use of effective, community-based alternatives to juvenile justice or mental health system institutional placements; or

''(B) providing training for State juvenile probation officers and community mental health and substance abuse program representatives on appropriate linkages between probation programs and mental health community programs, specifically focusing on the identification of mental disorders and substance abuse addiction in juveniles on probation, effective treatment interventions for those disorders, and making appropriate contact with mental health and substance abuse case managers and programs in the community, in order to ensure that juveniles on probation receive appropriate access to mental health and substance abuse treatment programs and services.

''(c) REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to receive an incentive grant under this section, a State shall submit to the Attorney General an application, in such form as shall be prescribed by the Attorney General, which shall contain assurances that, not later than 1 year after the date on which the State submits such application—

''(1) the State has established or will establish a system of graduated sanctions for juvenile offenders that ensures appropriate sanctions, which are graduated to reflect the severity or repeated nature of violations, for each act of delinquency;

''(2) the State has established or will establish a policy of drug testing (including followup testing) juvenile offenders upon their arrest for any offense within an appropriate category of offenses designated by the chief executive officer of the State; and

''(3) the State has an established policy recognizing the rights and needs of victims of crimes committed by juveniles.

''(d) ALLOCATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF STATE GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) STATE AND LOCAL DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to subparagraph (B), of amounts made available to the State, 30 percent may be retained by the State for use pursuant to paragraph (2) and 70 percent shall be reserved by the State for local distribution pursuant to paragraph (3).

''(B) SPECIAL RULE.—The Attorney General may waive the requirements of this paragraph with respect to any State in which the criminal and juvenile justice services for delinquent or other youth are organized primarily on a statewide basis, in which case not more than 50 percent of funds shall be made available to all units of local government in that State pursuant to paragraph (3).

''(2) OTHER DISTRIBUTION.—Of amounts retained by the State under paragraph (1)—

''(A) not less than 50 percent shall be designated for—

''(i) programs pursuant to paragraph (1) or (9) of subsection (b), except that if the State designates any amounts for purposes of construction or remodeling of short- or long-term facilities pursuant to subsection (b)(9), such amounts shall constitute not more than 50 percent of the estimated construction or remodeling cost and that no funds expended pursuant to this subparagraph may be used for the incarceration of any offender who was more than 21 years of age at the time of the offense, and no funds expended pursuant to this subparagraph may be used for construction, renovation, or expansion of facilities for such offenders, except that funds may be used to construct juvenile facilities collocated with adult facilities; or

''(ii) drug testing upon arrest for any offense within the category of offenses designated pursuant to subsection (c)(3), and intensive supervision thereafter pursuant to programs under subsection (b)(7) and subsection (c)(3); and

''(B) not less than 25 percent shall be used for the purposes set forth in paragraph (13), (14), or (15) of subsection (b).

''(3) LOCAL ELIGIBILITY AND DISTRIBUTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—

''(i) LOCAL DISTRIBUTION SUBGRANT ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive a subgrant, a unit of local government shall provide such assurances to the State as the State shall require, that, to the maximum extent applicable, the unit of local government has laws or policies and programs that comply with the eligibility requirements of subsection (c).

''(ii) COORDINATED LOCAL EFFORT.—Prior to receiving a grant under this section, a unit of local government shall certify that it has or will establish a coordinated enforcement plan for reducing juvenile crime within the jurisdiction of the unit of local government, developed by a juvenile crime enforcement coalition, such coalition consisting of individuals within the jurisdiction representing the police, sheriff, prosecutor, State or local probation services, juvenile court, schools, business, and religious affiliated, fraternal, nonprofit, or social service organizations involved in crime prevention.

''(B) SPECIAL RULE.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply to an eligible unit that receives funds from the Attorney General under subparagraph (H), except that information that would otherwise be submitted to the State shall be submitted to the Attorney General.

''(C) LOCAL DISTRIBUTION.—From amounts reserved for local distribution under paragraph (1), the State shall allocate to such units of local government an amount that bears the same ratio to the aggregate amount of such funds as—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the product of—

''(aa) two-thirds; multiplied by

''(bb) the average law enforcement expenditure for such unit of local government for the 3 most recent calendar years for which such data is available; plus

''(II) the product of—

''(aa) one-third; multiplied by

''(bb) the average annual number of part 1 violent crimes in such unit of local government for the 3 most recent calendar years for which such data is available, bears to—

''(ii) the sum of the products determined under subparagraph (A) for all such units of local government in the State.

''(D) EXPENDITURES.—The allocation any unit of local government shall receive under paragraph (1) for a payment period shall not exceed 100 percent of law enforcement expenditures of the unit for such payment period.

''(E) REALLOCATION.—The amount of any unit of local government's allocation that is not available to such unit by operation of paragraph (2) shall be available to other units of local government that are not affected by such operation in accordance with this subsection.

''(F) UNAVAILABILITY OF DATA FOR UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—If the State has reason to believe that the reported rate of part 1 violent crimes or law enforcement expenditure for a unit of local government is insufficient or inaccurate, the State shall—

''(i) investigate the methodology used by the unit to determine the accuracy of the submitted data; and

''(ii) if necessary, use the best available comparable data regarding the number of violent crimes or law enforcement expenditure for the relevant years for the unit of local government.

''(G) LOCAL GOVERNMENT WITH ALLOCATIONS LESS THAN $5,000.—If, under this section, a unit of local government is allocated less than $5,000 for a payment period, the amount allocated shall be expended by the State on services to units of local government whose allotment is less than such amount in a manner consistent with this part.

''(H) DIRECT GRANTS TO ELIGIBLE UNITS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If a State does not qualify or apply for a grant under this section, by the application deadline established by the Attorney General, the Attorney General shall reserve not more than 70 percent of the allocation that the State would have received for grants under this section under subsection (e) for such fiscal year to provide grants to eligible units that meet the requirements for funding under subparagraph (A).

''(ii) AWARD BASIS.—In addition to the qualification requirements for direct grants for eligible units the Attorney General may use the average amount allocated by the States to like governmental units as a basis for awarding grants under this section.

''(I) ALLOCATION BY UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—Of the total amount made available under this section to a unit of local government for a fiscal year, not less than 25 percent shall be used for the purposes set forth in paragraph (13), (14), or (15) of subsection (b), and not less than 50 percent shall be designated for—

''(i) paragraph (1) or (9) of subsection (b), except that, if amounts are allocated for purposes of construction or remodeling of short- or long-term facilities pursuant to subsection (b)(9)—

''(I) the unit of local government shall coordinate such expenditures with similar State expenditures;

''(II) Federal funds shall constitute not more than 50 percent of the estimated construction or remodeling cost; and

''(III) no funds expended pursuant to this clause may be used for the incarceration of any offender who was more than 21 years of age at the time of the offense or for construction, renovation, or expansion of facilities for such offenders, except that funds may be used to construct juvenile facilities collocated with adult facilities, including separate buildings for juveniles and separate juvenile wings, cells, or areas collocated within an adult jail or lockup; or

''(ii) drug testing upon arrest for any offense within the category of offenses designated pursuant to subsection (c)(3), and intensive supervision thereafter pursuant to programs under subsection (b)(7) and subsection (c)(3).

''(4) NONSUPPLANTATION.—Amounts made available under this section to the States (or units of local government in the State) shall not be used to supplant State or local funds (or in the case of Indian tribal governments, to supplant amounts provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs) but shall be used to increase the amount of funds that would in the absence of amounts received under this section, be made available from a State or local source, or in the case of Indian tribal governments, from amounts provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

''(e) ALLOCATION OF GRANTS AMONG QUALIFYING STATES; RESTRICTIONS ON USE.—

''(1) ALLOCATION.—Amounts made available under this section shall be allocated as follows:

''(A) 0.5 percent shall be allocated to each eligible State.

''(B) The amount remaining after the allocation under subparagraph (A) shall be allocated proportionately based on the population that is less than 18 years of age in the eligible States.

''(2) RESTRICTIONS ON USE.—Amounts made available under this section shall be subject to the restrictions of subsections (a) and (b) of section 292 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, except that the penalties in section 292(c) of such Act do not apply.

''(f) GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBES.—

''(1) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, from the amounts appropriated pursuant to section 291 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, for each fiscal year, the Attorney General shall reserve an amount equal to the amount to which all Indian tribes eligible to receive a grant under paragraph (3) would collectively be entitled, if such tribes were collectively treated as a State to carry out this subsection.

''(2) GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBES.—From the amounts reserved under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall make grants to Indian tribes for programs pursuant to the permissible purposes under section 1801.

''(3) APPLICATIONS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, an Indian tribe shall submit to the Attorney General an application in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may by regulation require. The requirements of subsection (c) apply to grants under this subsection.

''SEC. 1802. JUVENILE CRIMINAL HISTORY GRANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, through the Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics and with consultation and coordination with the Office of Justice Programs and the Attorney General, upon application from a State (in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require) shall make a grant to each eligible State to be used by the State exclusively for purposes of meeting the eligibility requirements of subsection (b).

''(b) ELIGIBILITY.—A State is eligible for a grant under subsection (a) if its application provides assurances that, not later than 3 years after the date on which such application is submitted, the State will—

''(1) maintain, at the adult State central repository in accordance with the State's established practices and policies relating to adult criminal history records—

''(A) a fingerprint supported record of the adjudication of delinquency of any juvenile who commits an act that, if committed by an adult, would constitute the offense of murder, armed robbery, rape (except statutory rape), or a felony offense involving sexual molestation of a child, or a conspiracy or attempt to commit any such offense (all as defined by State law), that is equivalent to, and maintained and disseminated in the same manner and for the same purposes as are adult criminal history records for the same offenses, except that the record may include a notation of expungement pursuant to State law; and

''(B) a fingerprint supported record of the adjudication of delinquency of any juvenile who commits an act that, if committed by an adult, would be a felony other than a felony described in subparagraph (A) that is equivalent to, and maintained and disseminated in the same manner for any criminal justice purpose as are adult criminal history records for the same offenses, except that the record may include a notation of expungement pursuant to State law; and

''(2) will establish procedures by which an official of an elementary, secondary, and post-secondary school may, in appropriate circumstances (as defined by applicable State law), gain access to the juvenile adjudication record of a student enrolled at the school, or a juvenile who seeks, intends, or is instructed to enroll at that school, if—

''(A) the official is subject to the same standards and penalties under applicable Federal and State law relating to the handling and disclosure of information contained in juvenile adjudication records as are employees of law enforcement and juvenile justice agencies in the State; and

''(B) information contained in the juvenile adjudication record may not be used for the purpose of making an admission determination.

''(c) VALIDITY OF CERTAIN JUDGMENTS.—Nothing in this section shall require States, in order to qualify for grants under this title, to modify laws concerning the status of any adjudication of juvenile delinquency or judgment of conviction under the law of the State that entered the judgment.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'criminal justice purpose' means the use by and within the criminal justice system for the detection, apprehension, detention, pretrial release, post-trial release, prosecution, adjudication, sentencing, disposition, correctional supervision, or rehabilitation of accused persons, criminal offenders, or juvenile delinquents; and

''(2) the term 'expungement' means the nullification of the legal effect of the conviction or adjudication to which the record applies.

''SEC. 1803. GRANTS TO COURTS FOR STATE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEMS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may make grants in accordance with this section to States and units of local government to assist State and local courts with juvenile offender dockets.

''(b) GRANT PURPOSES.—Grants under this section may be used—

''(1) for technology, equipment, and training for judges, probation officers, and other court personnel to implement an accountability-based juvenile justice system that provides substantial and appropriate sanctions that are graduated in such manner as to reflect (for each delinquent act or criminal offense) the severity or repeated nature of that act or offense;

''(2) to hire additional judges, probation officers, other necessary court personnel, victims counselors, and public defenders for juvenile courts or adult courts with juvenile offender dockets, including courts with specialized juvenile drug offense or juvenile firearms offense dockets to reduce juvenile court backlogs, and provide additional services to make more effective systems of graduated sanctions designed to reduce recidivism and deter future crimes or delinquent acts by juvenile offenders;

''(3) to provide funding to enable juvenile courts and juvenile probation officers to address drug, gang, and youth violence problems more effectively; and

''(4) to provide funds to—

''(A) effectively supervise and monitor juvenile offenders sentenced to probation or parole; and

''(B) enforce conditions of probation and parole imposed on juvenile offenders, including drug testing and payment of restitution.

''(c) APPLICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State or unit of local government that applies for a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Attorney General, in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In submitting an application for a grant under this part, a State or unit of local government shall provide assurances that the State or unit of local government will—

''(A) give priority to the prosecution of violent juvenile offenders;

''(B) seek to reduce any backlogs in juvenile justice cases and provide additional services to make more effective systems of graduated sanctions designed to reduce recidivism and deter future crimes or delinquent acts by juvenile offenders;

''(C) give adequate consideration to the rights and needs of victims of juvenile offenders; and

''(D) use amounts received under this section to supplement (and not supplant) State and local resources.

''(d) ALLOCATION OF GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) ALLOCATION TO STATES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In awarding grants under this part, the Attorney General may award grants provided for a State (including units of local government in that State) an aggregate amount equal to 0.75 percent of the amount made available to the Attorney General by appropriations for this section made pursuant to section 291(b)(1) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (reduced by amounts reserved under subsection (e)).

''(ii) ADJUSTMENT.—If the Attorney General determines that an insufficient number of applications have been submitted for a State, the Attorney General may adjust the aggregate amount awarded for a State under clause (i).

''(B) REMAINING AMOUNTS.—Of the adjusted amounts available to the Attorney General to carry out the grant program under this section referred to in subparagraph (A) that remain after the Attorney General distributes the amounts specified in that subparagraph (referred to in this subparagraph as the 'remaining amount') the Attorney General may award an additional aggregate amount to each State (including any political subdivision thereof) that (or with respect to which a political subdivision thereof) submits an application that is approved by the Attorney General under this section that bears the same ratio to the remaining amount as the population of juveniles residing in that State bears to the population of juveniles residing in all States.

''(2) EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.—The Attorney General shall ensure that the distribution of grant amounts made available for a State (including units of local government in that State) under this section is made on an equitable geographic basis, to ensure that—

''(A) an equitable amount of available funds are directed to rural areas, including those jurisdictions serving smaller urban and rural communities located along interstate transportation routes that are adversely affected by interstate criminal gang activity, such as illegal drug trafficking; and

''(B) the amount allocated to a State is equitably divided between the State, counties, and other units of local government to reflect the relative responsibilities of each such unit of local government.

''(e) ADMINISTRATION; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may reserve for each fiscal year not more than 2 percent of amounts appropriated for this section pursuant to section 291(b)(1) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974—

''(A) for the administration of this section; and

''(B) for the provision of technical assistance to recipients of or applicants for grant awards under this section.

''(2) CARRYOVER PROVISION.—Any amounts reserved for any fiscal year pursuant to paragraph (1) that are not expended during that fiscal year shall remain available until expended, except that any amount reserved under this subsection for the succeeding fiscal year from amounts made available by appropriations shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount that remains available.

''(f) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Any grant amounts awarded under this section shall remain available until expended.''.

SEC. 322. PILOT PROGRAM TO PROMOTE REPLICATION OF RECENT SUCCESSFUL JUVENILE CRIME REDUCTION STRATEGIES.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM TO PROMOTE REPLICATION OF RECENT SUCCESSFUL JUVENILE CRIME REDUCTION STRATEGIES.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Attorney General (or a designee of the Attorney General), in conjunction with the Secretary of the Treasury (or the designee of the Secretary), shall establish a pilot program (referred to in this section as the ''program'') to encourage and support communities that adopt a comprehensive approach to suppressing and preventing violent juvenile crime patterned after successful State juvenile crime reduction strategies.

(2) PROGRAM.—In carrying out the program, the Attorney General shall—

(A) make and track grants to grant recipients (referred to in this section as ''coalitions'');

(B) in conjunction with the Secretary of the Treasury, provide for technical assistance and training, data collection, and dissemination of relevant information; and

(C) provide for the general administration of the program.

(3) ADMINISTRATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall appoint or designate an Administrator (referred to in this section as the ''Administrator'') to carry out the program.

(4) PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.—To be eligible to receive an initial grant or a renewal grant under this section, a coalition shall meet each of the following criteria:

(A) COMPOSITION.—The coalition shall consist of 1 or more representatives of—

(i) the local police department or sheriff's department;

(ii) the local prosecutors' office;

(iii) the United States Attorney's office;

(iv) the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(v) the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms;

(vi) State or local probation officers;

(vii) religious affiliated or fraternal organizations involved in crime prevention;

(viii) schools;

(ix) parents or local grass roots organizations such as neighborhood watch groups;

(x) local recreation agencies; and

(xi) social service agencies involved in crime prevention.

(B) OTHER PARTICIPANTS.—If possible, in addition to the representatives from the categories listed in subparagraph (A), the coalition shall include—

(i) representatives from the business community; and

(ii) researchers who have studied criminal justice and can offer technical or other assistance.

(C) COORDINATED STRATEGY.—A coalition shall submit to the Attorney General, or the Attorney General's designee, a comprehensive plan for reducing violent juvenile crime. To be eligible for consideration, a plan shall—

(i) ensure close collaboration among all members of the coalition in suppressing and preventing juvenile crime;

(ii) place heavy emphasis on coordinated enforcement initiatives, such as Federal and State programs that coordinate local police departments, prosecutors, and local community leaders to focus on the suppression of violent juvenile crime involving gangs;

(iii) ensure that there is close collaboration between police and probation officers in the supervision of juvenile offenders, such as initiatives that coordinate the efforts of parents, school officials, and police and probation officers to patrol the streets and make home visits to ensure that offenders comply with the terms of their probation;

(iv) ensure that a program is in place to trace all firearms seized from crime scenes or offenders in an effort to identify illegal gun traffickers; and

(v) ensure that effective crime prevention programs are in place, such as programs that provide after-school safe havens and other opportunities for at-risk youth to escape or avoid gang or other criminal activity, and to reduce recidivism.

(D) ACCOUNTABILITY.—A coalition shall—

(i) establish a system to measure and report outcomes consistent with common indicators and evaluation protocols established by the Administrator and that receives the approval of the Administrator; and

(ii) devise a detailed model for measuring and evaluating the success of the plan of the coalition in reducing violent juvenile crime, and provide assurances that the plan will be evaluated on a regular basis to assess progress in reducing violent juvenile crime.

(5) GRANT AMOUNTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may grant to an eligible coalition under this paragraph, an amount not to exceed the amount of non-Federal funds raised by the coalition, including in-kind contributions, for that fiscal year.

(B) NONSUPPLANTING REQUIREMENT.—A coalition seeking funds shall provide reasonable assurances that funds made available under this program to States or units of local government shall be so used as to supplement and increase (but not supplant) the level of the State, local, and other non-Federal funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for programs described in this section, and shall in no event replace such State, local, or other non-Federal funds.

(C) SUSPENSION OF GRANTS.—If a coalition fails to continue to meet the criteria set forth in this section, the Administrator may suspend the grant, after providing written notice to the grant recipient and an opportunity to appeal.

(D) RENEWAL GRANTS.—Subject to subparagraph (D), the Administrator may award a renewal grant to grant recipient under this subparagraph for each fiscal year following the fiscal year for which an initial grant is awarded, in an amount not to exceed the amount of non-Federal funds raised by the coalition, including in-kind contributions, for that fiscal year, during the 4-year period following the period of the initial grant.

(E) LIMITATION.—The amount of a grant award under this section may not exceed $300,000 for a fiscal year.

(6) PERMITTED USE OF FUNDS.—A coalition receiving funds under this section may expend such Federal funds on any use or program that is contained in the plan submitted to the Administrator.

(7) CONGRESSIONAL CONSULTATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Two years after the date of implementation of the program established in this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report reviewing the effectiveness of the program in suppressing and reducing violent juvenile crime in the participating communities.

(B) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) an analysis of each community participating in the program, along with information regarding the plan undertaken in the community, and the effectiveness of the plan in reducing violent juvenile crime; and

(ii) recommendations regarding the efficacy of continuing the program.

(b) INFORMATION COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION WITH RESPECT TO COALITIONS.—

(1) COALITION INFORMATION.—For the purpose of audit and examination, the Attorney General—

(A) shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records that are pertinent to any grant or grant renewal request under this section; and

(B) may periodically request information from a coalition to ensure that the coalition meets the applicable criteria.

(2) REPORTING.—The Attorney General shall, to the maximum extent practicable and in a manner consistent with applicable law, minimize reporting requirements by a coalition and expedite any application for a renewal grant made under this section.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

(2) SOURCE OF SUMS.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this subsection may be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

SEC. 323. REPEAL OF UNNECESSARY AND DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS.

(a) VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994.—

(1) TITLE III.—Title III of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13741 et seq.) is amended by striking subtitles A through C, and subtitles G through S.

(2) TITLE XXVII.—Title XXVII of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14191 et seq.) is repealed.

(b) REFORM OF GREAT PROGRAM.—Section 32401(a) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13921(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) SELECTION OF COMMUNITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each community identified for a GREAT project referred to in paragraph (1) shall be selected by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of—

''(i) the level of gang activity and youth violence in the area in which the community is located;

''(ii) the number of schools in the community in which training would be provided under the project;

''(iii) the number of students who would receive the training referred to in clause (ii) in schools referred to in that clause; and

''(iv) a written description from officials of the community explaining the manner in which funds made available to the community under this section would be allocated.

''(B) EQUITABLE SELECTION.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall ensure that—

''(i) communities are identified and selected for GREAT projects under this subsection on an equitable geographic basis (except that this clause shall not be construed to require the termination of any projects selected prior to the beginning of fiscal year 1999); and

''(ii) the communities referred to in clause (i) include rural communities.''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''50 percent'' and inserting ''85 percent''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''50 percent'' and inserting ''15 percent''.

SEC. 324. EXTENSION OF VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 310001(b) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14211) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (5) and inserting the following:

''(1) for fiscal year 2001, $6,025,000,000;
''(2) for fiscal year 2002, $6,169,000,000;
''(3) for fiscal year 2003, $6,316,000,000;
''(4) for fiscal year 2004, $6,458,000,000; and
''(5) for fiscal year 2005, $6,616,000,000.''.

(b) DISCRETIONARY LIMITS.—Title XXXI of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14211 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 310001 the following:

''SEC. 310002. DISCRETIONARY LIMITS.

''For the purposes of allocations made for the discretionary category pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)), the term 'discretionary spending limit' means—

''(1) with respect to fiscal year 2001—

''(A) for the discretionary category, amounts of budget authority and outlays necessary to adjust the discretionary spending limits to reflect the changes in subparagraph (B) as determined by the Chairman of the Budget Committee; and

''(B) for the violent crime reduction category: $6,025,000,000 in new budget authority and $5,718,000,000 in outlays;

''(2) with respect to fiscal year 2002—

''(A) for the discretionary category, amounts of budget authority and outlays necessary to adjust the discretionary spending limits to reflect the changes in subparagraph (B) as determined by the Chairman of the Budget Committee; and

''(B) for the violent crime reduction category: $6,169,000,000 in new budget authority and $6,020,000,000 in outlays; and

''(3) with respect to fiscal year 2003—

''(A) for the discretionary category, amounts of budget authority and outlays necessary to adjust the discretionary spending limits to reflect the changes in subparagraph (B) as determined by the Chairman of the Budget Committee; and

''(B) for the violent crime reduction category: $6,316,000,000 in new budget authority and $6,161,000,000 in outlays;

''(4) with respect to fiscal year 2004—

''(A) for the discretionary category, amounts of budget authority and outlays necessary to adjust the discretionary spending limits to reflect the changes in subparagraph (B) as determined by the Chairman of the Budget Committee; and

''(B) for the violent crime reduction category: $6,458,000 in new budget authority and $6,303,000,000 in outlays; and

''(5) with respect to fiscal year 2005—

''(A) for the discretionary category, amounts of budget authority and outlays necessary to adjust the discretionary spending limits to reflect the changes in subparagraph (B) as determined by the Chairman of the Budget Committee; and

''(B) for the violent crime reduction category: $6,616,000 in new budget authority and $6,452,000,000 in outlays;

as adjusted in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)) and section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.''.

SEC. 325. REIMBURSEMENT OF STATES FOR COSTS OF INCARCERATING JUVENILE ALIENS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 501 of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (8 U.S.C. 1365) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''or illegal juvenile alien who has been adjudicated delinquent and committed to a juvenile correctional facility by such State or locality'' before the period;

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting ''(including any juvenile alien who has been adjudicated delinquent and has been committed to a correctional facility)'' before ''who is in the United States unlawfully''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) JUVENILE ALIEN DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'juvenile alien' means an alien (as defined in section 101(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act) who has been adjudicated delinquent and committed to a correctional facility by a State or locality as a juvenile offender.''.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 332 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1366) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) the number of illegal juvenile aliens that are committed to State or local juvenile correctional facilities, including the type of offense committed by each juvenile.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 241(i)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(i)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of clause (ii);

(2) by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) is a juvenile alien with respect to whom section 501 of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 applies.''.

Subtitle C—Alternative Education and Delinquency Prevention

SEC. 331. ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION.

Part D of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6421 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Subpart 4—Alternative Education Demonstration Project Grants

''SEC. 1441. PROGRAM AUTHORITY.

''(a) GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts appropriated under section 1443, the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, shall make grants to State educational agencies or local educational agencies for not less than 10 demonstration projects that enable the agencies to develop models for and carry out alternative education for at-risk youth.

''(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subpart shall be construed to affect the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

''(b) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—

''(1) PARTNERSHIPS.—Each agency receiving a grant under this subpart may enter into a partnership with a private sector entity to provide alternative educational services to at-risk youth.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each demonstration project assisted under this subpart shall—

''(A) accept for alternative education at-risk or delinquent youth who are referred by a local school or by a court with a juvenile delinquency docket and who—

''(i) have demonstrated a pattern of serious and persistent behavior problems in regular schools;

''(ii) are at risk of dropping out of school;

''(iii) have been convicted of a criminal offense or adjudicated delinquent for an act of juvenile delinquency, and are under a court's supervision; or

''(iv) have demonstrated that continued enrollment in a regular classroom—

''(I) poses a physical threat to other students; or

''(II) inhibits an atmosphere conducive to learning; and

''(B) provide for accelerated learning, in a safe, secure, and disciplined environment, including—

''(i) basic curriculum focused on mastery of essential skills, including targeted instruction in basic skills required for secondary school graduation; and

''(ii) emphasis on—

''(I) personal, academic, social, and workplace skills; and

''(II) behavior modification.

''(c) APPLICABILITY.—Except as provided in subsections (c) and (e) of section 1442, the provisions of section 1401(c), 1402, and 1431, and subparts 1 and 2, shall not apply to this subpart.

''(d) DEFINITION OF ADMINISTRATOR.—In this subpart, the term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention of the Department of Justice.

''SEC. 1442. APPLICATIONS; GRANTEE SELECTION.

''(a) APPLICATIONS.—Each State educational agency and local educational agency seeking a grant under this subpart shall submit an application in such form, and containing such information, as the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, may reasonably require.

''(b) SELECTION OF GRANTEES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall select State educational agencies and local educational agencies to receive grants under this subpart on an equitable geographic basis, including selecting agencies that serve urban, suburban, and rural populations.

''(2) MINIMUM.—The Secretary shall award a grant under this subpart to not less than 1 agency serving a population with a significant percentage of Native Americans.

''(3) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this subpart, the Secretary may give priority to State educational agencies and local educational agencies that demonstrate in the application submitted under subsection (a) that the State has a policy of equitably distributing resources among school districts in the State.

''(c) QUALIFICATIONS.—To qualify for a grant under this subpart, a State educational agency or local educational agency shall—

''(1) in the case of a State educational agency, have submitted a State plan under section 1414(a) that is approved by the Secretary;

''(2) in the case of a local educational agency, have submitted an application under section 1423 that is approved by the State educational agency;

''(3) certify that the agency will comply with the restrictions of section 292 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974;

''(4) explain the educational and juvenile justice needs of the community to be addressed by the demonstration project;

''(5) provide a detailed plan to implement the demonstration project; and

''(6) provide assurances and an explanation of the agency's ability to continue the program funded by the demonstration project after the termination of Federal funding under this subpart.

''(d) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Grant funds provided under this subpart shall not constitute more than 35 percent of the cost of the demonstration project funded.

''(2) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Matching funds for grants under this subpart may be derived from amounts available under section 205, or part B of title II, of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5611 et seq.) to the State in which the demonstration project will be carried out, except that the total share of funds derived from Federal sources shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost of the demonstration project.

''(e) PROGRAM EVALUATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State educational agency or local educational agency that receives a grant under this subpart shall evaluate the demonstration project assisted under this subpart in the same manner as programs are evaluated under section 1431. In addition, the evaluation shall include—

''(A) an evaluation of the effect of the alternative education project on order, discipline, and an effective learning environment in regular classrooms;

''(B) an evaluation of the project's effectiveness in improving the skills and abilities of at-risk students assigned to alternative education, including an analysis of the academic and social progress of such students; and

''(C) an evaluation of the project's effectiveness in reducing juvenile crime and delinquency, including—

''(i) reductions in incidents of campus crime in relevant school districts, compared with school districts not included in the project; and

''(ii) reductions in recidivism by at-risk students who have juvenile justice system involvement and are assigned to alternative education.

''(2) EVALUATION BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Administrator, shall comparatively evaluate each of the demonstration projects funded under this subpart, including an evaluation of the effectiveness of private sector educational services, and shall report the findings of the evaluation to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committees on the Judiciary and Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate not later than June 30, 2005.

''SEC. 1443. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subpart $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003.''.

Subtitle D—Parenting as Prevention

SEC. 341. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle shall be cited as the ''Parenting as Prevention Act''.

SEC. 342. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Defense shall establish a parenting support and education program as provided in sections 343, 344, and 345.

SEC. 343. NATIONAL PARENTING SUPPORT AND EDUCATION COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISH COMMISSION.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish a National Parenting Support and Education Commission (hereinafter referred to as the ''Commission'') to identify the best practices for parenting and to provide practical parenting advice for parents and caregivers based on the best available research data. She shall provide the Commission with necessary staff and other resources to fulfill its duties.

(b) MEMBERSHIP OF COMMISSION.—The Secretary shall appoint the Commission after consultation with the cabinet members identified in section 342. The Commission shall consist of the following members—

(1) an adolescent representative;

(2) a parent representative;

(3) an expert in brain research;

(4) experts in child development, youth development, early childhood education, primary education, and secondary education;

(5) an expert in children's mental health;

(6) an expert on children's health and nutrition;

(7) an expert on child abuse prevention, diagnosis, and treatment;

(8) a representative of parenting support programs;

(9) a representative of parenting education;

(10) a representative from law enforcement;

(11) an expert on firearm safety programs;

(12) a representative from a nonprofit organization that delivers services to children and their families which may include a faith based organization; and

(13) such other representatives as the Secretary deems necessary.

(c) DUTIES OF COMMISSION.—The Commission shall—

(1) identify best parenting practices for parents and caregivers of young children on topics including but not limited to brain stimulation, developing healthy attachments and social relationships, anger management and conflict resolution, character development, discipline, controlling access to television and other entertainment including computers, firearms safety, mental health, health care and nutrition including breastfeeding, encouraging reading and lifelong learning habits, and recognition and treatment of developmental and behavioral problems;

(2) identify best parenting practices of adolescents and pre-adolescents on topics including but not limited to methods of addressing peer pressure with respect to underage drinking, sexual relations, illegal drug use, and other negative behavior; developing healthy social and family relationships; exercising discipline; controlling access to television and other entertainment including computers, video games, and movies; firearm safety; encouraging success in school; and other issues of concern to parents of adolescents;

(3) identify best parenting practices and resources available for parents and caregivers of children with special needs including fetal alcohol syndrome, fetal alcohol effect, mental illness, autism, retardation, learning disabilities, behavioral disorders, chronic illness, and physical disabilities; and

(4) review existing parenting support and education programs and the data evaluating them and make recommendations to the Secretary and the Congress on which are most effective and should receive Federal support within 18 months of appointment.

(d) PUBLIC HEARINGS AND TESTIMONY.—The Commission shall conduct four public hearings, shall solicit and receive testimony from national experts and national organizations, shall conduct a comprehensive review of academic and other research literature, and shall seek information from the Governors on existing brain development and parenting programs which have been most successful.

(e) PUBLICATION OF MATERIALS.—If not otherwise available, the Commission shall prepare materials which may include written material, videotapes, CD's, and other audio and visual material on best parenting practices and shall make them available for distribution to parents, caregivers, and others through State and local government programs, hospitals, maternity centers, and other health care providers, adoption agencies, schools, public housing units, child care centers, and social service providers. If such materials are already available, the Commission may print, reproduce, and distribute such materials.

(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Commission shall prepare and submit a report of its findings and recommendations to the Secretary and the Congress no later than 18 months after appointment.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS.—There is authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 2000 such sums as may be necessary to support the work of the Commission and to produce and distribute the materials described in subsection (e). Such sum shall remain available until expended. Any fund appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 344. STATE AND LOCAL PARENTING SUPPORT AND EDUCATION GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—The Secretary shall make allotments to eligible States to support parenting support and training programs. Each State shall receive an amount that bears the same relationship to the amount appropriated as the total number of children in the State bears to the total number of children in all States, but no State shall receive less than one-half of one percent of the state allocation. From the amounts provided to each State with Indian or Alaska Native populations exceeding two percent of its total statewide population, the Governor shall set aside two percent for Indian tribes as that term is defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (P.L. 93–638, as amended; 25 U.S.C. 450b(e)) which shall be distributed based on the percentage of Indian children in each tribe except that with respect to Alaska, the funds shall be distributed to the nonprofit entities described in section 419(4)(B) of the Social Security Act pursuant to section 103 of Public Law 104–193 (110 Stat. 2159, 2160; 42 U.S.C. 619(4)(B)) which shall be allocated based on the percentage of Alaska Native children in each region.

(b) STATE PARENTING SUPPORT AND EDUCATION COUNCIL.—To be eligible to receive Federal funding, the Governor of each State shall appoint a State Parenting Support and Education Council (hereinafter referred to as the ''Council'') which shall include parent representatives, representatives of the State government, bipartisan representation from the State legislature, representatives from local communities, and interested children's organizations, except that the Governor may designate an existing entity that includes such groups. The Council shall conduct a needs and resources assessment of parenting support and education programs in the State to determine where programs are lacking or inadequate and identify what additional programs are needed and which programs require additional resources. It shall consider the findings and recommendations of the Parenting Commission in making those determinations. Upon completion of the assessment, the Council may consider grant applications from the State to provide statewide programs, from local communities including schools, and from nonprofit service providers including faith based organizations.

(c) GRANTS.—Grants may be made for:

(1) Parenting support to promote early brain development and childhood development and education including—

(A) assistance to schools to offer classroom instruction on brain stimulation, child development, and early childhood education;

(B) distribution of materials developed by the Commission or another entity that reflect best parenting practices;

(C) development and distribution of referral information on programs and services available to children and families at the local level, including eligibility criteria;

(D) voluntary hospital visits for postpartum women and in-home visits for families with infants, toddlers, or newly adopted children to provide hands-on training and one-on-one instruction on brain stimulation, child development, and early childhood education;

(E) parenting education programs including training with respect to the best parenting practices identified in subsection (c).

(2) Parenting support for adolescents and youth including funds for services and support for parents and other caregivers of young people being served by a range of education, social service, mental health, health, runaway and homeless youth programs. Programs may include the Boys and Girls Club, YMCA and YWCA, after school programs, 4–H programs, or other community based organizations. Eligible activities may include parent-caregiver support groups, peer support groups, parent education classes, seminars or discussion groups on problems facing adolescents, advocates and mentors to help parents understand and work with schools, the courts, and various treatment programs.

(3) Parenting support and education resource centers including—

(A) development of parenting resource centers which may serve as a single point of contact for the provision of comprehensive services available to children and their families including Federal, State, and local governmental and nonprofit services available to children. Such services may include child care, respite care, pediatric care, child abuse prevention programs, nutrition programs, parent training, infant and child CPR and safety training programs, caregiver training and education, and other related programs;

(B) a national toll free anonymous parent hotline with 24 hour a day consultation and advice including referral to local community based services;

(C) respite care for parents with children with special needs, single mothers, and at-risk youth.

(d) REPORTING.—Each entity that receives a grant under this section shall submit a report every 2 years to the Council describing the program it has developed, the number of parents and children served, and the success of the program using specific performance measures.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not more than 5 percent of the amounts received by a State may be used to pay for the administrative expenses of the Council in implementing the grant program.

(f) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local public funds expended for parenting support and education programs.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary for fiscal year 2000 and subsequent fiscal years.

SEC. 345. GRANTS TO ADDRESS THE PROBLEM OF VIOLENCE RELATED STRESS TO PARENTS AND CHILDREN.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that a child's brain is wired between the ages of 0–3. A child's ability to learn, develop healthy family and social relationships, resist peer pressure, and control violent impulses depends on the quality and quantity of brain stimulation he receives. Research shows that children exposed to negative brain stimulation in the form of physical and sexual abuse and violence in the family or community causes the brain to be miswired making it difficult for the child to be successful in life. Intervention early in a child's life to correct the miswiring is much more successful than adult rehabilitation efforts.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants, enter into contracts or cooperative agreements to public and nonprofit private entities, as well as to Indian tribes, Native Hawaiians, and Alaska Native nonprofit corporations to establish national and regional centers of excellence on psychological trauma response and to identify the best practices for treating psychiatric and behavioral disorders resulting from children witnessing or experiencing such stress.

(c) PRIORITIES.—In awarding grants, contracts or cooperative agreements under subsection (a) related to the identifying best practices for treating disorders associated with psychological trauma, the Secretary shall give priority to programs that work with children, adolescents, adults, and families who are survivors and witnesses of child abuse, domestic, school, and community violence, and disasters.

(d) GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall ensure that grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under subsection (a) with respect to centers of excellence are distributed equitably among the regions of the country and among urban and rural areas.

(e) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall require that each applicant for a grant, contract or cooperative agreement under subsection (a) submit a plan as part of his application for the rigorous evaluation of the activities funded under the grant, contract or agreement, including both process and outcomes evaluation, and the submission of an evaluation at the end of the project period.

(f) DURATION OF AWARDS.—With respect to a grant, contract or cooperative agreement under this section, the period during which payments under such an award will be made to the recipient may not be less than 3 years. Such grants, contract or agreement may be renewed.

(g) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the General Accounting Office shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives a report concerning whether individuals are covered for post-traumatic stress disorders under public and private health plans, and the course of treatment, if any, that is covered.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section for fiscal year 2000 and subsequent fiscal years.

TITLE IV—VOLUNTARY MEDIA AGREEMENTS FOR CHILDREN'S PROTECTION

Subtitle A—Children and the Media

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Children's Protection Act of 1999''.

SEC. 402. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Television is seen and heard in nearly every United States home and is a uniquely pervasive presence in the daily lives of Americans. The average American home has 2.5 televisions, and a television is turned on in the average American home 7 hours every day.

(2) Television plays a particularly significant role in the lives of children. Figures provided by Nielsen Research show that children between the ages of 2 years and 11 years spend an average of 21 hours in front of a television each week.

(3) Television has an enormous capability to influence perceptions, especially those of children, of the values and behaviors that are common and acceptable in society.

(4) The influence of television is so great that its images and messages often can be harmful to the development of children. Social science research amply documents a strong correlation between the exposure of children to televised violence and a number of behavioral and psychological problems.

(5) Hundreds of studies have proven conclusively that children who are consistently exposed to violence on television have a higher tendency to exhibit violent and aggressive behavior, both as children and later in life.

(6) Such studies also show that repeated exposure to violent programming causes children to become desensitized to and more accepting of real-life violence and to grow more fearful and less trusting of their surroundings.

(7) A growing body of social science research indicates that sexual content on television can also have a significant influence on the attitudes and behaviors of young viewers. This research suggests that heavy exposure to programming with strong sexual content contributes to the early commencement of sexual activity among teenagers.

(8) Members of the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) adhered for many years to a comprehensive code of conduct that was based on an understanding of the influence exerted by television and on a widely held sense of responsibility for using that influence carefully.

(9) This code of conduct, the Television Code of the National Association of Broadcasters, articulated this sense of responsibility as follows:

(A) ''In selecting program subjects and themes, great care must be exercised to be sure that the treatment and presentation are made in good faith and not for the purpose of sensationalism or to shock or exploit the audience or appeal to prurient interests or morbid curiosity.''.

(B) ''Broadcasters have a special responsibility toward children. Programs designed primarily for children should take into account the range of interests and needs of children, from instructional and cultural material to a wide variety of entertainment material. In their totality, programs should contribute to the sound, balanced development of children to help them achieve a sense of the world at large and informed adjustments to their society.''.

(C) ''Violence, physical, or psychological, may only be projected in responsibly handled contexts, not used exploitatively. Programs involving violence present the consequences of it to its victims and perpetrators. Presentation of the details of violence should avoid the excessive, the gratuitous and the instructional.''.

(D) ''The presentation of marriage, family, and similarly important human relationships, and material with sexual connotations, shall not be treated exploitatively or irresponsibly, but with sensitivity.''.

(E) ''Above and beyond the requirements of the law, broadcasters must consider the family atmosphere in which many of their programs are viewed. There shall be no graphic portrayal of sexual acts by sight or sound. The portrayal of implied sexual acts must be essential to the plot and presented in a responsible and tasteful manner.''.

(10) The National Association of Broadcasters abandoned the code of conduct in 1983 after three provisions of the code restricting the sale of advertising were challenged by the Department of Justice on antitrust grounds and a Federal district court issued a summary judgment against the National Association of Broadcasters regarding one of the provisions on those grounds. However, none of the programming standards of the code were challenged.

(11) While the code of conduct was in effect, its programming standards were never found to have violated any antitrust law.

(12) Since the National Association of Broadcasters abandoned the code of conduct, programming standards on broadcast and cable television have deteriorated dramatically.

(13) In the absence of effective programming standards, public concern about the impact of television on children, and on society as a whole, has risen substantially. Polls routinely show that more than 80 percent of Americans are worried by the increasingly graphic nature of sex, violence, and vulgarity on television and by the amount of programming that openly sanctions or glorifies criminal, antisocial, and degrading behavior.

(14) At the urging of Congress, the television industry has taken some steps to respond to public concerns about programming standards and content. The broadcast television industry agreed in 1992 to adopt a set of voluntary guidelines designed to ''proscribe gratuitous or excessive portrayals of violence''. Shortly thereafter, both the broadcast and cable television industries agreed to conduct independent studies of the violent content in their programming and make those reports public.

(15) In 1996, the television industry as a whole made a commitment to develop a comprehensive rating system to label programming that may be harmful or inappropriate for children. That system was implemented at the beginning of 1999.

(16) Despite these efforts to respond to public concern about the impact of television on children, millions of Americans, especially parents with young children, remain angry and frustrated at the sinking standards of television programming, the reluctance of the industry to police itself, and the harmful influence of television on the well-being of the children and the values of the United States.

(17) The Department of Justice issued a ruling in 1993 indicating that additional efforts by the television industry to develop and implement voluntary programming guidelines would not violate the antitrust laws. The ruling states that ''such activities may be likened to traditional standard setting efforts that do not necessarily restrain competition and may have significant procompetitive benefits . . . . Such guidelines could serve to disseminate valuable information on program content to both advertisers and television viewers. Accurate information can enhance the demand for, and increase the output of, an industry's products or services.''.

(18) The Children's Television Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–437) states that television broadcasters in the United States have a clear obligation to meet the educational and informational needs of children.

(19) Several independent analyses have demonstrated that the television broadcasters in the

United States have not fulfilled their obligations under the Children's Television Act of 1990 and have not noticeably expanded the amount of educational and informational programming directed at young viewers since the enactment of that Act.

(20) The popularity of video and personal computer (PC) games is growing steadily among children. Although most popular video and personal computer games are educational or harmless in nature, many of the most popular are extremely violent. One recent study by Strategic Record Research found that 64 percent of teenagers played video or personal computer games on a regular basis. Other surveys of children as young as elementary school age found that almost half of them list violent computer games among their favorites.

(21) Violent video games often present violence in a glamorized light. Game players are often cast in the role of shooter, with points scored for each ''kill''. Similarly, advertising for such games often touts violent content as a selling point—the more graphic and extreme, the better.

(22) As the popularity and graphic nature of such video games grows, so do their potential to negatively influence impressionable children.

(23) Music is another extremely pervasive and popular form of entertainment. American children and teenagers listen to music more than any other demographic group. The Journal of American Medicine reported that between the 7th and 12th grades the average teenager listens to 10,500 hours of rock or rap music, just slightly less than the entire number of hours spent in the classroom from kindergarten through high school.

(24) Teens are among the heaviest purchasers of music, and are most likely to favor music genres that depict, and often appear to glamorize violence.

(25) Music has a powerful ability to influence perceptions, attitudes, and emotional state. The use of music as therapy indicates its potential to increase emotional, psychological. and physical health. That influence can be used for ill as well.

SEC. 403. PURPOSES; CONSTRUCTION.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this subtitle are to permit the entertainment industry—

(1) to work collaboratively to respond to growing public concern about television programming, movies, video games, Internet content, and music lyrics, and the harmful influence of such programming, movies, games, content, and lyrics on children;

(2) to develop a set of voluntary programming guidelines similar to those contained in the Television Code of the National Association of Broadcasters; and

(3) to implement the guidelines in a manner that alleviates the negative impact of television programming, movies, video games, Internet content, and music lyrics on the development of children in the United States and stimulates the development and broadcast of educational and informational programming for such children.

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—This subtitle may not be construed as—

(1) providing the Federal Government with any authority to restrict television programming, movies, video games, Internet content, or music lyrics that is in addition to the authority to restrict such programming, movies, games, content, or lyrics under law as of the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) approving any action of the Federal Government to restrict such programming, movies, games, content, or lyrics that is in addition to any actions undertaken for that purpose by the Federal Government under law as of such date.

SEC. 404. EXEMPTION OF VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS ON GUIDELINES FOR CERTAIN ENTERTAINMENT MATERIAL FROM APPLICABILITY OF ANTITRUST LAWS.

(a) EXEMPTION.—Subject to subsection (b), the antitrust laws shall not apply to any joint discussion, consideration, review, action, or agreement by or among persons in the entertainment industry for the purpose of developing and disseminating voluntary guidelines designed—

(1) to alleviate the negative impact of telecast material, movies, video games, Internet content, and music lyrics containing violence, sexual content, criminal behavior, or other subjects that are not appropriate for children; or

(2) to promote telecast material that is educational, informational, or otherwise beneficial to the development of children.

(b) LIMITATION.—The exemption provided in subsection (a) shall not apply to any joint discussion, consideration, review, action, or agreement which—

(1) results in a boycott of any person; or

(2) concerns the purchase or sale of advertising, including (without limitation) restrictions on the number of products that may be advertised in a commercial, the number of times a program may be interrupted for commercials, and the number of consecutive commercials permitted within each interruption.

SEC. 405. EXEMPTION OF ACTIVITIES TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH RATINGS AND LABELING SYSTEMS FROM APPLICABILITY OF ANTITRUST LAWS.

(a) EXEMPTION FROM ANTITRUST LAWS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The antitrust laws shall not apply to any joint discussion, consideration, review, action, or agreement between or among persons in the motion picture, recording, or video game industry for the purpose of and limited to the development or enforcement of voluntary guidelines, procedures, and mechanisms designed to ensure compliance by persons and entities described in paragraph (2) with ratings and labeling systems to identify and limit dissemination of sexual, violent, or other indecent material to children.

(2) PERSONS AND ENTITIES DESCRIBED.—A person or entity described in this paragraph is a person or entity that is—

(A) engaged in the retail sales of motion pictures, recordings, or video games; or

(B) a theater owner or operator, video game arcade owner or operator, or other person or entity that makes available the viewing, listening, or use of a motion picture, recording, or video game to a member of the general public for compensation.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, in conjunction with the Federal Trade Commission, shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) the extent to which the motion picture, recording, and video game industry have developed or enforced guidelines, procedures, or mechanisms to ensure compliance by persons and entities described in subsection (b)(2) with ratings or labeling systems which identify and limit dissemination of sexual, violent, or other indecent material to children; and

(2) the extent to which Federal or State antitrust laws preclude those industries from developing and enforcing the guidelines described in subsection (b)(1).

SEC. 406. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) ANTITRUST LAWS.—The term ''antitrust laws'' has the meaning given such term in the first section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12) and includes section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45).

(2) INTERNET.—The term ''Internet'' means the combination of computer facilities and electromagnetic transmission media, and related equipment and software, comprising the interconnected worldwide network of computer networks that employ the Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol or any successor protocol to transmit information.

(3) MOVIES.—The term ''movies'' means motion pictures.

(4) PERSON IN THE ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY.—The term ''person in the entertainment industry'' means a television network, any entity which produces or distributes television programming (including motion pictures), the National Cable Television Association, the Association of Independent Television Stations, Incorporated, the National Association of Broadcasters, the Motion Picture Association of America, each of the affiliate organizations of the television networks, the Interactive Digital Software Association, any entity which produces or distributes video games, the Recording Industry Association of America, and any entity which produces or distributes music, and includes any individual acting on behalf of such person.

(5) TELECAST.—The term ''telecast'' means any program broadcast by a television broadcast station or transmitted by a cable television system.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

SEC. 411. STUDY OF MARKETING PRACTICES OF MOTION PICTURE, RECORDING, AND VIDEO/PERSONAL COMPUTER GAME INDUSTRIES.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General shall jointly conduct a study of the marketing practices of the motion picture, recording, and video/personal computer game industries.

(2) ISSUES EXAMINED.—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Commission and the Attorney General shall examine—

(A) the extent to which the motion picture, recording, and video/personal computer industries target the marketing of violent, sexually explicit, or other unsuitable material to minors, including whether such content is advertised or promoted in media outlets in which minors comprise a substantial percentage of the audience;

(B) the extent to which retail merchants, movie theaters, or others who engage in the sale or rental for a fee of products of the motion picture, recording, and video/personal computer industries—

(i) have policies to restrict the sale, rental, or viewing to minors of music, movies, or video/personal computer games that are deemed inappropriate for minors under the applicable voluntary industry rating or labeling systems; and

(ii) have procedures compliant with such policies;

(C) whether and to what extent the motion picture, recording, and video/personal computer industries require, monitor, or encourage the enforcement of their respective voluntary rating or labeling systems by industry members, retail merchants, movie theaters, or others who engage in the sale or rental for a fee of the products of such industries;

(D) whether any of the marketing practices examined may violate Federal law; and

(E) whether and to what extent the motion picture, recording, and video/personal computer industries engage in actions to educate the public on the existence, use, or efficacy of their voluntary rating or labeling systems.

(3) FACTORS FOR DETERMINATION.—In determining whether the products of the motion picture, recording, or video/personal computer industries are violent, sexually explicit, or otherwise unsuitable for minors for the purposes of paragraph (2)(A), the Commission and the Attorney General shall consider the voluntary industry rating or labeling systems of the industry concerned as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission and the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a).

(c) AUTHORITY.—For the purposes of the study conducted under subsection (a), the Commission may use its authority under section 6(b) of the Federal Trade Commission Act to require the filing of reports or answers in writing to specific questions, as well as to obtain information,

oral testimony, documentary material, or tangible things.

TITLE V—GENERAL FIREARM PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. SPECIAL LICENSEES; SPECIAL REGISTRATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(35) GUN SHOW.—The term 'gun show' means a gun show or event described in section 923(j).

''(36) SPECIAL LICENSE.—The term 'special license' means a license issued under section 923(m).

''(37) SPECIAL LICENSEE.—The term 'special licensee' means a person to whom a special license has been issued.

''(38) SPECIAL REGISTRANT.—The term 'special registrant' means a person to whom a special registration has been issued.

''(39) SPECIAL REGISTRATION.—The term 'special registration' means a registration issued under section 923(m).''.

(b) SPECIAL LICENSES; SPECIAL REGISTRATION.—Section 923 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) SPECIAL LICENSES; SPECIAL REGISTRATIONS.—

''(1) SPECIAL LICENSES.—

''(A) APPLICATION.—A person who—

''(i) is engaged in the business of dealing in firearms by—

''(I) buying or selling firearms solely or primarily at gun shows; or

''(II) buying or selling firearms as part of a gunsmith or firearm repair business or the conduct of other activity that, absent this subsection, would require a license under this chapter; and

''(ii) desires to have access to the National Instant Check System;

may submit to the Secretary an application for a special license.

''(B) EFFECT OF PARAGRAPH.—Nothing in this paragraph—

''(i) requires a license for conduct that did not require a license before the date of enactment of this subsection; or

''(ii) diminishes in any manner any right to display, sell, or otherwise dispose of firearms or ammunition, make repairs, or engage in any other conduct or activity, that was otherwise lawful to engage in without a license before the date of enactment of this subsection.

''(C) CONTENTS.—An application under subparagraph (A) shall—

''(i) contain a certification by the applicant that—

''(I) the applicant meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of subsection (d)(1);

''(II)(aa) the applicant conducts the firearm business primarily or solely at gun shows, and the applicant has premises (or a designated portion of premises) that may be inspected under this chapter from which the applicant conducts business (or intends to establish such premises) within a reasonable period of time; or

''(bb) the applicant conducts the firearm business from a premises (or a designated portion of premises) of a gunsmith or firearms repair business (or intends to establish such premises within a reasonable period of time); and

''(III) the firearm business to be conducted under the license—

''(aa) is not engaged in business for regularly buying and selling firearms from the applicant's premises;

''(bb) will be engaged in the buying or selling of firearms only—

''(AA) primarily or solely for a firearm business at gun shows; or

''(BB) as part of a gunsmith or firearm repair business;

''(cc) shall be conducted in accordance with all dealer recordkeeping required under this chapter for a dealer; and

''(dd) shall be subject to inspection under this chapter, including the special licensee's (or a designated portion of the premises), pursuant to the provisions in this chapter applicable to dealers;

''(ii) include a photograph and fingerprints of the applicant; and

''(iii) be in such form as the Secretary shall by regulation promulgate.

''(D) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE OR LOCAL LAW.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An applicant under subparagraph (A) shall not be required to certify or demonstrate that any firearm business to be conducted from the premises or elsewhere, to the extent permitted under this subsection, is or will be done in accordance with State or local law regarding the carrying on of a general business or commercial activity, including compliance with zoning restrictions.

''(ii) DUTY TO COMPLY.—The issuance of a special license does not relieve an applicant or licensee, as a matter of State or local law, from complying with State or local law described in clause (i).

''(E) APPROVAL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall approve an application under subparagraph (A) if the application meets the requirements of subparagraph (D).

''(ii) ISSUANCE OF LICENSE.—On approval of the application and payment by the applicant of a fee prescribed for dealers under this section, the Secretary shall issue to the applicant a license which, subject to the provisions of this chapter and other applicable provisions of law, entitles the licensee to conduct business during the 3-year period that begins on the date on which the license is issued.

''(iii) TIMING.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall approve or disapprove an application under subparagraph (A) not later than 60 days after the Secretary receives the application.

''(II) FAILURE TO ACT.—If the Secretary fails to approve or disapprove an application within the time specified by subclause (I), the applicant may bring an action under section 1361 of title 28 to compel the Secretary to act.

''(2) SPECIAL REGISTRANTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A person who is not licensed under this chapter (other than a licensed collector) and who wishes to perform instant background checks for the purposes of meeting the requirements of section 922(t) at a gun show may submit to the Secretary an application for a special registration.

''(B) CONTENTS.—An application under subparagraph (A) shall—

''(i) contain a certification by the applicant that—

''(I) the applicant meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of subsection (d)(1); and

''(II)(aa) any gun show at which the applicant will conduct instant checks under the special registration will be a show that is not prohibited by State or local law; and

''(bb) instant checks will be conducted only at gun shows that are conducted in accordance with Federal, State, and local law;

''(ii) include a photograph and fingerprints of the applicant; and

''(iii) be in such form as the Secretary shall by regulation promulgate.

''(C) APPROVAL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall approve an application under subparagraph (A) if the application meets the requirements of subparagraph (B).

''(ii) ISSUANCE OF REGISTRATION.—On approval of the application and payment by the applicant of a fee of $100 for 3 years, and upon renewal of valid registration a fee of $50 for 3 years, the Secretary shall issue to the applicant a special registration, and notify the Attorney General of the United States of the issuance of the special registration.

''(iii) PERMITTED ACTIVITY.—Under a special registration, a special registrant may conduct instant check screening during the 3-year period that begins with the date on which the registration is issued.

''(D) TIMING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall approve or deny an application under subparagraph (A) not later than 60 days after the Secretary receives the application.

''(ii) FAILURE TO ACT.—If the Secretary fails to approve or disapprove an application under subparagraph (A) within the time specified by clause (i), the applicant may bring an action under section 1361 of title 28 to compel the Secretary to act.

''(E) USE OF SPECIAL REGISTRANTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A person not licensed under this chapter who desires to transfer a firearm at a gun show in the person's State of residence to another person who is a resident of the same State, may use (but shall not be required to use) the services of a special registrant to determine the eligibility of the prospective transferee to possess a firearm by having the transferee provide the special registrant at the gun show, on a special and limited-purpose form that the Secretary shall prescribe for use by a special registrant—

''(I) the name, age, address, and other identifying information of the prospective transferee (or, in the case of a prospective transferee that is a corporation or other business entity, the identity and principal and local places of business of the prospective transferee); and

''(II) proof of verification of the identity of the prospective transferee as required by section 922(t)(1)(C).

''(ii) ACTION BY THE SPECIAL REGISTRANT.—The special registrant shall—

''(I) make inquiry of the national instant background check system (or as the Attorney General shall arrange, with the appropriate State point of contact agency for each jurisdiction in which the special registrant intends to offer services) concerning the prospective transferee in accordance with the established procedures for making such inquiries;

''(II) receive the response from the system;

''(III) indicate the response on both a portion of the inquiry form for the records of the special registrant and on a separate form to be provided to the prospective transferee;

''(IV) provide the response to the transferor; and

''(V) follow the procedures established by the Secretary and the Attorney General for advising a person undergoing an instant background check on the meaning of a response, and any appeal rights, if applicable.

''(iii) RECORDKEEPING.—A special registrant shall—

''(I) keep all records or documents that the special registrant collected pursuant to clause (ii) during the gun show; and

''(II) transmit the records to the Secretary when the special registration is no longer valid, expires, or is revoked.

''(iv) NO OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Except for the requirements stated in this section, a special registrant is not subject to any of the requirements imposed on licensees by this chapter, including those in section 922(t) and paragraphs (1)(A) and (3)(A) of subsection (g) with respect to the proposed transfer of a firearm.

''(3) NO CAUSE OF ACTION OR STANDARD OF CONDUCT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this subsection—

''(i) creates a cause of action against any special registrant or any other person, including the transferor, for any civil liability; or

''(ii) establishes any standard of care.

''(B) EVIDENCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except to give effect to the provisions of paragraph (3)(vi), evidence regarding the use or nonuse by a transferor of the services of a special registrant under this paragraph

shall not be admissible as evidence in any proceeding of any court, agency, board, or other entity for the purposes of establishing liability based on a civil action brought on any theory for harm caused by a product or by negligence.

''(4) IMMUNITY.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified civil liability action' means a civil action brought by any person against a person described in subparagraph (B) for damages resulting from the criminal or unlawful misuse of the firearm by the transferee or a third party.

''(ii) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'qualified civil liability action' shall not include an action—

''(B) IMMUNITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person who is—

''(i) a special registrant who performs a background check in the manner prescribed in this subsection at a gun show;

''(ii) a licensee or special licensee who acquires a firearm at a gun show from a nonlicensee, for transfer to another nonlicensee in attendance at the gun show, for the purpose of effectuating a sale, trade, or transfer between the 2 nonlicensees, all in the manner prescribed for the acquisition and disposition of a firearm under this chapter; or

''(iii) a nonlicensee person disposing of a firearm who uses the services of a person described in clause (i) or (ii);

shall be entitled to immunity from civil liability action as described in subparagraph (B).

''(C) PROSPECTIVE ACTIONS.—A qualified civil liability action may not be brought in any Federal or State court—

''(i) brought against a transferor convicted under section 922(h), or a comparable State felony law, by a person directly harmed by the transferee's criminal conduct, as defined in section 922(h); or

''(ii) brought against a transferor for negligent entrustment or negligence per se.

''(D) DISMISSAL OF PENDING ACTIONS.—A qualified civil liability action that is pending on the date of enactment of this subsection shall be dismissed immediately by the court.

''(5) REVOCATION.—A special license or special registration shall be subject to revocation under procedures provided for revocation of licensees in this chapter.''.

(b) PENALTIES.—Section 924(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7) SPECIAL LICENSEES; SPECIAL REGISTRANTS.—Whoever knowingly violates section 923(m)(1) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.''.

SEC. 502. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT FIREARM TRANSACTIONS AT GUN SHOWS.

Section 923 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (j) and inserting the following:

''(j) GUN SHOWS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer may, under regulations promulgated by the Secretary, conduct business at a temporary location, other than the location specified on the license, described in paragraph (2).

''(2) TEMPORARY LOCATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A temporary location referred to in paragraph (1) is a location for a gun show, or for an event in the State specified on the license, at which firearms, firearms accessories and related items may be bought, sold, traded, and displayed, in accordance with Federal, State, and local laws.

''(B) LOCATIONS OUT OF STATE.—If the location is not in the State specified on the license, a licensee may display any firearm, and take orders for a firearm or effectuate the transfer of a firearm, in accordance with this chapter, including paragraph (3) of this subsection.

''(C) QUALIFIED GUN SHOWS OR EVENTS.—A gun show or an event shall qualify as a temporary location if—

''(i) the gun show or event is one which is sponsored, for profit or not, by an individual, national, State, or local organization, association, or other entity to foster the collecting, competitive use, sporting use, or any other legal use of firearms; and

''(ii) the gun show or event has 20 percent or more firearm exhibitors out of all exhibitors.

''(D) FIREARM EXHIBITOR.—The term 'firearm exhibitor' means an exhibitor who displays 1 or more firearms (as defined by section 921(a)(3)) and offers such firearms for sale or trade at the gun show or event.

''(3) RECORDS.—Records of receipt and disposition of firearms transactions conducted at a temporary location—

''(A) shall include the location of the sale or other disposition;

''(B) shall be entered in the permanent records of the licensee; and

''(C) shall be retained at the location premises specified on the license.

''(4) VEHICLES.—Nothing in this subsection authorizes a licensee to conduct business in or from any motorized or towed vehicle.

''(5) NO SEPARATE FEE.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), a separate fee shall not be required of a licensee with respect to business conducted under this subsection.

''(6) INSPECTIONS AND EXAMINATIONS.—

''(A) AT A TEMPORARY LOCATION.—Any inspection or examination of inventory or records under this chapter by the Secretary at a temporary location shall be limited to inventory consisting of, or records relating to, firearms held or disposed at the temporary location.

''(B) NO REQUIREMENT.—Nothing in this subsection authorizes the Secretary to inspect or examine the inventory or records of a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer at any location other than the location specified on the license.

''(7) NO EFFECT ON OTHER RIGHTS.—Nothing in this subsection diminishes in any manner any right to display, sell, or otherwise dispose of firearms or ammunition that is in effect before the date of enactment of this subsection, including the right of a licensee to conduct firearms transfers and business away from their business premises with another licensee without regard to whether the location of the business is in the State specified on the license of either licensee.''.

SEC. 503. "INSTANT CHECK" GUN TAX AND GUN OWNER PRIVACY.

(a) PROHIBITION OF GUN TAX.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 33 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 540B. Prohibition of background check fee

''(a) IN GENERAL.—No officer, employee, or agent of the United States, including a State or local officer or employee acting on behalf of the United States, may charge or collect any fee in connection with any background check required in connection with the transfer of a firearm (as defined in section 921(a)(3) of title 18).

''(b) CIVIL REMEDIES.—Any person aggrieved by a violation of this section may bring an action in United States district court for actual damages, punitive damages, and such other remedies as the court may determine to be appropriate, including a reasonable attorney's fee.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 33 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 540A the following:

''540B. Prohibition of background check fee.''.

(b) PROTECTION OF GUN OWNER PRIVACY AND OWNERSHIP RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 931. Gun owner privacy and ownership rights

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States or officer, employee, or agent of the United States, including a State or local officer or employee acting on behalf of the United States shall—

''(1) perform any national instant criminal background check on any person through the system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note) (referred to in this section as the ''system'') if the system does not require and result in the immediate destruction of all information, in any form whatsoever or through any medium, concerning the person if the person is determined, through the use of the system, not to be prohibited by subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 or by State law from receiving a firearm; or

''(2) continue to operate the system (including requiring a background check before the transfer of a firearm) unless—

''(A) the National Instant Check System index complies with the requirements of section 552a(e)(5) of title 5, United States Code; and

''(B) does not invoke the exceptions under subsection (j)(2) or paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (k) of section 552a of title 5, United States Code, except if specifically identifiable information is compiled for a particular law enforcement investigation or specific criminal enforcement matter.

''(b) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a)(1) does not apply to the retention or transfer of information relating to—

''(1) any unique identification number provided by the national instant criminal background check system pursuant to section 922(t)(1)(B)(i) of title 18, United States Code; or

''(2) the date on which that number is provided.

''(c) CIVIL REMEDIES.—Any person aggrieved by a violation of this section may bring an action in United States district court for actual damages, punitive damages, and such other remedies as the court may determine to be appropriate, including a reasonable attorney's fee.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''931. Gun owner privacy and ownership rights.''.

(c) PROVISION RELATING TO PAWN AND OTHER TRANSACTIONS.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 655 of title VI of the Treasury and General Governmental Appropriations Act, 1999 (112 Stat. 2681–530) is repealed.

(2) RETURN OF FIREARM.—Section 922(t)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''(other than the return of a firearm to the person from whom it was received)'' before ''to any other person''.

SEC. 504. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) SECTIONS 501 AND 502.—The amendments made by sections 501 and 502 shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) SECTION 503.—The amendments made by section 503 take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, except that the amendment made by subsection (a) of that section takes effect on October 1, 1999.

TITLE VI—RESTRICTING JUVENILE ACCESS TO CERTAIN FIREARMS

SEC. 601. PENALTIES FOR UNLAWFUL ACTS BY JUVENILES.

(a) JUVENILE WEAPONS PENALTIES.—Section 924(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4) by striking ''Whoever'' at the beginning of the first sentence, and inserting in lieu thereof, ''Except as provided in paragraph (6) of this subsection, whoever''; and

(2) in paragraph (6), by amending it to read as follows:

''(6)(A) A juvenile who violates section 922(x) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both, except—

''(i) a juvenile shall be sentenced to probation on appropriate conditions and shall not be incarcerated unless the juvenile fails to comply with a condition of probation, if—

''(I) the offense of which the juvenile is charged is possession of a handgun, ammunition, large capacity ammunition feeding device or a semiautomatic assault weapon in violation of section 922(x)(2); and

''(II) the juvenile has not been convicted in any court of an offense (including an offense under section 922(x) or a similar State law, but not including any other offense consisting of conduct that if engaged in by an adult would not constitute an offense) or adjudicated as a juvenile delinquent for conduct that if engaged in by an adult would constitute an offense; or

''(ii) a juvenile shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both, if—

''(I) the offense of which the juvenile is charged is possession of a handgun, ammunition, large capacity ammunition feeding device or a semiautomatic assault weapon in violation of section 922(x)(2); and

''(II) during the same course of conduct in violating section 922(x)(2), the juvenile violated section 922(q), with the intent to carry or otherwise possess or discharge or otherwise use the handgun, ammunition, large capacity ammunition feeding device or a semiautomatic assault weapon in the commission of a violent felony.

''(B) A person other than a juvenile who knowingly violates section 922(x)—

''(i) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; and

''(ii) if the person sold, delivered, or otherwise transferred a handgun, ammunition, large capacity ammunition feeding device or a semiautomatic assault weapon to a juvenile knowing or having reasonable cause to know that the juvenile intended to carry or otherwise possess or discharge or otherwise use the handgun, ammunition, large capacity ammunition feeding device or semiautomatic assault weapon in the commission of a violent felony, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

''(C) For purposes of this paragraph a 'violent felony' means conduct as described in section 924(e)(2)(B) of this title.

''(D) Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, in any case in which a juvenile is prosecuted in a district court of the United States, and the juvenile is subject to the penalties under clause (ii) of paragraph (A), the juvenile shall be subject to the same laws, rules, and proceedings regarding sentencing (including the availability of probation, restitution, fines, forfeiture, imprisonment, and supervised release) that would be applicable in the case of an adult. No juvenile sentenced to a term of imprisonment shall be released from custody simply because the juvenile reaches the age of 18 years.''.

(b) UNLAWFUL WEAPONS TRANSFERS TO JUVENILES.—Section 922(x) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(x)(1) It shall be unlawful for a person to sell, deliver, or otherwise transfer to a person who the transferor knows or has reasonable cause to believe is a juvenile—

''(A) a handgun;

''(B) ammunition that is suitable for use only in a handgun;

''(C) a semiautomatic assault weapon; or

''(D) a large capacity ammunition feeding device.

''(2) It shall be unlawful for any person who is a juvenile to knowingly possess—

''(A) a handgun;

''(B) ammunition that is suitable for use only in a handgun;

''(C) a semiautomatic assault weapon; or

''(D) a large capacity ammunition feeding device.

''(3) This subsection does not apply to—

''(A) a temporary transfer of a handgun, ammunition, large capacity ammunition feeding device or a semiautomatic assault weapon to a juvenile or to the possession or use of a handgun, ammunition, large capacity ammunition feeding device or a semiautomatic assault weapon by a juvenile—

''(i) if the handgun, ammunition, large capacity ammunition feeding device or semiautomatic assault weapon are possessed and used by the juvenile—

''(I) in the course of employment,

''(II) in the course of ranching or farming related to activities at the residence of the juvenile (or on property used for ranching or farming at which the juvenile, with the permission of the property owner or lessee, is performing activities related to the operation of the farm or ranch),

''(III) for target practice,

''(IV) for hunting, or

''(V) for a course of instruction in the safe and lawful use of a firearm;

''(ii) clause (i) shall apply only if the juvenile's possession and use of a handgun, ammunition, large capacity ammunition feeding device or a semiautomatic assault weapon under this subparagraph are in accordance with State and local law, and the following conditions are met—

''(I) except when a parent or guardian of the juvenile is in the immediate and supervisory presence of the juvenile, the juvenile shall have in the juvenile's possession at all times when a handgun, ammunition, large capacity ammunition feeding device or semiautomatic assault weapon is in the possession of the juvenile, the prior written consent of the juvenile's parent or guardian who is not prohibited by Federal, State, or local law from possessing a firearm or ammunition; and

''(II) during transportation by the juvenile directly from the place of transfer to a place at which an activity described in clause (i) is to take place the firearm shall be unloaded and in a locked container or case, and during the transportation by the juvenile of that firearm, directly from the place at which such an activity took place to the transferor, the firearm shall also be unloaded and in a locked container or case; or

''(III) with respect to employment, ranching or farming activities as described in clause (i), a juvenile may possess and use a handgun, ammunition, large capacity ammunition feeding device or a semiautomatic assault rifle with the prior written approval of the juvenile's parent or legal guardian, if such approval is on file with the adult who is not prohibited by Federal, State, or local law from possessing a firearm or ammunition and that person is directing the ranching or farming activities of the juvenile;

''(B) a juvenile who is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States or the National Guard who possesses or is armed with a handgun, ammunition, large capacity ammunition feeding device or semiautomatic assault weapon in the line of duty;

''(C) a transfer by inheritance of title (but not possession) of a handgun, ammunition, large capacity ammunition feeding device or a semiautomatic assault weapon to a juvenile; or

''(D) the possession of a handgun, ammunition, large capacity ammunition feeding device or a semiautomatic assault weapon taken in lawful defense of the juvenile or other persons in the residence of the juvenile or a residence in which the juvenile is an invited guest.

''(4) A handgun, ammunition, large capacity ammunition feeding device or a semiautomatic assault weapon, the possession of which is transferred to a juvenile in circumstances in which the transferor is not in violation of this subsection, shall not be subject to permanent confiscation by the Government if its possession by the juvenile subsequently becomes unlawful because of the conduct of the juvenile, but shall be returned to the lawful owner when such handgun, ammunition, large capacity ammunition feeding device or semiautomatic assault weapon is no longer required by the Government for the purposes of investigation or prosecution.

''(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'juvenile' means a person who is less than 18 years of age.

''(6)(A) In a prosecution of a violation of this subsection, the court shall require the presence of a juvenile defendant's parent or legal guardian at all proceedings.

''(B) The court may use the contempt power to enforce subparagraph (A).

''(C) The court may excuse attendance of a parent or legal guardian of a juvenile defendant at a proceeding in a prosecution of a violation of this subsection for good cause shown.

''(7) For purposes of this subsection only, the term 'large capacity ammunition feeding device' has the same meaning as in section 921(a)(31) of title 18 and includes similar devices manufactured before the effective date of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994.''.

SEC. 602. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE VIII—EFFECTIVE GUN LAW ENFORCEMENT

Subtitle A—Criminal Use of Firearms by Felons

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be referred to as the ''Criminal Use of Firearms by Felons (CUFF) Act''.

SEC. 802. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Tragedies such as those occurring recently in the communities of Pearl, Mississippi, Paducah, Kentucky, Jonesboro, Arkansas, Springfield, Oregon, and Littleton, Colorado are terrible reminders of the vulnerability of innocent individuals to random and senseless acts of criminal violence.

(2) The United States Congress has responded to the problem of gun violence by passing numerous criminal statutes and by supporting the development of law enforcement programs designed both to punish the criminal misuse of weapons and also to deter individuals from undertaking illegal acts.

(3) In 1988, the Administration initiated an innovative program known as Project Achilles. The concept behind the initiative was that the illegal possession of firearms was the Achilles heel or the area of greatest vulnerability of criminals. By aggressively prosecuting criminals with guns in Federal court, the offenders were subject to stiffer penalties and expedited prosecutions. The Achilles program was particularly effective in removing the most violent criminals from our communities.

(4) In 1991, the Administration expanded its efforts to remove criminals with guns from our streets with Project Triggerlock. Triggerlock continued the ideas formulated in the Achilles program and committed the Department of Justice resources to the prosecution effort. Under the program, every United States Attorney was directed to form special teams of Federal, State, and local investigators to look for gang and drug cases that could be prosecuted as Federal weapon violations. Congress appropriated additional funds to allow a large number of new law enforcement officers and Federal prosecutors to target these gun and drug offenders. In 1992, approximately 7048 defendants were prosecuted under this initiative.

(5) Since 1993, the number of ''Project Triggerlock'' type gun prosecutions pursued by the Department of Justice has fallen to approximately 3807 prosecutions in 1998. This is a decline of over 40 percent in Federal prosecutions of criminals with guns.

(6) The threat of criminal prosecution in the Federal criminal justice system works to deter criminal behavior because the Federal system is known for speedier trials and longer prison sentences.

(7) The deterrent effect of Federal gun prosecutions has been demonstrated recently by successful programs, such as ''Project Exile'' in

Richmond, Virginia, which resulted in a 22 percent decrease in violent crime since 1994.

(8) The Department of Justice's failure to prosecute the criminal use of guns under existing Federal law undermines the significant deterrent effect that these laws are meant to produce.

(9) The Department of Justice already possesses a vast array of Federal criminal statutes that, if used aggressively to prosecute wrongdoers, would significantly reduce both the threat of, and the incidence of, criminal gun violence.

(10) As an example, the Department of Justice has the statutory authority in section 922(q) of title 18, United States Code, to prosecute individuals who bring guns to school zones. Although the Administration stated that over 6,000 students were expelled last year for bringing guns to school, the Justice Department reports prosecuting only 8 cases under section 922(q) in 1998.

(11) The Department of Justice is also empowered under section 922(x) of title 18, United States Code, to prosecute adults who transfer handguns to juveniles. In 1998, the Department of Justice reports having prosecuted only 6 individuals under this provision.

(12) The Department of Justice's utilization of existing prosecutorial power is 1 of the most significant steps that can be taken to reduce the number of criminal acts involving guns, and represents a better response to the problem of criminal violence than the enactment of new, symbolic laws, which, if current Departmental trends hold, would likely be underutilized.

SEC. 803. CRIMINAL USE OF FIREARMS BY FELONS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury shall establish in the jurisdictions specified in subsection (d) a program that meets the requirements of subsections (b) and (c). The program shall be known as the ''Criminal Use of Firearms by Felons (CUFF) Program''.

(b) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—Each program established under subsection (a) shall, for the jurisdiction concerned—

(1) provide for coordination with State and local law enforcement officials in the identification of violations of Federal firearms laws;

(2) provide for the establishment of agreements with State and local law enforcement officials for the referral to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms and the United States Attorney for prosecution of persons arrested for violations of section 922(a)(6), 922(g)(1), 922(g)(2), 922(g)(3), 922(j), 922(q), 922(k), or 924(c) of title 18, United States Code, or section 5861(d) or 5861(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, relating to firearms;

(3) require that the United States Attorney designate not less than 1 Assistant United States Attorney to prosecute violations of Federal firearms laws;

(4) provide for the hiring of agents for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms to investigate violations of the provisions referred to in paragraph (2) and section 922(a)(5) of title 18, United States Code, relating to firearms; and

(5) ensure that each person referred to the United States Attorney under paragraph (2) be charged with a violation of the most serious Federal firearm offense consistent with the act committed.

(c) PUBLIC EDUCATION CAMPAIGN.—As part of the program for a jurisdiction, the United States Attorney shall carry out, in cooperation with local civic, community, law enforcement, and religious organizations, an extensive media and public outreach campaign focused in high-crime areas to—

(1) educate the public about the severity of penalties for violations of Federal firearms laws; and

(2) encourage law-abiding citizens to report the possession of illegal firearms to authorities.

(d) COVERED JURISDICTIONS.—The jurisdictions specified in this subsection are the following 25 jurisdictions:

(1) The 10 jurisdictions with a population equal to or greater than 100,000 persons that had the highest total number of violent crimes according to the FBI uniform crime report for 1998.

(2) The 15 jurisdictions with such a population, other than the jurisdictions covered by paragraph (1), with the highest per capita rate of violent crime according to the FBI uniform crime report for 1998.

SEC. 804. ANNUAL REPORTS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of Senate and House of Representatives a report containing the following information:

(1) The number of Assistant United States Attorneys hired under the program under this subtitle during the year preceding the year in which the report is submitted in order to prosecute violations of Federal firearms laws in Federal court.

(2) The number of individuals indicted for such violations during that year by reason of the program.

(3) The increase or decrease in the number of individuals indicted for such violations during that year by reason of the program when compared with the year preceding that year.

(4) The number of individuals held without bond in anticipation of prosecution by reason of the program.

(5) To the extent information is available, the average length of prison sentence of the individuals convicted of violations of Federal firearms laws by reason of the program.

SEC. 805. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the program under section 803 $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, of which—

(1) $40,000,000 shall be used for salaries and expenses of Assistant United States Attorneys and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms agents; and

(2) $10,000,000 shall be available for the public relations campaign required by subsection (c) of that section.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) The Assistant United States Attorneys hired using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (a) shall prosecute violations of Federal firearms laws in accordance with section 803(b)(3).

(2) The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms agents hired using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (a) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, concentrate their investigations on violations of Federal firearms laws in accordance with section 803(b)(4).

(3) It is the sense of Congress that amounts made available under this section for the public education campaign required by section 803(c) should, to the maximum extent practicable, be matched with State or local funds or private donations.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts made available under subsection (a), there is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subtitle.

Subtitle B—Apprehension and Treatment of Armed Violent Criminals

SEC. 811. APPREHENSION AND PROCEDURAL TREATMENT OF ARMED VIOLENT CRIMINALS.

(a) PRETRIAL DETENTION FOR POSSESSION OF FIREARMS OR EXPLOSIVES BY CONVICTED FELONS.—Section 3156(a)(4) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting ''or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) an offense that is a violation of section 842(i) or 922(g) (relating to possession of explosives or firearms by convicted felons); and''.

(b) FIREARMS POSSESSION BY VIOLENT FELONS AND SERIOUS DRUG OFFENDERS.—Section 924(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''Whoever'' and inserting ''(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), any person who''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court shall not grant a probationary sentence to a person who has more than 1 previous conviction for a violent felony or a serious drug offense, committed under different circumstances.''.

Subtitle C—Youth Crime Gun Interdiction

SEC. 821. YOUTH CRIME GUN INTERDICTION INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) EXPANSION OF NUMBER OF CITIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall endeavor to expand the number of cities and counties directly participating in the Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative (in this section referred to as the ''YCGII'') to 75 cities or counties by October 1, 2000, to 150 cities or counties by October 1, 2002, and to 250 cities or counties by October 1, 2003.

(2) SELECTION.—Cities and counties selected for participation in the YCGII shall be selected by the Secretary of the Treasury and in consultation with Federal, State and local law enforcement officials.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall, utilizing the information provided by the YCGII, facilitate the identification and prosecution of individuals illegally trafficking firearms to prohibited individuals.

(2) SHARING OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall share information derived from the YCGII with State and local law enforcement agencies through on-line computer access, as soon as such capability is available.

(c) GRANT AWARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall award grants (in the form of funds or equipment) to States, cities, and counties for purposes of assisting such entities in the tracing of firearms and participation in the YCGII.

(2) USE OF GRANT FUNDS.—Grants made under this part shall be used to—

(A) hire or assign additional personnel for the gathering, submission and analysis of tracing data submitted to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms under the YCGII;

(B) hire additional law enforcement personnel for the purpose of identifying and arresting individuals illegally trafficking firearms; and

(C) purchase additional equipment, including automatic data processing equipment and computer software and hardware, for the timely submission and analysis of tracing data.

Subtitle D—Gun Prosecution Data

SEC. 831. COLLECTION OF GUN PROSECUTION DATA.

(a) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—On February 1, 2000, and on February 1 of each year thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary and on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report of information gathered under this section during the fiscal year that ended on September 30 of the preceding year.

(b) SUBJECT OF ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall require each component of the Department of Justice, including each United States Attorney's Office, to furnish for the purposes of the report described in subsection (a), information relating to any case

presented to the Department of Justice for review or prosecution, in which the objective facts of the case provide probable cause to believe that there has been a violation of section 922 of title 18, United States Code.

(c) ELEMENTS OF ANNUAL REPORT.—With respect to each case described in subsection (b), the report submitted under subsection (a) shall include information indicating—

(1) whether in any such case, a decision has been made not to charge an individual with a violation of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, or any other violation of Federal criminal law;

(2) in any case described in paragraph (1), the reason for such failure to seek or obtain a charge under section 922 of title 18, United States Code;

(3) whether in any case described in subsection (b), an indictment, information, or other charge has been brought against any person, or the matter is pending;

(4) whether, in the case of an indictment, information, or other charge described in paragraph (3), the charging document contains a count or counts alleging a violation of section 922 of title 18, United States Code;

(5) in any case described in paragraph (4) in which the charging document contains a count or counts alleging a violation of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, whether a plea agreement of any kind has been entered into with such charged individual;

(6) whether any plea agreement described in paragraph (5) required that the individual plead guilty, to enter a plea of nolo contendere, or otherwise caused a court to enter a conviction against that individual for a violation of section 922 of title 18, United States Code;

(7) in any case described in paragraph (6) in which the plea agreement did not require that the individual plead guilty, enter a plea of nolo contendere, or otherwise cause a court to enter a conviction against that individual for a violation of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, identification of the charges to which that individual did plead guilty, and the reason for the failure to seek or obtain a conviction under that section;

(8) in the case of an indictment, information, or other charge described in paragraph (3), in which the charging document contains a count or counts alleging a violation of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, the result of any trial of such charges (guilty, not guilty, mistrial); and

(9) in the case of an indictment, information, or other charge described in paragraph (3), in which the charging document did not contain a count or counts alleging a violation of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, the nature of the other charges brought and the result of any trial of such other charges as have been brought (guilty, not guilty, mistrial).

Subtitle E—Firearms Possession by Violent Juvenile Offenders

SEC. 841. PROHIBITION ON FIREARMS POSSESSION BY VIOLENT JUVENILE OFFENDERS.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 921(a)(20) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(20)'';

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) For purposes of subsections (d) and (g) of section 922, the term 'act of violent juvenile delinquency' means an adjudication of delinquency in Federal or State court, based on a finding of the commission of an act by a person prior to his or her eighteenth birthday that, if committed by an adult, would be a serious or violent felony, as defined in section 3559(c)(2)(F)(i) had Federal jurisdiction existed and been exercised (except that section 3559(c)(3)(A) shall not apply to this subparagraph).''; and

(4) in the undesignated paragraph following subparagraph (B) (as added by paragraph (3) of this subsection), by striking ''What constitutes'' and all that follows through ''this chapter,'' and inserting the following:

''(C) What constitutes a conviction of such a crime or an adjudication of an act of violent juvenile delinquency shall be determined in accordance with the law of the jurisdiction in which the proceedings were held. Any State conviction or adjudication of an act of violent juvenile delinquency that has been expunged or set aside, or for which a person has been pardoned or has had civil rights restored, by the jurisdiction in which the conviction or adjudication of an act of violent juvenile delinquency occurred shall not be considered to be a conviction or adjudication of an act of violent juvenile delinquency for purposes of this chapter,''.

(b) PROHIBITION.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

''(10) has committed an act of violent juvenile delinquency.''; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the comma at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

''(10) who has committed an act of violent juvenile delinquency,''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE OF ADJUDICATION PROVISIONS.—The amendments made by this section shall only apply to an adjudication of an act of violent juvenile delinquency that occurs after the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Attorney General certifies to Congress and separately notifies Federal firearms licensees, through publication in the Federal Register by the Secretary of the Treasury, that the records of such adjudications are routinely available in the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103(b) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act.

Subtitle F—Juvenile Access to Certain Firearms

SEC. 851. PENALTIES FOR FIREARM VIOLATIONS INVOLVING JUVENILES.

(a) PENALTIES FOR FIREARM VIOLATIONS BY JUVENILES.—Section 924(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''Whoever'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (6), whoever''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

''(6) TRANSFER TO OR POSSESSION BY A JUVENILE.—

''(A) DEFINITIONS OF VIOLENT FELONY.—In this paragraph—

''(i) the term 'juvenile' has the meaning given the term in section 922(x); and

''(ii) the term 'violent felony' has the meaning given the term in subsection (e)(2)(B).

''(B) POSSESSION BY A JUVENILE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii), a juvenile who violates section 922(x) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(ii) PROBATION.—Unless clause (iii) applies and unless a juvenile fails to comply with a condition of probation, the juvenile may be sentenced to probation on appropriate conditions if—

''(I) the offense with which the juvenile is charged is possession of a handgun, ammunition, or semiautomatic assault weapon in violation of section 922(x)(2); and

''(II) the juvenile has not been convicted in any court of an offense (including an offense under section 922(x) or a similar State law, but not including any other offense consisting of conduct that if engaged in by an adult would not constitute an offense) or adjudicated as a juvenile delinquent for conduct that if engaged in by an adult would constitute an offense.

''(iii) SCHOOL ZONES.—A juvenile shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both, if—

''(I) the offense of which the juvenile is charged is possession of a handgun, ammunition, or semiautomatic assault weapon in violation of section 922(x)(2); and

''(II) during the same course of conduct in violating section 922(x)(2), the juvenile violated section 922(q), with the intent to carry or otherwise possess or discharge or otherwise use the handgun, ammunition, or semiautomatic assault weapon in the commission of a violent felony.

''(C) TRANSFER TO A JUVENILE.—A person other than a juvenile who knowingly violates section 922(x)—

''(i) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not less than 1 year and not more than 5 years, or both; or

''(ii) if the person sold, delivered, or otherwise transferred a handgun, ammunition, or semiautomatic assault weapon to a juvenile knowing or having reasonable cause to know that the juvenile intended to carry or otherwise possess or discharge or otherwise use the handgun, ammunition, or semiautomatic assault weapon in the commission of a violent felony, shall be fined under this title and imprisoned not less than 10 and not more than 20 years.

''(D) CASES IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.—Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, in any case in which a juvenile is prosecuted in a district court of the United States, and the juvenile is subject to the penalties under subparagraph (B)(iii), the juvenile shall be subject to the same laws, rules, and proceedings regarding sentencing (including the availability of probation, restitution, fines, forfeiture, imprisonment, and supervised release) that would be applicable in the case of an adult.

''(E) NO RELEASE AT AGE 18.—No juvenile sentenced to a term of imprisonment shall be released from custody solely for the reason that the juvenile has reached the age of 18 years.''.

(b) UNLAWFUL WEAPONS TRANSFERS TO JUVENILES.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (x) and inserting the following:

''(x) JUVENILES.—

''(1) DEFINITION OF JUVENILE.—In this subsection, the term 'juvenile' means a person who is less than 18 years of age.

''(2) TRANSFER TO JUVENILES.—It shall be unlawful for a person to sell, deliver, or otherwise transfer to a person who the transferor knows or has reasonable cause to believe is a juvenile—

''(A) a handgun;

''(B) ammunition that is suitable for use only in a handgun; or

''(C) a semiautomatic assault weapon.

''(3) POSSESSION BY A JUVENILE.—It shall be unlawful for any person who is a juvenile to knowingly possess—

''(A) a handgun;

''(B) ammunition that is suitable for use only in a handgun; or

''(C) a semiautomatic assault weapon.

''(4) APPLICABILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—This subsection does not apply to—

''(i) if the conditions stated in subparagraph (B) are met, a temporary transfer of a handgun, ammunition, or semiautomatic assault weapon to a juvenile or to the possession or use of a handgun, ammunition, or semiautomatic assault weapon by a juvenile if the handgun, ammunition, or semiautomatic assault weapon is possessed and used by the juvenile—

''(I) in the course of employment;

''(II) in the course of ranching or farming related to activities at the residence of the juvenile (or on property used for ranching or farming at

which the juvenile, with the permission of the property owner or lessee, is performing activities related to the operation of the farm or ranch);

''(III) for target practice;

''(IV) for hunting; or

''(V) for a course of instruction in the safe and lawful use of a handgun;

''(ii) a juvenile who is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States or the National Guard who possesses or is armed with a handgun, ammunition, or semiautomatic assault weapon in the line of duty;

''(iii) a transfer by inheritance of title (but not possession) of handgun, ammunition, or semiautomatic assault weapon to a juvenile; or

''(iv) the possession of a handgun, ammunition, or semiautomatic assault weapon taken in lawful defense of the juvenile or other persons against an intruder into the residence of the juvenile or a residence in which the juvenile is an invited guest.

''(B) TEMPORARY TRANSFERS.—Clause (i) shall apply if—

''(i) the juvenile's possession and use of a handgun, ammunition, or semiautomatic assault weapon under this paragraph are in accordance with State and local law; and

''(ii)(I)(aa) except when a parent or guardian of the juvenile is in the immediate and supervisory presence of the juvenile, the juvenile, at all times when a handgun, ammunition, or semiautomatic assault weapon is in the possession of the juvenile, has in the juvenile's possession the prior written consent of the juvenile's parent or guardian who is not prohibited by Federal, State, or local law from possessing a firearm or ammunition; and

''(bb) during transportation by the juvenile directly from the place of transfer to a place at which an activity described in item (aa) is to take place, the firearm is unloaded and in a locked container or case, and during the transportation by the juvenile of the firearm, directly from the place at which such an activity took place to the transferor, the firearm is unloaded and in a locked container or case; or

''(II) with respect to ranching or farming activities as described in subparagraph (A)(i)(II)—

''(aa) a juvenile possesses and uses a handgun, ammunition, or semiautomatic assault weapon with the prior written approval of the juvenile's parent or legal guardian;

''(bb) the approval is on file with an adult who is not prohibited by Federal, State, or local law from possessing a firearm or ammunition; and

''(cc) the adult is directing the ranching or farming activities of the juvenile.

''(5) INNOCENT TRANSFERORS.—A handgun, ammunition, or semiautomatic assault weapon, the possession of which is transferred to a juvenile in circumstances in which the transferor is not in violation under this subsection, shall not be subject to permanent confiscation by the Government if its possession by the juvenile subsequently becomes unlawful because of the conduct of the juvenile, but shall be returned to the lawful owner when the handgun, ammunition, or semiautomatic assault weapon is no longer required by the Government for the purposes of investigation or prosecution.

''(6) ATTENDANCE BY PARENT OR LEGAL GUARDIAN AS CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS.—In a prosecution of a violation of this subsection, the court—

''(A) shall require the presence of a juvenile defendant's parent or legal guardian at all proceedings;

''(B) may use the contempt power to enforce subparagraph (A); and

''(C) may excuse attendance of a parent or legal guardian of a juvenile defendant for good cause.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Subtitle G—General Firearm Provisions

SEC. 861. NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) EXPEDITED ACTION BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall expedite—

(A) not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, a study of the feasibility of developing—

''(i) a single fingerprint convicted offender database in the Federal criminal records system maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

(ii) procedures under which a licensed firearm dealer may voluntarily transmit to the National Instant Check System a single digitalized fingerprint for prospective firearms transferees;

(B) the provision of assistance to States, under the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 1871), in gaining access to records in the National Instant Check System disclosing the disposition of State criminal cases; and

(C) development of a procedure for the collection of data identifying persons that are prohibited from possessing a firearm by section 922(g) of title 18, United States Code, including persons adjudicated as a mental defective, persons committed to a mental institution, and persons subject to a domestic violence restraining order.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing procedures under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall consider the privacy needs of individuals.

(b) COMPATIBILITY OF BALLISTICS INFORMATION SYSTEMS.—The Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury shall ensure the integration and interoperability of ballistics identification systems maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms through the National Integrated Ballistics Information Network.

(c) FORENSIC LABORATORY INSPECTION.—The Attorney General shall provide financial assistance to the American Academy of Forensic Science Laboratory Accreditation Board to be used to facilitate forensic laboratory inspection activities.

(d) RELIEF FROM DISABILITY DATABASE.—Section 925(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''(c) A person'' and inserting the following:

''(c) RELIEF FROM DISABILITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A person''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) DATABASE.—The Secretary shall establish a database, accessible through the National Instant Check System, identifying persons who have been granted relief from disability under paragraph (1).''.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2000—

(1) to pay the costs of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in operating the National Instant Check System, $68,000,000;

(2) for payments to States that act as points of contact for access to the National Instant Check System, $40,000,000;

(3) to carry out subsection (a)(1), $40,000,000;

(4) to carry out subsection (a)(3), $25,000,000;

(5) to carry out subsection (b), $1,150,000; and

(6) to carry out subsection (c), $1,000,000.

(f) INCREASED AUTHORIZATION.—Section 102(e)(1) of the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 14601(e)(1)) is amended by striking ''this section'' and all that follows and inserting ''this section—

''(A) $250,000,000 for fiscal year 1999;

''(B) $350,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.''.

TITLE IX—ENHANCED PENALTIES

SEC. 901. STRAW PURCHASES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 924(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7)(A) Notwithstanding paragraph (2), whoever knowingly violates section 922(a)(6) for the purpose of selling, delivering, or otherwise transferring a firearm, knowing or having reasonable cause to know that another person will carry or otherwise possess or discharge or otherwise use the firearm in the commission of a violent felony, shall be—

''(i) fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both; or

''(ii) imprisoned not less than 10 and not more than 20 years and fined under this title, if the procurement is for a juvenile.

''(B) In this paragraph—

''(i) the term 'juvenile' has the meaning given the term in section 922(x); and

''(ii) the term 'violent felony' has the meaning given the term in subsection (e)(2)(B).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 902. STOLEN FIREARMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''(i), (j),''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) Whoever knowingly violates subsection (i) or (j) of section 922 shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.'';

(2) in subsection (i)(1), by striking by striking ''10 years, or both'' and inserting ''15 years, or both''; and

(3) in subsection (l), by striking ''10 years, or both'' and inserting ''15 years, or both''.

(b) SENTENCING COMMISSION.—The United States Sentencing Commission shall amend the Federal sentencing guidelines to reflect the amendments made by subsection (a).

SEC. 903. INCREASE IN PENALTIES FOR CRIMES INVOLVING FIREARMS.

Section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1)(A)—

(A) in clause (iii), by striking ''10 years.'' and inserting ''12 years; and''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) if the firearm is used to injure another person, be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not less than 15 years.''; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking ''imprisoned not more than 10 years'' and inserting ''imprisoned not less than 5 years and not more than 10 years''.

SEC. 904. INCREASED PENALTIES FOR DISTRIBUTING DRUGS TO MINORS.

Section 418 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 859) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''one year'' and inserting ''3 years''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''one year'' and inserting ''5 years''.

SEC. 905. INCREASED PENALTY FOR DRUG TRAFFICKING IN OR NEAR A SCHOOL OR OTHER PROTECTED LOCATION.

Section 419 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 860) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''one year'' and inserting ''3 years''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''three years'' each place that term appears and inserting ''5 years''.

TITLE X—CHILD HANDGUN SAFETY

SEC. 1001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Safe Handgun Storage and Child Handgun Safety Act of 1999''.

SEC. 1002. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are as follows:

(1) To promote the safe storage and use of handguns by consumers.

(2) To prevent unauthorized persons from gaining access to or use of a handgun, including children who may not be in possession of a handgun, unless it is under one of the circumstances provided for in the Youth Handgun Safety Act.

(3) To avoid hindering industry from supplying law abiding citizens firearms for all lawful purposes, including hunting, self-defense, collecting and competitive or recreational shooting.

SEC. 1003. FIREARMS SAFETY.

(a) UNLAWFUL ACTS.—

(1) MANDATORY TRANSFER OF SECURE GUN STORAGE OR SAFETY DEVICE.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (y) the following:

''(z) SECURE GUN STORAGE OR SAFETY DEVICE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall be unlawful for any licensed manufacturer, licensed importer, or licensed dealer to sell, deliver, or transfer any handgun to any person other than any person licensed under the provisions of this chapter, unless the transferee is provided with a secure gun storage or safety device, as described in section 921(a)(35) of this chapter, for that handgun.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to the—

''(A)(i) manufacture for, transfer to, or possession by, the United States or a State or a department or agency of the United States, or a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision of a State, of a handgun; or

''(ii) transfer to, or possession by, a law enforcement officer employed by an entity referred to in clause (i) of a handgun for law enforcement purposes (whether on or off duty); or

''(B) transfer to, or possession by, a rail police officer employed by a rail carrier and certified or commissioned as a police officer under the laws of a State of a handgun for purposes of law enforcement (whether on or off duty);

''(C) transfer to any person of a handgun listed as a curio or relic by the Secretary pursuant to section 921(a)(13); or

''(D) transfer to any person of a handgun for which a secure gun storage or safety device is temporarily unavailable for the reasons described in the exceptions stated in section 923(e): Provided, That the licensed manufacturer, licensed importer, or licensed dealer delivers to the transferee within 10 calendar days from the date of the delivery of the handgun to the transferee a secure gun storage or safety device for the handgun.

''(3) LIABILITY FOR USE.—(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person who has lawful possession and control of a handgun, and who uses a secure gun storage or safety device with the handgun, shall be entitled to immunity from a civil liability action as described in this paragraph.

''(B) PROSPECTIVE ACTIONS.—A qualified civil liability action may not be brought in any Federal or State court. The term 'qualified civil liability action' means a civil action brought by any person against a person described in subparagraph (A) for damages resulting from the criminal or unlawful misuse of the handgun by a third party, where—

''(i) the handgun was accessed by another person who did not have the permission or authorization of the person having lawful possession and control of the handgun to have access to it; and

''(ii) at the time access was gained by the person not so authorized, the handgun had been made inoperable by use of a secure gun storage or safety device.

A 'qualified civil liability action' shall not include an action brought against the person having lawful possession and control of the handgun for negligent entrustment or negligence per se.''.

(b) CIVIL PENALTIES.—Section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''or (f)'' and inserting ''(f), or (p)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(p) PENALTIES RELATING TO SECURE GUN STORAGE OR SAFETY DEVICE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION OF LICENSE; CIVIL PENALTIES.—With respect to each violation of section 922(z)(1) by a licensed manufacturer, licensed importer, or licensed dealer, the Secretary may, after notice and opportunity for hearing—

''(i) suspend for up to six months, or revoke, the license issued to the licensee under this chapter that was used to conduct the firearms transfer; or

''(ii) subject the licensee to a civil penalty in an amount equal to not more than $2,500.

''(B) REVIEW.—An action of the Secretary under this paragraph may be reviewed only as provided in section 923(f).

''(2) ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES.—The suspension or revocation of a license or the imposition of a civil penalty under paragraph (1) does not preclude any administrative remedy that is otherwise available to the Secretary.''.

(c) LIABILITY; EVIDENCE.—

(1) LIABILITY.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to—

(A) create a cause of action against any Federal firearms licensee or any other person for any civil liability; or

(B) establish any standard of care.

(2) EVIDENCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, evidence regarding compliance or noncompliance with the amendments made by this title shall not be admissible as evidence in any proceeding of any court, agency, board, or other entity, except with respect to an action to enforce paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 922(z), or to give effect to paragraph (3) of section 922(z).

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to bar a governmental action to impose a penalty under section 924(p) of title 18, United States Code, for a failure to comply with section 922(z) of that title.

SEC. 1004. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE XI—SCHOOL SAFETY AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION

SEC. 1101. SCHOOL SAFETY AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION.

Title XIV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"PART I—SCHOOL SAFETY AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION

"SEC. 14851. SCHOOL SAFETY AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION.

''Notwithstanding any other provision of titles IV and VI, funds made available under such titles may be used for—

''(1) training, including in-service training, for school personnel (including custodians and bus drivers), with respect to—

''(A) identification of potential threats, such as illegal weapons and explosive devices;

''(B) crisis preparedness and intervention procedures; and

''(C) emergency response;

''(2) training for parents, teachers, school personnel and other interested members of the community regarding the identification and responses to early warning signs of troubled and violent youth;

''(3) innovative research-based delinquency and violence prevention programs, including—

''(A) school anti-violence programs; and

''(B) mentoring programs;

''(4) comprehensive school security assessments;

''(5) purchase of school security equipment and technologies, such as—

''(A) metal detectors;

''(B) electronic locks; and

''(C) surveillance cameras;

''(6) collaborative efforts with community-based organizations, including faith-based organizations, statewide consortia, and law enforcement agencies, that have demonstrated expertise in providing effective, research-based violence prevention and intervention programs to school aged children;

''(7) providing assistance to States, local educational agencies, or schools to establish school uniform policies;

''(8) school resource officers, including community policing officers; and

''(9) other innovative, local responses that are consistent with reducing incidents of school violence and improving the educational atmosphere of the classroom.''.

SEC. 1102. STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General shall carry out a study regarding school safety issues, including examining—

(1) incidents of school-based violence in the United States;

(2) impediments to combating school-based violence, including local, state, and Federal education and law enforcement impediments;

(3) promising initiatives for addressing school-based violence;

(4) crisis preparedness of school personnel;

(5) preparedness of local, State, and Federal law enforcement to address incidents of school-based violence; and

(6) evaluating current school violence prevention programs.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall prepare and submit to Congress a report regarding the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

SEC. 1103. SCHOOL UNIFORMS.

Part E of title XIV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8891 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 14515. SCHOOL UNIFORMS.

''(a) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit any State, local educational agency, or school from establishing a school uniform policy.

''(b) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds provided under titles IV and VI may be used for establishing a school uniform policy.''.

SEC. 1104. TRANSFER OF SCHOOL DISCIPLINARY RECORDS.

Part F of title XIV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8921 et seq.) is amended by adding after section 14603 (20 U.S.C. 8923) the following:

"SEC. 14604. TRANSFER OF SCHOOL DISCIPLINARY RECORDS.

''(a) NONAPPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.—The provisions of this section shall not apply to any disciplinary records transferred from a private, parochial, or other nonpublic school, person, institution, or other entity, that provides education below the college level.

''(b) DISCIPLINARY RECORDS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act of 1999, each State receiving Federal funds under this Act shall provide an assurance to the Secretary that the State has a procedure in place to facilitate the transfer of disciplinary records by local educational agencies to any private or public elementary school or secondary school for any student who is enrolled or seeks, intends, or is instructed to enroll, full-time or part-time, in the school.

SEC. 1105. SCHOOL VIOLENCE RESEARCH.

The Attorney General shall establish at the National Center for Rural Law Enforcement in Little Rock, Arkansas, a research center that shall serve as a resource center or clearinghouse for school violence research. The research center shall conduct, compile, and publish school violence research and otherwise conduct activities related to school violence research, including—

(1) the collection, categorization, and analysis of data from students, schools, communities,

parents, law enforcement agencies, medical providers, and others for use in efforts to improve school security and otherwise prevent school violence;

(2) the identification and development of strategies to prevent school violence; and

(3) the development and implementation of curricula designed to assist local educational agencies and law enforcement agencies in the prevention of or response to school violence.

SEC. 1106. NATIONAL CHARACTER ACHIEVEMENT AWARD.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The President is authorized to award to individuals under the age of 18, on behalf of the Congress, a National Character Achievement Award, consisting of medal of appropriate design, with ribbons and appurtenances, honoring those individuals for distinguishing themselves as a model of good character.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purposes of the award referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury shall design and strike a medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) ELIGIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall establish procedures for processing recommendations to be forwarded to the President for awarding National Character Achievement Award under subsection (a).

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS BY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS.—At a minimum, the recommendations referred to in paragraph (1) shall contain the endorsement of the principal (or equivalent official) of the school in which the individual under the age of 18 is enrolled.

SEC. 1107. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a commission to be known as the National Commission on Character Development (referred to in this section as the ''Commission'').

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) APPOINTING AUTHORITY.—The Commission shall consist of 36 members, of whom—

(A) 12 shall be appointed by the President;

(B) 12 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(C) 12 shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, on the recommendation of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate.

(2) COMPOSITION.—The President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall each appoint as members of the Commission—

(A) 1 parent;

(B) 1 student;

(C) 2 representatives of the entertainment industry (including the segments of the industry relating to audio, video, and multimedia entertainment);

(D) 2 members of the clergy;

(E) 2 representatives of the information or technology industry;

(F) 1 local law enforcement official;

(G) 2 individuals who have engaged in academic research with respect to the impact of cultural influences on child development and juvenile crime; and

(H) 1 representative of a grassroots organization engaged in community and child intervention programs.

(3) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(c) DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.—

(1) STUDY.—The Commission shall study and make recommendations with respect to the impact of current cultural influences (as of the date of the study) on the process of developing and instilling the key aspects of character, which include trustworthiness, honesty, integrity, an ability to keep promises, loyalty, respect, responsibility, fairness, a caring nature, and good citizenship.

(2) REPORTS.—

(A) INTERIM REPORTS.—The Commission shall submit to the President and Congress such interim reports relating to the study as the Commission considers to be appropriate.

(B) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit a final report to the President and Congress that shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission resulting from the study, together with recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as the Commission considers to be appropriate.

(d) CHAIRPERSON.—The Commission shall select a Chairperson from among the members of the Commission.

(e) POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.—

(1) HEARINGS.—The Commission may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers advisable to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(2) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(3) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(4) GIFTS.—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

(f) COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

(1) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Commission shall not receive compensation for the performance of services for the Commission, but shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(2) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement, and the detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(g) PERMANENT COMMISSION.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Commission.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2000 and 2001.

SEC. 1108. JUVENILE ACCESS TO TREATMENT.

(a) COORDINATED JUVENILE SERVICES GRANTS.—Title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5611 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 205 the following:

''SEC. 205A. COORDINATED JUVENILE SERVICES GRANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, working in conjunction with the Center for Substance Abuse of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, may make grants to a consortium within a State of State or local juvenile justice agencies or State or local substance abuse and mental health agencies, and child service agencies to coordinate the delivery of services to children among these agencies. Any public agency may serve as the lead entity for the consortium.

''(b) USE OF FUNDS.—A consortium described in subsection (a) that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant for the establishment and implementation of programs that address the service needs of adolescents with substance abuse or mental health treatment problems, including those who come into contact with the justice system by requiring the following:

''(1) Collaboration across child serving systems, including juvenile justice agencies, relevant public and private substance abuse and mental health treatment providers, and State or local educational entities and welfare agencies.

''(2) Appropriate screening and assessment of juveniles.

''(3) Individual treatment plans.

''(4) Significant involvement of juvenile judges where appropriate.

''(c) APPLICATION FOR COORDINATED JUVENILE SERVICES GRANT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A consortium described in subsection (a) desiring to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application containing such information as the Administrator may prescribe.

''(2) CONTENTS.—In addition to guidelines established by the Administrator, each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall provide—

''(A) certification that there has been appropriate consultation with all affected agencies and that there will be appropriate coordination with all affected agencies in the implementation of the program;

''(B) for the regular evaluation of the program funded by the grant and describe the methodology that will be used in evaluating the program;

''(C) assurances that the proposed program or activity will not supplant similar programs and activities currently available in the community; and

''(D) specify plans for obtaining necessary support and continuing the proposed program following the conclusion of Federal support.

''(3) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of a grant under this section shall not exceed 75 percent of the cost of the program.

''(d) REPORT.—Each recipient of a grant under this section during a fiscal year shall submit to the Attorney General a report regarding the effectiveness of programs established with the grant on the date specified by the Attorney General.

''(e) FUNDING.—Grants under this section shall be considered an allowable use under section 205(a) and subtitle B.''.

SEC. 1109. BACKGROUND CHECKS.

Section 5(9) of the National Child Protection Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 5119c(9)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i), by inserting ''(including an individual who is employed by a school in any capacity, including as a child care provider, a teacher, or another member of school personnel)'' before the semicolon; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by inserting ''(including an individual who seeks to be employed by a school in any capacity, including as a child care provider, a teacher, or another member of school personnel)'' before the semicolon.

SEC. 1110. DRUG TESTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''School Violence Prevention Act''.

(b) AMENDMENT.—Section 4116(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7116(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (10) as paragraph (11); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

''(10) consistent with the fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, testing a student for illegal drug use, including at the request of or with the consent of a parent or legal guardian of the student, if the local educational agency elects to so test; and''.

SEC. 1111. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that States receiving Federal elementary and secondary education funding should require local educational agencies to conduct, for each of their employees (regardless of when hired) and prospective employees, a nationwide background check for the purpose of determining whether the employee has been convicted of a crime that bears upon his fitness to have responsibility for the safety or well-being of children, to serve in the particular capacity in which he is (or is to be) employed, or otherwise to be employed at all thereby.

TITLE XII—TEACHER LIABILITY PROTECTION ACT

SEC. 1201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Teacher Liability Protection Act of 1999''.

SEC. 1202. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The ability of teachers, principals and other school professionals to teach, inspire and shape the intellect of our Nation's elementary and secondary school students is deterred and hindered by frivolous lawsuits and litigation.

(2) Each year more and more teachers, principals and other school professionals face lawsuits for actions undertaken as part of their duties to provide millions of school children quality educational opportunities.

(3) Too many teachers, principals and other school professionals face increasingly severe and random acts of violence in the classroom and in schools.

(4) Providing teachers, principals and other school professionals a safe and secure environment is an important part of the effort to improve and expand educational opportunities.

(5) Clarifying and limiting the liability of teachers, principals and other school professionals who undertake reasonable actions to maintain order, discipline and an appropriate educational environment is an appropriate subject of Federal legislation because—

(A) the national scope of the problems created by the legitimate fears of teachers, principals and other school professionals about frivolous, arbitrary or capricious lawsuits against teachers; and

(B) millions of children and their families across the Nation depend on teachers, principals and other school professionals for the intellectual development of the children.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to provide teachers, principals and other school professionals the tools they need to undertake reasonable actions to maintain order, discipline and an appropriate educational environment.

SEC. 1203. PREEMPTION AND ELECTION OF STATE NONAPPLICABILITY.

(a) PREEMPTION.—This title preempts the laws of any State to the extent that such laws are inconsistent with this title, except that this title shall not preempt any State law that provides additional protection from liability relating to teachers.

(b) ELECTION OF STATE REGARDING NONAPPLICABILITY.—This title shall not apply to any civil action in a State court against a teacher in which all parties are citizens of the State if such State enacts a statute in accordance with State requirements for enacting legislation—

(1) citing the authority of this subsection;

(2) declaring the election of such State that this title shall not apply, as of a date certain, to such civil action in the State; and

(3) containing no other provisions.

SEC. 1204. LIMITATION ON LIABILITY FOR TEACHERS.

(a) LIABILITY PROTECTION FOR TEACHERS.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (d), no teacher in a school shall be liable for harm caused by an act or omission of the teacher on behalf of the school if—

(1) the teacher was acting within the scope of the teacher's employment or responsibilities related to providing educational services;

(2) the actions of the teacher were carried out in conformity with local, state, or federal laws, rules or regulations in furtherance of efforts to control, discipline, expel, or suspend a student or maintain order or control in the classroom or school;

(3) if appropriate or required, the teacher was properly licensed, certified, or authorized by the appropriate authorities for the activities or practice in the State in which the harm occurred, where the activities were or practice was undertaken within the scope of the teacher's responsibilities;

(4) the harm was not caused by willful or criminal misconduct, gross negligence, reckless misconduct, or a conscious, flagrant indifference to the rights or safety of the individual harmed by the teacher; and

(5) the harm was not caused by the teacher operating a motor vehicle, vessel, aircraft, or other vehicle for which the State requires the operator or the owner of the vehicle, craft, or vessel to—

(A) possess an operator's license; or

(B) maintain insurance.

(b) CONCERNING RESPONSIBILITY OF TEACHERS TO SCHOOLS AND GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect any civil action brought by any school or any governmental entity against any teacher of such school.

(c) NO EFFECT ON LIABILITY OF SCHOOL OR GOVERNMENTAL ENTITY.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the liability of any school or governmental entity with respect to harm caused to any person.

(d) EXCEPTIONS TO TEACHER LIABILITY PROTECTION.—If the laws of a State limit teacher liability subject to one or more of the following conditions, such conditions shall not be construed as inconsistent with this section:

(1) A State law that requires a school or governmental entity to adhere to risk management procedures, including mandatory training of teachers.

(2) A State law that makes the school or governmental entity liable for the acts or omissions of its teachers to the same extent as an employer is liable for the acts or omissions of its employees.

(3) A State law that makes a limitation of liability inapplicable if the civil action was brought by an officer of a State or local government pursuant to State or local law.

(e) LIMITATION ON PUNITIVE DAMAGES BASED ON THE ACTIONS OF TEACHERS.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—Punitive damages may not be awarded against a teacher in an action brought for harm based on the action of a teacher acting within the scope of the teacher's responsibilities to a school or governmental entity unless the claimant establishes by clear and convincing evidence that the harm was proximately caused by an action of such teacher which constitutes willful or criminal misconduct, or a conscious, flagrant indifference to the rights or safety of the individual harmed.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Paragraph (1) does not create a cause of action for punitive damages and does not preempt or supersede any Federal or State law to the extent that such law would further limit the award of punitive damages.

(f) EXCEPTIONS TO LIMITATIONS ON LIABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The limitations on the liability of a teacher under this title shall not apply to any misconduct that—

(A) constitutes a crime of violence (as that term is defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code) or act of international terrorism (as that term is defined in section 2331 of title 18, United States Code) for which the defendant has been convicted in any court;

(B) involves a sexual offense, as defined by applicable State law, for which the defendant has been convicted in any court;

(C) involves misconduct for which the defendant has been found to have violated a Federal or State civil rights law; or

(D) where the defendant was under the influence (as determined pursuant to applicable State law) of intoxicating alcohol or any drug at the time of the misconduct.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to effect subsection (a)(3) or (e).

SEC. 1205. LIABILITY FOR NONECONOMIC LOSS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—In any civil action against a teacher, based on an action of a teacher acting within the scope of the teacher's responsibilities to a school or governmental entity, the liability of the teacher for noneconomic loss shall be determined in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNT OF LIABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each defendant who is a teacher, shall be liable only for the amount of noneconomic loss allocated to that defendant in direct proportion to the percentage of responsibility of that defendant (determined in accordance with paragraph (2)) for the harm to the claimant with respect to which that defendant is liable. The court shall render a separate judgment against each defendant in an amount determined pursuant to the preceding sentence.

(2) PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSIBILITY.—For purposes of determining the amount of noneconomic loss allocated to a defendant who is a teacher under this section, the trier of fact shall determine the percentage of responsibility of that defendant for the claimant's harm.

SEC. 1206. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title:

(1) ECONOMIC LOSS.—The term ''economic loss'' means any pecuniary loss resulting from harm (including the loss of earnings or other benefits related to employment, medical expense loss, replacement services loss, loss due to death, burial costs, and loss of business or employment opportunities) to the extent recovery for such loss is allowed under applicable State law.

(2) HARM.—The term ''harm'' includes physical, nonphysical, economic, and noneconomic losses.

(3) NONECONOMIC LOSSES.—The term ''noneconomic losses'' means losses for physical and emotional pain, suffering, inconvenience, physical impairment, mental anguish, disfigurement, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of society and companionship, loss of consortium (other than loss of domestic service), hedonic damages, injury to reputation and all other nonpecuniary losses of any kind or nature.

(4) SCHOOL.—The term ''school'' means a public or private kindergarten, a public or private elementary school or secondary school (as defined in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801)), or a home school.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, any other territory or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision of any such State, territory, or possession.

(6) TEACHER.—The term ''teacher'' means a teacher, instructor, principal, administrator, or other educational professional, that works in a school.

SEC. 1207. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This title shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) APPLICATION.—This title applies to any claim for harm caused by an act or omission of a teacher where that claim is filed on or after the effective date of this Act, without regard to whether the harm that is the subject of the claim or the conduct that caused the harm occurred before such effective date.

TITLE XIII—VIOLENCE PREVENTION TRAINING FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS

SEC. 1301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Violence Prevention Training for Early Childhood Educators Act''.

SEC. 1302. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to provide grants to institutions that carry out early childhood education training programs to enable the institutions to include violence prevention training as part of the preparation of individuals pursuing careers in early childhood development and education.

SEC. 1303. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Aggressive behavior in early childhood is the single best predictor of aggression in later life.

(2) Aggressive and defiant behavior predictive of later delinquency is increasing among our Nation's youngest children. Without prevention efforts, higher percentages of juveniles are likely to become violent juvenile offenders.

(3) Research has demonstrated that aggression is primarily a learned behavior that develops through observation, imitation, and direct experience. Therefore, children who experience violence as victims or as witnesses are at increased risk of becoming violent themselves.

(4) In a study at a Boston city hospital, 1 out of every 10 children seen in the primary care clinic had witnessed a shooting or a stabbing before the age of 6, with 50 percent of the children witnessing in the home and 50 percent of the children witnessing in the streets.

(5) A study in New York found that children who had been victims of violence within their families were 24 percent more likely to report violent behavior as adolescents, and adolescents who had grown up in families where partner violence occurred were 21 percent more likely to report violent delinquency than individuals not exposed to violence.

(6) Aggression can become well-learned and difficult to change by the time a child reaches adolescence. Early childhood offers a critical period for overcoming risk for violent behavior and providing support for prosocial behavior.

(7) Violence prevention programs for very young children yield economic benefits. By providing health and stability to the individual child and the child's family, the programs may reduce expenditures for medical care, special education, and involvement with the judicial system.

(8) Primary prevention can be effective. When preschool teachers teach young children interpersonal problem-solving skills and other forms of conflict resolution, children are less likely to demonstrate problem behaviors.

(9) There is evidence that family support programs in families with children from birth through 5 years of age are effective in preventing delinquency.

SEC. 1304. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AT-RISK CHILD.—The term ''at-risk child'' means a child who has been affected by violence through direct exposure to child abuse, other domestic violence, or violence in the community.

(2) EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION TRAINING PROGRAM.—The term ''early childhood education training program'' means a program that—

(A)(i) trains individuals to work with young children in early child development programs or elementary schools; or

(ii) provides professional development to individuals working in early child development programs or elementary schools;

(B) provides training to become an early childhood education teacher, an elementary school teacher, a school counselor, or a child care provider; and

(C) leads to a bachelor's degree or an associate's degree, a certificate for working with young children (such as a Child Development Associate's degree or an equivalent credential), or, in the case of an individual with such a degree, certificate, or credential, provides professional development.

(3) ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.—The term ''elementary school'' has the meaning given the term in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

(4) VIOLENCE PREVENTION.—The term ''violence prevention'' means—

(A) preventing violent behavior in children;

(B) identifying and preventing violent behavior in at-risk children; or

(C) identifying and ameliorating violent behavior in children who act out violently.

SEC. 1305. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

(a) GRANT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Education is authorized to award grants to institutions that carry out early childhood education training programs and have applications approved under section 1306 to enable the institutions to provide violence prevention training as part of the early childhood education training program.

(b) AMOUNT.—The Secretary of Education shall award a grant under this title in an amount that is not less than $500,000 and not more than $1,000,000.

(c) DURATION.—The Secretary of Education shall award a grant under this title for a period of not less than 3 years and not more than 5 years.

SEC. 1306. APPLICATION.

(a) APPLICATION REQUIRED.—Each institution desiring a grant under this title shall submit to the Secretary of Education an application at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary of Education may require.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each application shall—

(1) describe the violence prevention training activities and services for which assistance is sought;

(2) contain a comprehensive plan for the activities and services, including a description of—

(A) the goals of the violence prevention training program;

(B) the curriculum and training that will prepare students for careers which are described in the plan;

(C) the recruitment, retention, and training of students;

(D) the methods used to help students find employment in their fields;

(E) the methods for assessing the success of the violence prevention training program; and

(F) the sources of financial aid for qualified students;

(3) contain an assurance that the institution has the capacity to implement the plan; and

(4) contain an assurance that the plan was developed in consultation with agencies and organizations that will assist the institution in carrying out the plan.

SEC. 1307. SELECTION PRIORITIES.

The Secretary of Education shall give priority to awarding grants to institutions carrying out violence prevention programs that include 1 or more of the following components:

(1) Preparation to engage in family support (such as parent education, service referral, and literacy training).

(2) Preparation to engage in community outreach or collaboration with other services in the community.

(3) Preparation to use conflict resolution training with children.

(4) Preparation to work in economically disadvantaged communities.

(5) Recruitment of economically disadvantaged students.

(6) Carrying out programs of demonstrated effectiveness in the type of training for which assistance is sought, including programs funded under section 596 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as such section was in effect prior to October 7, 1998).

SEC. 1308. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

TITLE XIV—PREVENTING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY THROUGH CHARACTER EDUCATION

SEC. 1401. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to support the work of community-based organizations, local educational agencies, and schools in providing children and youth with alternatives to delinquency through strong school-based and after school programs that—

(1) are organized around character education;

(2) reduce delinquency, school discipline problems, and truancy; and

(3) improve student achievement, overall school performance, and youths' positive involvement in their community.

SEC. 1402. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated—

(1) $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, to carry out school-based programs under section 1403; and

(2) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, to carry out the after school programs under section 1404.

(b) SOURCE OF FUNDING.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section may be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

SEC. 1403. SCHOOL-BASED PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General, is authorized to award grants to schools, or local educational agencies that enter into a partnership with a school, to support the development of character education programs in the schools in order to—

(1) reduce delinquency, school discipline problems, and truancy; and

(2) improve student achievement, overall school performance, and youths' positive involvement in their community.

(b) APPLICATIONS.—Each school or local educational agency desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require.

(1) CONTENTS.—Each application shall include—

(A) a description of the community to be served and the needs that will be met with the program in that community;

(B) a description of how the program will reach youth at-risk of delinquency;

(C) a description of the activities to be assisted, including—

(i) how parents, teachers, students, and other members of the community will be involved in the design and implementation of the program;

(ii) the character education program to be implemented, including methods of teacher training and parent education that will be used or developed; and

(iii) how the program will coordinate activities assisted under this section with other youth serving activities in the larger community;

(D) a description of the goals of the program;

(E) a description of how progress toward the goals, and toward meeting the purposes of this title, will be measured; and

(F) an assurance that the school or local educational agency will provide the Secretary with information regarding the program and the effectiveness of the program.

SEC. 1404. AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General, is authorized to award grants to community-based organizations to enable the organizations to provide youth with alternative activities, in the after school or out of school hours, that include a strong character education component.

(b) ELIGIBLE COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary only shall award a grant under this section to a community-based organization that has a demonstrated capacity to provide after school or out of school programs to youth, including youth serving organizations, businesses, and other community groups.

(c) APPLICATIONS.—Each community-based organization desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require. Each application shall include—

(1) a description of the community to be served and the needs that will be met with the program in that community;

(2) a description of how the program will identify and recruit at-risk youth for participation in the program, and will provide continuing support for their participation;

(3) a description of the activities to be assisted, including—

(A) how parents, students, and other members of the community will be involved in the design and implementation of the program;

(B) how character education will be incorporated into the program; and

(C) how the program will coordinate activities assisted under this section with activities of schools and other community-based organizations;

(4) a description of the goals of the program;

(5) a description of how progress toward the goals, and toward meeting the purposes of this title, will be measured; and

(6) an assurance that the community-based organization will provide the Secretary with information regarding the program and the effectiveness of the program.

SEC. 1405. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) DURATION.—Each grant under this title shall be awarded for a period of not to exceed 5 years.

(b) PLANNING.—A school, local educational agency or community-based organization may use grant funds provided under this title for not more than 1 year for the planning and design of the program to be assisted.

(c) SELECTION OF GRANTEES.—

(1) CRITERIA.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall select, through a peer review process, community-based organizations, schools, and local educational agencies to receive grants under this title on the basis of the quality of the applications submitted and taking into consideration such factors as—

(A) the quality of the activities to be assisted;

(B) the extent to which the program fosters in youth the elements of character and reaches youth at-risk of delinquency;

(C) the quality of the plan for measuring and assessing the success of the program;

(D) the likelihood the goals of the program will be realistically achieved;

(E) the experience of the applicant in providing similar services; and

(F) the coordination of the program with larger community efforts in character education.

(2) DIVERSITY OF PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall approve applications under this title in a manner that ensures, to the extent practicable, that programs assisted under this title serve different areas of the United States, including urban, suburban and rural areas, and serve at-risk populations.

(d) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds under this title shall be used to support the work of community-based organizations, schools, or local educational agencies in providing children and youth with alternatives to delinquency through strong school-based, after school, or out of school programs that—

(1) are organized around character education;

(2) reduce delinquency, school discipline problems, and truancy; and

(3) improve student achievement, overall school performance, and youths' positive involvement in their community.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The terms used in this Act have the meanings given the terms in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

(2) CHARACTER EDUCATION.—The term ''character education'' means an organized educational program that works to reinforce core elements of character, including caring, civic virtue and citizenship, justice and fairness, respect, responsibility, and trustworthiness.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Education.

TITLE XV—VIOLENT OFFENDER DNA IDENTIFICATION ACT OF 1999

SEC. 1501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Violent Offender DNA Identification Act of 1999''.

SEC. 1502. ELIMINATION OF CONVICTED OFFENDER DNA BACKLOG.

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in coordination with the Assistant Attorney General of the Office of Justice Programs at the Department of Justice, and after consultation with representatives of State and local forensic laboratories, shall develop a voluntary plan to assist State and local forensic laboratories in performing DNA analyses of DNA samples collected from convicted offenders.

(2) OBJECTIVE.—The objective of the plan developed under paragraph (1) shall be to effectively eliminate the backlog of convicted offender DNA samples awaiting analysis in State or local forensic laboratory storage, including samples that need to be reanalyzed using upgraded methods, in an efficient, expeditious manner that will provide for their entry into the Combined DNA Indexing System (CODIS).

(b) PLAN CONDITIONS.—The plan developed under subsection (a) shall—

(1) require that each laboratory performing DNA analyses satisfy quality assurance standards and utilize state-of-the-art testing methods, as set forth by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in coordination with the Assistant Attorney General of the Office of Justice Programs of the Department of Justice; and

(2) require that each DNA sample collected and analyzed be accessible only—

(A) to criminal justice agencies for law enforcement identification purposes;

(B) in judicial proceedings, if otherwise admissible pursuant to applicable statutes or rules;

(C) for criminal defense purposes, to a defendant, who shall have access to samples and analyses performed in connection with the case in which such defendant is charged; or

(D) if personally identifiable information is removed, for a population statistics database, for identification research and protocol development purposes, or for quality control purposes.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN.—Subject to the availability of appropriations under subsection (d), the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in coordination with the Assistant Attorney General of the Office of Justice Programs at the Department of Justice, shall implement the plan developed pursuant to subsection (a) with State and local forensic laboratories that elect to participate.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice to carry out this section $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 and 2001.

SEC. 1503. DNA IDENTIFICATION OF FEDERAL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND MILITARY VIOLENT OFFENDERS.

(a) EXPANSION OF DNA IDENTIFICATION INDEX.—Section 811(a)(2) of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (28 U.S.C. 531 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall expand the combined DNA Identification System (CODIS) to include information on DNA identification records and analyses related to criminal offenses and acts of juvenile delinquency under Federal law, the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and the District of Columbia Code, in accordance with section 210304 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14132).''.

(b) INDEX TO FACILITATE LAW ENFORCEMENT EXCHANGE OF DNA IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—Section 210304 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14132) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''persons convicted of crimes'' and inserting ''individuals convicted of criminal offenses or adjudicated delinquent for acts of juvenile delinquency, including qualifying offenses (as defined in subsection (d)(1))'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking '', at regular intervals of not to exceed 180 days,'' and inserting ''semiannual''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) INCLUSION OF DNA INFORMATION RELATING TO VIOLENT OFFENDERS.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'crime of violence' has the meaning given such term in section 924(c)(3) of title 18, United States Code; and

''(B) the term 'qualifying offense' means a criminal offense or act of juvenile delinquency included on the list established by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation under paragraph (2)(A)(i).

''(2) REGULATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, and at the discretion of the Director thereafter, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in consultation with the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, the Director of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia or the Trustee appointed under section 11232(a) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (as appropriate), and the Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, shall by regulation establish—

''(i) a list of qualifying offenses; and

''(ii) standards and procedures for—

''(I) the analysis of DNA samples collected from individuals convicted of or adjudicated delinquent for a qualifying offense;

''(II) the inclusion in the index established by this section of the DNA identification records and DNA analyses relating to the DNA samples described in subclause (I); and

''(III) with respect to juveniles, the expungement of DNA identification records and DNA analyses described in subclause (II) from the index established by this section in any circumstance in which the underlying adjudication for the qualifying offense has been expunged.

''(B) OFFENSES INCLUDED.—The list established under subparagraph (A)(i) shall include—

''(i) each criminal offense or act of juvenile delinquency under Federal law that—

''(I) constitutes a crime of violence; or

''(II) in the case of an act of juvenile delinquency, would, if committed by an adult, constitute a crime of violence;

''(ii) each criminal offense under the District of Columbia Code that constitutes a crime of violence; and

''(iii) any other felony offense under Federal law or the District of Columbia Code, as determined by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(3) FEDERAL OFFENDERS.—

''(A) COLLECTION OF SAMPLES FROM FEDERAL PRISONERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Beginning 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall collect a DNA sample from each individual in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons who, before or after this subsection takes effect, has been convicted of or adjudicated delinquent for a qualifying offense.

''(ii) TIME AND MANNER.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall specify the time and manner of collection of DNA samples under this subparagraph.

''(B) COLLECTION OF SAMPLES FROM FEDERAL OFFENDERS ON SUPERVISED RELEASE, PAROLE, OR PROBATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Beginning 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the agency responsible for the supervision under Federal law of an individual on supervised release, parole, or probation (other than an individual described in paragraph (4)(B)(i)) shall collect a DNA sample from each individual who has, before or after this subsection takes effect, been convicted of or adjudicated delinquent for a qualifying offense.

''(ii) TIME AND MANNER.—The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall specify the time and manner of collection of DNA samples under this subparagraph.

''(4) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OFFENDERS.—

''(A) OFFENDERS IN CUSTODY OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Government of the District of Columbia may—

''(I) identify 1 or more categories of individuals who are in the custody of, or under supervision by, the District of Columbia, from whom DNA samples should be collected; and

''(II) collect a DNA sample from each individual in any category identified under clause (i).

''(ii) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term 'individuals in the custody of, or under supervision by, the District of Columbia'—

''(I) includes any individual in the custody of, or under supervision by, any agency of the Government of the District of Columbia; and

''(II) does not include an individual who is under the supervision of the Director of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia or the Trustee appointed under section 11232(a) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

''(B) OFFENDERS ON SUPERVISED RELEASE, PROBATION, OR PAROLE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Beginning 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Director of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, or the Trustee appointed under section 11232(a) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, as appropriate, shall collect a DNA sample from each individual under the supervision of the Agency or Trustee, respectively, who is on supervised release, parole, or probation and who has, before or after this subsection takes effect, been convicted of or adjudicated delinquent for a qualifying offense.

''(ii) TIME AND MANNER.—The Director or the Trustee, as appropriate, shall specify the time and manner of collection of DNA samples under this subparagraph.

''(5) WAIVER; COLLECTION PROCEDURES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, a person or agency responsible for the collection of DNA samples under this subsection may—

''(A) waive the collection of a DNA sample from an individual under this subsection if another person or agency has collected such a sample from the individual under this subsection or subsection (e); and

''(B) use or authorize the use of such means as are necessary to restrain and collect a DNA sample from an individual who refuses to cooperate in the collection of the sample.

''(e) INCLUSION OF DNA INFORMATION RELATING TO VIOLENT MILITARY OFFENDERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations that—

''(A) specify categories of conduct punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (referred to in this subsection as 'qualifying military offenses') that are comparable to qualifying offenses (as defined in subsection (d)(1)); and

''(B) set forth standards and procedures for—

''(i) the analysis of DNA samples collected from individuals convicted of a qualifying military offense; and

''(ii) the inclusion in the index established by this section of the DNA identification records and DNA analyses relating to the DNA samples described in clause (i).

''(2) COLLECTION OF SAMPLES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary of Defense shall collect a DNA sample from each individual under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of a military department who has, before or after this subsection takes effect, been convicted of a qualifying military offense.

''(B) TIME AND MANNER.—The Secretary of Defense shall specify the time and manner of collection of DNA samples under this paragraph.

''(3) WAIVER; COLLECTION PROCEDURES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the Secretary of Defense may—

''(A) waive the collection of a DNA sample from an individual under this subsection if another person or agency has collected or will collect such a sample from the individual under subsection (d); and

''(B) use or authorize the use of such means as are necessary to restrain and collect a DNA sample from an individual who refuses to cooperate in the collection of the sample.

''(f) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual from whom the collection of a DNA sample is required or authorized pursuant to subsection (d) who fails to cooperate in the collection of that sample shall be—

''(A) guilty of a class A misdemeanor; and

''(B) punished in accordance with title 18, United States Code.

''(2) MILITARY OFFENDERS.—An individual from whom the collection of a DNA sample is required or authorized pursuant to subsection (e) who fails to cooperate in the collection of that sample may be punished as a court martial may direct as a violation of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated—

''(1) to the Department of Justice to carry out subsection (d) of this section (including to reimburse the Federal judiciary for any reasonable costs incurred in implementing such subsection, as determined by the Attorney General) and section 3(d) of the Violent Offender DNA Identification Act of 1999—

''(A) $6,600,000 for fiscal year 2000; and

''(B) such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2004;

''(2) to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia or the Trustee appointed under section 11232(a) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (as appropriate), such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; and

''(3) to the Department of Defense to carry out subsection (e)—

''(A) $600,000 for fiscal year 2000; and

''(B) $300,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2004.''.

(c) CONDITIONS OF RELEASE.—

(1) CONDITIONS OF PROBATION.—Section 3563(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (7), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

''(9) that the defendant cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample from the defendant if the collection of such a sample is required or authorized pursuant to section 210304 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14132).''.

(2) CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISED RELEASE.—Section 3583(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting before ''The court shall also order'' the following: ''The court shall order, as an explicit condition of supervised release, that the defendant cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample from the defendant, if the collection of such a sample is required or authorized pursuant to section 210304 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14132).''.

(3) CONDITIONS OF RELEASE GENERALLY.—If the collection of a DNA sample from an individual on probation, parole, or supervised release pursuant to a conviction or adjudication of delinquency under the law of any jurisdiction (including an individual on parole pursuant to chapter 311 of title 18, United States Code, as in effect on October 30, 1997) is required or authorized pursuant to section 210304 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14132), and the sample has not otherwise been collected, the individual shall cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample as a condition of that probation, parole, or supervised release.

(d) REPORT AND EVALUATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, acting through the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs of the Department of Justice and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall—

(1) conduct an evaluation to—

(A) identify criminal offenses, including offenses other than qualifying offenses (as defined in section 210304(d)(1) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14132(d)(1)), as added by this section) that, if serving as a basis for the mandatory collection of a DNA sample under section 210304 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14132) or under State law, are likely to yield DNA matches, and the relative degree of such likelihood with respect to each such offense; and

(B) determine the number of investigations aided (including the number of suspects cleared), and the rates of prosecution and conviction of suspects identified through DNA matching; and

(2) submit to Congress a report describing the results of the evaluation under paragraph (1).

(e) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) DRUG CONTROL AND SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—Section 503(a)(12)(C) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3753(a)(12)(C)) is amended by striking '', at regular intervals of not to exceed 180 days,'' and inserting ''semiannual''.

(2) DNA IDENTIFICATION GRANTS.—Section 2403(3) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796kk–2(3)) is amended by striking '', at regular intervals not exceeding 180 days,'' and inserting ''semiannual''.

(3) FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.—Section 210305(a)(1)(A) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14133(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking '', at regular intervals of not to exceed 180 days,'' and inserting ''semiannual''.

TITLE XVI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—General Provisions

SEC. 1601. PROHIBITION ON FIREARMS POSSESSION BY VIOLENT JUVENILE OFFENDERS.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 921(a)(20) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(20)'';

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) For purposes of subsections (d) and (g) of section 922, the term 'act of violent juvenile

delinquency' means an adjudication of delinquency in Federal or State court, based on a finding of the commission of an act by a person prior to his or her eighteenth birthday that, if committed by an adult, would be a serious or violent felony, as defined in section 3559(c)(2)(F)(i) had Federal jurisdiction existed and been exercised (except that section 3559(c)(3) shall not apply to this subparagraph).''; and

(4) in the undesignated paragraph following subparagraph (B) (as added by paragraph (3) of this subsection), by striking ''What constitutes'' and all that follows through ''this chapter,'' and inserting the following:

''(C) What constitutes a conviction of such a crime or an adjudication of an act of violent juvenile delinquency shall be determined in accordance with the law of the jurisdiction in which the proceedings were held. Any State conviction or adjudication of an act of violent juvenile delinquency that has been expunged or set aside, or for which a person has been pardoned or has had civil rights restored, by the jurisdiction in which the conviction or adjudication of an act of violent juvenile delinquency occurred shall not be considered to be a conviction or adjudication of an act of violent juvenile delinquency for purposes of this chapter,''.

(b) PROHIBITION.—Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

''(10) has committed an act of violent juvenile delinquency.''; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the comma at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

''(10) who has committed an act of violent juvenile delinquency,''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE OF ADJUDICATION PROVISIONS.—The amendments made by this section shall only apply to an adjudication of an act of violent juvenile delinquency that occurs after the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Attorney General certifies to Congress and separately notifies Federal firearms licensees, through publication in the Federal Register by the Secretary of the Treasury, that the records of such adjudications are routinely available in the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103(b) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act.

SEC. 1602. SAFE STUDENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Safe Students Act.''

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to maximize local flexibility in responding to the threat of juvenile violence through the implementation of effective school violence prevention and safety programs.

(c) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, award grants to local education agencies and to law enforcement agencies to assist in the planning, establishing, operating, coordinating and evaluating of school violence prevention and school safety programs.

(d) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (c), an entity shall—

(A) be a local education agency or a law enforcement agency; and

(B) prepare and submit to the Attorney General an application at such time, in such manner and containing such information as the Attorney General may require, including—

(i) a detailed explanation of the intended uses of funds provided under the grant; and

(ii) a written assurance that the schools to be served under the grant will have a zero tolerance policy in effect for drugs, alcohol, weapons, truancy and juvenile crime on school campuses.

(2) PRIORITY.—The Attorney General shall give priority in awarding grants under this section to applications that have been submitted jointly by a local education agency and a law enforcement agency.

(e) ALLOWABLE USES OF FUNDS.—Amounts received under a grant under this section shall be used for innovative, local responses, consistent with the purposes of this Act, which may include—

(1) training, including in-service training, for school personnel, custodians and bus drivers in—

(A) the identification of potential threats (such as illegal weapons and explosive devices);

(B) crisis preparedness and intervention procedures; and

(C) emergency response;

(2) training of interested parents, teachers and other school and law enforcement personnel in the identification and responses to early warning signs of troubled and violent youth;

(3) innovative research-based delinquency and violence prevention programs, including mentoring programs;

(4) comprehensive school security assessments;

(5) the purchase of school security equipment and technologies such as metal detectors, electronic locks, surveillance cameras;

(6) collaborative efforts with law enforcement agencies, community-based organizations (including faith-based organizations) that have demonstrated expertise in providing effective, research-based violence prevention and intervention programs to school age children;

(7) providing assistance to families in need for the purpose of purchasing required school uniforms;

(8) school resource officers, including community police officers; and

(9) community policing in and around schools.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $200,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2004.

(g) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, and every 2 years thereafter, the Attorney General shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report concerning the manner in which grantees have used amounts received under a grant under this section.

SEC. 1603. STUDY OF MARKETING PRACTICES OF THE FIREARMS INDUSTRY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General shall jointly conduct a study of the marketing practices of the firearms industry, with respect to children.

(b) ISSUES EXAMINED.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Commission and the Attorney General shall examine the extent to which the firearms industry advertises and promotes its products to juveniles, including in media outlets in which minors comprise a substantial percentage of the audience.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission and the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 1604. PROVISION OF INTERNET FILTERING OR SCREENING SOFTWARE BY CERTAIN INTERNET SERVICE PROVIDERS.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE.—Each Internet service provider shall at the time of entering an agreement with a residential customer for the provision of Internet access services, provide to such customer, either at no fee or at a fee not in excess of the amount specified in subsection (c), computer software or other filtering or blocking system that allows the customer to prevent the access of minors to material on the Internet.

(b) SURVEYS OF PROVISION OF SOFTWARE OR SYSTEMS.—

(1) SURVEYS.—The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission shall jointly conduct surveys of the extent to which Internet service providers are providing computer software or systems described in subsection (a) to their subscribers.

(2) FREQUENCY.—The surveys required by paragraph (1) shall be completed as follows:

(A) One shall be completed not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) One shall be completed not later than two years after that date.

(C) One shall be completed not later than three years after that date.

(c) FEES.—The fee, if any, charged and collected by an Internet service provider for providing computer software or a system described in subsection (a) to a residential customer shall not exceed the amount equal to the cost of the provider in providing the software or system to the subscriber, including the cost of the software or system and of any license required with respect to the software or system.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—The requirement described in subsection (a) shall become effective only if—

(1) 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Office and the Commission determine as a result of the survey completed by the deadline in subsection (b)(2)(A) that less than 75 percent of the total number of residential subscribers of Internet service providers as of such deadline are provided computer software or systems described in subsection (a) by such providers;

(2) 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Office and the Commission determine as a result of the survey completed by the deadline in subsection (b)(2)(B) that less than 85 percent of the total number of residential subscribers of Internet service providers as of such deadline are provided such software or systems by such providers; or

(3) 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, if the Office and the Commission determine as a result of the survey completed by the deadline in subsection (b)(2)(C) that less than 100 percent of the total number of residential subscribers of Internet service providers as of such deadline are provided such software or systems by such providers.

(e) INTERNET SERVICE PROVIDER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Internet service provider'' means a service provider as defined in section 512(k)(1)(A) of title 17, United States Code, which has more than 50,000 subscribers.

SEC. 1605. APPLICATION OF SECTION 923 (j) AND (m).

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 923 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act, shall be applied by amending in subsections (j) and (m) the following:

(1) In subsection (j) amend—

(A) paragraph (2) (A), (B) and (C) to read as follows:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A temporary location referred to in paragraph (1) is a location for a gun show, or event in the State specified on the license, at which firearms, firearms accessories and related items may be bought, sold, traded, and displayed, in accordance with Federal, State, and local laws.

''(B) LOCATIONS OUT OF STATE.—If the location is not in the State specified on the license, a licensee may display any firearm, and take orders for a firearm or effectuate the transfer of a firearm, in accordance with this chapter, including paragraph (7) of this subsection.

''(C) QUALIFIED GUN SHOWS OR EVENTS.—A gun show or an event shall qualify as a temporary location if—

''(i) the gun show or event is one which is sponsored, for profit or not, by an individual,

national, State, or local organization, association, or other entity to foster the collecting, competitive use, sporting use, or any other legal use of firearms; and

''(ii) the gun show or event has—

''(I) 20 percent or more firearm exhibitors out of all exhibitors; or

''(II) 10 or more firearms exhibitors.''.

(B) paragraph (3)(C) to read as follows:

''(C) shall be retained at the premises specified on the license.''; and

(C) paragraph (7) to read as follows:

''(7) NO EFFECT ON OTHER RIGHTS.—Nothing in this subsection diminishes in any manner any right to display, sell, or otherwise dispose of firearms or ammunition that is in effect before the date of enactment of the Firearms Owners' Protection Act, including the right of a licensee to conduct firearms transfers and business away from their business premises with another licensee without regard to whether the location of the business is in the State specified on the license of either licensee.''.

(2) In subsection (m), amend—

(A) paragraph (2)(E)(i) to read as follows:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A person not licensed under this section who desires to transfer a firearm at a gun show in his State of residence to another person who is a resident of the same State, and not licensed under this section, shall only make such a transfer through a licensee who can conduct an instant background check at the gun show, or directly to the prospective transferee if an instant background check is first conducted by a special registrant at the gun show on the prospective transferee. For any instant background check conducted at a gun show, the time period stated in section 922(t)(1)(B)(ii) of this chapter shall be 24 hours in a calendar day since the licensee contacted the system. If the services of a special registrant are used to determine the firearms eligibility of the prospective transferee to possesses a firearm, the transferee shall provide the special registrant at the gun show, on a special and limited-purpose form that the Secretary shall prescribe for use by a special registrant—

''(I) the name, age, address, and other identifying information of the prospective transferee (or, in the case of a prospective transferee that is a corporation or other business entity, the identity and principal and local places of business of the prospective transferee); and

''(II) proof of verification of the identity of the prospective transferee as required by section 922(t)(1)(C).''; and

(B) paragraph (4) to read as follows:

''(4) IMMUNITY.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified civil liability action' means a civil action brought by any person against a person described in subparagraph (B) for damages resulting from the criminal or unlawful misuse of the firearm by the transferee or a third party.

''(ii) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'qualified civil liability action' shall not include an action—

''(I) brought against a transferor convicted under section 924(h), or a comparable State felony law, by a person directly harmed by the transferee's criminal conduct, as defined in section 924(h); or

''(II) brought against a transferor for negligent entrustment or negligence per se.

''(B) IMMUNITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person who is—

''(i) a special registrant who performs a background check in the manner prescribed in this subsection at a gun show;

''(ii) a licensee or special licensee who acquires a firearm at a gun show from a nonlicensee, for transfer to another nonlicensee in attendance at the gun show, for the purpose of effectuating a sale, trade, or transfer between the 2 nonlicensees, all in the manner prescribed for the acquisition and disposition of a firearm under this chapter; or

''(iii) a nonlicensee person disposing of a firearm who uses the services of a person described in clause (i) or (ii);

shall be entitled to immunity from civil liability action as described in subparagraphs (C) and (D).

''(C) PROSPECTIVE ACTIONS.—A qualified civil liability action may not be brought in any Federal or State court.

''(D) DISMISSAL OF PENDING ACTIONS.—A qualified civil liability action that is pending on the date of enactment of this subsection shall be dismissed immediately by the court.''.

SEC. 1606. CONSTITUTIONALITY OF MEMORIAL SERVICES AND MEMORIALS AT PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress of the United States finds that the saying of a prayer, the reading of a scripture, or the performance of religious music as part of a memorial service that is held on the campus of a public school in order to honor the memory of any person slain on that campus does not violate the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and that the design and construction of any memorial that is placed on the campus of a public school in order to honor the memory of any person slain on that campus a part of which includes religious symbols, motifs, or sayings does not violate the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(b) LAWSUITS.—In any lawsuit claiming that the type of memorial or memorial service described in subsection (a) violates the Constitution of the United States—

(1) each party shall pay its own attorney's fees and costs, notwithstanding any other provision of law, and

(2) the Attorney General of the United States is authorized to provide legal assistance to the school district or other governmental entity that is defending the legality of such memorial service.

SEC. 1607. TWENTY-FIRST AMENDMENT ENFORCEMENT.

(a) SHIPMENT OF INTOXICATING LIQUOR INTO STATE IN VIOLATION OF STATE LAW.—The Act entitled ''An Act divesting intoxicating liquors of their interstate character in certain cases'', approved March 1, 1913 (commonly known as the ''Webb-Kenyon Act'') (27 U.S.C. 122) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF IN FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'attorney general' means the attorney general or other chief law enforcement officer of a State, or the designee thereof;

''(2) the term 'intoxicating liquor' means any spirituous, vinous, malted, fermented, or other intoxicating liquor of any kind;

''(3) the term 'person' means any individual and any partnership, corporation, company, firm, society, association, joint stock company, trust, or other entity capable of holding a legal or beneficial interest in property, but does not include a State or agency thereof; and

''(4) the term 'State' means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any territory or possession of the United States.

''(b) ACTION BY STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—If the attorney general of a State has reasonable cause to believe that a person is engaged in, is about to engage in, or has engaged in, any act that would constitute a violation of a State law regulating the importation or transportation of any intoxicating liquor, the attorney general may bring a civil action in accordance with this section for injunctive relief (including a preliminary or permanent injunction or other order) against the person, as the attorney general determines to be necessary to—

''(1) restrain the person from engaging, or continuing to engage, in the violation; and

''(2) enforce compliance with the State law.

''(c) FEDERAL JURISDICTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over any action brought under this section.

''(2) VENUE.—An action under this section may be brought only in accordance with section 1391 of title 28, United States Code.

''(d) REQUIREMENTS FOR INJUNCTIONS AND ORDERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In any action brought under this section, upon a proper showing by the attorney general of the State, the court shall issue a preliminary or permanent injunction or other order without requiring the posting of a bond.

''(2) NOTICE.—No preliminary or permanent injunction or other order may be issued under paragraph (1) without notice to the adverse party.

''(3) FORM AND SCOPE OF ORDER.—Any preliminary or permanent injunction or other order entered in an action brought under this section shall—

''(A) set forth the reasons for the issuance of the order;

''(B) be specific in terms;

''(C) describe in reasonable detail, and not by reference to the complaint or other document, the act or acts to be restrained; and

''(D) be binding only upon—

''(i) the parties to the action and the officers, agents, employees, and attorneys of those parties; and

''(ii) persons in active cooperation or participation with the parties to the action who receive actual notice of the order by personal service or otherwise.

''(e) CONSOLIDATION OF HEARING WITH TRIAL ON MERITS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Before or after the commencement of a hearing on an application for a preliminary or permanent injunction or other order under this section, the court may order the trial of the action on the merits to be advanced and consolidated with the hearing on the application.

''(2) ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE.—If the court does not order the consolidation of a trial on the merits with a hearing on an application described in paragraph (1), any evidence received upon an application for a preliminary or permanent injunction or other order that would be admissible at the trial on the merits shall become part of the record of the trial and shall not be required to be received again at the trial.

''(f) NO RIGHT TO TRIAL BY JURY.—An action brought under this section shall be tried before the court.

''(g) ADDITIONAL REMEDIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A remedy under this section is in addition to any other remedies provided by law.

''(2) STATE COURT PROCEEDINGS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to prohibit an authorized State official from proceeding in State court on the basis of an alleged violation of any State law.''.

SEC. 1608. INTERSTATE SHIPMENT AND DELIVERY OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Chapter 59 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1263—

(A) by inserting ''a label on the shipping container that clearly and prominently identifies the contents as alcoholic beverages, and a'' after ''accompanied by''; and

(B) by inserting ''and requiring upon delivery the signature of a person who has attained the age for the lawful purchase of intoxicating liquor in the State in which the delivery is made,'' after ''contained therein,''; and

(2) in section 1264, by inserting ''or to any person other than a person who has attained the age for the lawful purchase of intoxicating liquor in the State in which the delivery is made,'' after ''consignee,''.

SEC. 1609. DISCLAIMER ON MATERIALS PRODUCED, PROCURED OR DISTRIBUTED FROM FUNDING AUTHORIZED BY THIS ACT.

(a) All materials produced, procured, or distributed, in whole or in part, as a result of Federal funding authorized under this Act for expenditure by Federal, State or local governmental recipients or other nongovernmental entities shall have printed thereon the following language:

''This material has been printed, procured or distributed, in whole or in part, at the expense of the Federal Government. Any person who objects to the accuracy of the material, to the completeness of the material, or to the representations made within the material, including objections related to this material's characterization of religious beliefs, are encouraged to direct their comments to the office of the Attorney General of the United States.''.

(b) All materials produced, procured, or distributed using funds authorized under this Act shall have printed thereon, in addition to the language contained in paragraph (a), a complete address for an office designated by the Attorney General to receive comments from members of the public.

(c) The office designated under paragraph (b) by the Attorney General to receive comments shall, every six months, prepare an accurate summary of all comments received by the office. This summary shall include details about the number of comments received and the specific nature of the concerns raised within the comments, and shall be provided to the Chairmen of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees, the Senate and House Education Committees, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate, and the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives. Further, the comments received shall be retained by the office and shall be made available to any member of the general public upon request.

SEC. 1610. AIMEE'S LAW.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as ''Aimee's Law''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DANGEROUS SEXUAL OFFENSE.—The term ''dangerous sexual offense'' means sexual abuse or sexually explicit conduct committed by an individual who has attained the age of 18 years against an individual who has not attained the age of 14 years.

(2) MURDER.—The term ''murder'' has the meaning given the term under applicable State law.

(3) RAPE.—The term ''rape'' has the meaning given the term under applicable State law.

(4) SEXUAL ABUSE.—The term ''sexual abuse'' has the meaning given the term under applicable State law.

(5) SEXUALLY EXPLICIT CONDUCT.—The term ''sexually explicit conduct'' has the meaning given the term under applicable State law.

(c) REIMBURSEMENT TO STATES FOR CRIMES COMMITTED BY CERTAIN RELEASED FELONS.—

(1) PENALTY.—

(A) SINGLE STATE.—In any case in which a State convicts an individual of murder, rape, or a dangerous sexual offense, who has a prior conviction for any 1 of those offenses in a State described in subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall transfer an amount equal to the costs of incarceration, prosecution, and apprehension of that individual, from Federal law enforcement assistance funds that have been allocated to but not distributed to the State that convicted the individual of the prior offense, to the State account that collects Federal law enforcement assistance funds of the State that convicted that individual of the subsequent offense.

(B) MULTIPLE STATES.—In any case in which a State convicts an individual of murder, rape, or a dangerous sexual offense, who has a prior conviction for any 1 or more of those offenses in more than 1 other State described in subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall transfer an amount equal to the costs of incarceration, prosecution, and apprehension of that individual, from Federal law enforcement assistance funds that have been allocated to but not distributed to each State that convicted such individual of the prior offense, to the State account that collects Federal law enforcement assistance funds of the State that convicted that individual of the subsequent offense.

(C) STATE DESCRIBED.—A State is described in this subparagraph if—

(i) the State has not adopted Federal truth-in-sentencing guidelines under section 20104 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13704);

(ii) the average term of imprisonment imposed by the State on individuals convicted of the offense for which the individual described in subparagraph (A) or (B), as applicable, was convicted by the State is less than 10 percent above the average term of imprisonment imposed for that offense in all States; or

(iii) with respect to the individual described in subparagraph (A) or (B), as applicable, the individual had served less than 85 percent of the term of imprisonment to which that individual was sentenced for the prior offense.

(2) STATE APPLICATIONS.—In order to receive an amount transferred under paragraph (1), the chief executive of a State shall submit to the Attorney General an application, in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require, which shall include a certification that the State has convicted an individual of murder, rape, or a dangerous sexual offense, who has a prior conviction for 1 of those offenses in another State.

(3) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Any amount transferred under paragraph (1) shall be derived by reducing the amount of Federal law enforcement assistance funds received by the State that convicted such individual of the prior offense before the distribution of the funds to the State. The Attorney General, in consultation with the chief executive of the State that convicted such individual of the prior offense, shall establish a payment schedule.

(4) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to diminish or otherwise affect any court ordered restitution.

(5) EXCEPTION.—This subsection does not apply if the individual convicted of murder, rape, or a dangerous sexual offense has been released from prison upon the reversal of a conviction for an offense described in paragraph (1) and subsequently been convicted for an offense described in paragraph (1).

(d) COLLECTION OF RECIDIVISM DATA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with calendar year 1999, and each calendar year thereafter, the Attorney General shall collect and maintain information relating to, with respect to each State—

(A) the number of convictions during that calendar year for murder, rape, and any sex offense in the State in which, at the time of the offense, the victim had not attained the age of 14 years and the offender had attained the age of 18 years; and

(B) the number of convictions described in subparagraph (A) that constitute second or subsequent convictions of the defendant of an offense described in that subparagraph.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 2000, and on March 1 of each year thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report, which shall include—

(A) the information collected under paragraph (1) with respect to each State during the preceding calendar year; and

(B) the percentage of cases in each State in which an individual convicted of an offense described in paragraph (1)(A) was previously convicted of another such offense in another State during the preceding calendar year.

SEC. 1611. DRUG TESTS AND LOCKER INSPECTIONS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''School Violence Prevention Act''.

(b) AMENDMENT.—Section 4116(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7116(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (10) as paragraph (11); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

''(10) consistent with the fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, testing a student for illegal drug use or inspecting a student's locker for guns, explosives, other weapons, or illegal drugs, including at the request of or with the consent of a parent or legal guardian of the student, if the local educational agency elects to so test or inspect; and''.

SEC. 1612. WAIVER FOR LOCAL MATCH REQUIREMENT UNDER COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAM.

Section 1701(i) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(i)) is amended by adding at the end of the first sentence the following:

''The Attorney General shall waive the requirement under this subsection of a non-Federal contribution to the costs of a program, project, or activity that hires law enforcement officers for placement in public schools by a jurisdiction that demonstrates financial need or hardship.''.

SEC. 1613. CARJACKING OFFENSES.

Section 2119 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking '', with the intent to cause death or serious bodily harm''.

SEC. 1614. SPECIAL FORFEITURE OF COLLATERAL PROFITS OF CRIME.

Section 3681 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) FORFEITURE OF PROCEEDS.—Upon the motion of the United States attorney made at any time after conviction of a defendant for an offense described in paragraph (2), and after notice to any interested party, the court shall order the defendant to forfeit all or any part of proceeds received or to be received by the defendant, or a transferee of the defendant, from a contract relating to the transfer of a right or interest of the defendant in any property described in paragraph (3), if the court determines that—

''(A) the interests of justice or an order of restitution under this title so require;

''(B) the proceeds (or part thereof) to be forfeited reflect the enhanced value of the property attributable to the offense; and

''(C) with respect to a defendant convicted of an offense against a State—

''(i) the property at issue, or the proceeds to be forfeited, have travelled in interstate or foreign commerce or were derived through the use of an instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce; and

''(ii) the attorney general of the State has declined to initiate a forfeiture action with respect to the proceeds to be forfeited.

''(2) OFFENSES DESCRIBED.—An offense is described in this paragraph if it is—

''(A) an offense under section 794 of this title;

''(B) a felony offense against the United States or any State; or

''(C) a misdemeanor offense against the United States or any State resulting in physical harm to any individual.

''(3) PROPERTY DESCRIBED.—Property is described in this paragraph if it is any property, tangible or intangible, including any—

''(A) evidence of the offense;

''(B) instrument of the offense, including any vehicle used in the commission of the offense;

''(C) real estate where the offense was committed;

''(D) document relating to the offense;

''(E) photograph or audio or video recording relating to the offense;

''(F) clothing, jewelry, furniture, or other personal property relating to the offense;

''(G) movie, book, newspaper, magazine, radio or television production, or live entertainment of any kind depicting the offense or otherwise relating to the offense;

''(H) expression of the thoughts, opinions, or emotions of the defendant regarding the offense; or

''(I) other property relating to the offense.''.

SEC. 1615. CALLER IDENTIFICATION SERVICES TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS AS PART OF UNIVERSAL SERVICE OBLIGATION.

(a) CLARIFICATION.—Section 254(h)(1)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254(h)(1)(B)) is amended by inserting after ''under subsection (c)(3),'' the following: ''including caller identification services with respect to elementary and secondary schools,''.

(b) OUTREACH.—The Federal Communications Commission shall take appropriate actions to notify elementary and secondary schools throughout the United States of—

(1) the availability of caller identification services as part of the services that are within the definition of universal service under section 254(h)(1)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934; and

(2) the procedures to be used by such schools in applying for such services under that section.

SEC. 1616. PARENT LEADERSHIP MODEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Crime Control and Prevention is authorized to make a grant to a national organization to provide training, technical assistance, best practice strategies, program materials and other necessary support for a mutual support, parental leadership model proven to prevent child abuse and juvenile delinquency.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated out of the Violent Crime Trust Fund, $3,000,000.

SEC. 1617. NATIONAL MEDIA CAMPAIGN AGAINST VIOLENCE.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the National Crime Prevention Council not to exceed $25,000,000, to be expended without fiscal-year limitation, for a 2-year national media campaign, to be conducted in consultation with national, statewide or community based youth organizations, Boys and Girls Clubs of America, and to be targeted to parents (and other caregivers) and to youth, to reduce and prevent violent criminal behavior by young Americans: Provided, That none of such funds may be used—(1) to propose, influence, favor, or oppose any change in any statute, rule, regulation, treaty, or other provision of law; (2) for any partisan political purpose; (3) to feature any elected officials, persons seeking elected office, cabinet-level officials, or Federal officials employed pursuant to Schedule C of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, section 213; or (4) in any way that otherwise would violate section 1913 of title 18 of the United States Code: Provided further, That, for purposes hereof, ''violent criminal behavior by young Americans'' means behavior, by minors residing in the United States (or in any jurisdiction under the sovereign jurisdiction thereof), that both is illegal under Federal, State, or local law, and involves acts or threats of physical violence, physical injury, or physical harm: Provided further, That not to exceed 10 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be used to commission an objective accounting, from a licensed and certified public accountant, using generally-accepted accounting principles, of the funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization and of any other funds or in-kind donations spent or used in the campaign, and an objective evaluation both of the impact and cost-effectiveness of the campaign and of the campaign-related activities of the Council and the Clubs, which accounting and evaluation shall be submitted by the Council to the Committees on Appropriations and the Judiciary of each House of Congress by not later than 9 months after the conclusion of the campaign.

SEC. 1618. VICTIMS OF TERRORISM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1404B of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10603b) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1404B. COMPENSATION AND ASSISTANCE TO VICTIMS OF TERRORISM OR MASS VIOLENCE.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'eligible crime victim compensation program' means a program that meets the requirements of section 1402(b);

''(2) the term 'eligible crime victim assistance program' means a program that meets the requirements of section 1404(b);

''(3) the term 'public agency' includes any Federal, State, or local government or nonprofit organization; and

''(4) the term 'victim'—

''(A) means an individual who is citizen or employee of the United States, and who is injured or killed as a result of a terrorist act or mass violence, whether occurring within or outside the United States; and

''(B) includes, in the case of an individual described in subparagraph (A) who is deceased, the family members of the individual.

''(b) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Director may make grants, as provided in either section 1402(d)(4)(B) or 1404—

''(1) to States, which shall be used for eligible crime victim compensation programs and eligible crime victim assistance programs for the benefit of victims; and

''(2) to victim service organizations, and public agencies that provide emergency or ongoing assistance to victims of crime, which shall be used to provide, for the benefit of victims—

''(A) emergency relief (including compensation, assistance, and crisis response) and other related victim services; and

''(B) training and technical assistance for victim service providers.

''(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to supplant any compensation available under title VIII of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by this section applies to any terrorist act or mass violence occurring on or after December 20, 1988, with respect to which an investigation or prosecution was ongoing after April 24, 1996.

SEC. 1619. TRUTH-IN-SENTENCING INCENTIVE GRANTS.

(a) QUALIFICATION DATE.—Section 20104 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13704(a)(3)) is amended by striking ''on April 26, 1996'' and inserting ''on or after April 26, 1996.''

(b) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—Section 20106 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13706) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) FORMULA ALLOCATION.—The amount made available to carry out this section for any fiscal year under section 20104 shall be allocated as follows:

''(1) .75 percent shall be allocated to each State that meets the requirements of section 20104, except that the United States Virgin Islands, America Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands each shall be allocated 0.05 percent; and

''(2) The amount remaining after the application of paragraph (1) shall be allocated to each State that meets the requirements of section 20104 in the ratio that the average annual number of part 1 violent crimes reported by that State to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the 3 years preceding the year in which the determination is made bears to the average annual number of part 1 violent crimes reported by States that meet the requirements of section 20104 to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the 3 years preceding the year in which the determination is made, except that a State may not receive more than 25 percent of the total amount available for such grants.''.

SEC. 1620. APPLICATION OF PROVISION RELATING TO A SENTENCE OF DEATH FOR AN ACT OF ANIMAL ENTERPRISE TERRORISM.

Section 3591 of title 18, United States Code (relating to circumstances under which a defendant may be sentenced to death), shall apply to sentencing for a violation of section 43 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act to include the death penalty as a possible punishment.

SEC. 1621. PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO EXPLOSIVE MATERIALS.

(a) PROHIBITION OF SALE, DELIVERY, OR TRANSFER OF EXPLOSIVE MATERIALS TO CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—Section 842 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

''(d) PROHIBITION OF SALE, DELIVERY, OR TRANSFER OF EXPLOSIVE MATERIALS TO CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—It shall be unlawful for any licensee to knowingly sell, deliver, or transfer any explosive materials to any individual who—

''(1) is less than 21 years of age;

''(2) is under indictment for, or has been convicted in any court of, a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year;

''(3) is a fugitive from justice;

''(4) is an unlawful user of or addicted to any controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802));

''(5) has been adjudicated as a mental defective or has been committed to any mental institution;

''(6) being an alien—

''(A) is illegally or unlawfully in the United States; or

''(B) except as provided in section 845(d), has been admitted to the United States under a nonimmigrant visa (as that term is defined in section 101(a)(26) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(26));

''(7) has been discharged from the Armed Forces under dishonorable conditions;

''(8) having been a citizen of the United States, has renounced his citizenship;

''(9) is subject to a court order that restrains such person from harassing, stalking, or threatening an intimate partner of such person or child of such intimate partner or person, or engaging in other conduct that would place an intimate partner in reasonable fear of bodily injury to the partner or child, except that this paragraph shall only apply to a court order that—

''(A) was issued after a hearing of which such person received actual notice, and at which such person had the opportunity to participate; and

''(B)(i) includes a finding that such person represents a credible threat to the physical safety of such intimate partner or child; and

''(ii) by its terms explicitly prohibits the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against such intimate partner or child that would reasonably be expected to cause bodily injury; or

''(10) has been convicted in any court of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence.''.

(b) PROHIBITION ON SHIPPING, TRANSPORTING, POSSESSION, OR RECEIPT OF EXPLOSIVES BY CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—Section 842 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (i) and inserting the following:

''(i) PROHIBITION ON SHIPPING, TRANSPORTING, POSSESSION, OR RECEIPT OF EXPLOSIVES BY CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—It shall be unlawful for any person to ship or transport in interstate or foreign commerce, or possess, in or affecting commerce, any explosive, or to receive any explosive that has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce, if that person—

''(1) is less than 21 years of age;

''(2) has been convicted in any court, of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year;

''(3) is a fugitive from justice;

''(4) is an unlawful user of or addicted to any controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802));

''(5) has been adjudicated as a mental defective or who has been committed to a mental institution;

''(6) being an alien—

''(A) is illegally or unlawfully in the United States; or

''(B) except as provided in section 845(d), has been admitted to the United States under a nonimmigrant visa (as that term is defined in section 101(a)(26) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(26));

''(7) has been discharged from the Armed Forces under dishonorable conditions;

''(8) having been a citizen of the United States, has renounced his citizenship; or

''(9) is subject to a court order that—

''(A) was issued after a hearing of which such person received actual notice, and at which such person had an opportunity to participate;

''(B) restrains such person from harassing, stalking, or threatening an intimate partner of such person or child of such intimate partner or person, or engaging in other conduct that would place an intimate partner in reasonable fear of bodily injury to the partner or child; and

''(C)(i) includes a finding that such person represents a credible threat to the physical safety of such intimate partner or child; and

''(ii) by its terms explicitly prohibits the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against such intimate partner or child that would reasonably be expected to cause bodily injury; or

''(10) has been convicted in any court of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence.''.

(c) EXCEPTIONS AND WAIVER FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—Section 845 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) EXCEPTIONS AND WAIVER FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'alien' has the same meaning as in section 101(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(3)); and

''(B) the term 'nonimmigrant visa' has the same meaning as in section 101(a)(26) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(26)).

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsections (d)(5)(B) and (i)(5)(B) of section 842 do not apply to any alien who has been lawfully admitted to the United States pursuant to a nonimmigrant visa, if that alien is—

''(A) admitted to the United States for lawful hunting or sporting purposes;

''(B) a foreign military personnel on official assignment to the United States;

''(C) an official of a foreign government or a distinguished foreign visitor who has been so designated by the Department of State; or

''(D) a foreign law enforcement officer of a friendly foreign government entering the United States on official law enforcement business.

''(3) WAIVER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any individual who has been admitted to the United States under a nonimmigrant visa and who is not described in paragraph (2), may receive a waiver from the applicability of subsection (d)(5)(B) or (i)(5)(B) of section 842, if—

''(i) the individual submits to the Attorney General a petition that meets the requirements of subparagraph (B); and

''(ii) the Attorney General approves the petition.

''(B) PETITIONS.—Each petition under subparagraph (A)(i) shall—

''(i) demonstrate that the petitioner has resided in the United States for a continuous period of not less than 180 days before the date on which the petition is submitted under this paragraph; and

''(ii) include a written statement from the embassy or consulate of the petitioner, authorizing the petitioner to engage in any activity prohibited under subsection (d) or (i) of section 842, as applicable, and certifying that the petitioner would not otherwise be prohibited from engaging in that activity under subsection (d) or (i) of section 842, as applicable.''.

SEC. 1622. DISTRICT JUDGES FOR DISTRICTS IN THE STATES OF ARIZONA, FLORIDA, AND NEVADA.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Emergency Federal Judgeship Act of 1999''.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

(1) 3 additional district judges for the district of Arizona;

(2) 4 additional district judges for the middle district of Florida; and

(3) 2 additional district judges for the district of Nevada.

(c) TABLES.—In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28, United States Code, will reflect the changes in the total number of permanent district judgeships authorized as a result of subsection (a) of this section—

(1) the item relating to Arizona in such table is amended to read as follows:

''Arizona ..... 11'';

(2) the item relating to Florida in such table is amended to read as follows:

''Florida:
Northern 4
Middle 15
Southern ..... 16'';

and

(3) the item relating to Nevada in such table is amended to read as follows:

''Nevada ..... 6''.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, including such sums as may be necessary to provide appropriate space and facilities for the judicial positions created by this section.

SEC. 1623. BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH ON YOUTH VIOLENCE.

(a) NIH RESEARCH.—The National Institutes of Health, acting through the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research, shall carry out a coordinated, multi-year course of behavioral and social science research on the causes and prevention of youth violence.

(b) NATURE OF RESEARCH.—Funds made available to the National Institutes of Health pursuant to this section shall be utilized to conduct, support, coordinate, and disseminate basic and applied behavioral and social science research with respect to youth violence, including research on 1 or more of the following subjects:

(1) The etiology of youth violence.

(2) Risk factors for youth violence.

(3) Childhood precursors to antisocial violent behavior.

(4) The role of peer pressure in inciting youth violence.

(5) The processes by which children develop patterns of thought and behavior, including beliefs about the value of human life.

(6) Science-based strategies for preventing youth violence, including school and community-based programs.

(7) Other subjects that the Director of the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research deems appropriate.

(c) ROLE OF THE OFFICE OF BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES RESEARCH.—Pursuant to this section and section 404A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 283c), the Director of the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research shall—

(1) coordinate research on youth violence conducted or supported by the agencies of the National Institutes of Health;

(2) identify youth violence research projects that should be conducted or supported by the research institutes, and develop such projects in cooperation with such institutes and in consultation with State and Federal law enforcement agencies;

(3) take steps to further cooperation and collaboration between the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, the agencies of the Department of Justice, and other governmental and nongovernmental agencies with respect to youth violence research conducted or supported by such agencies;

(4) establish a clearinghouse for information about youth violence research conducted by governmental and nongovernmental entities; and

(5) periodically report to Congress on the state of youth violence research and make recommendations to Congress regarding such research.

(d) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated, $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 to carry out this section. If amount are not separately appropriated to carry out this section, the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall carry out this section using funds appropriated generally to the National Institutes of Health, except that funds expended for under this section shall supplement and not supplant existing funding for behavioral research activities at the National Institutes of Health.

SEC. 1624. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING MENTORING PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the well-being of all people of the United States is preserved and enhanced when young people are given the guidance they need to live healthy and productive lives;

(2) adult mentors can play an important role in ensuring that young people become healthy, productive, successful members of society;

(3) at-risk young people with mentors are 46 percent less likely to begin using illegal drugs than at-risk young people without mentors;

(4) at-risk young people with mentors are 27 percent less likely to begin using alcohol than at-risk young people without mentors;

(5) at-risk young people with mentors are 53 percent less likely to skip school than at-risk young people without mentors;

(6) at-risk young people with mentors are 33 percent less likely to hit someone than at-risk young people without mentors;

(7) 73 percent of students with mentors report that their mentors helped raise their goals and expectations; and

(8) there are many employees of the Federal Government who would like to serve as youth or family mentors but are unable to leave their jobs to participate in mentoring programs.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the President should issue an Executive Order allowing all employees of the Federal Government to use a maximum of 1 hour each week of excused absence or administrative leave to serve as mentors in youth or family mentoring programs.

SEC. 1625. FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS TOGETHER PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency in the Department of Justice.

(2) FAST PROGRAM.—The term ''FAST program'' means a program that addresses the urgent social problems of youth violence and chronic juvenile delinquency by building and enhancing juveniles' relationships with their families, peers, teachers, school staff, and other

members of the community by bringing together parents, schools, and communities to help—

(A) at-risk children identified by their teachers to succeed;

(B) enhance the functioning of families with at-risk children;

(C) prevent alcohol and other drug abuse in the family; and

(D) reduce the stress that their families experience from daily life.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—In consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Education, and the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Administrator shall carry out a Family and Schools Together program to promote FAST programs.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Education, and the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services shall develop regulations governing the distribution of the funds for FAST programs.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $9,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

(2) ALLOCATION.—Of amounts appropriated under paragraph (1)—

(A) 83.33 percent shall be available for the implementation of local FAST programs; and

(B) 16.67 percent shall be available for research and evaluation of FAST programs.

SEC. 1626. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO VIOLENT CRIME IN INDIAN COUNTRY AND AREAS OF EXCLUSIVE FEDERAL JURISDICTION.

(a) ASSAULTS WITH MARITIME AND TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION.—Section 113(a)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''with intent to do bodily harm, and''.

(b) OFFENSES COMMITTED WITHIN INDIAN COUNTRY.—Section 1153 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''an offense for which the maximum statutory term of imprisonment under section 1363 is greater than 5 years,'' after ''a felony under chapter 109A,''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) Nothing in this section shall limit the inherent power of an Indian tribe to exercise criminal jurisdiction over any Indian with respect to any offense committed within Indian country, subject to the limitations on punishment under section 202(7) of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (25 U.S.C. 1302(7)).''.

(c) RACKETEERING ACTIVITY.—Section 1961(1)(A) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''(or would have been so chargeable except that the act or threat was committed in Indian country, as defined in section 1151, or in any other area of exclusive Federal jurisdiction)'' after ''chargeable under State law''.

(d) MANSLAUGHTER WITHIN THE SPECIAL MARITIME AND TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES.—Section 1112(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''ten years'' and inserting ''20 years''.

(e) EMBEZZLEMENT AND THEFT FROM INDIAN TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The second undesignated paragraph of section 1163 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''so embezzled,'' and inserting ''embezzled,''.

SEC. 1627. FEDERAL JUDICIARY PROTECTION ACT OF 1999.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Federal Judiciary Protection Act of 1999''.

(b) ASSAULTING, RESISTING, OR IMPEDING CERTAIN OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES.—Section 111 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''three'' and inserting ''8''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''ten'' and inserting ''20''.

(c) INFLUENCING, IMPEDING, OR RETALIATING AGAINST A FEDERAL OFFICIAL BY THREATENING OR INJURING A FAMILY MEMBER.—Section 115(b)(4) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''five'' and inserting ''10''; and

(2) by striking ''three'' and inserting ''6''.

(d) MAILING THREATENING COMMUNICATIONS.—Section 876 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by designating the first 4 undesignated paragraphs as subsections (a) through (d), respectively;

(2) in subsection (c), as so designated, by adding at the end the following: ''If such a communication is addressed to a United States judge, a Federal law enforcement officer, or an official who is covered by section 1114, the individual shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.''; and

(3) in subsection (d), as so designated, by adding at the end the following: ''If such a communication is addressed to a United States judge, a Federal law enforcement officer, or an official who is covered by section 1114, the individual shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.''.

(e) AMENDMENT OF THE SENTENCING GUIDELINES FOR ASSAULTS AND THREATS AGAINST FEDERAL JUDGES AND CERTAIN OTHER FEDERAL OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission shall review and amend the Federal sentencing guidelines and the policy statements of the Commission, if appropriate, to provide an appropriate sentencing enhancement for offenses involving influencing, assaulting, resisting, impeding, retaliating against, or threatening a Federal judge, magistrate judge, or any other official described in section 111 or 115 of title 18, United States Code.

(2) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In carrying out this section, the United States Sentencing Commission shall consider, with respect to each offense described in paragraph (1)—

(A) any expression of congressional intent regarding the appropriate penalties for the offense;

(B) the range of conduct covered by the offense;

(C) the existing sentences for the offense;

(D) the extent to which sentencing enhancements within the Federal sentencing guidelines and the court's authority to impose a sentence in excess of the applicable guideline range are adequate to ensure punishment at or near the maximum penalty for the most egregious conduct covered by the offense;

(E) the extent to which Federal sentencing guideline sentences for the offense have been constrained by statutory maximum penalties;

(F) the extent to which Federal sentencing guidelines for the offense adequately achieve the purposes of sentencing as set forth in section 3553(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code;

(G) the relationship of Federal sentencing guidelines for the offense to the Federal sentencing guidelines for other offenses of comparable seriousness; and

(H) any other factors that the Commission considers to be appropriate.

SEC. 1628. LOCAL ENFORCEMENT OF LOCAL ALCOHOL PROHIBITIONS THAT REDUCE JUVENILE CRIME IN REMOTE ALASKA VILLAGES.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Villages in remote areas of Alaska lack local law enforcement due to the absence of a tax base to support such services and to small populations that do not secure sufficient funds under existing State and Federal grant program formulas.

(2) State troopers are often unable to respond to reports of violence in remote villages if there is inclement weather, and often only respond in reported felony cases.

(3) Studies conclude that alcohol consumption is strongly linked to the commission of violent crimes in remote Alaska villages and that youth are particularly susceptible to developing chronic criminal behaviors associated with alcohol in the absence of early intervention.

(4) Many remote villages have sought to limit the introduction of alcohol into their communities as a means of early intervention and to reduce criminal conduct among juveniles.

(5) In many remote villages, there is no person with the authority to enforce these local alcohol restrictions in a manner consistent with judicical standards of due process required under the State and Federal constitutions.

(6) Remote Alaska villages are experiencing a marked increase in births and the number of juveniles residing in villages is expected to increase dramatically in the next 5 years.

(7) Adoption of alcohol prohibitions by voters in remote villages represents a community-based effort to reduce juvenile crime, but this local policy choice requires local law enforcement to be effective.

(b) GRANT OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—(1) The Attorney General is authorized to provide to the State of Alaska funds for State law enforcement, judicial infrastructure and other costs necessary in remote villages to implement the prohibitions on the sale, importation and possession of alcohol adopted pursuant to State local option statutes.

(2) Funds provided to the State of Alaska under this section shall be in addition to and shall not disqualify the State, local governments, or Indian tribes (as that term is defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (P.L. 93–638, as amended; 25 U.S.C. 450b(e) (1998)) from Federal funds available under other authority.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

(A) $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

(B) $17,000,000 for fiscal year 2001;

(C) $18,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

(2) SOURCE OF SUMS.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this subsection may be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

SEC. 1629. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to create, expand or diminish or in any way affect the jurisdiction of an Indian tribe in the State of Alaska.

SEC. 1630. BOUNTY HUNTER ACCOUNTABILITY AND QUALITY ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) bounty hunters, also known as bail enforcement officers or recovery agents, provide law enforcement officers and the courts with valuable assistance in recovering fugitives from justice;

(2) regardless of the differences in their duties, skills, and responsibilities, the public has had difficulty in discerning the difference between law enforcement officers and bounty hunters;

(3) the availability of bail as an alternative to the pretrial detention or unsecured release of criminal defendants is important to the effective functioning of the criminal justice system;

(4) the safe and timely return to custody of fugitives who violate bail contracts is an important matter of public safety, as is the return of any other fugitive from justice;

(5) bail bond agents are widely regulated by the States, whereas bounty hunters are largely unregulated;

(6) the public safety requires the employment of qualified, well-trained bounty hunters; and

(7) in the course of their duties, bounty hunters often move in and affect interstate commerce.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''bail bond agent'' means any retail seller of a bond to secure the release of a criminal defendant pending judicial proceedings, unless such person also is self-employed to obtain the recovery of any fugitive from justice who has been released on bail;

(2) the term ''bounty hunter''—

(A) means any person whose services are engaged, either as an independent contractor or as an employee of a bounty hunter employer, to obtain the recovery of any fugitive from justice who has been released on bail; and

(B) does not include any—

(i) law enforcement officer acting under color of law;

(ii) attorney, accountant, or other professional licensed under applicable State law;

(iii) employee whose duties are primarily internal audit or credit functions;

(iv) person while engaged in the performance of official duties as a member of the Armed Forces on active duty (as defined in section 101(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code); or

(v) bail bond agent;

(3) the term ''bounty hunter employer''—

(A) means any person that—

(i) employs 1 or more bounty hunters; or

(ii) provides, as an independent contractor, for consideration, the services of 1 or more bounty hunters (which may include the services of that person); and

(B) does not include any bail bond agent; and

(4) the term ''law enforcement officer'' means a public officer or employee authorized under applicable Federal or State law to conduct or engage in the prevention, investigation, prosecution, or adjudication of criminal offenses, including any public officer or employee engaged in corrections, parole, or probation functions, or the recovery of any fugitive from justice.

(c) MODEL GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall develop model guidelines for the State control and regulation of persons employed or applying for employment as bounty hunters. In developing such guidelines, the Attorney General shall consult with organizations representing—

(A) State and local law enforcement officers;

(B) State and local prosecutors;

(C) the criminal defense bar;

(D) bail bond agents;

(E) bounty hunters; and

(F) corporate sureties.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall include recommendations of the Attorney General regarding whether—

(A) a person seeking employment as a bounty hunter should—

(i) be required to submit to a fingerprint-based criminal background check prior to entering into the performance of duties pursuant to employment as a bounty hunter; or

(ii) not be allowed to obtain such employment if that person has been convicted of a felony offense under Federal or State law;

(B) bounty hunters and bounty hunter employers should be required to obtain adequate liability insurance for actions taken in the course of performing duties pursuant to employment as a bounty hunter; and

(C) State laws should provide—

(i) for the prohibition on bounty hunters entering any private dwelling, unless the bounty hunter first knocks on the front door and announces the presence of 1 or more bounty hunters; and

(ii) the official recognition of bounty hunters from other States.

(3) EFFECT ON BAIL.—The guidelines published under paragraph (1) shall include an analysis of the estimated effect, if any, of the adoption of the guidelines by the States on—

(A) the cost and availability of bail; and

(B) the bail bond agent industry.

(4) NO REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to authorize the promulgation of any Federal regulation relating to bounty hunters, bounty hunter employers, or bail bond agents.

(5) PUBLICATION OF GUIDELINES.—The Attorney General shall publish model guidelines developed pursuant to paragraph (1) in the Federal Register.

SEC. 1631. ASSISTANCE FOR UNINCORPORATED NEIGHBORHOOD WATCH PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1701(d) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (10), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (11), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(12) provide assistance to unincorporated neighborhood watch organizations approved by the appropriate local police or sheriff's department, in an amount equal to not more than $1,950 per organization, for the purchase of citizen band radios, street signs, magnetic signs, flashlights, and other equipment relating to neighborhood watch patrols.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(11) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking clause (vi) and inserting the following:

''(vi) $282,625,000 for fiscal year 2000.''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) by inserting after ''(B)'' the following: ''Of amounts made available to carry out part Q in each fiscal year $14,625,000 shall be used to carry out section 1701(d)(12).''.

SEC. 1632. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings—

(1) The Nation's highest priority should be to ensure that children begin school ready to learn.

(2) New scientific research shows that the electrical activity of brain cells actually changes the physical structure of the brain itself and that without a stimulating environment, a baby's brain will suffer. At birth, a baby's brain contains 100,000,000,000 neurons, roughly as many nerve cells as there are stars in the Milky Way, but the wiring pattern between these neurons develops over time. Children who play very little or are rarely touched develop brains that are 20 to 30 percent smaller than normal for their age.

(3) This scientific research also conclusively demonstrates that enhancing children's physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development will result in tremendous benefits for children, families, and the Nation.

(4) Since more than 50 percent of the mothers of children under the age of 3 now work outside of the home, society must change to provide new supports so young children receive the attention and care that they need.

(5) There are 12,000,000 children under the age of 3 in the United States today and 1 in 4 lives in poverty.

(6) Compared with most other industrialized countries, the United States has a higher infant mortality rate, a higher proportion of low-birth weight babies, and a smaller proportion of babies immunized against childhood diseases.

(7) National and local studies have found a strong link between—

(A) lack of early intervention for children; and

(B) increased violence and crime among youth.

(8) The United States will spend more than $35,000,000,000 over the next 5 years on Federal programs for at-risk or delinquent youth and child welfare programs, which address crisis situations that frequently could have been avoided or made much less severe through good early intervention for children.

(9) Many local communities across the country have developed successful early childhood efforts and with additional resources could expand and enhance opportunities for young children.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Federal funding for early childhood development collaboratives should be a priority in the Federal budget for fiscal year 2000 and subsequent fiscal years.

SEC. 1633. PROHIBITION ON PROMOTING VIOLENCE ON FEDERAL PROPERTY.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—A Federal department or agency that—

(1) considers a request from an individual or entity for the use of any property, facility, equipment, or personnel of the department or agency, or for any other cooperation from the department or agency, to film a motion picture or television production for commercial purposes; and

(2) makes 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; or

(2) any public service announcement.

SEC. 1634. PROVISIONS RELATING TO PAWN SHOPS AND SPECIAL LICENSEES.

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the repeal heretofore effected by paragraph (1) and the amendment heretofore effected by paragraph (2) of subsection (c) with the heading ''Provision Related to Pawn and Other Transactions'' of section 503 of title V with the heading ''General Firearm Provisions'' shall be null and void.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 923(m)(1), of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore provided, is amended by adding at the end the following subparagraph:

''(F) COMPLIANCE.—Except as to the State and local planning and zoning requirements for a licensed premises as provided in subparagraph (D), a special licensee shall be subject to all of the provisions of this chapter applicable to dealers, including, but not limited to, the performance of an instant background check.''.

SEC. 1635. EXTENSION OF BRADY BACKGROUND CHECKS TO GUN SHOWS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) more than 4,400 traditional gun shows are held annually across the United States, attracting thousands of attendees per show and hundreds of Federal firearms licensees and nonlicensed firearms sellers;

(2) traditional gun shows, as well as flea markets and other organized events, at which a large number of firearms are offered for sale by Federal firearms licensees and nonlicensed firearms sellers, form a significant part of the national firearms market;

(3) firearms and ammunition that are exhibited or offered for sale or exchange at gun shows, flea markets, and other organized events move easily in and substantially affect interstate commerce;

(4) in fact, even before a firearm is exhibited or offered for sale or exchange at a gun show, flea market, or other organized event, the gun, its component parts, ammunition, and the raw materials from which it is manufactured have moved in interstate commerce;

(5) gun shows, flea markets, and other organized events at which firearms are exhibited or offered for sale or exchange, provide a convenient and centralized commercial location at which firearms may be bought and sold anonymously, often without background checks and without records that enable gun tracing;

(6) at gun shows, flea markets, and other organized events at which guns are exhibited or offered for sale or exchange, criminals and other

prohibited persons obtain guns without background checks and frequently use guns that cannot be traced to later commit crimes;

(7) many persons who buy and sell firearms at gun shows, flea markets, and other organized events cross State lines to attend these events and engage in the interstate transportation of firearms obtained at these events;

(8) gun violence is a pervasive, national problem that is exacerbated by the availability of guns at gun shows, flea markets, and other organized events;

(9) firearms associated with gun shows have been transferred illegally to residents of another State by Federal firearms licensees and nonlicensed firearms sellers, and have been involved in subsequent crimes including drug offenses, crimes of violence, property crimes, and illegal possession of firearms by felons and other prohibited persons; and

(10) Congress has the power, under the interstate commerce clause and other provisions of the Constitution of the United States, to ensure, by enactment of this Act, that criminals and other prohibited persons do not obtain firearms at gun shows, flea markets, and other organized events.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(35) GUN SHOW.—The term 'gun show' means any event—

''(A) at which 50 or more firearms are offered or exhibited for sale, transfer, or exchange, if 1 or more of the firearms has been shipped or transported in, or otherwise affects, interstate or foreign commerce; and

''(B) at which—

''(i) not less than 20 percent of the exhibitors are firearm exhibitors;

''(ii) there are not less than 10 firearm exhibitors; or

''(iii) 50 or more firearms are offered for sale, transfer, or exchange.

''(36) GUN SHOW PROMOTER.—The term 'gun show promoter' means any person who organizes, plans, promotes, or operates a gun show.

''(37) GUN SHOW VENDOR.—The term 'gun show vendor' means any person who exhibits, sells, offers for sale, transfers, or exchanges 1 or more firearms at a gun show, regardless of whether or not the person arranges with the gun show promoter for a fixed location from which to exhibit, sell, offer for sale, transfer, or exchange 1 or more firearms.''

(c) REGULATION OF FIREARMS TRANSFERS AT GUN SHOWS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 931. Regulation of firearms transfers at gun shows

''(a) REGISTRATION OF GUN SHOW PROMOTERS.—It shall be unlawful for any person to organize, plan, promote, or operate a gun show unless that person—

''(1) registers with the Secretary in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary; and

''(2) pays a registration fee, in an amount determined by the Secretary.

''(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF GUN SHOW PROMOTERS.—It shall be unlawful for any person to organize, plan, promote, or operate a gun show unless that person—

''(1) before commencement of the gun show, verifies the identity of each gun show vendor participating in the gun show by examining a valid identification document (as defined in section 1028(d)(1)) of the vendor containing a photograph of the vendor;

''(2) before commencement of the gun show, requires each gun show vendor to sign—

''(A) a ledger with identifying information concerning the vendor; and

''(B) a notice advising the vendor of the obligations of the vendor under this chapter; and

''(3) notifies each person who attends the gun show of the requirements of this chapter, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe; and

''(4) maintains a copy of the records described in paragraphs (1) and (2) at the permanent place of business of the gun show promoter for such period of time and in such form as the Secretary shall require by regulation.

''(c) RESPONSIBILITIES OF TRANSFERORS OTHER THAN LICENSEES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If any part of a firearm transaction takes place at a gun show, it shall be unlawful for any person who is not licensed under this chapter to transfer a firearm to another person who is not licensed under this chapter, unless the firearm is transferred through a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer in accordance with subsection (e).

''(2) CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS.—A person who is subject to the requirement of paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall not transfer the firearm to the transferee until the licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer through which the transfer is made under subsection (e) makes the notification described in subsection (e)(3)(A); and

''(B) notwithstanding subparagraph (A), shall not transfer the firearm to the transferee if the licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer through which the transfer is made under subsection (e) makes the notification described in subsection (e)(3)(B).

''(3) ABSENCE OF RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this section shall permit or authorize the Secretary to impose recordkeeping requirements on any nonlicensed vendor.

''(d) RESPONSIBILITIES OF TRANSFEREES OTHER THAN LICENSEES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If any part of a firearm transaction takes place at a gun show, it shall be unlawful for any person who is not licensed under this chapter to receive a firearm from another person who is not licensed under this chapter, unless the firearm is transferred through a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer in accordance with subsection (e).

''(2) CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS.—A person who is subject to the requirement of paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall not receive the firearm from the transferor until the licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer through which the transfer is made under subsection (e) makes the notification described in subsection (e)(3)(A); and

''(B) notwithstanding subparagraph (A), shall not receive the firearm from the transferor if the licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer through which the transfer is made under subsection (e) makes the notification described in subsection (e)(3)(B).

''(e) RESPONSIBILITIES OF LICENSEES.—A licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer who agrees to assist a person who is not licensed under this chapter in carrying out the responsibilities of that person under subsection (c) or (d) with respect to the transfer of a firearm shall—

''(1) enter such information about the firearm as the Secretary may require by regulation into a separate bound record;

''(2) record the transfer on a form specified by the Secretary;

''(3) comply with section 922(t) as if transferring the firearm from the inventory of the licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer to the designated transferee (although a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer complying with this subsection shall not be required to comply again with the requirements of section 922(t) in delivering the firearm to the nonlicensed transferor), and notify the nonlicensed transferor and the nonlicensed transferee—

''(A) of such compliance; and

''(B) if the transfer is subject to the requirements of section 922(t)(1), of any receipt by the licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer of a notification from the national instant criminal background check system that the transfer would violate section 922 or would violate State law;

''(4) not later than 10 days after the date on which the transfer occurs, submit to the Secretary a report of the transfer, which report—

''(A) shall be on a form specified by the Secretary by regulation; and

''(B) shall not include the name of or other identifying information relating to any person involved in the transfer who is not licensed under this chapter;

''(5) if the licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer assists a person other than a licensee in transferring, at 1 time or during any 5 consecutive business days, 2 or more pistols or revolvers, or any combination of pistols and revolvers totaling 2 or more, to the same nonlicensed person, in addition to the reports required under paragraph (4), prepare a report of the multiple transfers, which report shall be—

''(A) prepared on a form specified by the Secretary; and

''(B) not later than the close of business on the date on which the transfer occurs, forwarded to—

''(i) the office specified on the form described in subparagraph (A); and

''(ii) the appropriate State law enforcement agency of the jurisdiction in which the transfer occurs; and

''(6) retain a record of the transfer as part of the permanent business records of the licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer.

''(f) RECORDS OF LICENSEE TRANSFERS.—If any part of a firearm transaction takes place at a gun show, each licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, and licensed dealer who transfers 1 or more firearms to a person who is not licensed under this chapter shall, not later than 10 days after the date on which the transfer occurs, submit to the Secretary a report of the transfer, which report—

''(1) shall be in a form specified by the Secretary by regulation;

''(2) shall not include the name of or other identifying information relating to the transferee; and

''(3) shall not duplicate information provided in any report required under subsection (e)(4).

''(g) FIREARM TRANSACTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'firearm transaction'—

''(1) includes the offer for sale, sale, transfer, or exchange of a firearm; and

''(2) does not include the mere exhibition of a firearm.''.

(2) PENALTIES.—Section 924(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7)(A) Whoever knowingly violates section 931(a) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(B) Whoever knowingly violates subsection (b) or (c) of section 931, shall be—

''(i) fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both; and

''(ii) in the case of a second or subsequent conviction, such person shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(C) Whoever willfully violates section 931(d), shall be—

''(i) fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both; and

''(ii) in the case of a second or subsequent conviction, such person shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(D) Whoever knowingly violates subsection (e) or (f) of section 931 shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(E) In addition to any other penalties imposed under this paragraph, the Secretary may,

with respect to any person who knowingly violates any provision of section 931—

''(i) if the person is registered pursuant to section 931(a), after notice and opportunity for a hearing, suspend for not more than 6 months or revoke the registration of that person under section 931(a); and

''(ii) impose a civil fine in an amount equal to not more than $10,000.''.

(3) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the chapter analysis, by adding at the end the following:

''931. Regulation of firearms transfers at gun shows.'';

and

(B) in the first sentence of section 923(j), by striking ''a gun show or event'' and inserting ''an event''; and

(d) INSPECTION AUTHORITY.—Section 923(g)(1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(E) Notwithstanding subparagraph (B), the Secretary may enter during business hours the place of business of any gun show promoter and any place where a gun show is held for the purposes of examining the records required by sections 923 and 931 and the inventory of licensees conducting business at the gun show. Such entry and examination shall be conducted for the purposes of determining compliance with this chapter by gun show promoters and licensees conducting business at the gun show and shall not require a showing of reasonable cause or a warrant.''.

(e) INCREASED PENALTIES FOR SERIOUS RECORDKEEPING VIOLATIONS BY LICENSEES.—Section 924(a)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), any licensed dealer, licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed collector who knowingly makes any false statement or representation with respect to the information required by this chapter to be kept in the records of a person licensed under this chapter, or violates section 922(m) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

''(B) If the violation described in subparagraph (A) is in relation to an offense—

''(i) under paragraph (1) or (3) of section 922(b), such person shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both; or

''(ii) under subsection (a)(6) or (d) of section 922, such person shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.''.

(f) INCREASED PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) PENALTIES.—Section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking ''subsection (s) or (t) of section 922'' and inserting ''section 922(s)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) Whoever knowingly violates section 922(t) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.''.

(2) ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN ELEMENTS OF OFFENSE.—Section 922(t)(5) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and, at the time'' and all that follows through ''State law''.

(g) GUN OWNER PRIVACY AND PREVENTION OF FRAUD AND ABUSE OF SYSTEM INFORMATION.—Section 922(t)(2)(C) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', as soon as possible, consistent with the responsibility of the Attorney General under section 103(h) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act to ensure the privacy and security of the system and to prevent system fraud and abuse, but in no event later than 90 days after the date on which the licensee first contacts the system with respect to the transfer''.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section (other than subsection (i)) and the amendments made by this section shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

*(i) INAPPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the provisions of the title headed ''**GENERAL FIREARM PROVISIONS**'' (as added by the amendment of Mr. Craig number 332) and the provisions of the section headed ''**APPLICATION OF SECTION 923 (j) AND (m)**'' (as added by the amendment of Mr. Hatch number 344) shall be null and void.*

SEC. 1636. APPROPRIATE INTERVENTIONS AND SERVICES; CLARIFICATION OF FEDERAL LAW.

(a) APPROPRIATE INTERVENTIONS AND SERVICES.—School personnel shall ensure that immediate appropriate interventions and services, including mental health interventions and services, are provided to a child removed from school for any act of violence, including carrying or possessing a weapon to or at a school, on school premises, or to or at a school function under the jurisdiction of a State or local educational agency, in order to—

(1) to ensure that our Nation's schools and communities are safe; and

(2) maximize the likelihood that such child shall not engage in such behaviors, or such behaviors do not reoccur.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF FEDERAL LAW.—Nothing in Federal law shall be construed—

(1) to prohibit an agency from reporting a crime committed by a child, including a child with a disability, to appropriate authorities; or

(2) to prevent State law enforcement and judicial authorities from exercising their responsibilities with regard to the application of Federal and State law to a crime committed by a child, including a child with a disability.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to pay the costs of the interventions and services described in subsection (a) such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

(2) DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary of Education shall provide for the distribution of the funds made available under paragraph (1)—

(A) to States for a fiscal year in the same manner as the Secretary makes allotments to States under section 4011(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7111(b)) for the fiscal year; and

(B) to local educational agencies for a fiscal year in the same manner as funds are distributed to local educational agencies under section 4113(d)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7113(d)(2)) for the fiscal year.

SEC. 1637. SAFE SCHOOLS.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Part F of title XIV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8921 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) SHORT TITLE.—Section 14601(a) is amended by replacing ''Gun-Free'' with ''Safe'', and ''1994'' with ''1999''.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 14601(b)(1) is amended by inserting after ''determined'' the following: ''to be in possession of felonious quantities of an illegal drug, on school property under the jurisdiction of, or in a vehicle operated by an employee or agent of, a local educational agency in that State, or''.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—Section 14601(b)(4) is amended by replacing ''Definition'' with ''Definitions'' in the catchline, by replacing ''section'' in the matter under the catchline with ''part'', by redesignating the matter under the catchline after the comma as subparagraph (A), by replacing the period with a semicolon, and by adding new subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) as follows:

''(B) the term 'illegal drug' means a controlled substance, as defined in section 102(6) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(6)), the possession of which is unlawful under the Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) or under the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), but does not mean a controlled substance used pursuant to a valid prescription or as authorized by law; and

''(C) the term 'illegal drug paraphernalia' means drug paraphernalia, as defined in section 422(d) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 863(d)), except that the first sentence of that section shall be applied by inserting 'or under the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.)', before the period.

''(D) the term 'felonious quantities of an illegal drug' means any quantity of an illegal drug—

''(i) possession of which quantity would, under Federal, State, or local law, either constitute a felony or indicate an intent to distribute; or

''(ii) that is possessed with an intent to distribute.''.

(4) REPORT TO STATE.—Section 14601(d)(2)(C) is amended by inserting ''illegal drugs or'' before ''weapons''.

(5) REPEALER.—Section 14601 is amended by striking subsection (f).

(6) POLICY REGARDING CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM REFERRAL.—Section 14602(a) is amended by replacing ''served by'' with ''under the jurisdiction of'', and by inserting after ''who'' the following: ''is in possession of an illegal drug, or illegal drug paraphernalia, on school property under the jurisdiction of, or in a vehicle operated by an employee or agent of, such agency, or who''.

(7) DATA AND POLICY DISSEMINATION UNDER IDEA.—Section 14603 is amended by inserting ''current'' before ''policy'', by striking ''in effect on October 20, 1994'', by striking all the matter after ''schools'' and inserting a period thereafter, and by inserting before ''engaging'' the following: ''possessing illegal drugs, or illegal drug paraphernalia, on school property, or in vehicles operated by employees or agents of, schools or local educational agencies, or''.

(b) COMPLIANCE DATE; REPORTING.—(1) States shall have 2 years from the date of enactment of this Act to comply with the requirements established in the amendments made by subsection (a).

(2) Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall submit to Congress a report on any State that is not in compliance with the requirements of this part.

(3) Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall submit to Congress a report analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of approaches regarding the disciplining of children with disabilities.

SEC. 1638. SCHOOL COUNSELING.

Section 10102 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8002) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 10102. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND SECONDARY SCHOOL COUNSELING DEMONSTRATION.

''(a) COUNSELING DEMONSTRATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award grants under this section to local educational agencies to enable the local educational agencies to establish or expand elementary school counseling programs.

''(2) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give special consideration to applications describing programs that—

''(A) demonstrate the greatest need for new or additional counseling services among the children in the schools served by the applicant;

''(B) propose the most promising and innovative approaches for initiating or expanding school counseling; and

''(C) show the greatest potential for replication and dissemination.

''(3) EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall

ensure an equitable geographic distribution among the regions of the United States and among urban, suburban, and rural areas.

''(4) DURATION.—A grant under this section shall be awarded for a period not to exceed three years.

''(5) MAXIMUM GRANT.—A grant under this section shall not exceed $400,000 for any fiscal year.

''(b) APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each local educational agency desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

''(2) CONTENTS.—Each application for a grant under this section shall—

''(A) describe the school population to be targeted by the program, the particular personal, social, emotional, educational, and career development needs of such population, and the current school counseling resources available for meeting such needs;

''(B) describe the activities, services, and training to be provided by the program and the specific approaches to be used to meet the needs described in subparagraph (A);

''(C) describe the methods to be used to evaluate the outcomes and effectiveness of the program;

''(D) describe the collaborative efforts to be undertaken with institutions of higher education, businesses, labor organizations, community groups, social service agencies, and other public or private entities to enhance the program and promote school-linked services integration;

''(E) describe collaborative efforts with institutions of higher education which specifically seek to enhance or improve graduate programs specializing in the preparation of school counselors, school psychologists, and school social workers;

''(F) document that the applicant has the personnel qualified to develop, implement, and administer the program;

''(G) describe how any diverse cultural populations, if applicable, would be served through the program;

''(H) assure that the funds made available under this part for any fiscal year will be used to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of funds that would otherwise be available from non-Federal sources for the program described in the application, and in no case supplant such funds from non-Federal sources; and

''(I) assure that the applicant will appoint an advisory board composed of parents, school counselors, school psychologists, school social workers, other pupil services personnel, teachers, school administrators, and community leaders to advise the local educational agency on the design and implementation of the program.

''(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Grant funds under this section shall be used to initiate or expand school counseling programs that comply with the requirements in paragraph (2).

''(2) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—Each program assisted under this section shall—

''(A) be comprehensive in addressing the personal, social, emotional, and educational needs of all students;

''(B) use a developmental, preventive approach to counseling;

''(C) increase the range, availability, quantity, and quality of counseling services in the elementary schools of the local educational agency;

''(D) expand counseling services only through qualified school counselors, school psychologists, and school social workers;

''(E) use innovative approaches to increase children's understanding of peer and family relationships, work and self, decisionmaking, or academic and career planning, or to improve social functioning;

''(F) provide counseling services that are well-balanced among classroom group and small group counseling, individual counseling, and consultation with parents, teachers, administrators, and other pupil services personnel;

''(G) include inservice training for school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, other pupil services personnel, teachers, and instructional staff;

''(H) involve parents of participating students in the design, implementation, and evaluation of a counseling program;

''(I) involve collaborative efforts with institutions of higher education, businesses, labor organizations, community groups, social service agencies, or other public or private entities to enhance the program and promote school-linked services integration;

''(J) evaluate annually the effectiveness and outcomes of the counseling services and activities assisted under this section;

''(K) ensure a team approach to school counseling by maintaining a ratio in the elementary schools of the local educational agency that does not exceed 1 school counselor to 250 students, 1 school social worker to 800 students, and 1 school psychologist to 1,000 students; and

''(L) ensure that school counselors, school psychologists, or school social workers paid from funds made available under this section spend at least 85 percent of their total worktime at the school in activities directly related to the counseling process and not more than 15 percent of such time on administrative tasks that are associated with the counseling program.

''(3) REPORT.—The Secretary shall issue a report evaluating the programs assisted pursuant to each grant under this subsection at the end of each grant period in accordance with section 14701, but in no case later than January 30, 2003.

''(4) DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall make the programs assisted under this section available for dissemination, either through the National Diffusion Network or other appropriate means.

''(5) LIMIT ON ADMINISTRATION.—Not more than five percent of the amounts made available under this section in any fiscal year shall be used for administrative costs to carry out this section.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) the term 'school counselor' means an individual who has documented competence in counseling children and adolescents in a school setting and who—

''(A) possesses State licensure or certification granted by an independent professional regulatory authority;

''(B) in the absence of such State licensure or certification, possesses national certification in school counseling or a specialty of counseling granted by an independent professional organization; or

''(C) holds a minimum of a master's degree in school counseling from a program accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs or the equivalent;

''(2) the term 'school psychologist' means an individual who—

''(A) possesses a minimum of 60 graduate semester hours in school psychology from an institution of higher education and has completed 1,200 clock hours in a supervised school psychology internship, of which 600 hours shall be in the school setting;

''(B) possesses State licensure or certification in the State in which the individual works; or

''(C) in the absence of such State licensure or certification, possesses national certification by the National School Psychology Certification Board;

''(3) the term 'school social worker' means an individual who holds a master's degree in social work and is licensed or certified by the State in which services are provided or holds a school social work specialist credential; and

''(4) the term 'supervisor' means an individual who has the equivalent number of years of professional experience in such individual's respective discipline as is required of teaching experience for the supervisor or administrative credential in the State of such individual.

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.''.

SEC. 1639. CRIMINAL PROHIBITION ON DISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION RELATING TO EXPLOSIVES, DESTRUCTIVE DEVICES, AND WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.

(a) UNLAWFUL CONDUCT.—Section 842 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(p) DISTRIBUTION OF INFORMATION RELATING TO EXPLOSIVES, DESTRUCTIVE DEVICES, AND WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) The term 'destructive device' has the same meaning as in section 921(a)(4).

''(B) The term 'explosive' has the same meaning as in section 844(j).

''(C) The term 'weapon of mass destruction' has the same meaning as in section 2332a(c)(2).

''(2) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for any person—

''(A) to teach or demonstrate the making or use of an explosive, a destructive device, or a weapon of mass destruction, or to distribute by any means information pertaining to, in whole or in part, the manufacture or use of an explosive, destructive device, or weapon of mass destruction, with the intent that the teaching, demonstration, or information be used for, or in furtherance of, an activity that constitutes a Federal crime of violence; or

''(B) to teach or demonstrate to any person the making or use of an explosive, a destructive device, or a weapon of mass destruction, or to distribute to any person, by any means, information pertaining to, in whole or in part, the manufacture or use of an explosive, destructive device, or weapon of mass destruction, knowing that such person intends to use the teaching, demonstration, or information for, or in furtherance of, an activity that constitutes a Federal crime of violence.''.

(b) PENALTIES.—Section 844 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''person who violates any of subsections'' and inserting the following: ''person who—

''(1) violates any of subsections'';

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and'';

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) violates subsection (p)(2) of section 842, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.''; and

(4) in subsection (j), by striking ''and (i)'' and inserting ''(i), and (p)''.

Subtitle B—James Guelff Body Armor Act

SEC. 1641. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''James Guelff Body Armor Act of 1999''.

SEC. 1642. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) nationally, police officers and ordinary citizens are facing increased danger as criminals use more deadly weaponry, body armor, and other sophisticated assault gear;

(2) crime at the local level is exacerbated by the interstate movement of body armor and other assault gear;

(3) there is a traffic in body armor moving in or otherwise affecting interstate commerce, and existing Federal controls over such traffic do not adequately enable the States to control this traffic within their own borders through the exercise of their police power;

(4) recent incidents, such as the murder of San Francisco Police Officer James Guelff by an assailant wearing 2 layers of body armor and a

1997 bank shoot out in north Hollywood, California, between police and 2 heavily armed suspects outfitted in body armor, demonstrate the serious threat to community safety posed by criminals who wear body armor during the commission of a violent crime;

(5) of the approximately 1,200 officers killed in the line of duty since 1980, more than 30 percent could have been saved by body armor, and the risk of dying from gunfire is 14 times higher for an officer without a bulletproof vest;

(6) the Department of Justice has estimated that 25 percent of State and local police are not issued body armor;

(7) the Federal Government is well-equipped to grant local police departments access to body armor that is no longer needed by Federal agencies; and

(8) Congress has the power, under the interstate commerce clause and other provisions of the Constitution of the United States, to enact legislation to regulate interstate commerce that affects the integrity and safety of our communities.

SEC. 1643. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) BODY ARMOR.—The term ''body armor'' means any product sold or offered for sale, in interstate or foreign commerce, as personal protective body covering intended to protect against gunfire, regardless of whether the product is to be worn alone or is sold as a complement to another product or garment.

(2) LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—The term ''law enforcement agency'' means an agency of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(3) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term ''law enforcement officer'' means any officer, agent, or employee of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

SEC. 1644. AMENDMENT OF SENTENCING GUIDELINES WITH RESPECT TO BODY ARMOR.

(a) SENTENCING ENHANCEMENT.—The United States Sentencing Commission shall amend the Federal sentencing guidelines to provide an appropriate sentencing enhancement, increasing the offense level not less than 2 levels, for any offense in which the defendant used body armor.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—No amendment made to the Federal Sentencing Guidelines pursuant to this section shall apply if the Federal offense in which the body armor is used constitutes a violation of, attempted violation of, or conspiracy to violate the civil rights of any person by a law enforcement officer acting under color of the authority of such law enforcement officer.

SEC. 1645. PROHIBITION OF PURCHASE, USE, OR POSSESSION OF BODY ARMOR BY VIOLENT FELONS.

(a) DEFINITION OF BODY ARMOR.—Section 921 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(35) The term 'body armor' means any product sold or offered for sale, in interstate or foreign commerce, as personal protective body covering intended to protect against gunfire, regardless of whether the product is to be worn alone or is sold as a complement to another product or garment.''.

(b) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 931. Prohibition on purchase, ownership, or possession of body armor by violent felons

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall be unlawful for a person to purchase, own, or possess body armor, if that person has been convicted of a felony that is—

''(1) a crime of violence (as defined in section 16); or

''(2) an offense under State law that would constitute a crime of violence under paragraph (1) if it occurred within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

''(b) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be an affirmative defense under this section that—

''(A) the defendant obtained prior written certification from his or her employer that the defendant's purchase, use, or possession of body armor was necessary for the safe performance of lawful business activity; and

''(B) the use and possession by the defendant were limited to the course of such performance.

''(2) EMPLOYER.—In this subsection, the term 'employer' means any other individual employed by the defendant's business that supervises defendant's activity. If that defendant has no supervisor, prior written certification is acceptable from any other employee of the business.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''931. Prohibition on purchase, ownership, or possession of body armor by violent felons.''.

(c) PENALTIES.—Section 924(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7) Whoever knowingly violates section 931 shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.''.

SEC. 1646. DONATION OF FEDERAL SURPLUS BODY ARMOR TO STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''Federal agency'' and ''surplus property'' have the meanings given such terms under section 3 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 472).

(b) DONATION OF BODY ARMOR.—Notwithstanding section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484), the head of a Federal agency may donate body armor directly to any State or local law enforcement agency, if such body armor is—

(1) in serviceable condition; and

(2) surplus property.

(c) NOTICE TO ADMINISTRATOR.—The head of a Federal agency who donates body armor under this section shall submit to the Administrator of General Services a written notice identifying the amount of body armor donated and each State or local law enforcement agency that received the body armor.

(d) DONATION BY CERTAIN OFFICERS.—

(1) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—In the administration of this section with respect to the Department of Justice, in addition to any other officer of the Department of Justice designated by the Attorney General, the following officers may act as the head of a Federal agency:

(A) The Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

(B) The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(C) The Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

(D) The Director of the United States Marshals Service.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.—In the administration of this section with respect to the Department of the Treasury, in addition to any other officer of the Department of the Treasury designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, the following officers may act as the head of a Federal agency:

(A) The Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms.

(B) The Commissioner of Customs.

(C) The Director of the United States Secret Service.

SEC. 1647. ADDITIONAL FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Officer Dale Claxton of the Cortez, Colorado, Police Department was shot and killed by bullets that passed through the windshield of his police car after he stopped a stolen truck, and his life may have been saved if his police car had been equipped with bullet resistant equipment;

(2) the number of law enforcement officers who are killed in the line of duty would significantly decrease if every law enforcement officer in the United States had access to additional bullet resistant equipment;

(3) according to studies, between 1985 and 1994, 709 law enforcement officers in the United States were feloniously killed in the line of duty;

(4) the Federal Bureau of Investigation estimates that the risk of fatality to law enforcement officers while not wearing bullet resistant equipment, such as an armor vest, is 14 times higher than for officers wearing an armor vest;

(5) according to studies, between 1985 and 1994, bullet-resistant materials helped save the lives of more than 2,000 law enforcement officers in the United States; and

(6) the Executive Committee for Indian Country Law Enforcement Improvements reports that violent crime in Indian country has risen sharply despite a decrease in the national crime rate, and has concluded that there is a ''public safety crisis in Indian country''.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this chapter is to save lives of law enforcement officers by helping State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies provide officers with bullet resistant equipment and video cameras.

SEC. 1648. MATCHING GRANT PROGRAMS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT BULLET RESISTANT EQUIPMENT AND FOR VIDEO CAMERAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ll et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking the part designation and part heading and inserting the following:

''PART Y—MATCHING GRANT PROGRAMS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

''Subpart A—Grant Program For Armor Vests'';

(2) by striking ''this part'' each place it appears and inserting ''this subpart''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''Subpart B—Grant Program For Bullet Resistant Equipment

''SEC. 2511. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance is authorized to make grants to States, units of local government, and Indian tribes to purchase bullet resistant equipment for use by State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers.

''(b) USES OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded under this section shall be—

''(1) distributed directly to the State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe; and

''(2) used for the purchase of bullet resistant equipment for law enforcement officers in the jurisdiction of the grantee.

''(c) PREFERENTIAL CONSIDERATION.—In awarding grants under this subpart, the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance may give preferential consideration, if feasible, to an application from a jurisdiction that—

''(1) has the greatest need for bullet resistant equipment based on the percentage of law enforcement officers in the department who do not have access to a vest;

''(2) has a violent crime rate at or above the national average as determined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; or

''(3) has not received a block grant under the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant program described under the heading 'Violent Crime Reduction Programs, State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance' of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105–119).

''(d) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—Unless all eligible applications submitted by any State or unit of local government within such State for a grant under this section have been funded, such State, together with grantees within the State (other than Indian tribes), shall be allocated in each fiscal year under this section not less than 0.25 percent of the total amount appropriated in the fiscal year for grants pursuant to this section except that the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands shall each be allocated 0.10 percent.

''(e) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—A qualifying State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe may not receive more than 5 percent of the total amount appropriated in each fiscal year for grants under this section, except that a State, together with the grantees within the State may not receive more than 20 percent of the total amount appropriated in each fiscal year for grants under this section.

''(f) MATCHING FUNDS.—The portion of the costs of a program provided by a grant under subsection (a) may not exceed 50 percent. Any funds appropriated by Congress for the activities of any agency of an Indian tribal government or the Bureau of Indian Affairs performing law enforcement functions on any Indian lands may be used to provide the non-Federal share of a matching requirement funded under this subsection.

''(g) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—At least half of the funds available under this subpart shall be awarded to units of local government with fewer than 100,000 residents.

''SEC. 2512. APPLICATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—To request a grant under this subpart, the chief executive of a State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe shall submit an application to the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance in such form and containing such information as the Director may reasonably require.

''(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subpart, the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance shall promulgate regulations to implement this section (including the information that must be included and the requirements that the States, units of local government, and Indian tribes must meet) in submitting the applications required under this section.

''(c) ELIGIBILITY.—A unit of local government that receives funding under the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant program (described under the heading 'Violent Crime Reduction Programs, State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance' of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 104–119)) during a fiscal year in which it submits an application under this subpart shall not be eligible for a grant under this subpart unless the chief executive officer of such unit of local government certifies and provides an explanation to the Director that the unit of local government considered or will consider using funding received under the block grant program for any or all of the costs relating to the purchase of bullet resistant equipment, but did not, or does not expect to use such funds for such purpose.

''SEC. 2513. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subpart—

''(1) the term 'equipment' means windshield glass, car panels, shields, and protective gear;

''(2) the term 'State' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands;

''(3) the term 'unit of local government' means a county, municipality, town, township, village, parish, borough, or other unit of general government below the State level;

(4) the term 'Indian tribe' has the same meaning as in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)); and

''(5) the term 'law enforcement officer' means any officer, agent, or employee of a State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, or investigation of any violation of criminal law, or authorized by law to supervise sentenced criminal offenders.

''Subpart C—Grant Program For Video Cameras

''SEC. 2521. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance is authorized to make grants to States, units of local government, and Indian tribes to purchase video cameras for use by State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies in law enforcement vehicles.

''(b) USES OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded under this section shall be—

''(1) distributed directly to the State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe; and

''(2) used for the purchase of video cameras for law enforcement vehicles in the jurisdiction of the grantee.

''(c) PREFERENTIAL CONSIDERATION.—In awarding grants under this subpart, the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance may give preferential consideration, if feasible, to an application from a jurisdiction that—

''(1) has the greatest need for video cameras, based on the percentage of law enforcement officers in the department do not have access to a law enforcement vehicle equipped with a video camera;

''(2) has a violent crime rate at or above the national average as determined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; or

''(3) has not received a block grant under the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant program described under the heading 'Violent Crime Reduction Programs, State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance' of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105–119).

''(d) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—Unless all eligible applications submitted by any State or unit of local government within such State for a grant under this section have been funded, such State, together with grantees within the State (other than Indian tribes), shall be allocated in each fiscal year under this section not less than 0.25 percent of the total amount appropriated in the fiscal year for grants pursuant to this section, except that the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands shall each be allocated 0.10 percent.

''(e) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—A qualifying State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe may not receive more than 5 percent of the total amount appropriated in each fiscal year for grants under this section, except that a State, together with the grantees within the State may not receive more than 20 percent of the total amount appropriated in each fiscal year for grants under this section.

''(f) MATCHING FUNDS.—The portion of the costs of a program provided by a grant under subsection (a) may not exceed 50 percent. Any funds appropriated by Congress for the activities of any agency of an Indian tribal government or the Bureau of Indian Affairs performing law enforcement functions on any Indian lands may be used to provide the non-Federal share of a matching requirement funded under this subsection.

''(g) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—At least half of the funds available under this subpart shall be awarded to units of local government with fewer than 100,000 residents.

''SEC. 2522. APPLICATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—To request a grant under this subpart, the chief executive of a State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe shall submit an application to the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance in such form and containing such information as the Director may reasonably require.

''(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subpart, the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance shall promulgate regulations to implement this section (including the information that must be included and the requirements that the States, units of local government, and Indian tribes must meet) in submitting the applications required under this section.

''(c) ELIGIBILITY.—A unit of local government that receives funding under the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant program (described under the heading 'Violent Crime Reduction Programs, State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance' of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105–119)) during a fiscal year in which it submits an application under this subpart shall not be eligible for a grant under this subpart unless the chief executive officer of such unit of local government certifies and provides an explanation to the Director that the unit of local government considered or will consider using funding received under the block grant program for any or all of the costs relating to the purchase of video cameras, but did not, or does not expect to use such funds for such purpose.

''SEC. 2523. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subpart—

''(1) the term 'Indian tribe' has the same meaning as in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e));

''(2) the term 'law enforcement officer' means any officer, agent, or employee of a State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, or investigation of any violation of criminal law, or authorized by law to supervise sentenced criminal offenders;

''(3) the term 'State' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands; and

''(4) the term 'unit of local government' means a county, municipality, town, township, village, parish, borough, or other unit of general government below the State level.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (23) and inserting the following:

''(23) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part Y—

''(A) $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2002 for grants under subpart A of that part;

''(B) $40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2002 for grants under subpart B of that part; and

''(C) $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2002 for grants under subpart C of that part.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to the part heading of part Y and inserting the following:

''PART Y—MATCHING GRANTS PROGRAMS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

''SUBPART A—GRANT PROGRAM FOR ARMOR VESTS''; AND

(2) by adding at the end of the matter relating to part Y the following:

''SUBPART B—GRANT PROGRAM FOR BULLET RESISTANT EQUIPMENT

''2511. Program authorized.

''2512. Applications.
''2513. Definitions.

''SUBPART C—GRANT PROGRAM FOR VIDEO CAMERAS

''2521. Program authorized.
''2522. Applications.
''2523. Definitions.''.

SEC. 1649. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided using funds appropriated or otherwise made available under subpart B or C of part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as added by this chapter, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving the assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

SEC. 1650. TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.

Section 202 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3722) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) BULLET RESISTANT TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Institute is authorized to—

''(A) conduct research and otherwise work to develop new bullet resistant technologies (i.e., acrylic, polymers, aluminized material, and transparent ceramics) for use in police equipment (including windshield glass, car panels, shields, and protective gear);

''(B) inventory bullet resistant technologies used in the private sector, in surplus military property, and by foreign countries;

''(C) promulgate relevant standards for, and conduct technical and operational testing and evaluation of, bullet resistant technology and equipment, and otherwise facilitate the use of that technology in police equipment.

''(2) PRIORITY.—In carrying out this subsection, the Institute shall give priority in testing and engineering surveys to law enforcement partnerships developed in coordination with High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas.

''(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $3,000,000 for fiscal years 2000 through 2002.''.

SEC. 1651. MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ARMOR VESTS.

Section 2501(f) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ll(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The portion'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the portion''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) WAIVER.—The Director may waive, in whole or in part, the requirement of paragraph (1) in the case of fiscal hardship, as determined by the Director.''.

Subtitle C—Animal Enterprise Terrorism and Ecoterrorism

SEC. 1652. ENHANCEMENT OF PENALTIES FOR ANIMAL ENTERPRISE TERRORISM.

Section 43 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A), by striking ''under this title'' and inserting ''consistent with this title or double the amount of damages, whichever is greater,''; and

(B) by striking ''one year'' and inserting ''five years''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

''(2) EXPLOSIVES OR ARSON.—Whoever in the course of a violation of subsection (a) maliciously damages or destroys, or attempts to damage or destroy, by means of fire or an explosive, any building, vehicle, or other real or personal property used by the animal enterprise shall be imprisoned for not less than 5 years and not more than 20 years, fined under this title, or both.''; and

(C) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking ''under this title and'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''under this title, imprisoned for life or for any term of years, or sentenced to death.''.

SEC. 1653. NATIONAL ANIMAL TERRORISM AND ECOTERRORISM INCIDENT CLEARINGHOUSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish and maintain a national clearinghouse for information on incidents of crime and terrorism—

(1) committed against or directed at any animal enterprise;

(2) committed against or directed at any commercial activity because of the perceived impact or effect of such commercial activity on the environment; or

(3) committed against or directed at any person because of such person's perceived connection with or support of any enterprise or activity described in paragraph (1) or (2).

(b) CLEARINGHOUSE.—The clearinghouse established under subsection (a) shall—

(1) accept, collect, and maintain information on incidents described in subsection (a) that is submitted to the clearinghouse by Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies, by law enforcement agencies of foreign countries, and by victims of such incidents;

(2) collate and index such information for purposes of cross-referencing; and

(3) upon request from a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, or from a law enforcement agency of a foreign country, provide such information to assist in the investigation of an incident described in subsection (a).

(c) SCOPE OF INFORMATION.—The information maintained by the clearinghouse for each incident shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) the date, time, and place of the incident;

(2) details of the incident;

(3) any available information on suspects or perpetrators of the incident; and

(4) any other relevant information.

(d) DESIGN OF CLEARINGHOUSE.—The clearinghouse shall be designed for maximum ease of use by participating law enforcement agencies.

(e) PUBLICITY.—The Director shall publicize the existence of the clearinghouse to law enforcement agencies by appropriate means.

(f) RESOURCES.—In establishing and maintaining the clearinghouse, the Director may—

(1) through the Attorney General, utilize the resources of any other department or agency of the Federal Government; and

(2) accept assistance and information from private organizations or individuals.

(g) COORDINATION.—The Director shall carry out the Director's responsibilities under this section in cooperation with the Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''animal enterprise'' has the same meaning as in section 43 of title 18, United States Code.

(2) The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

Subtitle D—Jail-Based Substance Abuse

SEC. 1654. JAIL-BASED SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) USE OF RESIDENTIAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT GRANTS TO PROVIDE AFTERCARE SERVICES.—Section 1901 of part S of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ff–1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) USE OF GRANT AMOUNTS FOR NONRESIDENTIAL AFTERCARE SERVICES.—A State may use amounts received under this part to provide nonresidential substance abuse treatment aftercare services for inmates or former inmates that meet the requirements of subsection (c), if the chief executive officer of the State certifies to the Attorney General that the State is providing, and will continue to provide, an adequate level of residential treatment services.''.

(b) JAIL-BASED SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT.—Part S of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ff et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 1906. JAIL-BASED SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'jail-based substance abuse treatment program' means a course of individual and group activities, lasting for a period of not less than 3 months, in an area of a correctional facility set apart from the general population of the correctional facility, if those activities are—

''(A) directed at the substance abuse problems of prisoners; and

''(B) intended to develop the cognitive, behavioral, social, vocational, and other skills of prisoners in order to address the substance abuse and related problems of prisoners; and

''(2) the term 'local correctional facility' means any correctional facility operated by a unit of local government.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less than 10 percent of the total amount made available to a State under section 1904(a) for any fiscal year may be used by the State to make grants to local correctional facilities in the State for the purpose of assisting jail-based substance abuse treatment programs established by those local correctional facilities.

''(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of a grant made by a State under this section to a local correctional facility may not exceed 75 percent of the total cost of the jail-based substance abuse treatment program described in the application submitted under subsection (c) for the fiscal year for which the program receives assistance under this section.

''(c) APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant from a State under this section for a jail-based substance abuse treatment program, the chief executive of a local correctional facility shall submit to the State, in such form and containing such information as the State may reasonably require, an application that meets the requirements of paragraph (2).

''(2) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) with respect to the jail-based substance abuse treatment program for which assistance is sought, a description of the program and a written certification that—

''(i) the program has been in effect for not less than 2 consecutive years before the date on which the application is submitted; and

''(ii) the local correctional facility will—

''(I) coordinate the design and implementation of the program between local correctional facility representatives and the appropriate State and local alcohol and substance abuse agencies;

''(II) implement (or continue to require) urinalysis or other proven reliable forms of substance abuse testing of individuals participating in the program, including the testing of individuals released from the jail-based substance abuse treatment program who remain in the custody of the local correctional facility; and

''(III) carry out the program in accordance with guidelines, which shall be established by the State, in order to guarantee each participant in the program access to consistent, continual care if transferred to a different local correctional facility within the State;

''(B) written assurances that Federal funds received by the local correctional facility from the State under this section will be used to supplement, and not to supplant, non-Federal

funds that would otherwise be available for jail-based substance abuse treatment programs assisted with amounts made available to the local correctional facility under this section; and

''(C) a description of the manner in which amounts received by the local correctional facility from the State under this section will be coordinated with Federal assistance for substance abuse treatment and aftercare services provided to the local correctional facility by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.

''(d) REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon receipt of an application under subsection (c), the State shall—

''(A) review the application to ensure that the application, and the jail-based residential substance abuse treatment program for which a grant under this section is sought, meet the requirements of this section; and

''(B) if so, make an affirmative finding in writing that the jail-based substance abuse treatment program for which assistance is sought meets the requirements of this section.

''(2) APPROVAL.—Based on the review conducted under paragraph (1), not later than 90 days after the date on which an application is submitted under subsection (c), the State shall—

''(A) approve the application, disapprove the application, or request a continued evaluation of the application for an additional period of 90 days; and

''(B) notify the applicant of the action taken under subparagraph (A) and, with respect to any denial of an application under subparagraph (A), afford the applicant an opportunity for reconsideration.

''(3) ELIGIBILITY FOR PREFERENCE WITH AFTERCARE COMPONENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In making grants under this section, a State shall give preference to applications from local correctional facilities that ensure that each participant in the jail-based substance abuse treatment program for which a grant under this section is sought, is required to participate in an aftercare services program that meets the requirements of subparagraph (B), for a period of not less than 1 year following the earlier of—

''(i) the date on which the participant completes the jail-based substance abuse treatment program; or

''(ii) the date on which the participant is released from the correctional facility at the end of the participant's sentence or is released on parole.

''(B) AFTERCARE SERVICES PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), an aftercare services program meets the requirements of this paragraph if the program—

''(i) in selecting individuals for participation in the program, gives priority to individuals who have completed a jail-based substance abuse treatment program;

''(ii) requires each participant in the program to submit to periodic substance abuse testing; and

''(iii) involves the coordination between the jail-based substance abuse treatment program and other human service and rehabilitation programs that may assist in the rehabilitation of program participants, such as—

''(I) educational and job training programs;

''(II) parole supervision programs;

''(III) half-way house programs; and

''(IV) participation in self-help and peer group programs; and

''(iv) assists in placing jail-based substance abuse treatment program participants with appropriate community substance abuse treatment facilities upon release from the correctional facility at the end of a sentence or on parole.

''(e) COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION.—

''(1) COORDINATION.—Each State that makes 1 or more grants under this section in any fiscal year shall, to the maximum extent practicable, implement a statewide communications network with the capacity to track the participants in jail-based substance abuse treatment programs established by local correctional facilities in the State as those participants move between local correctional facilities within the State.

''(2) CONSULTATION.—Each State described in paragraph (1) shall consult with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure that each jail-based substance abuse treatment program assisted with a grant made by the State under this section incorporates applicable components of comprehensive approaches, including relapse prevention and aftercare services.

''(f) USE OF GRANT AMOUNTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each local correctional facility that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant amount solely for the purpose of carrying out the jail-based substance abuse treatment program described in the application submitted under subsection (c).

''(2) ADMINISTRATION.—Each local correctional facility that receives a grant under this section shall carry out all activities relating to the administration of the grant amount, including reviewing the manner in which the amount is expended, processing, monitoring the progress of the program assisted, financial reporting, technical assistance, grant adjustments, accounting, auditing, and fund disbursement.

''(3) RESTRICTION.—A local correctional facility may not use any amount of a grant under this section for land acquisition or a construction project.

''(g) REPORTING REQUIREMENT; PERFORMANCE REVIEW.—

''(1) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than March 1 of each year, each local correctional facility that receives a grant under this section shall submit to the Attorney General, through the State, a description and evaluation of the jail-based substance abuse treatment program carried out by the local correctional facility with the grant amount, in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

''(2) PERFORMANCE REVIEW.—The Attorney General shall conduct an annual review of each jail-based substance abuse treatment program assisted under this section, in order to verify the compliance of local correctional facilities with the requirements of this section.

''(h) NO EFFECT ON STATE ALLOCATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the allocation of amounts to States under section 1904(a).''.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended, in the matter relating to part S, by adding at the end the following:

''1906. Jail-based substance abuse treatment.''.

Subtitle E—Safe School Security

SEC. 1655. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Safe School Security Act of 1999''.

SEC. 1656. ESTABLISHMENT OF SCHOOL SECURITY TECHNOLOGY CENTER.

(a) SCHOOL SECURITY TECHNOLOGY CENTER.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Attorney General, the Secretary of Education, and the Secretary of Energy shall enter into an agreement for the establishment at the Sandia National Laboratories, in partnership with the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center—Southeast and the National Center for Rural Law Enforcement, of a center to be known as the ''School Security Technology Center''. The School Security Technology Center shall be administered by the Attorney General.

(2) FUNCTIONS.—The School Security Technology Center shall be a resource to local educational agencies for school security assessments, security technology development, technology availability and implementation, and technical assistance relating to improving school security. The School Security Technology Center shall also conduct and publish research on school violence, coalesce data from victim groups, and monitor and report on schools that implement school security strategies.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

(1) $3,700,000 for fiscal year 2000;

(2) $3,800,000 for fiscal year 2001; and

(3) $3,900,000 for fiscal year 2002.

SEC. 1657. GRANTS FOR LOCAL SCHOOL SECURITY PROGRAMS.

Subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7111 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 4119. LOCAL SCHOOL SECURITY PROGRAMS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From amounts appropriated under subsection (c), the Secretary shall award grants on a competitive basis to local educational agencies to enable the agencies to acquire security technology for, or carry out activities related to improving security at, the middle and secondary schools served by the agencies, including obtaining school security assessments, and technical assistance, for the development of a comprehensive school security plan from the School Security Technology Center.

''(2) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a local educational agency shall submit to the Secretary an application in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including information relating to the security needs of the agency.

''(3) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to local educational agencies that demonstrate the highest security needs, as reported by the agency in the application submitted under paragraph (2).

''(b) APPLICABILITY.—The provisions of this part (other than this section) shall not apply to this section.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002.''.

SEC. 1658. SAFE AND SECURE SCHOOL ADVISORY REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Energy, or their designees, shall—

(1) develop a proposal to further improve school security; and

(2) submit that proposal to Congress.

Subtitle F—Internet Prohibitions

SEC. 1661. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Internet Firearms and Explosives Advertising Act of 1999''.

SEC. 1662. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Citizens have an individual right, under the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution, to keep and bear arms. The Gun Control Act of 1968 and the Firearms Owners Protection Act of 1986 specifically state that it is not the intent of Congress to frustrate the free exercise of that right in enacting Federal legislation. The free exercise of that right includes law abiding firearms owners buying, selling, trading, and collecting guns in accordance with Federal, State, and local laws for whatever lawful use they deem desirable.

(2) The Internet is a powerful information medium, which has and continues to be an excellent tool to educate citizens on the training, education and safety programs available to use firearms safely and responsibly. It has, and should continue to develop, as a 21st century tool for ''e-commerce'' and marketing many

products, including firearms and sporting goods. Many web sites related to these topics are sponsored in large part by the sporting firearms and hunting community.

(3) It is the intent of Congress that this legislation be applied where the Internet is being exploited to violate the applicable explosives and firearms laws of the United States.

SEC. 1663. PROHIBITIONS ON USES OF THE INTERNET.

(a) In General.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 931. Criminal firearms and explosives solicitations

''(a)(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person who, in a circumstance described in paragraph (2), knowingly makes, prints, or publishes, or causes to be made, printed, or published, any notice or advertisement seeking or offering to receive, exchange, buy, sell, produce, distribute, or transfer—

''(A) a firearm knowing that such transaction, if carried out as noticed or advertised, would violate subsection (a), (d), (g), or (x) of section 922 of this chapter, or

''(B) explosive materials knowing that such transaction, if carried out as noticed or advertised, would violate subsection (a), (d), and (i) of section 842 of this title,

shall be punished as provided under subsection (b).

''(2) The circumstance referred to in paragraph (1) is that—

''(A) such person knows or has reason to know that such notice or advertisement will be transported in interstate or foreign commerce by computer; or

''(B) such notice or advertisement is transported in interstate or foreign commerce by computer.

''(b) PENALTIES.—Any individual who violates, or attempts or conspires to violate, this section shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 1 year, and both, but if such person has one prior conviction under this section, or under the laws of any State relating to the same offense, such person shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for not more than 5 years, but if such person has 2 or more prior convictions under this section, or under the laws of any State relating to the same offense, such person shall be fined under this title and imprisoned not less than 10 years nor more than 20 years. Any organization that violates, or attempts or conspires to violate, this section shall be fined under this title. Whoever, in the course of an offense under this section, engages in conduct that results in the death of a juvenile, herein defined as an individual who has not yet attained the age of 18 years, shall be punished by death, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life.

''(c) DEFENSES.—It is an affirmative defense against any proceeding involving this section if the proponent proves by a preponderance of the evidence that—

''(1) the advertisement or notice came from—

''(A) a web site, notice or advertisement operated or created by a person licensed—

''(i) as a manufacturer, importer, or dealer under section 923 of this chapter; or

''(ii) under chapter 40 of this title; and

''(B) the site, advertisement or notice, advised the person at least once prior to the offering of the product, material or information to the person that sales or transfers of the product or information will be made in accord with Federal, State and local law applicable to the buyer or transferee, and such notice includes, in the case of firearms or ammunition, additional information that firearms transfers will only be made through a licensee, and that firearms and ammunition transfers are prohibited to felons, fugitives, juveniles and other persons under the Gun Control Act of 1968 prohibited from receiving or possessing firearms or ammunition; or

''(2) the advertisement or notice came from—

''(A) a web site, notice or advertisement is operated or created by a person not licensed as stated in paragraph (1); and

''(B) the site, advertisement or notice, advised the person at least once prior to the offering of the product, material or information to the person that the sales or transfers of the product or information—

''(i) will be made in accord with Federal, State and local law applicable to the buyer or transferee, and such notice includes, in the case of firearms or ammunition, that firearms and ammunition transfers are prohibited to felons, fugitives, juveniles and other persons under the Gun Control Act of 1968 prohibited from receiving or possessing firearms or ammunition; and

''(ii) as a term or condition for posting or listing the firearm for sale or exchange on the web site for a prospective transferor, the web site, advertisement or notice requires that, in the event of any agreement to sell or exchange the firearm pursuant to that posting or listing, the firearm be transferred to that person for disposition through a Federal firearms licensee, where the Gun Control Act of 1968 requires the transfer to be made through a Federal firearms licensee.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 930 the following:

''931. Criminal firearms and explosives solicitations.''.

SEC. 1664. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by sections 1661–1663 shall take effect beginning on the date that is 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle G—Partnerships for High-Risk Youth

SEC. 1671. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Partnerships for High-Risk Youth Act''.

SEC. 1672. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) violent juvenile crime rates have been increasing in United States schools, causing many high-profile deaths of young, innocent school children;

(2) in 1994, there were 2,700,000 arrests of persons under age 18 (a third of whom were under age 15), up from 1,700,000 in 1991;

(3) while crime is generally down in many urban and suburban areas, crime committed by teenagers has spiked sharply over the past few years;

(4) there is no single solution, or panacea, to the problem of rising juvenile crime;

(5) there will soon be over 34,000,000 teenagers in the United States, which is 26 percent higher than the number of such teenagers in 1990 and the largest number of teenagers in the United States to date;

(6) in order to ensure the safety of youth in the United States, the Nation should begin to explore innovative methods of curbing the rise in violent crime in United States schools, such as use of faith-based and grassroots initiatives; and

(7)(A) a strong partnership among law enforcement, local government, juvenile and family courts, schools, businesses, charitable organizations, families, and the religious community can create a community environment that supports the youth of the Nation and reduces the occurrence of juvenile crime; and

(B) the development of character and strong moral values will—

(i) greatly decrease the likelihood that youth will fall victim to the temptations of crime; and

(ii) improve the lives and future prospects of high-risk youth and their communities.

SEC. 1673. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this subtitle are as follows:

(1) To establish a national demonstration project to promote learning about successful youth interventions, with programs carried out by institutions that can identify and employ effective approaches for improving the lives and future prospects of high-risk youth and their communities.

(2) To document best practices for conducting successful interventions for high-risk youth, based on the results of local initiatives.

(3) To produce lessons and data from the operating experience from those local initiatives that will—

(A) provide information to improve policy in the public and private sectors; and

(B) promote the operational effectiveness of other local initiatives throughout the United States.

SEC. 1674. ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall establish and carry out a demonstration project. In carrying out the demonstration project, the Attorney General shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, award a grant to Public-Private Ventures, Inc. to enable Public-Private Ventures, Inc. to award grants to eligible partnerships to pay for the Federal share of the cost of carrying out collaborative intervention programs for high-risk youth, described in section 1676, in the following 12 cities:

(1) Boston, Massachusetts.
(2) New York, New York.
(3) Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
(4) Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
(5) Detroit, Michigan.
(6) Denver, Colorado.
(7) Seattle, Washington.
(8) Cleveland, Ohio.
(9) San Francisco, California.
(10) Austin, Texas.
(11) Memphis, Tennessee.
(12) Indianapolis, Indiana.

(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost described in subsection (a) shall be 70 percent.

(2) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost may be provided in cash.

SEC. 1675. ELIGIBILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under section 1674, a partnership—

(1) shall submit an application to Public-Private Ventures Inc. at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as Public-Private Ventures, Inc. may require;

(2) shall enter into a memorandum of understanding with Public-Private Ventures, Inc.; and

(3)(A) shall be a collaborative entity that includes representatives of local government, juvenile detention service providers, local law enforcement, probation officers, youth street workers, and local educational agencies, and religious institutions that have resident-to-membership percentages of at least 40 percent; and

(B) shall serve a city referred to in section 1674(a).

(b) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In making grants under section 1674, Public-Private Ventures, Inc. shall consider—

(1) the ability of a partnership to design and implement a local intervention program for high-risk youth;

(2) the past experience of the partnership, and key participating individuals, in intervention programs for youth and similar community activities; and

(3) the experience of the partnership in working with other community-based organizations.

SEC. 1676. USES OF FUNDS.

(a) PROGRAMS.—

(1) CORE FEATURES.—An eligible partnership that receives a grant under section 1674 shall use the funds made available through the grant to carry out an intervention program with the following core features:

(A) TARGET GROUP.—The program will target a group of youth (including young adults) who—

(i) are at high risk of—

(I) leading lives that are unproductive and negative;

(II) not being self-sufficient; and

(III) becoming incarcerated; and

(ii) are likely to cause pain and loss to other individuals and their communities.

(B) VOLUNTEERS AND MENTORS.—The program will make significant use of volunteers and mentors.

(C) LONG-TERM INVOLVEMENT.—The program will feature activities that promote long-term involvement in the lives of the youth (including young adults).

(2) PERMISSIBLE SERVICES.—The partnership, in carrying out the program, may use funds made available through the grant to provide, directly or through referrals, comprehensive support services to the youth (including young adults).

(b) EVALUATION AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.—Using funds made available through its grant under section 1674, Public-Private Ventures, Inc. shall—

(1) prepare and implement an evaluation design for evaluating the programs that receive grants under section 1674;

(2) conduct a quarterly evaluation of the performance and progress of the programs;

(3) organize and conduct national and regional conferences to promote peer learning about the operational experiences from the programs;

(4) provide technical assistance to the partnerships carrying out the programs, based on the quarterly evaluations; and

(5) prepare and submit to the Attorney General a report that describes the activities of the partnerships and the results of the evaluations.

(c) LIMITATION.—Not more than 20 percent of the funds appropriated under section 1677 for a fiscal year may be used—

(1) to provide comprehensive support services under subsection (a)(2);

(2) to carry out activities under subsection (b); and

(3) to pay for the administrative costs of Public-Private Ventures, Inc., related to carrying out this subtitle.

SEC. 1677. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle $4,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

Subtitle H—National Youth Crime Prevention

SEC. 1681. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''National Youth Crime Prevention Demonstration Act''.

SEC. 1682. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this subtitle are as follows:

(1) To establish a demonstration project that establishes violence-free zones that would involve successful youth intervention models in partnership with law enforcement, local housing authorities, private foundations, and other public and private partners.

(2) To document best practices based on successful grassroots interventions in cities, including Washington, District of Columbia; Boston, Massachusetts; Hartford, Connecticut; and other cities to develop methodologies for widespread replication.

(3) To increase the efforts of the Department of Justice, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and other agencies in supporting effective neighborhood mediating approaches.

SEC. 1683. ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL YOUTH CRIME PREVENTION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

The Attorney General shall establish and carry out a demonstration project. In carrying out the demonstration project, the Attorney General shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, award a grant to the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise (referred to in this subtitle as the ''National Center'') to enable the National Center to award grants to grassroots entities in the following 8 cities:

(1) Washington, District of Columbia.

(2) Detroit, Michigan.

(3) Hartford, Connecticut.

(4) Indianapolis, Indiana.

(5) Chicago (and surrounding metropolitan area), Illinois.

(6) San Antonio, Texas.

(7) Dallas, Texas.

(8) Los Angeles, California.

SEC. 1684. ELIGIBILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subtitle, a grassroots entity referred to in section 1683 shall submit an application to the National Center to fund intervention models that establish violence-free zones.

(b) SELECTION CRITERIA.—In awarding grants under this subtitle, the National Center shall consider—

(1) the track record of a grassroots entity and key participating individuals in youth group mediation and crime prevention;

(2) the engagement and participation of a grassroots entity with other local organizations; and

(3) the ability of a grassroots entity to enter into partnerships with local housing authorities, law enforcement agencies, and other public entities.

SEC. 1685. USES OF FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds received under this subtitle may be used for youth mediation, youth mentoring, life skills training, job creation and entrepreneurship, organizational development and training, development of long-term intervention plans, collaboration with law enforcement, comprehensive support services and local agency partnerships, and activities to further community objectives in reducing youth crime and violence.

(b) GUIDELINES.—The National Center will identify local lead grassroots entities in each designated city.

(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The National Center, in cooperation with the Attorney General, shall also provide technical assistance for startup projects in other cities.

SEC. 1686. REPORTS.

The National Center shall submit a report to the Attorney General evaluating the effectiveness of grassroots agencies and other public entities involved in the demonstration project.

SEC. 1687. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) GRASSROOTS ENTITY.—The term ''grassroots entity'' means a not-for-profit community organization with demonstrated effectiveness in mediating and addressing youth violence by empowering at-risk youth to become agents of peace and community restoration.

(2) NATIONAL CENTER FOR NEIGHBORHOOD ENTERPRISE.—The term ''National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise'' means a not-for-profit organization incorporated in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 1688. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle—

(1) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

(2) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001;

(3) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2002;

(4) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2003; and

(5) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2004.

(b) RESERVATION.—The National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise may use not more than 20 percent of the amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) in any fiscal year for administrative costs, technical assistance and training, comprehensive support services, and evaluation of participating grassroots organizations.

Subtitle I—National Youth Violence Commission

SEC. 1691. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''National Youth Violence Commission Act''.

SEC. 1692. NATIONAL YOUTH VIOLENCE COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.—There is established a commission to be known as the National Youth Violence Commission (hereinafter referred to in this subtitle as the ''Commission''). The Commission shall—

(1) be composed of 16 members appointed in accordance with subsection (b); and

(2) conduct its business in accordance with the provisions of this subtitle.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) PERSONS ELIGIBLE.—Except for those members who hold the offices described under paragraph (2)(A), and those members appointed under paragraph (2) (C)(ii) and (D)(iv), the members of the Commission shall be individuals who have expertise, by both experience and training, in matters to be studied by the Commission under section 1693. The members of the Commission shall be well-known and respected among their peers in their respective fields of expertise.

(2) APPOINTMENTS.—The members of the Commission shall be appointed for the life of the Commission as follows:

(A) Four shall be appointed by the President of the United States, including—

(i) the Surgeon General of the United States;

(ii) the Attorney General of the United States;

(iii) the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services; and

(iv) the Secretary of the Department of Education.

(B) Four shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, including—

(i) 1 member who meets the criteria for eligibility in paragraph (1) in the field of law enforcement or crime enforcement;

(ii) 1 member who meets the criteria for eligibility in paragraph (1) in the field of school administration, teaching, or counseling;

(iii) 1 member who meets the criteria for eligibility in paragraph (1) in the field of parenting and family studies; and

(iv) 1 member who meets the criteria for eligibility in paragraph (1) in the field of child or adolescent psychology.

(C) Two shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, including—

(i) 1 member who meets the criteria for eligibility in paragraph (1) in the field of law enforcement or crime enforcement; and

(ii) 1 member who is a recognized religious leader.

(D) Four shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate, including—

(i) 1 member who meets the criteria for eligibility in paragraph (1) in the field of law enforcement or crime enforcement;

(ii) 1 member who meets the criteria for eligibility in paragraph (1) in the field of school administration, teaching, or counseling;

(iii) 1 member who meets the criteria for eligibility in paragraph (1) in the social sciences; and

(iv) 1 member who is a recognized religious leader.

(E) Two shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate, including—

(i) 1 member who meets the criteria for eligibility in paragraph (1) in the field of school administration, teaching, or counseling; and

(ii) 1 member who meets the criteria for eligibility in paragraph (1) in the field of parenting and family studies.

(3) COMPLETION OF APPOINTMENTS; VACANCIES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the appointing authorities under paragraph (2) shall each make their respective appointments. Any vacancy that occurs during the life of the Commission shall not affect the powers of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment not later than 30 days after the vacancy occurs.

(4) OPERATION OF THE COMMISSION.—

(A) CHAIRMANSHIP.—The appointing authorities under paragraph (2) shall jointly designate 1 member as the Chairman of the Commission. In the event of a disagreement among the appointing authorities, the Chairman shall be determined by a majority vote of the appointing

authorities. The determination of which member shall be Chairman shall be made not later than 15 days after the appointment of the last member of the Commission, but in no case later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman. The initial meeting of the Commission shall be conducted not later than 30 days after the later of—

(i) the date of the appointment of the last member of the Commission; or

(ii) the date on which appropriated funds are available for the Commission.

(C) QUORUM; VOTING; RULES.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum to conduct business, but the Commission may establish a lesser quorum for conducting hearings scheduled by the Commission. Each member of the Commission shall have 1 vote, and the vote of each member shall be accorded the same weight. The Commission may establish by majority vote any other rules for the conduct of the Commission's business, if such rules are not inconsistent with this subtitle or other applicable law.

SEC. 1693. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be the duty of the Commission to conduct a comprehensive factual study of incidents of youth violence to determine the root causes of such violence.

(2) MATTERS TO BE STUDIED.—In determining the root causes of incidents of youth violence, the Commission shall study any matter that the Commission determines relevant to meeting the requirements of paragraph (1), including at a minimum—

(A) the level of involvement and awareness of teachers and school administrators in the lives of their students and any impact of such involvement and awareness on incidents of youth violence;

(B) trends in family relationships, the level of involvement and awareness of parents in the lives of their children, and any impact of such relationships, involvement, and awareness on incidents of youth violence;

(C) the alienation of youth from their schools, families, and peer groups, and any impact of such alienation on incidents of youth violence;

(D) the availability of firearms to youth, including any illegal means by which youth acquire such firearms, and any impact of such availability on incidents of youth violence;

(E) any impact upon incidents of youth violence of the failure to execute existing laws designed to restrict youth access to certain firearms, and the illegal purchase, possession, or transfer of certain firearms;

(F) the effect upon youth of depictions of violence in the media and any impact of such depictions on incidents of youth violence; and

(G) the availability to youth of information regarding the construction of weapons, including explosive devices, and any impact of such information on incidents of youth violence.

(3) TESTIMONY OF PARENTS AND STUDENTS.—In determining the root causes of incidents of youth violence, the Commission shall, pursuant to section 1694(a), take the testimony of parents and students to learn and memorialize their views and experiences regarding incidents of youth violence.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Based on the findings of the study required under subsection (a), the Commission shall make recommendations to the President and Congress to address the causes of youth violence and reduce incidents of youth violence. If the Surgeon General issues any report on media and violence, the Commission shall consider the findings and conclusions of such report in making recommendations under this subsection.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Commission first meets, the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a comprehensive report of the Commission's findings and conclusions, together with the recommendations of the Commission.

(2) SUMMARIES.—The report under this subsection shall include a summary of—

(A) the reports submitted to the Commission by any entity under contract for research under section 1694(e); and

(B) any other material relied on by the Commission in the preparation of the Commission's report.

SEC. 1694. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) HEARINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers advisable to carry out its duties under section 1693.

(2) WITNESS EXPENSES.—Witnesses requested to appear before the Commission shall be paid the same fees as are paid to witnesses under section 1821 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) SUBPOENAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a person fails to supply information requested by the Commission, the Commission may by majority vote request the Attorney General of the United States to require by subpoena the production of any written or recorded information, document, report, answer, record, account, paper, computer file, or other data or documentary evidence necessary to carry out the Commission's duties under section 1693. The Commission shall transmit to the Attorney General a confidential, written request for the issuance of any such subpoena. The Attorney General shall issue the requested subpoena if the request is reasonable and consistent with the Commission's duties under section 1693. A subpoena under this paragraph may require the production of materials from any place within the United States.

(2) INTERROGATORIES.—The Commission may, with respect only to information necessary to understand any materials obtained through a subpoena under paragraph (1), request the Attorney General to issue a subpoena requiring the person producing such materials to answer, either through a sworn deposition or through written answers provided under oath (at the election of the person upon whom the subpoena is served), to interrogatories from the Commission regarding such information. The Attorney General shall issue the requested subpoena if the request is reasonable and consistent with the Commission's duties under section 1693. A complete recording or transcription shall be made of any deposition made under this paragraph.

(3) CERTIFICATION.—Each person who submits materials or information to the Attorney General pursuant to a subpoena issued under paragraph (1) or (2) shall certify to the Attorney General the authenticity and completeness of all materials or information submitted. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to any false statements made with respect to the certification required under this paragraph.

(4) TREATMENT OF SUBPOENAS.—Any subpoena issued by the Attorney General under paragraph (1) or (2) shall comply with the requirements for subpoenas issued by a United States district court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

(5) FAILURE TO OBEY A SUBPOENA.—If a person refuses to obey a subpoena issued by the Attorney General under paragraph (1) or (2), the Attorney General may apply to a United States district court for an order requiring that person to comply with such subpoena. The application may be made within the judicial district in which that person is found, resides, or transacts business. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as civil contempt.

(c) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out its duties under section 1693. Upon the request of the Commission, the head of such department or agency may furnish such information to the Commission.

(d) INFORMATION TO BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be considered an agency of the Federal Government for purposes of section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, and any individual employed by any individual or entity under contract with the Commission under subsection (e) shall be considered an employee of the Commission for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18, United States Code.

(2) DISCLOSURE.—Information obtained by the Commission or the Attorney General under this Act and shared with the Commission, other than information available to the public, shall not be disclosed to any person in any manner, except—

(A) to Commission employees or employees of any individual or entity under contract to the Commission under subsection (e) for the purpose of receiving, reviewing, or processing such information;

(B) upon court order; or

(C) when publicly released by the Commission in an aggregate or summary form that does not directly or indirectly disclose—

(i) the identity of any person or business entity; or

(ii) any information which could not be released under section 1905 of title 18, United States Code.

(e) CONTRACTING FOR RESEARCH.—The Commission may enter into contracts with any entity for research necessary to carry out the Commission's duties under section 1693.

SEC. 1695. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission. All members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of service for the Commission.

(c) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties. The employment and termination of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by a majority of the members of the Commission.

(2) COMPENSATION.—The executive director shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code. The Chairman may fix the compensation of other personnel without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for such personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(3) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Any Federal Government employee, with the approval of the head of the appropriate Federal

agency, may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status, benefits, or privilege.

(d) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The Chairman of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

SEC. 1696. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission and any agency of the Federal Government assisting the Commission in carrying out its duties under this subtitle such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subtitle. Any sums appropriated shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until expended.

SEC. 1697. TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION.

The Commission shall terminate 30 days after the Commission submits the report under section 1693(c).

Subtitle J—School Safety

SEC. 1698. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''School Safety Act of 1999''.

SEC. 1699. AMENDMENTS TO THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT.

(a) PLACEMENT IN ALTERNATIVE EDUCATIONAL SETTING.—Section 615(k) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1415(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)(ii)(I), by inserting ''(other than a gun or firearm)'' after ''weapon'';

(2) by redesignating paragraph (10) as paragraph (11); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new section:

''(10) DISCIPLINE WITH REGARD TO GUNS OR FIREARMS.—

''(A) AUTHORITY OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL WITH RESPECT TO GUNS OR FIREARMS.—

''(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, school personnel may discipline (including expel or suspend) a child with a disability who carries or possesses a gun or firearm to or at a school, on school premises, or to 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.

''(ii) Nothing in clause (i) shall be construed to prevent a child with a disability who is disciplined pursuant to the authority provided under clause (i) from asserting a defense that the carrying or possession of the gun or firearm was unintentional or innocent.

''(B) FREE APPROPRIATE PUBLIC EDUCATION.—

''(i) CEASING TO PROVIDE EDUCATION.—Notwithstanding section 612(a)(1)(A), a child expelled or suspended under subparagraph (A) shall not be entitled to continued educational services, including a free appropriate public education, under this title, during the term of such expulsion or suspension, if the State in which the local educational agency responsible for providing educational services to such child does not require a child without a disability to receive educational services after being expelled or suspended.

''(ii) PROVIDING EDUCATION.—Notwithstanding clause (i), the local educational agency responsible for providing educational services to a child with a disability who is expelled or suspended under subparagraph (A) may choose to continue to provide educational services to such child. If the local educational agency so chooses to continue to provide the services—

''(I) nothing in this title shall require the local educational agency to provide such child with a free appropriate public education, or any particular level of service; and

''(II) the location where the local educational agency provides the services shall be left to the discretion of the local educational agency.

''(C) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—No agency shall be considered to be in violation of section 612 or 613 because the agency has provided discipline, services, or assistance in accordance with this paragraph.

''(ii) PROCEDURE.—Actions taken pursuant to this paragraph shall not be subject to the provisions of this section, other than this paragraph.

''(D) FIREARM.—The term 'firearm' has the meaning given the term under section 921 of title 18, United States Code.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 615(f)(1) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1415(f)(1)) is amended by striking ''Whenever'' and inserting the following: ''Except as provided in section 615(k)(10), whenever''.

LOTT AMENDMENT NO. 1345

Mr. LOTT proposed an amendment to amendment No. 1344 proposed by him to the bill, H.R. 1501, supra; as follows:

In the substitute add the following:

This bill will become effective 1 day after enactment.

LOTT AMENDMENT NO. 1346

Mr. LOTT proposed an amendment to amendment No. 1345 proposed by him to the bill, H.R. 1501, supra; as follows:

In the amendment to the substitute add the following:

This bill will become effective 2 days after enactment.

LOTT AMENDMENT NO. 1347

Mr. LOTT proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 1501, supra; as follows:

In the bill add the following:

This bill will become effective 3 days after enactment.

LOTT AMENDMENT NO. 1348

Mr. LOTT proposed an amendment to amendment No. 1347 proposed by him to the bill, H.R. 1501, supra; as follows:

In the amendment to the bill add the following:

The bill will become effective 4 days after enactment.

FEDERAL RESEARCH INVESTMENT ACT

FRIST AMENDMENT NO. 1349

Mr. GORTON (for Mr. FRIST) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 296 to provide for continuation of the federal research investment in a fiscally sustainable way, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 15, line 15, strike ''$42,290,000,000'' and insert ''$44,290,000,000''.

On page 15, line 17, strike ''$44,290,000,000'' and insert ''$49,290,000,000''.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

GREGG AMENDMENT NO. 1350

Mr. GORTON (for Mr. GREGG) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1217) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 21, line 16, delete ''$3,131,895,000'' and insert in lieu thereof: ''$3,121,774,000''.

On page 66, line 20, delete ''−$469,000'' and insert in lieu thereof: ''$9,652,000''.

On page 66, line 20, delete ''−$3,370,000'' and insert in lieu thereof: ''$6,751,000''.

LEAHY AMENDMENT NO. 1351

Mr. GORTON (For Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1217, supra; as follows:

On page 21, line 16, strike ''$3,151,895,000'' and insert ''$3,146,895,000''.

On page 71, line 22, strike ''$4,743,000'' and insert ''$9,743,000''.

NICKLES AMENDMENT NO. 1352

Mr. GORTON (for Mr. NICKLES) proposed an amendment to the bill, S, 1217, supra; as follows:

On page 73, between line 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 306.—

(A) Section 3006A(d)(4)(D)(vi) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after the word ''require'' the following: '', except that the amount of the fees shall not be considered a reason justifying any limited disclosure under 18 U.S.C. Sec. 3006A(d)(A)''

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

This Act shall apply to all disclosures made under 3006A(d) of title 18, United States Code, related to any criminal trial or appeal involving a sentence of death where the underlying alleged criminal conduct took place on or after April 19, 1995.

DURBIN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1353

Mr. GORTON (for Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KOHL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REID, and Mr. JEFFORDS)) proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 1217, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PROTECTION OF SENIORS AND THE DISABLED IN FEDERAL FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) of the estimated more than 1,000,000 persons age 65 and over who are victims of family violence each year, at least ⅔ are women;

(2) national statistics are not available on the incidence of domestic or family violence and sexual assault against disabled women, although several studies indicate that abuse of disabled women is of a longer duration compared to abuse suffered by women who are not disabled;

(3) in almost 9 out of 10 incidents of domestic elder abuse and neglect, the perpetrator is a family member, and adult children of the victims are the largest category of perpetrators and spouses are the second largest category of perpetrators;

(4) the number of reports of elder abuse in the United States increased by 150 percent between 1986 and 1996 and is expected to continue increasing;

(5) it is estimated that at least 5 percent of the Nation's elderly are victims of moderate to severe abuse and that the rate for all forms of abuse may be as high as 10 percent;

(6) elder abuse is severely underreported, with 1 in 5 cases being reported in 1980 and only 1 in 8 cases being reported today;

(7) many older and disabled women fail to report abuse because of shame or as a result of prior unsatisfactory experiences with individual agencies or others who lack sensitivity to the concerns or needs of older or disabled individuals;

(8) many older or disabled individuals also fail to report abuse because they are dependent on their abusers and fear being abandoned or institutionalized;

(9) disabled women may fear reporting abuse because they are fearful of losing their children in a custody case;

(10) public and professional awareness and identification of violence against older or disabled Americans may be difficult because these persons are not integrated into many social networks (such as schools or jobs), and may become isolated in their homes, which can increase the risk of domestic abuse; and

(11) older and disabled Americans would greatly benefit from policies that develop, strengthen, and implement programs for the prevention of abuse, including neglect and exploitation, and provide related assistance for victims.

(b) IN GENERAL.—Part T of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended—

(1) in section 2001 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg)—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by inserting '', including older women and women with a disability'' after ''combat violent crimes against women''; and

(ii) by inserting '', including older women and women with a disability'' before the period; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting '', including older women and women with a disability'' after ''against women'';

(ii) in paragraph (6), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(iii) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) developing a curriculum to train and assist law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and relevant officers of the Federal, State, tribal, and local courts in identifying and responding to crimes of domestic violence and sexual assault against older individuals and individuals with a disability and implementing that training and assistance.'';

(2) in section 2002(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–1) by inserting ''and service programs tailored to the needs of older and disabled victims of domestic violence and sexual assault'' before the semicolon; and

(3) in section 2003 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–2)—

(A) in paragraph (7), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(9) both the term 'elder' and the term 'older individual' have the meaning given the term 'older individual' in section 102 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3002); and

''(10) the term 'disability' has the meaning given the term in section 3(3) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102(3)).''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any grant made beginning with fiscal year 2000.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will meet on July 27, 1999 in SR–328A at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss consolidation and anti-trust issues in Agricultural business.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet on Wednesday, July 28, 1999 at 9:30 a.m. in room SR–301 Russell Senate Office Building, to receive testimony on the operations of the Smithsonian Institution.

For further information concerning this meeting, please contact Lani Gerst at the Rules Committee on 4–6352.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will meet on July 29, 1999 in SR–328A at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss the mark-up of the original bill regarding the Livestock Mandatory Reporting Act of 1999.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, August 3, 1999 at 10:00 a.m. to conduct a hearing on S. 964, a bill to provide for equitable compensation for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe.

The hearing will be held in room 485, Russell Senate Office Building.

Please direct any inquiries to committee staff at 202/224–2251.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, August 3, 1999 at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing on S. 692, a bill to prohibit Internet Gaming. The hearing will be held in room 485, Russell Senate Office Building.

Please direct any inquiries to committee staff at 202/224–2251.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, August 4, 1999 at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing on S. 299, a bill to elevate the Director of the Indian Health Service to an Assistant Secretary for Indian Health within the Department of Health and Human Services; and S. 406, a bill to allow tribes to bill directly for Medicare and Medicaid; to be followed by a business meeting, to consider pending legislation. The hearing/meeting will be held in room 485, Russell Senate Office Building.

Please direct any inquiries to committee staff at 202/224–2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, July 26, 1999 at 3:30 p.m. to hold a hearing.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNITION OF THE HI-POINT PROGRAM AT FRANKLIN PIERCE HIGH SCHOOL

• Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, education has been one of the predominant topics of discussion during the 106th Congress. As you know, I have been vocal in my support of returning decision-making authority to local educators who know best how to address the unique needs of students in their communities. For too long, the federal government has focused on bureaucrats and red tape rather than students and classrooms. In my travels to schools across Washington state, I have heard from educators who are concerned that this burden of federal regulations and paperwork is restricting their ability to instruct children in a common-sense manner. I have had the pleasure of discovering a program which has found a way to thrive in an area which is particularly burdened with federal mandates and red tape—special education. Accordingly, I am pleased to present an Innovation in Education Award to the Hi-Point program at Franklin Pierce High School in Tacoma, WA.

I and many of my colleagues in the Senate have heard from constituents about the effects of unfunded mandates on local classrooms. In spite of the burden states and school districts face because of unfunded federal special education mandates, the Hi-Point program has found a way to maximize its staff and community support to create an exemplary program.

The key to Hi-Point's success lies with dedicated individuals whose zeal for their job and passion for success are infectious to those around them. Transition Specialist Brian Redman has displayed the kind of compassion, understanding, and drive to see what students can become despite their limitations. In fact, Principal Rick Thompson refers to him as a ''magician.'' Brian has been a Special Educator for over twenty years and the Hi-Point program's success can be attributed directly to the expertise, patience, and skill with which he leads an amazing team of coworkers. This teamwork includes weekly meetings by the Student Services Team to communicate ''best practices,'' and to produce ideas to meet the evolving needs of the students. The team combines the knowledge of the school psychologist, teachers, and a business teacher to ensure maximum preparation for those higher-functioning students who may be able to join the workforce.

An examination of the work done by the Hi-Point staff indicates the numerous tasks required by those involved in

special education. Those duties include: budgets, transportation, medications, individual study needs, parent contacts, and cooperation with all school district officials.

Hi-Point also utilizes a nurse, a speech therapist, an occupational therapist, and a physical therapist. While this combination of services is not unheard of in many schools across Washington state, and America, it is the creativity of the Hi-Point program in balancing the special needs of its student population with limited budgets, legal restrictions, and at times, intense demands from parents which make the success of Hi-Point all the more striking.

Hi-Point programs, coordinated with community agencies, include: A Personal Learning Lab for special needs students in need of support in regular curriculum classes. Basic Skills courses for developmentally delayed students—to learn simple math, how to use a calculator, how to sign a check, and other such necessary tasks. Life Skills such as riding the bus, doing laundry, and cooking meals which are necessary to function in the community. Field Trips to the Zoo, Bowling Alley, and the Grocery Store. Work Crews for Landscape and House Cleaning. An Auto Detailing program to serve as a training ground for students while providing an economic service to the community.

Clearly, Hi-Point is not only maximizing its resources to meet the needs of special needs students but is doing so in a creative manner which also maximizes the learning experience of students involved in the program.

Too often the Federal Government has done more harm than good in efforts to reach into local classrooms. It is time we changed the focus of federal education programs back to students and learning and away from bureaucracy and process. The Hi-Point program is a shining example of the innovation that can be accomplished in spite of burdensome red tape. Imagine what educators like those at Hi-Point could accomplish without these unnecessary regulations—that is the true untapped resource in education today. I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the outstanding work of the Hi-Point staff and in supporting the common-sense idea that educators like Rick Thompson and Brian Redman deserve more say in Federal Eduation programs than Washington, DC, bureaucrats.●

TRIBUTE TO MRS. PEARL SALOTTO

● Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge Mrs. Pearl Salotto of Warwick, Rhode Island for her dedicated work in establishing the ''Respect for Living Things Day'' in the state of Rhode Island. Mrs. Salotto has established a number of programs in Rhode Island including the D.J. Pet Assisted Therapy University Certificate Program, the D.J. Pet Assisted Therapy High School Program, and the D.J. Respect for Living Things Elementary School Program. Mr. President, I ask that Mrs. Salotto's op-ed on July 21st, 1999 in the Providence Journal be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[The Providence Journal]

THE BEST WAY TO REMEMBER DJ, THERAPY DOG

(By Pearl Salotto)

DJ, dog of joy, recently passed away peacefully within the loving arms of her family. The smiling face of this big white dog had become synonymous with professional Pet Assisted Therapy (PAT), locally and nationally, because of her enthusiasm for life and her unconditional love, because of the countless people of all ages whose lives she touched, because of the many programs as well as social-reform initiatives that she inspired, because of the many dreams that she helped turn into reality.

Anyone who recognizes that pets and people are good for each other can turn this moment of sadness into a celebration of DJ's life and commit to carrying on her legacy, recognizing that she did more than her part in bringing about a healthier, friendlier, and more peaceful world simply by being herself.

DJ showed me, at a New York nursing home in 1998, how residents could find a renewed joy of life through her loving touch and thus inspired not only my university program but also my vision that all universities should have PAT degree programs so that ultimately all facilities could have professional PAT as part of their treatment team.

DJ showed me, in my granddaughter's first-grade classroom in New York in 1991, how a dog's strolling up and down aisles and interacting with children could open up their hearts and minds to their responsibilities to pets, people and themselves.

DJ showed all of us the profound and life-changing impact that her freely given love could have on Feinstein High School students, giving them the ''heart-opening'' opportunity to learn of the positive impact that animals can have in all of our lives through their one-of-a-kind PAT curriculum and the subsequent follow-up opportunity to share their love with others through PAT Service Learning.

DJ showed me from the first day of our experiences together that the bond between the therapy pet and the professional is the ethical foundation of this profession, protecting the pet in the field and providing the example from which all else flows.

DJ and DJ-inspired programs have led to schoolchildren writing and singing songs about respecting animals, other people and themselves, Rhode Island Health Department guidelines for pet therapy, an official state commission, annual DJ Respect for Living Things Days on her birthday, May 8, several Rhode Island agencies having professional PAT programs, the integration of PAT with Service Learning and Windwalker Humane Coalition for Professional Pet Assisted Therapy, among other programs.

Won't you join my children and grandchildren, friends and colleagues, elementary school students of Central Falls, Woonsocket, Providence and Feinstein High School students, and students of all ages who knew and loved DJ, in doing all in our power through all our words and deeds to help this magical profession earn its rightful place in health care, education, social services, and society as a whole, spearheaded over the past 13 years by the smiling face and extended paw of a big white dog named DJ?●

TRIBUTE TO NACKEY SCRIPPS LOEB OF GOFFSTOWN ON HER RETIREMENT

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Nackey Scripps Loeb, a remarkable person who has retired as president and publisher of the Union Leader and New Hampshire Sunday News newspapers.

I have been blessed with Mrs. Loeb's friendship since I began my career in politics more than 15 years ago. She, and her late husband Bill, were an inspiration to me in the late 1970's and early 1980's, as well as helped fight in the conservative revolution. After Bill's death, Nackey took over the Union Leader Corporation in 1981. She had some big shoes to fill—Bill was an outspoken and controversial leader in both the newspaper industry and the world of politics. But Mrs. Loeb took over with dedication, drive, determination and distinction. She proved that the knack for hard-hitting journalism does run in the family! Her editorials have been the cause of many political aspirants' success or failure in their bid for public office.

Mr. President, I owe Mrs. Loeb a great deal of thanks for her guidance and continuous support during the years that I have held public office. She supported my philosophy in times when many turned their backs. I respect and commend her commitment to doing what is right, even during the days when being a conservative was not ''in.'' Her husband once told me, ''stand for something or you stand for nothing.'' Nackey Loeb has always fought for the principles on which the Union Leader, and the State of New Hampshire, were founded.

Nackey Loeb has guided the Union Leader into the twenty first century in several ways. She oversaw the move of production into a larger building and the purchasing of more advanced press equipment. She has also driven the Union Leader's involvement on the Internet. ''The Paper,'' as it is known, is nationally recognized and respected largely because of the efforts of Nackey Loeb.

Mrs. Loeb has been a powerful force in New Hampshire during her 18 years as president and publisher of the Union Leader. Her vision, forthrightness and principled views are admired by all who know her and will be sorely missed.

I would like to extend my best wishes to Nackey as she enjoys a peaceful time with her family. People like Mrs. Loeb help to maintain the quality of life we enjoy in New Hampshire and make it a special and unique place to live. It is an honor to represent Nackey Loeb in the United States Senate.●

THE EUROPEAN UNION'S HUSHKIT RULE

● Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by Senator GORTON regarding the European Union's (EU) rule affecting hushkitted and re-engined aircraft. This Sense of

the Senate amendment will make clear to the Europeans that the United States will not tolerate unfair, discriminatory restrictions on trade that go against international principles and standards.

For those who are not familiar with the issue, I will provide a brief background. To comply with international aircraft noise standards, the U.S. aviation industry adopted so-called hushkit technology to bring its older aircraft into compliance. Some airlines also purchased new engines for their older aircraft. Even though these hushkitted and re-engined aircraft comply with the new international noise standard, the EU took legislative action to freeze the number of these aircraft within the EU Community at the 1999 level. Although the EU delayed final implementation of this rule for one year, this move has the effect of setting a more stringent noise standard in Europe.

Unfortunately, implementation of this rule is likely to have a discriminatory and costly impact on the United States aviation industry without any noise reduction benefits. The fact that this rule does not have a similar effect on industries in the EU is troubling. It is my understanding that certain aspects of the rule were tailored to protect European aviation interests. But one of the worst aspects of this rule is the terrible precedent that it sets for unilateral action by countries or groups of countries outside of the established international standards-setting process.

Earlier this year I wrote to European officials to express my deep frustration with their having chosen this particular, unilateral course of action to address the issue of aircraft emissions. Regulations such as the one at issue should be taken through the appropriate international channels, such as the International Civil Aviation Organization. Adoption of this rule by the EU has effectively breached a 50-year regime of global environmental rules in aviation.

A regional rule such as this one will undermine the ability of lesser-developed nations, the aerospace industry, airlines, and the United States to work toward international standards for more stringent aircraft engine emissions, which is the purported rationale for the EU rule. I sincerely hope that the EU will come to realize the benefits of a single, rational aviation regime for all nations.

The delay in implementation of the rule was granted as a result of a U.S. commitment to work in partnership with the EU within the established international process to develop a new, more stringent global aircraft noise standard. Since its adoption, the Federal Aviation Administration has been working bilaterally with representatives of the European Commission to develop an agreement to work in partnership on resolving this matter to everyone's satisfaction.

Despite the ongoing consultations, and regardless of the delay in implementation of the rule, U.S. industry is being negatively impacted right now. Because the hushkit rule is on the books, the market assumes that the rule will eventually come into effect. This has had a profound impact upon many businesses. So it is important that this matter be resolved soon.

The Europeans must understand how important it is that the considerations of the United States are taken into account with respect to this matter. If progress is not made in the near future, calls for taking strong action against the EU will grow. As a committed proponent of free trade, I am adamantly opposed to the EU rule. For the same reason, I do not support inappropriate retaliation on the part of the United States in this matter. Despite my opposition, however, the U.S. may in fact retaliate, which could do harm to businesses and consumers on both sides of the Atlantic.

Whether retaliatory in nature or not, the U.S. has many tools at its disposal to address the matter if the EU proves to be intractable in its position. For example, the United States Trade Representative is considering preparation of a World Trade Organization case focusing on the discriminatory aspects of the rule. Northwest Airlines has filed a complaint with Department of Transportation asking for retaliatory measures. Most recently, the U.S. aviation industry has asked the government to take official action under the so-called Chicago Convention, which governs many aspects of international aviation, claiming that the EU rule is not in compliance with international standards.

I do not want this issue to become the subject of a trade war. But if the EU fails to grasp the determined opposition of the U.S. aviation industry to this rule, there may be serious repercussions. I hope that this Sense of the Senate will begin to get the message to the EU that this issue cannot remain unresolved for too much longer.●

RECOGNITION OF RASCHELLE FREEMAN, 5TH GRADE TEACHER

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, as the Senate debates education issues and initiatives, too often we talk in the form of numbers and statistics rather than concrete examples of excellence or success in our schools. A 5th grade teacher in the town of East Wenatchee, Washington has come to my attention for her exemplary service to her school, Lee Elementary, and to her community. Her name is Raschelle Freeman and I am pleased to present her with my Innovation in Education award.

Ms. Freeman's list of accomplishments is certainly impressive. This year she was chosen as the Washington state recipient of the prestigious Christa McAuliffe Fellowship. Last January she was one of 100 teachers nationwide to receive the Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics Teaching. This national recognition reflects the respect and admiration of those who work with Ms. Freeman each day.

The Assistant Superintendent of the Eastmont School District, Ms. Beverly Jagla, says Ms. Freeman is the ''most effective'' educator she has ever met—''She is energy personified.'' Ms. Jagla further emphasized Ms. Freeman's dedication as a member of the faculty team at Lee Elementary as well as her great skill at mathematics instruction; a talent so considerable that Ms. Freeman leads workshops for superintendents, administrators, principals, and other teachers around Washington state that emphasize ''best practices'' for successful math education.

Lee Elementary's former Principal, Ms. Kathy West, noted that in her 22 years in education she has never encountered a teacher who excelled in every instructional area. For example, this past year Ms. Freeman's class put on a major theater production, complete with music and costumes, that was so impressive students from other schools were bused in to see a performance. Ms. West also noted that 12 hour days are the norm for Ms. Freeman as she juggles her many pursuits. In addition to the time spent educating her students and peers, Ms. Freeman spends countless hours writing grant applications to bring more money and resources to her school district.

The final testament to Ms. Freeman's devotion is the choice she made with the $34,000 McAuliffe Award. The funds are intended to allow the recipient to take time away from teaching to further his or her own continuing education. Ms. Freeman, however, chose to give the money to her school's Science Math with Accountability and Responsible Technology (SMART) project. The SMART program integrates reading, technical writing, math, science, and technology into an innovative model that will be used to improve the learning of students throughout Lee Elementary.

I have long been a supporter of greater flexibility for local educators. It is educators like Raschelle Freeman that demonstrate local communities really do know best. The Federal Government should provide more flexibility to promote the work of educators like Ms. Freeman. I am proud to present her with my Innovation in Education Award, and I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing her accomplishments.●

MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR—S. 1427

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due for its second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1427) to authorize the Attorney General to appoint a special counsel to investigate or prosecute a person for a possible violation of criminal law when the Attorney

General determines that the appointment of a special counsel is in the public interest.

Mr. GORTON. I object to further proceedings on this bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY BY SENATE EMPLOYEE

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 162 submitted earlier today by Senators LOTT and DASCHLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 162) to authorize the testimony of employee of the Senate in State of New Mexico v. Felix Lucero Chavez.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 162) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 162

Whereas, in the case of *State of New Mexico* v. *Felix Lucero Chavez*, No. CR 4646–99, pending in the Metropolitan Court for Bernalillo County, New Mexico, a subpoena has been served on Kristen Ludecke, an employee of the Senate;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Kristen Ludecke is authorized to testify in the case of *State of New Mexico* v. *Felix Lucero Chavez*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a request for testimony in a criminal action brought by the State of New Mexico against a resident of Bernalillo County. The State charges that, during an attempt by the Bernalillo County Sheriff's Department and juvenile probation office to execute a bench warrant for the arrest of a juvenile, as part of a law enforcement program called ''Operation Night Light,'' the defendant created a public disturbance and obstructed the Sheriff's deputies.

An employee on Senator BINGAMAN's staff, Kristen Ludecke, was accompanying the Senator the night of this incident on a ride-along with the Sheriff's Department to observe the Operation Night Light program. The Sheriff's Department is requesting that Ms. Ludecke testify at the hearing in this case, scheduled for August 2, about what she observed during the ride-along.

This resolution would accordingly authorize Ms. Ludecke to testify in this matter.

FEDERAL RESEARCH INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 205, S. 296.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 296) to provide for continuation of the Federal research investment in a fiscally sustainable way, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with amendments, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

S. 296

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Federal Research Investment Act''.

SEC. 2. GENERAL FINDINGS REGARDING FEDERAL INVESTMENT IN RESEARCH.

(a) VALUE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The Congress makes the following findings with respect to the value of research and development to the United States:

(1) Federal investment in research has resulted in the development of technology that saved lives in the United States and around the world.

(2) Research and development investment across all Federal agencies has been effective in creating technology that has enhanced the American quality of life.

(3) The Federal investment in research and development conducted or underwritten by both military and civilian agencies has produced benefits that have been felt in both the private and public sector.

(4) Discoveries across the spectrum of scientific inquiry have the potential to raise the standard of living and the quality of life for all Americans.

(5) Science, engineering, and technology play a critical role in shaping the modern world.

(6) Studies show that about half of all United States post-World War II economic growth is a direct result of technical innovation; and science, engineering, and technology contribute to the creation of new goods and services, new jobs and new capital.

(7) Technical innovation is the principal driving force behind the long-term economic growth and increased standards of living of the world's modern industrial societies. Other nations are well aware of the pivotal role of science, engineering, and technology, and they are seeking to exploit it wherever possible to advance their own global competitiveness.

(8) Federal programs for investment in research, which lead to technological innovation and result in economic growth, should be structured to address current funding disparities and develop enhanced capability in States and regions that currently underparticipate in the national science and technology enterprise.

(b) STATUS OF THE FEDERAL INVESTMENT.—The Congress makes the following findings with respect to the status of the Federal Investment in research and development activities:

(1) Federal investment of approximately 13 to 14 percent of the Federal discretionary budget in research and development over the past 11 years has resulted in a doubling of the nominal amount of Federal funding.

(2) Fiscal realities now challenge Congress to steer the Federal government's role in science, engineering, and technology in a manner that ensures a prudent use of limited public resources. There is both a long-term problem—addressing the ever-increasing level of mandatory spending—and a near-term challenge—apportioning a dwindling amount of discretionary funding to an increasing range of targets in science, engineering, and technology. This confluence of increased national dependency on technology, increased targets of opportunity, and decreased fiscal flexibility has created a problem of national urgency. Many indicators show that more funding for science, engineering, and technology is needed but, even with increased funding, priorities must be established among different programs. The United States cannot afford the luxury of fully funding all deserving programs.

(3) Current projections of Federal research funding show a downward trend.

SEC. 3. SPECIAL FINDINGS REGARDING HEALTH-RELATED RESEARCH.

The Congress makes the following findings with respect to health-related research:

(1) HEALTH AND ECONOMIC BENEFITS PROVIDED BY HEALTH-RELATED RESEARCH.—Because of health-related research, cures for many debilitating and fatal diseases have been discovered and deployed. At present, the medical research community is on the cusp of creating cures for a number of leading diseases and their associated burdens. In particular, medical research has the potential to develop treatments that can help manage the escalating costs associated with the aging of the United States population.

(2) FUNDING OF HEALTH-RELATED RESEARCH.—Many studies have recognized that clinical and basic science are in a state of crisis because of a failure of resources to meet the opportunity. Consequently, health-related research has emerged as a national priority and has been given significantly increased funding by Congress in fiscal year 1999. In order to continue addressing this urgent national need, the pattern of substantial budgetary expansion begun in fiscal year 1999 should be maintained.

(3) INTERDISCIPLINARY NATURE OF HEALTH-RELATED RESEARCH.—Because all fields of science and engineering are interdependent, full realization of the nation's historic investment in health will depend on major advances both in the biomedical sciences and in other science and engineering disciplines. Hence, the vitality of all disciplines must be preserved, even as special considerations are given to the health research field.

[SEC. 4.] ***SEC. 4.*** **ADDITIONAL FINDINGS REGARDING THE LINK BETWEEN THE RESEARCH PROCESS AND USEFUL TECHNOLOGY.**

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) FLOW OF SCIENCE, ENGINEERING, AND TECHNOLOGY.—The process of science, engineering, and technology involves many steps. The present Federal science, engineering, and technology structure reinforces the increasingly artificial distinctions between basic and applied activities. The result too often is a set of discrete programs that each

support a narrow phase of research or development and are not coordinated with one another. The government should maximize its investment by encouraging the progression of science, engineering, and technology from the earliest stages of research up to a pre-commercialization stage, through funding agencies and vehicles appropriate for each stage. This creates a flow of technology, subject to merit review at each stage, so that promising technology is not lost in a bureaucratic maze.

(2) EXCELLENCE IN THE AMERICAN RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE.—Federal investment in science, engineering, and technology programs must foster a close relationship between research and education. Investment in research at the university level creates more than simply world-class research. It creates world-class researchers as well. The Federal strategy must continue to reflect this commitment to a strong geographically-diverse research infrastructure. Furthermore, the United States must find ways to extend the excellence of its university system to primary and secondary educational institutions and to better utilize the community college system to prepare many students for vocational opportunities in an increasingly technical workplace.

(3) COMMITMENT TO A BROAD RANGE OF RESEARCH INITIATIVES.—An increasingly common theme in many recent technical breakthroughs has been the importance of revolutionary innovations that were sparked by overlapping of research disciplines. The United States must continue to encourage this trend by providing and encouraging opportunities for interdisciplinary projects that foster collaboration among fields of research.

(4) PARTNERSHIPS AMONG INDUSTRY, UNIVERSITIES, AND FEDERAL LABORATORIES.—Each of these contributors to the national science and technology delivery system has special talents and abilities that complement the others. In addition, each has a central mission that must provide their focus and each has limited resources. The nation's investment in science, engineering, and technology can be optimized by seeking opportunities for leveraging the resources and talents of these three major players through partnerships that do not distort the missions of each partner. For that reason, Federal dollars are wisely spent forming such partnerships.

[SEC. 4.] *SEC. 5.* **MAINTENANCE OF FEDERAL RESEARCH EFFORT; GUIDING PRINCIPLES.**

(a) MAINTAINING UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP IN SCIENCE, ENGINEERING, AND TECHNOLOGY.—It is imperative for the United States to nurture its superb resources in science, engineering, and technology carefully in order to maintain its own globally competitive position.

(b) GUIDING PRINCIPLES.—Federal research and development programs should be conducted in accordance with the following guiding principles:

(1) GOOD SCIENCE.—Federal science, engineering, and technology programs include both knowledge-driven science together with its applications, and mission-driven, science-based requirements. In general, both types of programs must be focused, peer- and merit-reviewed, and not unnecessarily duplicative, although the details of these attributes must vary with different program objectives.

(2) FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY.—The Congress must exercise oversight to ensure that programs funded with scarce Federal dollars are well managed. The United States cannot tolerate waste of money through inefficient management techniques, whether by government agencies, by contractors, or by Congress itself. Fiscal resources would be better utilized if program and project funding levels were predictable across several years to enable better project planning; a benefit of such predictability would be that agencies and Congress can better exercise oversight responsibilities through comparisons of a project's and program's progress against carefully planned milestones.

(3) PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS.—The United States needs to make sure that government programs achieve their goals. As the Congress crafts science, engineering, and technology legislation, it must include a process for gauging program effectiveness, selecting criteria based on sound scientific judgment and avoiding unnecessary bureaucracy. The Congress should also avoid the trap of measuring the effectiveness of a broad science, engineering, and technology program by passing judgment on individual projects. Lastly, the Congress must recognize that a negative result in a well-conceived and executed project or program may still be critically important to the funding agency.

(4) CRITERIA FOR GOVERNMENT FUNDING.—Program selection for Federal funding should continue to reflect the nation's 2 traditional research and development priorities: (A) basic, scientific, and technological research that represents investments in the nation's long-term future scientific and technological capacity, for which government has traditionally served as the principle resource; and (B) mission research investments, that is, investments in research that derive from necessary public functions, such as defense, health, education, environmental protection, and raising the standard of living, which may include pre-commercial, pre-competitive engineering research and technology development. Additionally, government funding should not compete with or displace the short-term, market-driven, and typically more specific nature of private-sector funding. Government funding should be restricted to pre-competitive activities, leaving competitive activities solely for the private sector. As a rule, the government should not invest in commercial technology that is in the product development stage, very close to the broad commercial marketplace, except to meet a specific agency goal. When the government provides funding for any science, engineering, and technology investment program, it must take reasonable steps to ensure that the potential benefits derived from the program will accrue broadly.

[SEC. 5.] *SEC. 6.* **POLICY STATEMENT.**

[(a) POLICY.—This Act is intended—

[(1) to encourage, as an overall goal, the doubling of the annual authorized amount of Federal funding for basic scientific, medical, and pre-competitive engineering research over the 11-year period following the date of enactment of this Act;

[(2) to invest in the future of the United States and the people of the United States by expanding the research activities referred to in paragraph (1);

[(3) to enhance the quality of life for all people of the United States;

[(4) to guarantee the leadership of the United States in science, engineering, medicine, and technology; and

[(5) to ensure that the opportunity and the support for undertaking good science is widely available throughout the States by supporting a geographically-diverse research and development enterprise.]

(a) POLICY.— This Act is intended to—

(1) assure a base level of Federal funding for basic scientific, biomedical, and pre-competitive engineering research, with this base level defined as a doubling of Federal basic research funding over the 11 year period following the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) invest in the future economic growth of the United States by expanding the research activities referred to in paragraph (1);

(3) enhance the quality of life and health for all people of the United States through expanded support for health-related research;

(4) allow for accelerated growth of agencies such as the National Institutes of Health to meet critical national needs;

(5) guarantee the leadership of the United States in science, engineering, medicine, and technology; and

(6) ensure that the opportunity and the support for undertaking good science is widely available throughout the United States by supporting a geographically-diverse research and development enterprise.

(b) AGENCIES COVERED.—The agencies intended to be covered to the extent that they are engaged in science, engineering, and technology activities for basic scientific, medical, or pre-competitive engineering research by this Act are—

(1) the National Institutes of Health, within the Department of Health and Human Services;

(2) the National Science Foundation;

(3) the National Institute for Standards and Technology, within the Department of Commerce;

(4) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(5) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, within the Department of Commerce;

(6) the Centers for Disease Control, within the Department of Health and Human Services;

(7) the Department of Energy (to the extent that it is not engaged in defense-related activities);

(8) the Department of Agriculture;

(9) the Department of Transportation;

(10) the Department of the Interior;

(11) the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(12) the Smithsonian Institution;

(13) the Department of Education;

(14) the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(15) the [Federal] *Food and* Drug Administration, within the Department of Health and Human Services.

[(c) CURRENT INVESTMENT.—The investment in civilian research and development efforts for fiscal year 1998 was 2.1 percent of the overall Federal budget.]

[(d)] *(c)* DAMAGE TO RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE.—A continued trend of funding appropriations equal to or lower than current budgetary levels will lead to permanent damage to the United States research infrastructure. This could threaten American dominance of high-technology industrial leadership.

[(e) INCREASE FUNDING.—In order to maintain and enhance the economic strength of the United States in the world market, funding levels for fundamental, scientific, and pre-competitive engineering research should be increased to equal approximately 2.6 percent of the total annual budget.

[(f) *(d)* FUTURE FISCAL YEAR ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) GOALS.—The long-term strategy for research and development funding under this section would be achieved by a steady 2.5 percent annual increase above the rate of inflation throughout a 11-year period.

(2) INFLATION ASSUMPTION.—The authorizations contained in paragraph (3) assume that the rate of inflation for each year will be 3 percent.

(3) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated for civilian research and development in the agencies listed in subsection (b)—

(A) $39,790,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

(B) $41,980,000,000 for fiscal year 2001;

(C) $42,290,000,000 for fiscal year 2002;

(D) $46,720,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

(E) [$49,290,000,000] *$44,290,000,000* for fiscal year 2004;

(F) $52,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;

(G) $54,870,000,000 for fiscal year 2006;

(H) $57,880,000,000 for fiscal year 2007;

(I) $61,070,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;

(J) $64,420,000,000 for fiscal year 2009; and

(K) $67,970,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.

(4) ACCELERATION TO MEET NATIONAL NEEDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the amount appropriated for any fiscal year to an agency for the purposes stated in paragraph (3) increases by more than 8 percent over the amount appropriated to it for those purposes for the preceding fiscal year, then the amounts authorized by paragraph (3) for subsequent fiscal years for that agency and other agencies shall be determined under subparagraphs (B) and (C).

(B) EXCLUSION OF AGENCY IN DETERMINING OTHER AGENCY AMOUNTS FOR NEXT FISCAL YEAR.—For the next fiscal year after a fiscal year described in subparagraph (A), the amount authorized to be appropriated to other agencies under paragraph (3) shall be determined by excluding the agency described in subparagraph (A). Any amount that would, but for this subparagraph, be authorized to be appropriated to that agency shall not be appropriated.

(C) RESUMPTION OF REGULAR TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (B), an agency may not be excluded from the determination of the amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (3) for a fiscal year following a fiscal year for which the sum of the amounts appropriated to that agency for fiscal year 2000 and all subsequent fiscal years for the purposes described in paragraph (3) does not exceed the sum of—

(i) the amount appropriated to that agency for such purposes for fiscal year 2000; and

(ii) the amounts that would have been appropriated for such purposes for subsequent fiscal years if the goal described in paragraph (1) had been met (and not exceeded) with respect to that agency's funding.

(D) NO LIMITATION ON OTHER FUNDING.—Nothing in this paragraph limits the amount that may be appropriated to any agency for the purposes described in paragraph (3).

[(g)] *(e)* CONFORMANCE WITH BUDGETARY CAPS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be made available under this Act in a manner that does not conform with the discretionary spending caps provided in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget or threatens the economic stability of the annual budget.

[(h)] *(f)* BALANCED RESEARCH PORTFOLIO.—Because of the interdependent nature of the scientific and engineering disciplines, the aggregate funding levels authorized by the section assume that the Federal research portfolio will be well-balanced among the various scientific and engineering disciplines, and geographically dispersed throughout the States.

[SEC. 6.] *SEC. 7.* **PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL BUDGET REQUEST.**

The President of the United States shall, in coordination with the President's annual budget request, include a report that parallels Congress' commitment to support Federally-funded research and development by providing—

(1) a detailed summary of the total level of funding for research and development programs throughout all civilian agencies;

(2) a focused strategy that reflects the funding projections of this Act for each future fiscal year until 2010, including specific targets for each agency that funds civilian research and development;

(3) an analysis which details funding levels across Federal agencies by methodology of funding, including grant agreements, procurement contracts, and cooperative agreements (within the meaning given those terms in chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code); and

(4) specific proposals for infrastructure development and research and development capacity building in States with less concentrated research and development resources in order to create a nationwide research and development community.

[SEC. 7.] *SEC. 8.* **COMPREHENSIVE ACCOUNTABILITY STUDY FOR FEDERALLY-FUNDED RESEARCH.**

(a) STUDY.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall enter into agreement with the National Academy of Sciences for the Academy to conduct a comprehensive study to develop methods for evaluating Federally-funded research and development programs. This study shall—

(1) recommend processes to determine an acceptable level of success for Federally-funded research and development programs by—

(A) describing the research process in the various scientific and engineering disciplines;

(B) describing in the different sciences what measures and what criteria each community uses to evaluate the success or failure of a program, and on what time scales these measures are considered reliable—both for exploratory long-range work and for short-range goals; and

(C) recommending how these measures may be adapted for use by the Federal government to evaluate Federally-funded research and development programs;

(2) assess the extent to which agencies incorporate independent merit-based review into the formulation of the strategic plans of funding agencies and if the quantity or quality of this type of input is unsatisfactory;

(3) recommend mechanisms for identifying Federally-funded research and development programs which are unsuccessful or unproductive;

(4) evaluate the extent to which independent, merit-based evaluation of Federally-funded research and development programs and projects achieves the goal of eliminating unsuccessful or unproductive programs and projects; and

(5) investigate and report on the validity of using quantitative performance goals for aspects of programs which relate to administrative management of the program and for which such goals would be appropriate, including aspects related to—

(A) administrative burden on contractors and recipients of financial assistance awards;

(B) administrative burdens on external participants in independent, merit-based evaluations;

(C) cost and schedule control for construction projects funded by the program;

(D) the ratio of overhead costs of the program relative to the amounts expended through the program for equipment and direct funding of research; and

(E) the timeliness of program responses to requests for funding, participation, or equipment use.

(6) examine the extent to which program selection for Federal funding across all agencies exemplifies our nation's historical research and development priorities—

(A) basic, scientific, and technological research in the long-term future scientific and technological capacity of the nation; and

(B) mission research derived from a high-priority public function.

(b) ALTERNATIVE FORMS FOR PERFORMANCE GOALS.—Not later than 6 months after transmitting the report under subsection (a) to Congress, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, after public notice, public comment, and approval by the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy and in consultation with the National Science and Technology Council shall promulgate one or more alternative forms for performance goals under section 1115(b)(10)(B) of title 31, United States Code, based on the recommendations of the study under subsection (a) of this section. The head of each agency containing a program activity that is a research and development program may apply an alternative form promulgated under this section for a performance goal to such a program activity without further authorization by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(c) STRATEGIC PLANS.—Not later than one year after promulgation of the alternative performance goals in subsection (b) of this section, the head of each agency carrying out research and development activities, upon updating or revising a strategic plan under subsection 306(b) of title 5, United States Code, shall describe the current and future use of methods for determining an acceptable level of success as recommended by the study under subsection (a).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

(2) PROGRAM ACTIVITY.—The term ''program activity'' has the meaning given that term by section 1115(f)(6) of title 31, United States Code.

(3) INDEPENDENT MERIT-BASED EVALUATION.—The term ''independent merit-based evaluation'' means review of the scientific or technical quality of research or development, conducted by experts who are chosen for their knowledge of scientific and technical fields relevant to the evaluation and who—

(A) in the case of the review of a program activity, do not derive long-term support from the program activity; or

(B) in the case of the review of a project proposal, are not seeking funds in competition with the proposal.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the study required by subsection (a) $600,000 for the 18-month period beginning October 1, 2000.

[SEC. 8.] *SEC. 9.* **PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM FOR FEDERALLY-FUNDED RESEARCH.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

''§ 1120. Accountability for research and development programs

''(a) IDENTIFICATION OF UNSUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS.—Based upon program performance reports for each fiscal year submitted to the President under section 1116, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall identify the civilian research and development program activities, or components thereof, which do not meet an acceptable level of success as defined in section 1115(b)(1)(B). Not later than 30 days after the submission of the reports under section 1116, the Director shall furnish a copy of a report listing the program activities or component identified under this subsection to the President and the Congress.

''(b) ACCOUNTABILITY IF NO IMPROVEMENT SHOWN.—For each program activity or component that is identified by the Director under subsection (a) as being below the acceptable level of success for 2 fiscal years in a row, the head of the agency shall no later than 30 days after the Director submits the second report so identifying the program, submit to the appropriate congressional committees of jurisdiction:

''(1) a concise statement of the steps necessary to—

''(A) bring such program into compliance with performance goals; or

''(B) terminate such program should compliance efforts fail; and

''(2) any legislative changes needed to put the steps contained in such statement into effect.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The chapter analysis for chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

''1120. Accountability for research and development programs''.

(2) Section 1115(f) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking ''through 1119,'' and inserting ''through 1120''.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1349

(Purpose: To provide minor technical changes)

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator FRIST and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], for Mr. FRIST, for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER, proposes an amendment numbered 1349.

On page 15, line 15, strike ''$42,290,000,000'' and insert ''$44,290,000,000''.

On page 15, line 17, strike ''$44,290,000,000'' and insert ''$49,290,000,000''.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, the bill be read the third time, and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill appear in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1349) was agreed to.

The bill (S. 296), as amended, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 296

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Federal Research Investment Act''.

SEC. 2. GENERAL FINDINGS REGARDING FEDERAL INVESTMENT IN RESEARCH.

(a) VALUE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The Congress makes the following findings with respect to the value of research and development to the United States:

(1) Federal investment in research has resulted in the development of technology that saved lives in the United States and around the world.

(2) Research and development investment across all Federal agencies has been effective in creating technology that has enhanced the American quality of life.

(3) The Federal investment in research and development conducted or underwritten by both military and civilian agencies has produced benefits that have been felt in both the private and public sector.

(4) Discoveries across the spectrum of scientific inquiry have the potential to raise the standard of living and the quality of life for all Americans.

(5) Science, engineering, and technology play a critical role in shaping the modern world.

(6) Studies show that about half of all United States post-World War II economic growth is a direct result of technical innovation; and science, engineering, and technology contribute to the creation of new goods and services, new jobs and new capital.

(7) Technical innovation is the principal driving force behind the long-term economic growth and increased standards of living of the world's modern industrial societies. Other nations are well aware of the pivotal role of science, engineering, and technology, and they are seeking to exploit it wherever possible to advance their own global competitiveness.

(8) Federal programs for investment in research, which lead to technological innovation and result in economic growth, should be structured to address current funding disparities and develop enhanced capability in States and regions that currently underparticipate in the national science and technology enterprise.

(b) STATUS OF THE FEDERAL INVESTMENT.—The Congress makes the following findings with respect to the status of the Federal Investment in research and development activities:

(1) Federal investment of approximately 13 to 14 percent of the Federal discretionary budget in research and development over the past 11 years has resulted in a doubling of the nominal amount of Federal funding.

(2) Fiscal realities now challenge Congress to steer the Federal government's role in science, engineering, and technology in a manner that ensures a prudent use of limited public resources. There is both a long-term problem—addressing the ever-increasing level of mandatory spending—and a near-term challenge—apportioning a dwindling amount of discretionary funding to an increasing range of targets in science, engineering, and technology. This confluence of increased national dependency on technology, increased targets of opportunity, and decreased fiscal flexibility has created a problem of national urgency. Many indicators show that more funding for science, engineering, and technology is needed but, even with increased funding, priorities must be established among different programs. The United States cannot afford the luxury of fully funding all deserving programs.

(3) Current projections of Federal research funding show a downward trend.

SEC. 3. SPECIAL FINDINGS REGARDING HEALTH-RELATED RESEARCH.

The Congress makes the following findings with respect to health-related research:

(1) HEALTH AND ECONOMIC BENEFITS PROVIDED BY HEALTH-RELATED RESEARCH.—Because of health-related research, cures for many debilitating and fatal diseases have been discovered and deployed. At present, the medical research community is on the cusp of creating cures for a number of leading diseases and their associated burdens. In particular, medical research has the potential to develop treatments that can help manage the escalating costs associated with the aging of the United States population.

(2) FUNDING OF HEALTH-RELATED RESEARCH.—Many studies have recognized that clinical and basic science are in a state of crisis because of a failure of resources to meet the opportunity. Consequently, health-related research has emerged as a national priority and has been given significantly increased funding by Congress in fiscal year 1999. In order to continue addressing this urgent national need, the pattern of substantial budgetary expansion begun in fiscal year 1999 should be maintained.

(3) INTERDISCIPLINARY NATURE OF HEALTH-RELATED RESEARCH.—Because all fields of science and engineering are interdependent, full realization of the nation's historic investment in health will depend on major advances both in the biomedical sciences and in other science and engineering disciplines. Hence, the vitality of all disciplines must be preserved, even as special considerations are given to the health research field.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL FINDINGS REGARDING THE LINK BETWEEN THE RESEARCH PROCESS AND USEFUL TECHNOLOGY.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) FLOW OF SCIENCE, ENGINEERING, AND TECHNOLOGY.—The process of science, engineering, and technology involves many steps. The present Federal science, engineering, and technology structure reinforces the increasingly artificial distinctions between basic and applied activities. The result too often is a set of discrete programs that each support a narrow phase of research or development and are not coordinated with one another. The government should maximize its investment by encouraging the progression of science, engineering, and technology from the earliest stages of research up to a precommercialization stage, through funding agencies and vehicles appropriate for each stage. This creates a flow of technology, subject to merit review at each stage, so that promising technology is not lost in a bureaucratic maze.

(2) EXCELLENCE IN THE AMERICAN RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE.—Federal investment in science, engineering, and technology programs must foster a close relationship between research and education. Investment in research at the university level creates more than simply world-class research. It creates world-class researchers as well. The Federal strategy must continue to reflect this commitment to a strong geographically-diverse research infrastructure. Furthermore, the United States must find ways to extend the excellence of its university system to primary and secondary educational institutions and to better utilize the community college system to prepare many students for vocational opportunities in an increasingly technical workplace.

(3) COMMITMENT TO A BROAD RANGE OF RESEARCH INITIATIVES.—An increasingly common theme in many recent technical breakthroughs has been the importance of revolutionary innovations that were sparked by overlapping of research disciplines. The United States must continue to encourage this trend by providing and encouraging opportunities for interdisciplinary projects that foster collaboration among fields of research.

(4) PARTNERSHIPS AMONG INDUSTRY, UNIVERSITIES, AND FEDERAL LABORATORIES.—Each of these contributors to the national science and technology delivery system has special talents and abilities that complement the others. In addition, each has a central mission that must provide their focus and each has limited resources. The nation's investment in science, engineering, and technology can be optimized by seeking opportunities for leveraging the resources and talents of these three major players through partnerships that do not distort the missions of each partner. For that reason, Federal dollars are wisely spent forming such partnerships.

SEC. 5. MAINTENANCE OF FEDERAL RESEARCH EFFORT; GUIDING PRINCIPLES.

(a) MAINTAINING UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP IN SCIENCE, ENGINEERING, AND TECHNOLOGY.—It is imperative for the United States to nurture its superb resources in science, engineering, and technology carefully in order to maintain its own globally competitive position.

(b) GUIDING PRINCIPLES.—Federal research and development programs should be conducted in accordance with the following guiding principles:

(1) GOOD SCIENCE.—Federal science, engineering, and technology programs include both knowledge-driven science together with its applications, and mission-driven, science-based requirements. In general, both types of programs must be focused, peer- and merit-reviewed, and not unnecessarily duplicative, although the details of these attributes must vary with different program objectives.

(2) FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY.—The Congress must exercise oversight to ensure that programs funded with scarce Federal dollars are well managed. The United States cannot tolerate waste of money through inefficient management techniques, whether by government agencies, by contractors, or by Congress itself. Fiscal resources would be better utilized if program and project funding levels were predictable across several years to enable better project planning; a benefit of such predictability would be that agencies and Congress can better exercise oversight responsibilities through comparisons of a project's and program's progress against carefully planned milestones.

(3) PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS.—The United States needs to make sure that government programs achieve their goals. As the Congress crafts science, engineering, and technology legislation, it must include a process for gauging program effectiveness, selecting criteria based on sound scientific judgment and avoiding unnecessary bureaucracy. The Congress should also avoid the trap of measuring the effectiveness of a broad science, engineering, and technology program by passing judgment on individual projects. Lastly, the Congress must recognize that a negative result in a well-conceived and executed project or program may still be critically important to the funding agency.

(4) CRITERIA FOR GOVERNMENT FUNDING.—Program selection for Federal funding should continue to reflect the nation's 2 traditional research and development priorities: (A) basic, scientific, and technological research that represents investments in the nation's long-term future scientific and technological capacity, for which government has traditionally served as the principle resource; and (B) mission research investments, that is, investments in research that derive from necessary public functions, such as defense, health, education, environmental protection, and raising the standard of living, which may include pre-commercial, pre-competitive engineering research and technology development. Additionally, government funding should not compete with or displace the short-term, market-driven, and typically more specific nature of private-sector funding. Government funding should be restricted to pre-competitive activities, leaving competitive activities solely for the private sector. As a rule, the government should not invest in commercial technology that is in the product development stage, very close to the broad commercial marketplace, except to meet a specific agency goal. When the government provides funding for any science, engineering, and technology investment program, it must take reasonable steps to ensure that the potential benefits derived from the program will accrue broadly.

SEC. 6. POLICY STATEMENT.

(a) POLICY.— This Act is intended to—

(1) assure a base level of Federal funding for basic scientific, biomedical, and pre-competitive engineering research, with this base level defined as a doubling of Federal basic research funding over the 11 year period following the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) invest in the future economic growth of the United States by expanding the research activities referred to in paragraph (1);

(3) enhance the quality of life and health for all people of the United States through expanded support for health-related research;

(4) allow for accelerated growth of agencies such as the National Institutes of Health to meet critical national needs;

(5) guarantee the leadership of the United States in science, engineering, medicine, and technology; and

(6) ensure that the opportunity and the support for undertaking good science is widely available throughout the United States by supporting a geographically-diverse research and development enterprise.

(b) AGENCIES COVERED.—The agencies intended to be covered to the extent that they are engaged in science, engineering, and technology activities for basic scientific, medical, or pre-competitive engineering research by this Act are—

(1) the National Institutes of Health, within the Department of Health and Human Services;

(2) the National Science Foundation;

(3) the National Institute for Standards and Technology, within the Department of Commerce;

(4) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(5) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, within the Department of Commerce;

(6) the Centers for Disease Control, within the Department of Health and Human Services;

(7) the Department of Energy (to the extent that it is not engaged in defense-related activities);

(8) the Department of Agriculture;

(9) the Department of Transportation;

(10) the Department of the Interior;

(11) the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(12) the Smithsonian Institution;

(13) the Department of Education;

(14) the Environmental Protection Agency; and

(15) the Food and Drug Administration, within the Department of Health and Human Services.

(c) DAMAGE TO RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE.—A continued trend of funding appropriations equal to or lower than current budgetary levels will lead to permanent damage to the United States research infrastructure. This could threaten American dominance of high-technology industrial leadership.

(d) FUTURE FISCAL YEAR ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) GOALS.—The long-term strategy for research and development funding under this section would be achieved by a steady 2.5 percent annual increase above the rate of inflation throughout a 11-year period.

(2) INFLATION ASSUMPTION.—The authorizations contained in paragraph (3) assume that the rate of inflation for each year will be 3 percent.

(3) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated for civilian research and development in the agencies listed in subsection (b)—

(A) $39,790,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

(B) $41,980,000,000 for fiscal year 2001;

(C) $44,290,000,000 for fiscal year 2002;

(D) $46,720,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

(E) $49,290,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

(F) $52,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;

(G) $54,870,000,000 for fiscal year 2006;

(H) $57,880,000,000 for fiscal year 2007;

(I) $61,070,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;

(J) $64,420,000,000 for fiscal year 2009; and

(K) $67,970,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.

(4) ACCELERATION TO MEET NATIONAL NEEDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the amount appropriated for any fiscal year to an agency for the purposes stated in paragraph (3) increases by more than 8 percent over the amount appropriated to it for those purposes for the preceding fiscal year, then the amounts authorized by paragraph (3) for subsequent fiscal years for that agency and other agencies shall be determined under subparagraphs (B) and (C).

(B) EXCLUSION OF AGENCY IN DETERMINING OTHER AGENCY AMOUNTS FOR NEXT FISCAL YEAR.—For the next fiscal year after a fiscal year described in subparagraph (A), the amount authorized to be appropriated to other agencies under paragraph (3) shall be determined by excluding the agency described in subparagraph (A). Any amount that would, but for this subparagraph, be authorized to be appropriated to that agency shall not be appropriated.

(C) RESUMPTION OF REGULAR TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (B), an agency may not be excluded from the determination of the amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (3) for a fiscal year following a fiscal year for which the sum of the amounts appropriated to that agency for fiscal year 2000 and all subsequent fiscal years for the purposes described in paragraph (3) does not exceed the sum of—

(i) the amount appropriated to that agency for such purposes for fiscal year 2000; and

(ii) the amounts that would have been appropriated for such purposes for subsequent fiscal years if the goal described in paragraph (1) had been met (and not exceeded) with respect to that agency's funding.

(D) NO LIMITATION ON OTHER FUNDING.—Nothing in this paragraph limits the amount that may be appropriated to any agency for the purposes described in paragraph (3).

(e) CONFORMANCE WITH BUDGETARY CAPS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be made available under this Act in a manner that does not conform with the discretionary spending caps provided in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget or threatens the economic stability of the annual budget.

(f) BALANCED RESEARCH PORTFOLIO.—Because of the interdependent nature of the scientific and engineering disciplines, the aggregate funding levels authorized by the section assume that the Federal research portfolio will be well-balanced among the various scientific and engineering disciplines, and geographically dispersed throughout the States.

SEC. 7. PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL BUDGET REQUEST.

The President of the United States shall, in coordination with the President's annual budget request, include a report that parallels Congress' commitment to support federally-funded research and development by providing—

(1) a detailed summary of the total level of funding for research and development programs throughout all civilian agencies;

(2) a focused strategy that reflects the funding projections of this Act for each future fiscal year until 2010, including specific targets for each agency that funds civilian research and development;

(3) an analysis which details funding levels across Federal agencies by methodology of funding, including grant agreements, procurement contracts, and cooperative agreements (within the meaning given those

terms in chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code); and

(4) specific proposals for infrastructure development and research and development capacity building in States with less concentrated research and development resources in order to create a nationwide research and development community.

SEC. 8. COMPREHENSIVE ACCOUNTABILITY STUDY FOR FEDERALLY-FUNDED RESEARCH.

(a) STUDY.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall enter into agreement with the National Academy of Sciences for the Academy to conduct a comprehensive study to develop methods for evaluating federally-funded research and development programs. This study shall—

(1) recommend processes to determine an acceptable level of success for federally-funded research and development programs by—

(A) describing the research process in the various scientific and engineering disciplines;

(B) describing in the different sciences what measures and what criteria each community uses to evaluate the success or failure of a program, and on what time scales these measures are considered reliable—both for exploratory long-range work and for short-range goals; and

(C) recommending how these measures may be adapted for use by the Federal government to evaluate federally-funded research and development programs;

(2) assess the extent to which agencies incorporate independent merit-based review into the formulation of the strategic plans of funding agencies and if the quantity or quality of this type of input is unsatisfactory;

(3) recommend mechanisms for identifying federally-funded research and development programs which are unsuccessful or unproductive;

(4) evaluate the extent to which independent, merit-based evaluation of federally-funded research and development programs and projects achieves the goal of eliminating unsuccessful or unproductive programs and projects; and

(5) investigate and report on the validity of using quantitative performance goals for aspects of programs which relate to administrative management of the program and for which such goals would be appropriate, including aspects related to—

(A) administrative burden on contractors and recipients of financial assistance awards;

(B) administrative burdens on external participants in independent, merit-based evaluations;

(C) cost and schedule control for construction projects funded by the program;

(D) the ratio of overhead costs of the program relative to the amounts expended through the program for equipment and direct funding of research; and

(E) the timeliness of program responses to requests for funding, participation, or equipment use.

(6) examine the extent to which program selection for Federal funding across all agencies exemplifies our nation's historical research and development priorities—

(A) basic, scientific, and technological research in the long-term future scientific and technological capacity of the nation; and

(B) mission research derived from a high-priority public function.

(b) ALTERNATIVE FORMS FOR PERFORMANCE GOALS.—Not later than 6 months after transmitting the report under subsection (a) to Congress, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, after public notice, public comment, and approval by the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy and in consultation with the National Science and Technology Council shall promulgate one or more alternative forms for performance goals under section 1115(b)(10)(B) of title 31, United States Code, based on the recommendations of the study under subsection (a) of this section. The head of each agency containing a program activity that is a research and development program may apply an alternative form promulgated under this section for a performance goal to such a program activity without further authorization by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(c) STRATEGIC PLANS.—Not later than one year after promulgation of the alternative performance goals in subsection (b) of this section, the head of each agency carrying out research and development activities, upon updating or revising a strategic plan under subsection 306(b) of title 5, United States Code, shall describe the current and future use of methods for determining an acceptable level of success as recommended by the study under subsection (a).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

(2) PROGRAM ACTIVITY.—The term ''program activity'' has the meaning given that term by section 1115(f)(6) of title 31, United States Code.

(3) INDEPENDENT MERIT-BASED EVALUATION.—The term ''independent merit-based evaluation'' means review of the scientific or technical quality of research or development, conducted by experts who are chosen for their knowledge of scientific and technical fields relevant to the evaluation and who—

(A) in the case of the review of a program activity, do not derive long-term support from the program activity; or

(B) in the case of the review of a project proposal, are not seeking funds in competition with the proposal.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the study required by subsection (a) $600,000 for the 18-month period beginning October 1, 2000.

SEC. 9. EFFECTIVE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM FOR FEDERALLY-FUNDED RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

''§ 1120. Accountability for research and development programs

''(a) IDENTIFICATION OF UNSUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS.—Based upon program performance reports for each fiscal year submitted to the President under section 1116, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall identify the civilian research and development program activities, or components thereof, which do not meet an acceptable level of success as defined in section 1115(b)(1)(B). Not later than 30 days after the submission of the reports under section 1116, the Director shall furnish a copy of a report listing the program activities or component identified under this subsection to the President and the Congress.

''(b) ACCOUNTABILITY IF NO IMPROVEMENT SHOWN.—For each program activity or component that is identified by the Director under subsection (a) as being below the acceptable level of success for 2 fiscal years in a row, the head of the agency shall no later than 30 days after the Director submits the second report so identifying the program, submit to the appropriate congressional committees of jurisdiction:

''(1) a concise statement of the steps necessary to—

''(A) bring such program into compliance with performance goals; or

''(B) terminate such program should compliance efforts fail; and

''(2) any legislative changes needed to put the steps contained in such statement into effect.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The chapter analysis for chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

''1120. Accountability for research and development programs''.

(2) Section 1115(f) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking ''through 1119,'' and inserting ''through 1120''.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—Resumed

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1350 THROUGH 1353, EN BLOC

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that four amendments at the desk to S. 1217 be agreed to, and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The amendments (Nos. 1350 through 1353) were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1350

(Purpose: To make technical corrections)

On page 21, line 16, delete ''$3,131,895,000'' and insert in lieu thereof: ''$3,121,774,000''.

On page 66, line 20, delete ''−$469,000'' and insert in lieu thereof: ''$9,652,000''.

On page 66, line 20, delete ''−$3,370,000'' and insert in lieu thereof: ''$6,751,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 1351

(Purpose: To restore funding for United States Sentencing Commission)

On page 21, line 16, strike ''$3,151,895,000'' and insert ''$3,146,895,000''.

On page 71, line 22, strike ''$4,743,000'' and insert ''$9,743,000''.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senate has agreed to my amendment to restore funding for the United States Sentencing Commission. I am pleased that Senator KENNEDY joined me as a cosponsor of this amendment in support of the Commission.

Our amendment to S. 1217 transfers $5 million from the Bureau of Prisons account to the U.S. Sentencing Commission account. As a result, the Commission will be funded at $9,743,000 for FY 2000 instead of the current level of only $4,743,000. This new funding is an increase of $300,000 compared to the Commission's FY 1999 appropriation of $9,487,000 but still substantially below the President's request of $10,800,000 for the Commission.

I understand the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Subcommittee reduced funding for the Commission in part because of their frustration over the vacancy of all seven Commission members since October 31, 1998. I share that frustration, but I am happy to report that the President announced last month his intent to nominate seven highly-qualified individuals to serve as Members of

the Commission—Judge Diana E. Murphy, Judge Ruben Castillo, Judge Sterling Johnson, Jr., Judge Joe Kendall, Professor Michael O'Neill, Judge William K. Sessions, III, and Mr. John R. Steer. I am proud to note that Judge Sessions is a Vermonter and dear friend.

The Senate should act promptly to consider and confirm the nominees to the U.S. Sentencing Commission. This Commission has been struggling without a full slate of commissioners for more than a year. We should not only put the Sentencing Commission back into business but we should restore full funding so the Commission is able to fulfill its statutory mandate.

The Commerce, State, Justice Appropriations bill had significantly cut funding for the U.S. Sentencing Commission. In reducing funding for this important commission, the Appropriations Subcommittee stated in its report that ''the carriage of justice has continued unabated in the absence of commissioners.'' However, that is in direct contradiction to what the Chief Justice of the United States recently stated in his year-end report for the federal judiciary. He stated, ''the fact that no appointments have been made to fill any one of these seven vacancies is paralyzing a critical component of the federal criminal justice system.''

The Sentencing Commission is such a critical component of the federal criminal justice system because it establishes and maintains mandatory sentencing guidelines for over 51,000 criminal cases sentenced in the federal courts each year. The Commission's most critical responsibility today is to adjust the guidelines to implement the important crime legislation we enact every year. Let me emphasize this point: when we enact legislation that calls for increased criminal penalties, it is the Commission's job to make sure that convicted defendants suffer the impact. With no Commissioners since last year, the Commission has been unable to do this job, nor will it next year without new Commissioners and sufficient funding.

Let me give you a few examples of increased penalties we enacted that, to this day, have not caused even one convicted defendant to stay in jail even one more day. Last year, in the Protection of Children from Sexual Predators Act, we required increased penalties for heinous sex abuse against our nation's young. To date, not one sexual predator has been imprisoned for even one day longer. Why? Because the Commission cannot do its job. Nor will it next year without new commissioners and sufficient funding.

Last year, we also passed legislation that required increased penalties for fraudulent telemarketers who prey upon another vulnerable segment of our population, the elderly. Although the outgoing Commission did enact some temporary measures, they are scheduled to expire this Fall. If they do, fraudulent telemarketers, once again, will escape the intended consequences of our legislation. Why? Because the Commission cannot do its job. Nor will it next year without new Commissioners and sufficient funding.

Last Congress, we also passed legislation that required increased penalties for copyright and trademark offenses to protect affected industries from the rampant piracy that threatens job creation and continued economic growth. Once again, not one convicted offender has suffered any increased punishment. Why? Because the Commission cannot do its job. Nor will it next year without new Commissioners and sufficient funding.

So long as the Commission cannot do its job, convicted defendants will also escape the impact of criminal laws we have enacted to combat other serious crimes: methamphetamine trafficking, firearms, phone cloning, and identity theft, just to name a few.

Recently, the Senate approved the juvenile justice legislation, S. 254, that would require the Sentencing Commission to develop comprehensive guidelines for juvenile offenders, so that we can stem the rising tide of juvenile crime. How can the Commission accomplish this vital and historic undertaking without Commissioners and sufficient funding?

We face other unintended, and potentially very costly, consequences of not getting the Commission fully operational soon. I understand that defendants across the country are beginning to mount challenges to the legality of the guidelines in the absence of Commissioners. Regardless of the merits, one can only imagine the paralyzing effects on the criminal justice system if 51,000 defendants start raising this issue. There are better ways to spend limited judicial and prosecutorial resources in fighting crime and enforcing the law than in defending against these claims.

Even in the absence of Commissioners, we should ensure that the Commission is fully funded so that the staff of the Commission may continue to perform its important work. The Commission has an ongoing statutory obligation to amend the sentencing guidelines as necessary to respond to enacted crime legislation, court decisions, and other developments coming to its attention. While the Commission cannot vote to promulgate amendments to the guidelines without commissioners, even in their absence it is essential that Commission staff systematically continue to prepare all supporting material necessary so that incoming commissioners may act to implement the will of Congress in short order.

Apart from the policy decision-making that only Commissioners may perform, the Commission has numerous routine statutory obligations on which Commission staff typically take the lead even when there is a complete slate of Commissioners. The Commission has an ongoing statutory obligation to receive—and federal judges have a corresponding statutory obligation to send—a report from the sentencing court with respect to every sentence imposed under the guidelines, to analyze and share the data in those reports, and use that data to improve the guideline system. Commission staff analyze and enter into our comprehensive database over 50,000 of such cases and extract more than 260 pieces of information from each case annually. Next year, more than 50,000 cases that contain valuable information regarding sentencing practices, offenders, and deterrence will go without analysis if the Commission is not sufficiently funded for fiscal year 2000.

The Commission also has an ongoing statutory obligation to serve as the lead instrumentality for training newly appointed judges and probation officers, as well as prosecuting and defense attorneys, regarding application of the sentencing guidelines and related sentencing issues. Similarly, the Commission has an ongoing responsibility to provide needed continuing education for all those who use the sentencing guidelines to ensure that they are sufficiently informed of recent amendments to the guidelines and significant court decisions. Commission staff served as lead trainers to more than 2,500 individuals at 47 training programs across the country in fiscal year 1998. Next year, this need for training will go unmet if the Commission is not sufficiently funded for fiscal year 2000.

The Commission also has an ongoing statutory obligation to serve as a clearinghouse of information on sentencing-related topics and to stay current on advancements in the knowledge of human behavior and the degree to which the guidelines are achieving the purposes of sentencing such as deterrence and rehabilitation. Ongoing research on important topics such as federal sentencing for crimes involving firearms, associations between federal appellate decisions and offender race, trends in sentences and offender characteristics in drug trafficking cases, and differing sentencing practices of federal immigration offenders by judicial district will not be completed if the Commission is not sufficiently funded for fiscal year 2000.

Finally, I would like to emphasize what the Chief Justice said. If we are going to have guidelines and require federal judges to impose guideline sentences, the Sentencing Commission must be empowered to do its work. And that means it needs both Commissioners and sufficient funding to fulfill its critical role in the federal criminal justice system.

I appreciate the support of my colleagues to restore funding for the U.S. Sentencing Commission for the next fiscal year.

AMENDMENT NO. 1352

(Purpose: To modify the circumstances under which attorneys' fees in Federal capital cases can be disclosed)

On page 73, between line 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 306.—

(A) Section 3006A(d)(D)(vi) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after the word ''require'' the following: '', except that the amount of the fees shall not be considered a reason justifying any limited disclosure under 18 U.S.C. Sec. 3006A(d)(4)''

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

This Act shall apply to all disclosures made under 3006A(d) of title 18, United States Code, related to any criminal trial or appeal involving a sentence of death where the underlying alleged criminal conduct took place on or after April 19, 1995.

AMENDMENT NO. 1353

(Purpose: To ensure that current Federal family violence prevention programs are sensitive to the needs of all Americans including seniors and the disabled)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PROTECTION OF SENIORS AND THE DISABLED IN FEDERAL FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) of the estimated more than 1,000,000 persons age 65 and over who are victims of family violence each year, at least ⅔ are women;

(2) national statistics are not available on the incidence of domestic or family violence and sexual assault against disabled women, although several studies indicate that abuse of disabled women is of a longer duration compared to abuse suffered by women who are not disabled;

(3) in almost 9 out of 10 incidents of domestic elder abuse and neglect, the perpetrator is a family member, and adult children of the victims are the largest category of perpetrators and spouses are the second largest category of perpetrators;

(4) the number of reports of elder abuse in the United States increased by 150 percent between 1986 and 1996 and is expected to continue increasing;

(5) it is estimated that at least 5 percent of the Nation's elderly are victims of moderate to severe abuse and that the rate for all forms of abuse may be as high as 10 percent;

(6) elder abuse is severely underreported, with 1 in 5 cases being reported in 1980 and only 1 in 8 cases being reported today;

(7) many older and disabled women fail to report abuse because of shame or as a result of prior unsatisfactory experiences with individual agencies or others who lack sensitivity to the concerns or needs of older or disabled individuals;

(8) many older or disabled individuals also fail to report abuse because they are dependent on their abusers and fear being abandoned or institutionalized;

(9) disabled women may fear reporting abuse because they are fearful of losing their children in a custody case;

(10) public and professional awareness and identification of violence against older or disabled Americans may be difficult because these persons are not integrated into many social networks (such as schools or jobs), and may become isolated in their homes, which can increase the risk of domestic abuse; and

(11) older and disabled Americans would greatly benefit from policies that develop, strengthen, and implement programs for the prevention of abuse, including neglect and exploitation, and provide related assistance for victims.

(b) IN GENERAL.—Part T of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is amended—

(1) in section 2001 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg)—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by inserting '', including older women and women with a disability'' after ''combat violent crimes against women''; and

(ii) by inserting '', including older women and women with a disability'' before the period; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting '', including older women and women with a disability'' after ''against women'';

(ii) in paragraph (6), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(iii) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) developing a curriculum to train and assist law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and relevant officers of the Federal, State, tribal, and local courts in identifying and responding to crimes of domestic violence and sexual assault against older individuals and individuals with a disability and implementing that training and assistance.'';

(2) in section 2002(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–1) by inserting ''and service programs tailored to the needs of older and disabled victims of domestic violence and sexual assault'' before the semicolon; and

(3) in section 2003 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg–2)—

(A) in paragraph (7), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(9) both the term 'elder' and the term 'older individual' have the meaning given the term 'older individual' in section 102 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3002); and

''(10) the term 'disability' has the meaning given the term in section 3(3) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102(3)).''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any grant made beginning with fiscal year 2000.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. GORTON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 216, S. 1393.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by Title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1393) to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans, to amend title 38, United States Code, to codify the previous cost-of-living adjustment in such rates, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read the third time, and the Veterans' Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2280. I further ask consent that the Senate proceed to its consideration, all after the enacting clause be stricken, and the text of S. 1393 be inserted in lieu thereof, the bill be read the third time, and passed.

I finally ask that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD and S. 1393 be placed back on the calendar.

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

The bill (H.R. 2280), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1999

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 222, S. 1402.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1402) to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance programs providing education benefits for veterans, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1402) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1402

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Programs Improvements Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 3. AVAILABILITY OF MONTGOMERY GI BILL BENEFITS FOR PREPARATORY COURSES FOR COLLEGE AND GRADUATE SCHOOL ENTRANCE EXAMS.

Section 3002(3) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph (B):

''(B) includes—

''(i) a preparatory course for a test that is required or utilized for admission to an institution of higher education; and

''(ii) a preparatory course for a test that is required or utilized for admission to a graduate school; and''.

SEC. 4. INCREASE IN BASIC BENEFIT OF ACTIVE DUTY EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) INCREASE IN BASIC BENEFIT.—Section 3015 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''$528'' and inserting ''$600''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''$429'' and inserting ''$488''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 1999, and shall apply with respect

to educational assistance allowances paid for months after September 1999. However, no adjustment in rates of educational assistance shall be made under section 3015(g) of title 38, United States Code, for fiscal year 2000.

SEC. 5. INCREASE IN RATES OF SURVIVORS AND DEPENDENTS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) SURVIVORS AND DEPENDENTS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 3532 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking ''$485'' and inserting ''$550'';

(B) by striking ''$365'' and inserting ''$414''; and

(C) by striking ''$242'' and inserting ''$274'';

(2) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''$485'' and inserting ''$550'';

(3) in subsection (b), by striking ''$485'' and inserting ''$550''; and

(4) in subsection (c)(2)—

(A) by striking ''$392'' and inserting ''$445'';

(B) by striking ''$294'' and inserting ''$333''; and

(C) by striking ''$196'' and inserting ''$222''.

(b) CORRESPONDENCE COURSE.—Section 3534(b) is amended by striking ''$485'' and inserting ''$550''.

(c) SPECIAL RESTORATIVE TRAINING.—Section 3542(a) is amended—

(1) by striking ''$485'' and inserting ''$550'';

(2) by striking ''$152'' each place it appears and inserting ''$172''; and

(3) by striking ''$16.16'' and inserting ''$18.35''.

(d) APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING.—Section 3687(b)(2) is amended—

(1) by striking ''$353'' and inserting ''$401'';

(2) by striking ''$264'' and inserting ''$299'';

(3) by striking ''$175'' and inserting ''$198''; and

(4) by striking ''$88'' and inserting ''$99''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1999, and shall apply with respect to educational assistance paid for months after September 1999.

SEC. 6. INCREASED ACTIVE DUTY EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE BENEFIT FOR CONTRIBUTING MEMBERS.

(a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INCREASED ASSISTANCE AMOUNT.—(1) Section 3011 is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (j); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (h) the following new subsection (i):

''(i)(1) Any individual eligible for educational assistance under this section who does not make an election under subsection (c)(1) may contribute amounts for purposes of receiving an increased amount of basic educational assistance as provided for under section 3015(g) of this title. Such contributions shall be in addition to any reductions in the basic pay of such individual under subsection (b).

''(2) An individual covered by paragraph (1) may make the contributions authorized by that paragraph at any time while on active duty.

''(3) The total amount of the contributions made by an individual under paragraph (1) may not exceed $600. Such contributions shall be made in multiples of $4.

''(4) Contributions under this subsection shall be made to the Secretary. The Secretary shall deposit any amounts received by the Secretary as contributions under this subsection into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.''.

(2) Section 3012 is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection (g):

''(g)(1) Any individual eligible for educational assistance under this section who does not make an election under subsection (d)(1) may contribute amounts for purposes of receiving an increased amount of basic educational assistance as provided for under section 3015(g) of this title. Such contributions shall be in addition to any reductions in the basic pay of such individual under subsection (c).

''(2) An individual covered by paragraph (1) may make the contributions authorized by that paragraph at any time while on active duty.

''(3) The total amount of the contributions made by an individual under paragraph (1) may not exceed $600. Such contributions shall be made in multiples of $4.

''(4) Contributions under this subsection shall be made to the Secretary. The Secretary shall deposit any amounts received by the Secretary as contributions under this subsection into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.''.

(b) INCREASED ASSISTANCE AMOUNT.—Section 3015, as amended by section 4 of this Act, is further amended—

(1) by striking ''subsection (g)'' each place it appears in subsections (a)(1) and (b)(1) and inserting ''subsection (h)'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection (g):

''(g) In the case of an individual who has made contributions authorized by section 3011(i) or 3012(g) of this title, the monthly amount of basic educational assistance allowance applicable to such individual under subsection (a), (b), or (c) shall be the monthly rate otherwise provided for under the applicable subsection increased by—

''(1) an amount equal to $1 for each $4 contributed by such individual under section 3011(i) or 3012(g), as the case may be, for an approved program of education pursued on a full-time basis; or

''(2) an appropriately reduced amount based on the amount so contributed, as determined under regulations which the Secretary shall prescribe, for an approved program of education pursued on less than a full-time basis.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2000.

SEC. 7. CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY FOR EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ATTENDING OFFICER TRAINING SCHOOL.

Section 3011(a)(1) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(ii)—

(A) by striking ''or (III)'' and inserting ''(III)''; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ''or (IV) for immediate reenlistment to accept a commission as an officer and subsequently completes the resulting obligated period of active duty service as a commissioned officer''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(ii)—

(A) by striking '', or (III)'' and inserting ''; (III)''; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ''or (IV) for immediate reenlistment to accept a commission as an officer and subsequently completes the resulting obligated period of active duty service as a commissioned officer''.

SEC. 8. ELIGIBILITY OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO WITHDRAW ELECTIONS NOT TO RECEIVE MONTGOMERY GI BILL BASIC EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) MEMBERS ON ACTIVE DUTY.—Section 3011(c) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4)(A) An individual who makes an election under paragraph (1) may withdraw the election at any time before the discharge or release of the individual from active duty in the Armed Forces. An individual who withdraws such an election may become entitled to basic educational assistance under this chapter.

''(B) The withdrawal of an election under this paragraph shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense or by the Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

''(C)(i) In the case of an individual who withdraws an election under this paragraph—

''(I) the basic pay of the individual shall be reduced by $100 for each month after the month in which the election is made until the total amount of such reductions equals $1,500; or

''(II) to the extent that basic pay is not so reduced before the individual's discharge or release from active duty in the Armed Forces, the Secretary, before authorizing the payment of educational assistance under this chapter, shall ensure that an amount equal to the difference between $1,500 and the total amount of reductions under subclause (I) was paid before the discharge or release of the individual from active duty in the Armed Forces.

''(ii) An individual described in clause (i) may pay the Secretary at any time before discharge or release from active duty in the Armed Forces an amount equal to the total amount of the reduction in basic pay otherwise required with respect to the individual under that clause minus the total amount of reductions of basic pay of the individual under that clause at the time of the payment under this clause.

''(iii) The second sentence of subsection (b) shall apply to any reductions in basic pay under clause (i)(I).

''(iv) Amounts paid under clauses (i)(II) and (ii) shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

''(D) The withdrawal of an election under this paragraph is irrevocable.''.

(b) MEMBERS OF SELECTED RESERVE.—Section 3012(d) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4)(A) An individual who makes an election under paragraph (1) may withdraw the election at any time before the discharge or release of the individual from the Armed Forces. An individual who withdraws such an election may become entitled to basic educational assistance under this chapter.

''(B) The withdrawal of an election under this paragraph shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense or by the Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

''(C)(i) In the case of an individual who withdraws an election under this paragraph—

''(I) the basic pay or compensation of the individual shall be reduced by $100 for each month after the month in which the election is made until the total amount of such reductions equals $1,500; or

''(II) to the extent that basic pay or compensation is not so reduced before the individual's discharge or release from the Armed Forces, the Secretary, before authorizing the payment of educational assistance under this chapter, shall ensure that an amount equal to the difference between $1,500 and the total amount of reductions under subclause (I) was paid before the discharge or release of the individual from the Armed Forces.

''(ii) An individual described in clause (i) may pay the Secretary at any time before discharge or release from the Armed Forces an amount equal to the total amount of the

reduction in basic pay or compensation otherwise required with respect to the individual under that clause minus the total amount of reductions of basic pay or compensation of the individual under that clause at the time of the payment under this clause.

''(iii) The second sentence of subsection (c) shall apply to any reductions in basic pay or compensation under clause (i)(I).

''(iv) Amounts paid under clauses (i)(II) and (ii) shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

''(D) The withdrawal of an election under this paragraph is irrevocable.''.

SEC. 9. ACCELERATED PAYMENTS OF BASIC EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 3014 is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a)'' before ''The Secretary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b)(1) The Secretary may make payments of basic educational assistance under this subchapter on an accelerated basis.

''(2) The Secretary may pay basic educational assistance on an accelerated basis under this subsection only to an individual entitled to payment of such assistance under this subchapter who has made a request for payment of such assistance on an accelerated basis.

''(3) In the event an adjustment under section 3015(g) of this title in the monthly rate of basic educational assistance will occur during a period for which a payment of such assistance is made on an accelerated basis under this subsection, the Secretary shall pay on an accelerated basis the amount of such assistance otherwise payable under this subchapter for the period without regard to the adjustment under that section.

''(4) For each accelerated payment made to an individual, the individual's entitlement under this subchapter shall be charged as if the individual had received a monthly educational assistance allowance for the period of educational pursuit covered by the accelerated payment.

''(5) Basic educational assistance shall be paid on an accelerated basis under this subsection as follows:

''(A) In the case of assistance for a course leading to a standard college degree, at the beginning of the quarter, semester, or term of the course in a lump-sum amount equivalent to the aggregate amount of monthly assistance otherwise payable under this subchapter for the quarter, semester, or term, as the case may be, of the course.

''(B) In the case of assistance for a course other than a course referred to in subparagraph (A)—

''(i) at the later of (I) the beginning of the course, or (II) a reasonable time after the request for payment by the individual concerned; and

''(ii) in any amount requested by the individual concerned within the limit, if any, specified in the regulations prescribed by the Secretary under paragraph (6), with such limit not to exceed the aggregate amount of monthly assistance otherwise payable under this subchapter for the period of the course.

''(6) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for purposes of making payments of basic educational assistance on an accelerated basis under this subsection. Such regulations shall include requirements relating to the request for, making and delivery of, and receipt and use of such payments and may include a limit on the amount payable for a course under paragraph (5)(B)(ii).''.

SEC. 10. VETERANS EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING BENEFITS PROVIDED BY THE STATES.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—(1) Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and January 31 of each year thereafter, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Labor, submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on veterans education and vocational training benefits provided by the States.

(2) A report under paragraph (1) shall include, for the one-year period ending on the date of the report, the following:

(A) A description of the assistance in securing post-secondary education and vocational training provided veterans by each State.

(B) A list of the States which provide veterans full or partial waivers of tuition for attending institutions of higher education that are State-supported.

(C) A description of the actions taken by the Department of Veterans Affairs, Department of Defense, Department of Education, and Department of Labor to encourage the States to provide benefits designed to assist veterans in securing post-secondary education and vocational training.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING STATE VETERANS EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING BENEFITS.—(1) Congress makes the following findings:

(A) The peace and prosperity of the citizens of the States are ensured by the voluntary service of men and women in the Armed Forces.

(B) Veterans benefit from the military training and discipline and the success-oriented attitude that are inculcated by service in the Armed Forces.

(C) It is in the social and economic interests of the States to take advantage of the positive personal attributes of veterans which are nurtured through service in the Armed Forces.

(D) A post-secondary education provides veterans the means to maximize their contribution to the society and economy of the States.

(E) Some States have recognized that it is in their interest to provide veterans post-secondary education on a tuition-free basis.

(2) It is the sense of Congress that each of the States should admit qualified veterans to publicly-supported institutions of higher education on a tuition-free basis.

(c) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''State'' has the meaning given that term in section 101(20) of title 38, United States Code.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 27, 1999

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, July 27. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday immediately following the prayer the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business for 30 minutes with Senators speaking for up to five minutes each, and that the time be equally divided in the usual form.

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

Mr. GORTON. I also ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10 a.m. Following morning business, the Senate will begin consideration of any available appropriations bills. It is hoped that the Senate can make significant progress on appropriations bills this week. Therefore, amendments and votes are expected throughout tomorrow's session of the Senate.

As a reminder, cloture on the substitute amendment to the juvenile justice legislation was filed today. By previous consent, that cloture vote will occur on Wednesday at 9:45 a.m.

Further, the Senate is expected to begin consideration of the reconciliation bill during Wednesday's session of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:10 p.m. adjourned until Tuesday, July 27, 1999, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 26, 1999:

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

THOMAS K. AANSTOOS, 0000
JESSE ADAMS, JR., 0000
MICHAEL A. ADAMS, 0000
DENNIS E. AHERN, 0000
GEORGE P. ALESSIO, JR., 0000
WILLIAM S. ARAMONY, 0000
JAMES C. ARRINGTON, 0000
NANCY J. ATKINSON, 0000
FRANKLIN E. BAILEY, 0000
DAVID A. BANACH, 0000
DENNIS M. BASH, 0000
FLORIDA B. BATTLE, 0000
MARK A. BATTLE, 0000
HARRY A. BECK, 0000
ARTHUR S. BENSON, 0000
JOHN A. BERNETSKIE, 0000
VANCE D. BERRY, JR., 0000
WILLIAM T. BERSSON, 0000
CONNIE L. BEST, 0000
KAREN F. BLACKBURN, 0000
LELAND S. BLOUGH, JR., 0000
GERALD W. BOCK, 0000
ULYSSES S. BOWLER, JR., 0000
KENT D. BROSTROM, 0000
WALTER W. BROWN, 0000
JOE P. BRYAN, 0000
JOHNATHAN W. BRYAN, 0000
ROBERT L. BRYANT, 0000
KATHLEEN S. BURKHART, 0000
GLEN A. BUSBY, 0000
KURT B. BUSKA, 0000
TIMOTHY J. BUTSON, 0000
FLOYD G. CAMPEN, 0000
ROBERT H. CAUTHEN, 0000
BECKY J. CERVENKA, 0000
JOHN C. CHAHBAZI, 0000
MARK E. CHESTON, 0000
RONALD D. CHRISTIAN, 0000
RALPH A. CICORA, 0000
JOSEPH R. COCKRELL, 0000
REX D. CONGER, 0000

NOREEN CONSIDINE, 0000
GLEN A. COOK, 0000
RICHARD A. COULON, 0000
HUGH P. COWDIN, JR., 0000
THOMAS L. COX, 0000
SEAN F. CREAN, 0000
LARRY D. CRIPPS, 0000
JOHN M. CROSS, 0000
STEPHEN J. DANGELO, 0000
JOHN H. DEASY, 0000
JOHN B. DELCAMBRE, 0000
GREGORY K. DENARDO, 0000
MICHAEL M. DICKERSON, 0000
MARK G. DOHERTY, 0000
JUDITH E. DOUGHERTY, 0000
SARA G. DRAPER, 0000
JON B. DULL, 0000
GREGORY L. DUNCAN, 0000
LESLIE H. DUNLAP, 0000
LINDA A. EARHART, 0000
ROBERT J. EATINGER, JR., 0000
NORMAN V. EID, 0000
ERWIN L. EPPLE, 0000
JOHN A. FABIAN III, 0000
DAVID D. FABRE, 0000
ROBERT G. FERNHOLZ, 0000
EDWARD B. FERRER, 0000
JOHN E. FETTER, 0000
JAMES M. FORSETH, 0000
CARL J. FRANK, 0000
HUGH E. FRASER, 0000
MICHAEL C. FREEMYERS, 0000
BRIAN L. FRESHER, 0000
RANDALL E. FROST, 0000
STEPHEN S. FROST, 0000
VERA GARBER, 0000
BENJAMIN M. GASTON IV, 0000
JAMES F. GATES, 0000
LAURENCE R. GERBO, 0000
DAN E. GODBOLD, 0000
FRANK A. GRECO, 0000
ROBERT E. GREENE, 0000
ROBERT C. GREER IV, 0000
BRUCE V. GRONKIEWICZ, 0000
STEVEN K. HAMILTON, 0000
WILLIAM E. HARTMAN, 0000
JAMES D. HARTY, 0000
MARK D. HEILMAN, 0000
WILLIAM L. HENNRIKUS, 0000
DOUGLAS J. HENSCHEL, 0000
WILLIAM L. HEROLD, 0000
MICHAEL J. HERRIGES, 0000
STEPHEN M. HICKEL, 0000
STANLEY M. HIGGINS, 0000
WADE L. HILL, 0000
DOUGLAS M. HINSON, 0000
TONI J. HOLLAND, 0000
DAVID T. HOV, 0000
MARY R. HOV, 0000
DENNIS E. HUGHES, 0000
JUDITH D. IRVINE, 0000
ROBERT C. JACKSON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER F. JAMES, 0000
DOUGLAS G. JEU, 0000
RAY JOHANSMEIER, 0000
STEPHEN H. JOHNSON, 0000
TIMOTHY L. JOHNSON, 0000
WESLEY H. JOHNSON, 0000
CHRISTINA JOY, 0000
NORMA J. JUST, 0000
STEPHEN W. KAJA, 0000
MARY E. KAPPUS, 0000
SUSAN KAWESKI, 0000
JOYCE M. KELLER, 0000
RICHARD W. KING, 0000
LYNN A. KLANCHAR, 0000
CARL W. KNUCKLES, 0000
PAUL F. KRUG, 0000
ALAN K. KULP, 0000
JERONE T. LANDSTROM, 0000
PETER M. LARSEN, 0000
GEORGE F. LEIDIG, JR., 0000
JOSHUA M. LIEBERMAN, 0000
PAUL M. LOEFFLER, 0000
MARK A.D. LONG, 0000
GARY W. LOVGREN, 0000
JOSEPH M. LYNCH III, 0000
RON J. MACLAREN, 0000
THOMAS D. MADISON, 0000
KEVIN MAHONEY, 0000
CRAIG L. MAJKOWSKI, 0000
JAMES P. MAKOFSKE, 0000
DELANOR A. MANSON, 0000
DANIEL E. MARTINEZ, 0000
DOUGLAS W. MARX, 0000
JAMES M. MAXWELL, 0000
JAMES G. MAYO, 0000
IRENE M. MC ALEER, 0000
NANCY M. MC CARTHEY, 0000
TIMOTHY J. MC CULLOUGH, 0000
JOHN D. MC DIVITT, 0000
RUSSELL R. MC KINNEY, 0000
CHARLES E. MC MANUS, 0000
DOUGLAS B. MC MULLEN, 0000
WILLIAM H. MCNAMARA, 0000
CHARLES B. MCVEIGH, JR., 0000
VIVIAN G. MELIDOSIAN, 0000
ROBERT D. METCALFE III, 0000
KENNETH J. METZGER, 0000
DAVID O. MILLER, 0000
LADSON F. MILLS III, 0000
CRAIG S. MITCHELL, 0000
JESSE H. MONESTERSKY, 0000
MARY V. MOON, 0000
STEPHEN G. MORSE, 0000
ROGER W. NADEAU, 0000
BONNIE A. NAULT, 0000
MICHAEL E. NELLESTEIN, 0000
MIKAL H. NICHOLLS, 0000
ANDREW M. NIENHAUS, 0000
STEVEN D. NOWICKI, 0000
MARK A. OBRIEN, 0000
MARY E. OGDEN, 0000
JONATHAN S. OLSHAKER, 0000
LINDA L. OTIS, 0000
MIGUEL M. PALOS, 0000
FREDERICK G. PANICO, 0000
HARRIETTE C. PARSONS, 0000
WALTER J. PASKEY, JR., 0000
JOSEPH A. PASQUALUCCI, 0000
ALLAN K. PATCH, 0000
MICHAEL S. PATTERSON, 0000
DAVID J. PAVEGLIO, 0000
PAUL A. PAYNE, 0000
JOSEPH P. PECORELLI, 0000
ANN M. PEDEN, 0000
RUSSELL G. PENDERGRASS, 0000
THOMAS J. PETERS, 0000
JAMES K. PETERSON, 0000
ANTHONY D. QUINN, 0000
SHACKLEY F. RAFFETTO, 0000
JAMES E. RANDOL, 0000
SHARON H. REDPATH, 0000
DANNY C. RHODES, 0000
FREDERICK J. RIBLE, JR., 0000
EMILY L. RICHIE, 0000
MARY L. RITZ, 0000
MITCHELL L. ROBINSON, 0000
RONAL ROGALSKY, 0000
JUNE M. ROGERS, 0000
RICHARD M. ROGERS, 0000
JOE P. ROUSE, 0000
LAURENCE P. RUSSE II, 0000
WILLIAM L. SAUL, 0000
DENNIS R. SCHRADER, 0000
ROBERT C. SCIORTINO, 0000
DAVID J. SCOTT, 0000
STRATTON SHANNON, 0000
HENRY C. SHELLEY, JR., 0000
GEORGE J. SHEPPARD III, 0000
KIMBERLY SHUNK, 0000
LAWRENCE R. SMITH, 0000
NELSON A. SMITH, 0000
ROBERT M. SMITH, 0000
WILLIAM SMITH, 0000
KENTON O. SMITHERMAN, 0000
AMBALAVANAR SOMASKANDA, 0000
DENNIS R. STAGGS, 0000
CLAUDE R. STEPHENS, JR., 0000
RENEE M. STEVENS, 0000
ROM A. STEVENS, 0000
LEWIS E. STEWART, 0000
WILLIAM R. STRAND, 0000
WILLIAM B. SWALLOW, 0000
JAYNE A. TAYLOR, 0000
HARVEY F. THOMAS, 0000
MICHAEL D. THOMAS, 0000
WILLIAM R. THOMPSON, 0000
SUSAN R. TOKLE, 0000
BARBARA J. TOMCKO, 0000
JOHN F. TOMPKINS II, 0000
ERIC C. TORP, 0000
BETH A. TROUM, 0000
KENNETH G. TUEBNER, 0000
JOHN R. TYLER, 0000
ELAINE K. TYREE, 0000
PATRICIA J. UNDERDAHL, 0000
PHILIP J. VARGAS, 0000
CHARLES F. VAUGHAN, 0000
JOSEPH M. VULGAMORE, 0000
DANIEL P. WALSH, 0000
SUSAN J. WALSH, 0000
ROBERT M. WARLING, 0000
DAVID G. WEAVER, 0000
MICHAEL D. WELCH, 0000
TODD R. WELLENSIEK, 0000
BRIAN D. WELTZIEN, 0000
THOMAS G. WESTBROOK, 0000
STEPHEN E. WILSON, 0000
SUZANNE J. WINGATE, 0000
WILLIAM D. WRIGHT, JR., 0000
ROBERT D. YOUNGER, 0000

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2488, FINANCIAL FREEDOM ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. DAVID L. HOBSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1999

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to dispute statements recently made on the House floor by Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi that mischaracterize the record of Republican support for the men and women who serve this country.

First, let me say that the Clinton Administration, not the Republicans, has severely overstretched and underfunded our military. From 1991 to 1998, our military has been deployed 33 times. Compare that with only 10 from 1946 to 1991. The funding increases and commitments needed to sustain these missions abroad has been conspicuously lacking from this Administration.

Let me provide some examples. The defense budget presented by the President fell far short of the quality of life needs that our military had requested. For instance, the Administration disregarded requests for new family housing construction in the Continental United States (CONUS) made by the Army and Navy. That was unwise, given the housing backlog that stretches for ten years, and a real property maintenance backlog of almost $1 billion.

What's worse, the services provided the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee with an unfunded priority list of over $11 billion for this year alone, and over $150 billion over the next five years.

While remaining within the budget caps, the Republican's Fiscal Year 2000 Defense Appropriations bill addresses these shortfalls by providing an extra $2.8 billion above the Administration's request. Some of the highlights of the bill include: $300 million above the budget request for pilot bonuses; $854 million above the budget request for Qualify of Life enhancements; $103 million above the budget request for recruiting; $2.8 billion above the budget request for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation; and 4.8 percent pay raise (above the budget request).

Moreover, the Administration proposed in its Fiscal 2000 budget request to split-fund military construction needs, overlooking the dire situation facing many military families and personnel. Instead of providing funding up front for new housing, child care, and work facilities, as the House-passed Military Construction bill does, the Administration put budget gimmicks before the needs of the services.

To redress these wrongs, Republicans have provided funding to dramatically improve the quality of life for military families. The House approved by an overwhelming vote of 414 to 4 the Fiscal Year 2000 Military Construction Appropriations bill, which contains several provisions to improve quality of life for our troops. It includes $800 million for new housing, $747 million for new family housing units, and $2.8 billion for operation and maintenance of existing family housing units.

In the wake of increased single-parent and dual income families within the military, the legislation also provides $21 million for child development centers. These child development centers will help military families cope with their changing life circumstances.

The Republican record of support for our Armed Forces is strong. While there is more to be done to redress years of downsizing, we have provided for the well-being of our troops and the stability of our national security.

TRIBUTE TO VIRGINIA MEDINA

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today in tribute to Virginia Medina of Clarksburg, California. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in remembering this remarkable wife, mother, and public servant.

Mrs. Medina passed away on June 27, 1999 following a three-year battle with ovarian cancer. She worked as a law librarian at the California State Department of Water Resources. I salute her professional as well as personal dedication to inspiring others and working hard to make a better life for her family.

State Senator Deborah Ortiz, Mrs. Medina's daughter, described her mother as ''my greatest inspiration.'' Mrs. Medina was a working mother who put herself through secretarial school after surviving an early bout with thyroid cancer.

She had a wonderful reputation throughout her community as a warm, loving woman who never hesitated to help others in need. Mrs. Medina inspired significant legislation in the California State Legislature, authored by her daughter, which provides for annual research funding into gender-based cancers.

At the Department of Water Resources, Mrs. Medina was known as an exceptionally hard worker with a sunny personality. She served the people of California in that agency for over fifteen years.

One of her coworkers told the Sacramento Bee, ''Despite all her suffering, she always had time to listen and to encourage others. She didn't complain. She wasn't cynical. She brought a lot of love and light to other peoples' lives.''

A native of Lafayette, Colorado, Virginia Medina was born to a family of migrant workers. She moved to the Sacramento area at the age of seven. Although she was a high school dropout who married at 16, she always stressed the importance of education to her own children.

Mrs. Medina not only served as a worthy role model for her daughter, but for her four sons as well. We can all respect the way in which she raised her family, promoted strong values, and contributed to her community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in remembering this strong and vibrant wife, mother, and citizen. As her family and friends endure this great loss, our thoughts are with them during this most difficult of times. Yet the legacy which Mrs. Medina leaves behind will endure for years to come.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 16, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Sahara Africa.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 434, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act. I am honored to say that today, the vast majority of American civic, religious, and business leaders strongly support this bill. More important, all 43 nations of sub-Saharan Africa have voiced unanimous support for this bold step toward stronger economic ties between the United States and Africa.

We have also recognized that Africa's fragile democracies cannot sustain themselves without economic prosperity. I am proud to say that our government supported and promoted free and fair elections in every country where leaders were willing to allow liberty to flourish.

Now, we turn our attention toward strengthening Africa economically through US-Africa trade. The globalization of the economy, marked by integration of markets throughout the world, has made Africa the new economic frontier for economic growth. Western Europe and Japan are aggressively pursuing new trade relations with African countries. This vast continent, with its enormous resources and human capacity, may become the world's economic engine well into the 21st Century.

Africa is on the brink of a major economic revival. The United States faces strong competition from the European and Asian economic communities. The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act provides the United States with a mechanism to leverage stronger US-African public and private partnerships while promoting African and American long-term economic interests.

HR 434 is bipartisan, provides a viable framework for modernizing Africa's trade infrastructure, strengthens relations between the African and American private sector, promotes African economic reform, and lays a foundation for future cooperation.

HR 434 is the beginning of an ongoing relationship between the United States and Africa.

The bill's requirement that the President create and convene regularly a U.S.-Africa Economic Forum means there will be opportunity to revisit and expand the program as trade increases.

Much has been said about the need for debt relief for Africa. Congressman JESSE JACKSON has forcefully brought this point home to all of us. The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act calls for deep debt relief for the poorest countries in Africa. We should keep a discussion alive on this serious matter and seek to address the debt burden in an appropriate manner.

However, today we began to build strong trade relations between the United States and Africa as it is a critical part of Africa's economic recovery and is good for American businesses.

I urge passage of HR 434.

MEMORIAL DAY

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to honor every ''Hoosier'' who took part in the 1999 Memorial Day activities in Indianapolis. It was one of the most significant weekends in the history of that great city.

As the last days of the 20th century continue to unfold, Memorial Day weekend in the capital of Indiana was one to remember. Nearly 100 Medal of Honor recipients were guests for a series of stirring tributes. These included a solemn Memorial Service; the dedication of the only memorial to recipients of the Medal of Honor; grand marshals in the IPALCO 500 Festival Parade; an outdoor concert by the Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra; and a parade lap around the famed Indianapolis Motor Speedway prior to the start of the race.

As the 20th century draws to a close, many wonder if the Nation has lost sight of the sacrifices which have been made to preserve freedom. After this year's Memorial Day weekend in Indianapolis, my heart remains swollen with pride in our land and my fellow citizens. The reception given these ordinary citizens who did extraordinary things can never be equaled.

I am especially proud of the untold hundreds of volunteers who gave their free time and talent to make these events possible. Memorial Day weekend 1999 did much to convince me that our Nation's spirit of freedom is alive and well. It also underscored the true meaning of ''Hoosier Hospitality.''

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN MARVEL FOR MAKING THE DURANGO COMMUNITY A BETTER PLACE TO LIVE

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to acknowledge the great achievements and outstanding efforts of John Marvel. For many years, Mr. Marvel has been involved in and contributed much to the Durango community. I wish to commend Mr. Marvel for his efforts and work for the citizens of Durango.

After completing his education at Adams State College, John Marvel began his career in banking. For the last 28 years he has contributed to the banking industry, working in 4 banks and serving as CEO for 3 of those banks. Currently, Mr. Marvel dedicates his energies to First National Bank of Durango where he is Bank President.

John Marvel also designates time to enhancing the town of Durango through various endeavors and leadership roles. Serving as President of the Durango Area Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Marvel was named the DACRA Volunteer of the Year for 1998. He has also been influential in his positions as President of Durango Industrial Development Foundation, Members of the Fort Lewis College Foundation Board, and Member of the Colorado Association of Commerce and Industry Board. Because of his dedication and involvement, John Marvel was named the 1998 Recipient of Fort Lewis College Distinguished Service Award.

For his extensive work and service, I commend Mr. John Marvel and thank him for his endeavors. Mr. Marvel is a unique individual and I appreciate his commitment and work ethic.

MILITARY RECRUITMENT THROUGH EFFECTIVE PRESENTATIONS TO AMERICA'S YOUNG PEOPLE

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, we know that today our armed forces are facing serious shortfalls in recruitment. Already, these shortfalls are having a dangerous impact on our Nation's military readiness. We will have all the best tools, and no one to fight the war. In part, the problem may be caused by a blessing: America's flourishing economy, which leads our young people to enter a booming job market rather than the rigors of military service. Therefore, it is essential for our national security that our government do all that it can to support our armed forces in effectively communicating to young people of recruitment age the advantages and benefits of service.

Honor, patriotism, and the desire for adventure still engage and motivate America's young men and women. America's armed forces offer the opportunity to be part of something meaningful, to learn self-discipline and sacrifice. For many idealist young people the military offers them an experience unmatchable elsewhere. So we have to get the message out about what service in the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines means to their own country, and what opportunities such service entails. And we must recognize that in today's world, we are competing with some of the most effective marketing and recruitment techniques ever devised by U.S. companies, which quite reasonably want to catch as many of the best and the brightest as they can for themselves.

Therefore, it is essential that we convey our message by the most effective means possible, employing language and images engaging to young Americans of recruitment age. Programming messages by the U.S. Navy have scored significant recruiting success in recent months, partially reversing the downward trend of Navy recruitment. Programming directed toward high school students for post-graduation enlistment can be particularly beneficial. For example, Channel One, the in-school news analysis program reaches eight million American students daily. Studies have shown that it is particularly well targeted and unusually effective means of increasing awareness of the military service option and positive attitudes toward it. As a result of this exposure, students in Channel One schools are more likely to consider enlisting.

Mr. Speaker, the use of innovative methods to educate and encourage young people about the benefits of service to their country is essential in today's marketplace. Our national security demands such an effort. At the same time, service in the United States military truly provides young Americans with an opportunity to gain by giving to their country. I intend to work hard to ensure that our government expands its support for our armed forces' efforts in this direction.

THE STATE HORNET

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to recognize the 50th Anniversary of The State Hornet, the newspaper of California State University, Sacramento. As the CSUS community celebrates this journalistic milestone, I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in honoring the great work of this student newspaper.

Fifty years ago, just four students at the newly established Sacramento State College began The State Hornet newspaper. Their tireless work became the foundation upon which the future successes of the publication would be built.

The State Hornet first appeared on April 14, 1949. Since that first day, the student editors and reporters have worked hard to cover the news stories that most directly affect the everyday lives of its student readership and the Sacramento State community-at-large.

Since its founding, The State Hornet has experienced dramatic growth and change that is not reflected in the mere passage of fifty years. Since 1949, hundreds of talented students and generations of journalists have learned their trade in the offices of The State Hornet.

Today, approximately 75 students and staff work for the newspaper, which makes the State Hornet not only one of Sacramento State's oldest employers, but one of the largest as well. Along the way, the staff has moved from the converted shoe repair shop where the newspaper began into a modern university building.

The State Hornet is the only college newspaper in California with offices designed as a professional newsroom. Its circulation has grown from a few dozen in 1949 to 12,000 copies distributed currently.

Through decades of journalistic accomplishment, The State Hornet has provided the California State University, Sacramento community with impressive, amusing, and sometimes controversial news coverage.

The paper has documented fraudulent voting, income tax evasion, and many other significant issues. The State Hornet is moving into the next century by debuting an Internet edition that will be available on the World Wide Web.

Since 1996 The State Hornet has produced an archive of each weekly issue that is available online. In time for its 50th Anniversary, The Hornet is launching its second newspaper, The State Hornet Online. This web site will contain all the stories and information included in the print edition, but other articles will be posted daily.

Mr. Speaker, the staff of The State Hornet at CSUS has accomplished a great deal over the past five decades. These accomplishments have led to the paper's worthy reputation for journalistic excellence and sound reporting. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in saluting The State Hornet on the occasion of its 50th Anniversary and wishing it every continued success in the years ahead.

IN HONOR OF JANIE STRIDER

HON. RONNIE SHOWS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I would like to take a minute to tell my fellow colleagues and the American People about Janie Strider. Ms. Strider recently passed away and it is important that we pause to remember this remarkable Mississippian and American.

Ms. Janie Strider is from that Great Generation of Americans who carried this country through the Great Depression and World War II. She raised a family and contributed to our nation following World War II. Everyone around her knew of the love she had for her God, her family and her nation.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Strider was in her 90s. Just imagine all the changes she experienced over her lifetime. Just think about the advances in transportation and communications she saw. When she was born things like e-mail, faxes and cable television were mere science fiction.

She was an All-American Southern lady who loved baseball and the democratic Party. Ms. Janie Strider's legacy will endure for generations in the children and grandchildren and greatgrandchildren she instilled with the ideas of democracy and Christian-based values that she spent her life believing in.

Mr. Speaker, Mississippi and our nation are better off because of the life of Janie Strider. I salute her and the great family she gave to all of us.

POLICE BRUTALITY; PROSTITUTION

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have printed in the RECORD statements by high school students from my home State of Vermont, who were speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people today. I am asking that you please insert these statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as I believe that the views of these young persons will benefit my colleagues.

POLICE BRUTALITY

(On behalf of Chris Callahan, Ingrid O'Reilly, Chris Lancaster, Reah Greico and Andy Weber)

Ingrid O'Reilly: To serve, honor and protect. It's a phrase that is supposed to be a representation of police forces all over America. They serve the American people, but do they really honor and protect them? By definition, honor means to regard or to treat with respect. But it seems that the police officers that harassed Officer Aaron Campbell of Florida were not respecting him, never mind honoring him.

Then there is the question of protect. Americans depend on officers in the time of danger, but for Amadou Diallo, he lost his life when four New York City officers emptied their entire rounds on him because he looked suspicious. Is our law enforcement system covered by a blue curtain and our officers put on a pedestal, or is the law enforcement just getting a bad reputation for a few mistakes?

Chris Callahan: Aaron Campbell, a 26-year veteran of the Miami Dade Police Department, was pulled over and charged with a traffic violation. Campbell didn't believe that he was pulled over because of any traffic violation, but was a victim of racial profiling. Campbell resisted arrest, and later was accused of assaulting a police officer.

Campbell was successful in convincing the jury that racial profiling is an everyday occurrence. He was later acquitted of all charges, except for resisting arrest. The fact that Campbell was a police officer helped his case significantly. Imagine the victims who are not professionally affiliated with the legal system, and the difficulty that they have proving their innocence.

Reah Greico: On February 4, 1999, Amadou Diallo, a 22-year-old African immigrant, was shot and killed by four white policemen. Officers pleaded not guilty to the murder, believing that Diallo looked like a sketch of a serial rapist, and that he was reaching for a gun. The four officers were indicted for second-degree murder.

While the murder of Amadou Diallo is not believed to have been an intentional case of police brutality, it shows how susceptible minorities are to police prejudices and brutalities.

Andy Weber: Since police enforcement began, there has always been some form of brutality or misuse of power. While there is no one solution to end brutality, many organizations and plans have been adopted to control this problem. Many precincts are waging heavier fines, longer suspensions, and even dismissals for officers convicted of brutality.

However, these actions should not even be happening. Therefore, many ideas have brought forth on how to prevent the brutality. The most popular of these ideas is community policing. Recently, the Los Angeles Police Department instituted a community policing program, which a report explains by the following: The catalyst for moving the department away from the faceless militaristic organization, toward a 21st century model that is more compatible and interactive with local communities.

Lastly, one of the most important ways to end police brutality is the destruction of the blue curtain. Though this is the easiest solution, it is also the hardest to actually carry out.

Chris Lancaster: Both brutality and corruption among law enforcement agencies have always been problems. Fortunately, today, it has been acknowledged that these problems exist, and this is the first step towards any possible resolution. These are problems that cannot be solved by any one policy or program, and programs such as the Los Angeles Community Policing Program are simply the beginning.

As for the blue curtain, it is time to realize that, while such a code may strengthen the bonds and camaraderie among police officers, it is no excuse to withhold the truth. Taking a definitive stance on eliminating the blue curtain will end a large percentage of corruption among police, and will lead to a more productive, constructive relationship between the police and the public.

Congressman Sanders: Good job.

PROSTITUTION

(On behalf of Lynn Clough, Angela DeBlasio, Kayla Gildersleeve and Tess Grossi)

Lynn Clough: Prostitution is a major concern and a policy issue for many countries, including the United States. Prostitution is defined as a relatively indiscriminate sexually exchange made for material gain. Persons prostitute themselves when they grant sexual access for money, gifts or other forms of payment, and in doing so, use their bodies as a commodity. In legal terms, the world ''prostitute'' refers only to those who engage frequently and overtly in such sexual economic exchanges.

Prostitution is now illegal for most of the United States. Prostitution is wrong. It spreads deadly diseases such as AIDS, promotes violence and cruelty, and minorities are involved for the easy way out. The violence is terrible and inhumane, but the prostitutes have to deal with it. Currently, if a prostitute is murdered, the police wouldn't make a big priority of it, but it really needs to be.

The government has to realize that prostitution is still happening and is not going to ever stop. Wise governments will accept that paid sex is ineradicable and concentrate on keeping the business clean, safe and inconspicuous. Prostitution is not going to go away and it needs to be taken care of.

Angela DeBlasio: Many people know that prostitution is illegal, but they find that they have sexual needs. They know they can't get a prostitute, so they try and pick up fellow workers, which brings up sexual harassment. The United States holds a huge sexual harassment problem. Sexual harassment is one of the fastest expanding areas of American law.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which handles sexual harassment complaints, in 1991 handled over 6,000 cases, and in 1997 close to 16,000. If prostitution was legal and open for business, would there be any reason for sexual harassment cases?

Kayla Gildersleeve: One would wonder, if prostitution is going on anyway, why legalize it? The answer is simple. If prostitution is legalized, then the government would be in charge, and there would be great protection from diseases and violence. Also, there

wouldn't be any unprotected prostitutes on the streets, and they would get paid, not the pimps.

Tess Grossi: Prostitution has been a part of life throughout history, and what would make the government think that making it illegal will stop it? The sex industry is exposed to many of the forces that normal businesses must contend with, but will it ever become a normal and respected part of society? History suggests that it might. Throughout history, there have been all forms of prostitution, including legal prostitution.

Again, prostitution causes deadly diseases to spread more rapidly, and there is great violence and inhumanity involved. All of these problems can be eradicated if the government would legalize it. The government is the only answer to solving the problem. Prostitution will never go away. Therefore, the government should legalize prostitution.

Lynn Clough: The people and the prostitutes are afraid to go to the government for help, and so the government needs to go to them.

Thank you.

WARREN VILLAGE IN DENVER, COLORADO IS AN INNOVATIVE AND UNIQUE FAMILY SERVICE COMMUNITY

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize one of Colorado's most innovative and unique family service communities, Warren Village in Denver, Colorado. Warren Village is a service created to help low-income single-parents move from public assistance to personal and economic self-sufficiency through subsidized housing, on-site child care, counseling, and education, or job training.

Warren Village was established in 1974, marking July as the institution's 25th anniversary. Upon establishment, Warren Village was the Nation's first federally subsidized transitional housing program for single-parent families. Founders of Warren Village included Warren United Methodist Church, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and local business leaders.

Warren Village provides three integrated programs to its residents. The housing program provides accommodations for families of up to four children and one adult. The Learning Center uses a multi-cultural and gender-fair curriculum for at-risk urban children. The Family Services Program provides comprehensive case-management, vocational assessment, and life classes on topics ranging from goal achievement, to parenting, and leadership opportunities.

Residents of Warren Village are required to participate in activities that include evening educational classes, volunteer services, and must attend school or work full time. These activities must be completed as a condition of their lease agreement; progress of each resident is monitored quarterly. Residence at Warren Village is not an entitlement, but rather a privilege to be earned by personal progress.

Warren Village is a nonprofit organization that has more than 1,500 active community volunteers from schools, businesses, youth groups, and churches. In 1998, Warren Village had over 1,800 unduplicated volunteers donate their time. The limited financial resources of the institution are supplemented by the time and remarkable talents of these volunteers.

Over the past 25 years, Warren Village has received numerous national and State honors and awards for its outstanding services to the Denver Metro area. Warren Village has become a national model for providing constructive solutions for serious issues that plague every community in the Nation. With more than 2,500 families graduated from the program, cities across the country have replicated the Warren Village model.

I would like to congratulate Warren Village on 25 years of remarkable service and outstanding dedication to the community of Denver, as well as the State of Colorado. The hard work and significant achievements of Warren Village exemplify the notion of public service and civic duty. Colorado is both honored and extremely fortunately to have such an effective agency derive from our State.

COMMERCIAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 1999 (H.R. 2607)

HON. DANA ROHRABACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Commercial Space Transportation Competitiveness Act of 1999.

Last year, the American people learned that two U.S. companies had helped Communist China improve its Long March launch vehicles. And we've all heard about the immediate and long-term impacts this is having on our national security.

But this travesty was merely the symptom of a greater challenge. In Communist China, we have a ruthless dictatorship that is using commercial space activities to help its military someday compete with the United States. In America, however, we have a space transportation industry that has grown up as an extension of the government, and therefore hasn't been dynamic enough to meet the launch needs of our vibrant commercial satellite industry. Sadly, these two facts created the circumstances that led to the technology transfers we have learned about.

Ever since I entered Congress over a decade ago I have championed the issue of improving America's space transportation capabilities. With leadership and support from colleagues like my late friend George Brown, the Committee on Science has reported, won House passage, and seen enactment of several legislative initiatives over the past decade. The legislation I am introducing today is another significant step towards the goal stated by the Select Committee led by CHRIS COX and NORM DICKS; improving U.S. ''space launch capacity and competition.''

The aerospace industry—along with the FAA—has testified before the Space & Aeronautics Subcommittee on ways to improve U.S. launch competitiveness. The message we have heard loud-and-clear is that their top priority is the renewal of the government-industry risk sharing plan known as ''indemnification.'' Mr. Speaker, this bill extends indemnification authority for a full 5 years beyond its scheduled expiration this December.

I do wish, however, that we had more time to fully consider this issue. Industry has been signing launch contracts for nearly 3 years that presupposed an automatic renewal. With little time for debate about whether this is the right risk sharing plan for the future, the Science Committee was put in a tough spot that I for one don't want to see repeated in 5 years.

So this bill also directs that various government agencies and industry sectors present Congress with the broadest possible range of ideas as to whether and how this risk sharing regime should change in the future. Make no mistake about this: we want to give U.S. industry a stable business environment so they can be more competitive in the international marketplace. However, we also want to start the process now of planning for risk sharing in 2005 and beyond.

This legislation authorizes funding through Fiscal Year 2002 for the FAA's Office of the Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation. Over the past two years, Patti Grace Smith has dramatically reformed and improved this office. She and her staff have worked hard to keep up with rapid growth in U.S. commercial space transportation, while drafting regulations to help industry move forward into the era of reusable launch vehicles. For these reasons, we have provided this office with a steady increase in funding over the next 3 years.

The other non-user agency that works with the commercial space transportation industry is the Office of Space Commercialization (OSC) within the Department of Commerce. Last year the Congress created this office in law, and this bill provides OSC with steady funding but requires the office to lay out more specific programmatic objectives and results so the Congress can judge its progress.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer this legislation to help make America's commercial space transportation industry more competitive. I want to thank Science Committee Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER for his help and encouragement in developing this bill. I would also like to thank Chairmen JOHN MCCAIN and BILL FRIST in the Senate, and also Senator JOHN BREAUX, for actively focusing on commercial space transportation issues. We look forward to joining with them soon to send a mutually agreeable version of this legislation to the White House for the President's signature.

TRADE POLICY REFORM ACT

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, our foreign competitors have been dumping steel in America below market value for well over a year. This practice, which has been allowed to continue unencumbered by the Clinton Administration, has had a devastating effect on the U.S. steel industry and U.S. steelworkers. I have taken numerous actions, alone and in conjunction with the Congressional Steel Caucus, to urge the Administration to change its backward trade policy and remedy the current

crisis. In March, the House passed the Bipartisan Steel Recovery Act, which imposes quotas on steel imports above a certain level, for three years. Short-term solutions, however, are not a panacea. In order to rebuild the confidences of American industry and the American worker in the international trading system—and particularly in U.S. trade policy—Congress should reform three major trade law regimes: (1) enforcement of international trade agreements, (2) remedies against disruptive import surges, and (3) remedies against foreign unfair trade practices.

There is an urgent need to strengthen Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974, which was enacted to enable the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) to open foreign markets closed to imported products and services by unreasonable trade barriers. The effectiveness of Section 301 has been significantly undermined by the World Trade Organization (WTO) Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) and the emergence of new, harder-to-reach forms of foreign trade barriers. Section 301 now serves almost exclusively as a mechanism by which complaints are funneled through the USTR en route to the WTO. The bilateral component of U.S. trade diplomacy has been allowed to decay. The WTO has been ineffectual in dealing with modern, complex trade issues such as the closure of foreign markets by governments working with private monopolies and cartels (e.g. *Kodak* v. *Fuji*). Title I of the Trade Policy Reform Act would reinstate this bilateral component of U.S. trade diplomacy and require new reporting requirements by the Office of U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) to Congress. These new reporting requirements: (1) make the USTR more accountable to Congress, and (2) provide for direct information dissemination to Congress, in order to improve Congressional oversight, and (3) address both market access barriers and foreign compliance with international accords. The ''Trade Policy Reform Act'' also mandates appropriate action by the Commerce Department when market access barriers or non-compliance with trade accords is found.

Specifically, Title I requires monitoring of and reports on foreign market access for U.S. goods and services, negotiations to gain market access, progress reports on negotiations, monitoring of compliance with trade agreements, and 301 actions should negotiations fail or should countries refuse to negotiate or in the case of noncompliance with agreements. The Trade Policy Reform Act would also bring the National Trade Estimates (NTE) report closer to Congress' original goals and address current illegal trade practices such as prison labor, etc. The NTE is further amended to include input by affected U.S. industries and their employees. Congress devised the NTE in the 1980s to inventory, on an annual basis, foreign trade barriers affecting U.S. exports of goods and services. The purpose was to bring about negotiations to eliminate such barriers. The list today does not serve its intended function.

With respect to relief from unfair trade practices, Title II of the Trade Policy Reform Act mandates action by the USTR, for the first time, against collaborations between foreign governments and private enterprises to restrict market access for U.S. goods and services by making such collaborations actionable. Moreover, the legislation would allow any interested party, defined as one who has been economically adversely affected, to request a review of country compliance with any trade agreement. Non-compliance is actionable.

In addition, Title II would prohibit the Secretary of Commerce from using any funds appropriated by Congress to implement existing agreements and negotiate any new ones for those categories of steel included in H.R. 975, the Bipartisan Steel Recovery Act. Section 2106 also directs the Secretary to withdraw from the current agreements and notify the other signatories of that action.

Title III of the Trade Policy Reform Act would abolish the International Trade Commission and transfer its authority and responsibilities to the Department of Commerce. The ITC's continued independence and existence outside of any institution accountable to the people of the United States undermines America's industry and hurts America's workers. The ITC's independence is precisely what makes it the least appropriate body to determine whether U.S. industries are being injured by imports and what relief those industries should be given. America's workers deserve to have an agency on their side, protecting their interests, with their security and success its primary goal. Although the ITC Commissioners are confirmed by the Senate, Congress has no other role whatsoever in its oversight (other than appropriating its operating funds).

When the ITC purports to not be a policy-making body, it really means that it does not follow American policy, just its own. The ITC's policy clearly places the concerns of foreign industries on the same plateau as our own industries, and American workers suffer. Furthermore, the ITC contradicts itself. On one hand it claims to be an independent agency that conducts objective studies on international trade. On the other hand the ITC is required to assist the President, making recommendations on how to relieve industries injured by increasing exports, and advising him on whether agriculture imports interfere with governmental price support programs. In filling these dual roles, the ITC is the equivalent of a referee that makes calls in a game while coaching his team from the sidelines. The Commissioners of the ITC are supposed to serve the American people. The American worker does not need a coach that is also required to fill the role of ''objective'' referee. An agency like the ITC cannot entirely fulfill its duties. Title III will abolish this problematic agency, transfer its authority to the Department of Commerce, and in doing so fill the much-needed role of a trade agency that successfully champions the causes of the American workers.

For an agency charged with the awesome responsibility of being the last line of defense of American industry against foreign attack, objectivity and unaccountability are unacceptable. Moving its functions to the Secretary of Commerce would subject those roles to tougher scrutiny by Congressional committees of jurisdiction and, consequently, to the American people. The Secretary would be responsible for all decisions made on behalf of America's workers and would have to answer to the elected representatives of the American people for those determinations.

Finally, Title IV of the Trade Policy Reform Act creates a WTO Review Commission to strengthen the dispute resolution process. Section 301 provisions require the U.S. to bring Section 301 cases involving trade agreements to the dispute settlement procedures established under the agreements. Therefore, U.S. membership in the WTO does not diminish or restrict the ability of the United States to initiate Section 301 cases, but does require it to submit cases involving WTO trade agreements to the WTO for dispute settlement. If the U.S. wins, the loser must comply with the WTO ruling or face retaliation measures.

What happens when the U.S. loses a case in the WTO? Technically, the United States could issue Section 301 trade sanctions, despite any decision made under the WTO dispute resolution process. However, if the United States imposed an unauthorized sanction on a WTO-covered item (e.g. raised the tariff beyond a negotiated rate), the sanctioned country might issue a complaint to the WTO, which might rule against the U.S. The WTO has no real authority to force any nation to change its laws or abide by its rulings. If the U.S. chose to ignore WTO rulings, it would run the risk that other nations would too. In order for the DSU mechanism to work, WTO members, including the U.S. must be willing to ''play by the rules.''

Specifically, the WTO Review Commission would review the WTO dispute settlement cases adverse to the United States to determine if the WTO had exceeded its authority, which could lead the President to seek changes in WTO dispute settlement rules. For example, should the Commission determine that the WTO's ruling in favor of Japan in the Kodak-Fuji case was due to lack of authority in anti-competitive practices, the Commission could then direct the President to negotiate an anti-competitive trade agreement to expand WTO authority. The creation of a WTO Dispute Settlement Review Commission is both a mechanism for protecting U.S. trade interests as well as an ''official'' means for the U.S. to initiate improvements in the Dispute Settlement system, as problems arise. The United States could base future trade negotiations on the Commissions findings.

It is incumbent upon Congress to restore to confidence of U.S. industry and American workers in our international trading system. To accomplish this objective, Congress must ensure a fair and equitable international trading system: illegal trade practices must not be tolerated, foreign markets that restrict American goods and services must be liberalized, international panels must be scrutinized for any bias, conflict of interest, or overstepping or authority, and ineffective government agencies must be reinvented to serve U.S. business and labor. The ''Trade Policy Reform Act'' provides common sense solutions to some of the key problems with America's trade policies. I urge all Members to cosponsor this legislation.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 514TH AIR MOBILITY WING

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the men and women of the 514th Air Mobility Wing on the commemoration of your 50th anniversary! The citizens of the United States, and especially of New Jersey, recognize and

appreciate your impressive contributions to our great nation.

Over the past 50 years you have endured changes in your name, command, mission, aircraft, and location. You've been activated and deactivated, stretched far beyond your resources and had your budgets slashed to frightening levels. Through it all, you stayed the course, steadfast in your commitment to serve, professional and dependable, always meeting the demands placed upon you.

You continue to enjoy unparalleled success as the premier associate wing in the Air Force Reserve Command. The nation has watched the members of the 514th AMW leave your families and home for the Korean war, the Cuban missile crisis, the Vietnam war and the evacuation of South Vietnamese refugees. Alongside your active duty brethren, you were among the first forces into the Vietnam conflict. In fact, it was a reserve crew from the now-deactivated 335th Military Airlift Squadron that flew the last mission of Operation Babylift from Saigon. You continue to support Operation Southern Watch and humanitarian missions too numerous to count.

Please accept this tribute of a nation grateful for the tremendous sacrifices you have made and continue to make in defense of the many freedoms we enjoy. We are proud of you. We support you. We thank you.

MAYS FAMILY IN ROBSTOWN

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a family that has been a large part of the history of my hometown, Robstown, Texas, for the better part of the 20th Century. Next week, the Mays Family will hold a family reunion in the Omni Bayfront Hotel in Corpus Christi, Texas.

I am honored to know this fine family, and I want to let my colleagues in the House of Representatives know about these pioneers. Riley and Ella Mays moved to Robstown from Kosse, Texas, in 1912; they were the first black family to live in Robstown, which is a largely Hispanic enclave west of Corpus Christi in Nueces County in the Coastal Bend of Texas.

The Mays family is a distinguished and respected family in the community and in the Mt. Zion Missionary Baptist Church, which was founded by Riley Mays. Both Riley and Ella saw the need for a Baptist church in the area, so they acquired a building which doubled as a church and as the first black public school in the area.

Riley Mays was the first Deacon there and a Sunday School teacher until his death. Ella Mays was a nurse and the first president of the Mt. Zion Missionary Baptist Church's missionary society. They both directed the school there.

To commemorate the first black family to settle in Robstown and to honor the family patriarch, the city named a street in Riley Mays' honor. Shortly, a historical marker will be established at the Mt. Zion Missionary Baptist Church to pay tribute to the Mays family as well. The great and lasting legacy left to their family by Riley and Ella Mays is that the strength of the United States is found in the family unit.

This is the tradition that their descendants celebrate each day and it is the tradition that they will celebrate en masse August 6–8, when they hold their family reunion. Riley and Ella Mays had 14 children, and today have over 450 descendants who are active in their communities, schools and churches all over Texas and the United States.

I ask my colleague to join me in wishing them well as they gather to commemorate their families' tradition of service to community and country.

HONORING RONALD E. TEATER

HON. RONNIE SHOWS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I would like to take a minute to tell my fellow colleagues and the American people about Ronald E. Teater. Mr. Teater is a great, faithful and hardworking Mississippian. He is the kind of person who should serve as a role model for all of us.

I am telling you about Mr. Teater today because he is being honored this weekend by the Mendenhall, Mississippi Fire Department. Can you imagine being part of one organization for fifty years? Mr. Teater can because that is how long he has been faithfully serving the citizens of Mendenhall in their fire department. This dedication to the people of his community speaks loudly and clearly as to the good character of Mr. Teater.

Ronald E. Teater is an American who fought for his nation during World War II in the United States Navy. Mr. Teater has also served the people of Mendenhall as a town alderman. He has been a man for all seasons. He has given his time in making all of our lives safer and better.

And, I understand that Mr. Teater has no intentions of slowing down.

Just think about being a fireman for 50 years. Think about the countless people he has protected. Think about the folks he has helped and consoled. We can never be thankful enough to our nation's firefighters. And, Mr. Teater goes at the top of the list.

Ronald E. Teater is a person to admire, look up to and respect. He is a man that deserves our praise. To Mr. Teater I would like to say thank you. Thank you for serving, thank you for caring and thank you for giving your time, energy and efforts to make Mendenhall, Mississippi and America what they are today.

RECOGNIZING JACK QUINN

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the outstanding efforts and hard work of Mr. Jack Quinn. Because of his leadership, work ethic, and selection to participate in the Washington, DC Fannie Mae Partnership Summit, I now honor this remarkable man.

Mr. Quinn received a bachelor of science degree from Fairfield University and later earned a master of arts in public administration from the University of Northern Colorado. After finishing his education, he went on to serve the people of Colorado, specifically Pueblo, CO, in various capacities.

Jack Quinn has been an active participant in many housing organizations including Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, Colorado Housing Finance Authority, and Pueblo Neighborhood Housing Services. He was instrumental in founding the Mountain/Plains Regional Council of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials in 1973. Recently, he completed a 2-year term as National President of this association.

Mr. Quinn also takes an active role in his community, serving as the chairman of the board of St. Mary Corwin Regional Medical Center and chairman of the Finance Committee for Pueblo Community College Foundation. At one time, he also dedicated his time and energy to serving as Chairman of United Way. Presently, Mr. Jack Quinn works with the Pueblo Chamber of Commerce, the Latino Chamber of Commerce, and the State Fair.

Mr. Jack Quinn is a unique and valuable individual. Working for the Pueblo Housing Authority for over 30 years, he has served as Executive Director for 27 of those years. I greatly appreciate his role in leadership, his involvement and dedication to the Pueblo community, and the example he sets.

FINANCIAL FREEDOM ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1999

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today to express his qualified support for H.R. 2488, the Financial Freedom Act. At the outset, this Member thinks that a tax cut is very good for the American people and for the economy, but he wants to make sure that it is the right size and that it focuses on middle income Americans.

In particular, this Member also wants to see some of the future surplus funds used to reduce the national debt. By locking away some of the additional money for Social Security and Medicare, and by reasonable limits on the tax cut, we can devote more of any real surplus to retiring more of the national debt. At this Member's town hall meetings, he has found Nebraskans resoundingly in favor of reducing the national debt and many of his colleagues have told him that they have had the same experience. This Member is pleased to know that the manager's amendment to H.R. 2488 expresses the sense of Congress on its commitment to debt reduction and a national debt increase trigger which would annually block the across-the-board Federal income tax reduction if the amount of that debt interest outlay increases for total U.S. Federal Government debt from the amount of the previous year. This means there will be an iron-clad method to assure that there is a payment toward reducing the national debt.

This Member is confident that the size of the tax cut will be reduced in conference. He thinks that the proposed reduction in taxes

over the next 10 years may be too big because of overly optimistic budget surplus projections. This Member fully expects that after conference with the Senate this tax cut will be reduced in size.

In regards to inheritance taxes, this Member does not think the conference version of this tax bill should or will include a total elimination of the Federal inheritance tax in the case of ''super-wealthy'' individuals. While this Member wants to give inheritance tax relief to family farms and family small businesses by accelerating the exemption level for Federal inheritance taxes to $1 million, he does not think it is appropriate at this time to eliminate the Federal inheritance tax altogether for very wealthy individuals. Hopefully, the complete phase-out will be eliminated in the House-Senate Conference. Some say the super-wealthy don't pay inheritance tax anyway—that they in part give it to charities or establish foundations to avoid taxes. Of course that is an exaggeration, but certainly we don't want to reduce such charity or beneficial giving by eliminating the inheritance tax on the super-wealthy. The American society would surely be harmed.

This Member also notes that the legislation includes tax relief for private utilities with nuclear power plants in a state-deregulated environment. It is important to recognize that as states have taken action to deregulate, two unintended Federal tax problems have resulted. This bill addresses the nuclear decommissioning fund issue which affects private utilities. Unfortunately, the bill does not address the private-use issue which affects consumer-owned utilities. This Member hopes that during the conference, relief can also be provided to consumer-owned utilities which are also hindered by an outdated Federal tax law.

On a different note, this Member is quite pleased that two particular provisions are included in H.R. 2488 which will increase rural housing opportunities. In fact, this Member has been quite active during his entire tenure in promoting the need for adequate, affordable rural housing. First, H.R. 2488 includes an increase in the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program from $1.25 to $1.75 per capita. The bill phases in the increase by 10 cents per year from 2000 to 2004 until it reaches $1.75 and indexes it for inflation thereafter. This provision will give states additional resources in providing rural housing throughout America. Second, H.R. 2488 accelerates the phase in of the private activity cap to $75 per capita beginning in 2000. This provision will give additional capital for financing home purchases by low and moderate-income homebuyers in the mortgage revenue bond program.

Therefore, for the above reasons and others, this Member gives his qualified support to H.R. 2488, the Financial Freedom Act.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TEACHER TAX EXEMPTION ACT OF 1999

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation that would strengthen our national educational system by addressing the most important education issue facing the country, teacher quality.

My legislation will provide a financial bonus, in the form of a tax exemption, to qualified teachers who teach in schools where fifty-percent or more of the children qualify for free or reduced-price lunches.

There are many things we can do to increase teacher quality, and some steps are being attempted now through other legislation. But one of the most concrete and important steps we can take is to create real financial incentives for qualified individuals to teach in high-poverty schools.

For high poverty schools, attracting and retraining well-qualified teachers is a critical part of a comprehensive strategy to close the achievement gap between rich and poor students and between minority and non-minority students.

Schools serving low-income students have far too few adequately qualified teachers. Research suggests that this is one of the primary reasons that the achievement of low-income students lags behind that of more affluent students.

This achievement gap is both unnecessary and dangerous. All children can achieve at high levels if they are taught at high levels. The achievement gap threatens not only the life chances of millions of low-income students but also the civic and economic health of the country as a whole.

It is incumbent upon us to act quickly and decisively to correct it.

We have heard much about nationwide ''teacher shortages.'' Indeed, the U.S. Department of Education estimates that schools will need to hire 2 million teachers over the next decade.

But the real problem is not absolute teacher shortages, but rather shortages in specific geographical areas and in certain academic subjects. In particular, there is a dearth of teachers in particular subject areas—such as special and bilingual education, mathematics, and science. And there is a shortage of qualified teachers in underfunded schools, particularly in urban and rural districts.

For example, in the largest local educational agency in my Congressional district—the West Contra Costa County Unified School District—62% of all teachers hired this year are college interns or are teachers with emergency credentials. Because West Contra Costa is not as affluent as other neighboring school districts, and therefore cannot offer the same salaries and working conditions, it faces serious challenges in competing for qualified teachers.

Furthermore, even within the same school district, where schools offer the same salary schedules, emergency-certified teachers are overwhelmingly concentrated in the highest poverty schools. While the high-poverty schools 50% or more of the entire faculty is under-qualified, in other schools, just miles away, all teachers are fully-credentialed.

I believe that higher pay, along with ongoing professional development and support, especially for new teachers, can go a long way in leveling the educational playing field. Boosting pay in key professions is widely recognized as an effective strategy for maintaining quality. For example, the House Defense Appropriations bill for the Fiscal Year 2000 contains $300 million in bonuses to help retain qualified Air Force pilots.

We need to mount a similar effort nationwide to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers so that all children, regardless of where they live or their family background, have the opportunity for a world-class education.

My legislation would exempt the first $40,000 in salary for teachers teaching academic subjects in high-poverty schools—schools in which at least 50% of the students enrolled qualify for the free or reduced price lunch programs. It would increase take-home pay by about $5,900 for a qualified single teacher with the average national teacher salary of $40,000.

In order to qualify for the exemption, teachers who provide instruction would have to be qualified to provide instruction in each and every academic course they teach. Elementary school teachers would have to demonstrate teaching skill and general subject matter knowledge required to teach effectively in reading, writing, mathematics, social studies, science, and other elements of a liberal arts education. Middle school and secondary school teachers would have to demonstrate a high level of teaching skill and subject matter knowledge in the subjects they teach either by attaining passing scores on academic subject area tests or by holding a bachelor's degree with an academic major in each of the subject areas in which they provide instruction.

Qualified special education teachers and bilingual teachers also would be eligible for the exemption.

I believe a teacher salary tax exemption is an ideal way to solve several critical problems. It would strengthen education, and address the most important education issue facing the country, by steering high quality teachers to underperforming schools. And it would provide targeted tax relief to the middle class rather than an open-ended tax cut that benefits wealthier Americans without solving any critical particular social problem.

U.S. teachers teach more hours per day than their counterparts in other countries and take more work home to complete at night, on the weekends and holidays. At the same time, U.S. teachers must go into substantial debt to become prepared for a field that pays less than virtually any other occupation requiring a college degree.

I believe taxpayers are willing to direct additional resources to raise teacher salaries to a level commensurate with teachers' knowledge and skills and with the important role they play in our society. But I also think the public wants and deserves to know that such funds are being spent in an effective and responsible manner that results in improved academic achievement for students. That means tying increased pay to teacher qualifications and deploying our most talented teaches in the areas that are having the most difficult time attracting and retaining them.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in passing this important legislation.

CONGRATULATING MS. WILSON'S KINDERGARTEN CLASS

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a great day, on which thirty Kindergarten students from the Shady Lane

Elementary School reached all of the appropriate levels on their Terra Nova test. Ms. Martha Wilson's Kindergarten class is an outstanding group of young people. I wish the best of luck to the following group of kindergartners who shared this special day with me at the Shady Lane School: Courtney Callahan, Nicholas Battee, Jaimie Beeker, Destiny Bingham, Brian Buck, John Childress, Robert Kilcourse, Kody McMichael, Marisa Peters, Matthews Raively, Deborah Robinson, Karen Sabater, Donald Smith, Richard Smith, Marcus Smith, Ayana Thomas, Jessica Welch, George Williams, and Nylan Wolcott.

RECOGNIZING CHICAGO BOTANIC GARDEN'S BUEHLER ENABLING GARDEN

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to recognize one of the most beautiful places in my District, the Chicago Botanic Garden, and to celebrate the Garden's grand opening of the Buehler Enabling Garden.

The Chicago Botanic Garden is a clear leader in horticultural therapy and barrier-free gardening. It is only fitting that in the year that our nation celebrates the 10th anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Chicago Botanic Garden celebrates the grand opening of a beautiful and unique 11,000-square-foot garden design to encourage lifelong gardening for people of all ages and abilities. Over two years of design and construction work culminated in the July 17th and 18th grand opening of the Buehler Enabling Garden, a garden that will serve to demonstrate an array of techniques that can make gardening fully accessible to people with disabilities.

For millions of individuals, gardening offers relaxation, social involvement, exercise, and a sense of accomplishment. Unfortunately, for people with disabilities, gardening may be cumbersome and difficult. The Chicago Botanic Garden's Buehler Enabling Garden, however, is not only barrier-free but its plant materials and garden structures have been carefully chosen to accommodate people with disabilities and older adults. The Enabling Garden is intended to serve as a model for people with disabilities, human service professionals and landscape architects. In fact, on July 28th, the Chicago Botanic Garden will hold a symposium for professionals in the health, human service and design fields to learn how to transfer techniques learned at the Enabling Garden to their own institutions or their own backyards.

Some of the examples of such gardening techniques are raising flower bed and containers, building vertical gardens and hanging baskets on pulley systems, and providing adequate seating, shade, water and paving within the garden for the disabled. The Buehler Enabling Garden also exhibits a wide range of devices, tools and plants that contribute to accessibility and sensory appeal for the sight-impaired. Appropriate tools used in an enabling garden are generally small and lightweight or have large, foam-padded handles that are easy to manipulate. In addition, the variety of plants that are best suited for an enabling garden could include fragrant or textural plants for those people with visual impairments, or dwarf plants in containers or hanging baskets that can bring gardening activities within easy reach.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Chicago Botanic Gardens is sharing its expertise in horticultural therapy to make gardening accessible to people of all abilities. I invite all Members to join me in recognizing the grand opening of the Buehler Enabling Garden at the Chicago Botanic Garden.

RECOGNIZING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CASPIAN CITY MANAGER ROSALIE KING

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dedicated public servant who has served her small northern Michigan community of Caspian for almost a quarter of a century.

A reception for Rosalie King tonight celebrates her many services to the residents of Caspian. Although I can't be at that event, I'd like to share some thoughts with you and House colleagues on her work.

Let me first remark on the kind of community in which Rosalie has worked since 1978.

Much of northern Michigan was settled in the late 1800s. Most of these towns in northern Michigan were part of an early boom in such industries as mining—both copper and iron mining—and timber. By the turn of the century, many of these settlements had become communities. In the next quarter century services, such as water and wastewater treatment and brick streets, were added to these many small towns.

The problem faced by many of these towns is the aging of this basic infrastructure. Water pipes no longer provide pressure sufficient for adequate fire protection, and in some cases they sustain failures because of frost heaving or age-related problems that force continuous and expensive repairs.

More important, with the boom years far behind, basic infrastructure does not permit the development of industrial parks or the rehabilitation of downtowns that can be the basis for economic redevelopment.

It has been in the area of pursuing grants for this kind of community maintenance and redevelopment that Rosalie King has excelled. As the city manager of Caspian she has successfully won millions in grants and equally successfully administered them, making future grant acquisition more likely.

I have had the pleasure of being able to work with the dynamic community leader who has fought so long and hard for the betterment of the citizens she serves. Rosalie personifies the best of what local leadership can be and she has demonstrated the best that programs like Rural Development can be in terms of helping small communities maintain a quality of life and an ability to maintain and even attract economic investment. Other northern Michigan communities look to Caspian as an inspiration and a model for community pride and leadership.

But Rosalie King has been more to her community than a public official. She is one of those rare individuals who has been able to give complete dedication to all areas of her life, family, church and community. In addition, she has been interested and involved in recreation programs, especially hockey.

I know Rosalie will continue to dedicate her many talents to the friends and neighbors that make up the Caspian community. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to join me in this salute to Rosalie King, a dynamic city manager, as she brings to a close a long distinguished career.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE GRAND OPENING OF THE EASTMONT COMPUTING CENTER FOR THE OAKLAND COMMUNITY

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Eastmont Computing Center, located in East Oakland, California, on its grand opening. This multi-million dollar computing center is a project of The Oakland Citizens Committee for Urban Renewal (OCCUR), which was established in Oakland, California in 1954 for the purpose of raising the quality of life for all of Oakland's residents, with the emphasis on serving those in the greatest need of a balanced delivery of goods, effective public policy, and services. OCCUR created the Eastmont Computing Center (ECC) to serve as a community resource on information technologies in order to provide universal computer and Internet access and employment focused training to Oakland citizens.

The Eastmont Computing Center provides cutting-edge information technology training to youth and other residents of under-served communities. The Center provides a broad range of unique skills and employment training programs to youth, senior citizens, and community-based organizations.

The Center is one of only three California recipients of the highly competitive U.S. Department of Commerce Telecommunications and Information Infrastructure Assistance Program grants. Additional funding for the Center is provided by a number of government, foundation, corporate and individual donors including the Eastmont Town Center, Pacific Gas and Electric, Chevron, Pacific Bell, The San Francisco Foundation, Oracle, Hewlett Packard and IBM.

I wish to commend the management and staff of the Eastmont Computing Center for their tireless work and for their diligence. It has been through their perseverance that they have garnered the resources necessary to establish and operate this training facility for the benefit of all the citizens of Oakland.

I wish to extend to the Eastmont Computing Center, its staff, donors and support volunteers sincere best wishes for success as they begin to deliver technology access and employment training services to the citizens of Oakland.

HONORING RAYDELL MOORE'S 35 YEARS AS A POSTAL UNION NATIONAL OFFICER

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the recognition of Mr. Raydell Moore of Long Beach, California by the American Postal Union (APWU), AFL–CIO, as one of their longest serving national officers. Mr. Moore has served APWU proudly for 35 years as a national officer in the western region.

Mr. Moore was born in Austin, Texas and received has formal education there. While in high school, he played football and was a teammate of Dick (Night-Train) Layne who later played for the Detroit Lions. Mr. Moore graduated from Tillitson College with a B.A. Degree in Chemistry.

Mr. Moore served in the U.S. Air Force beginning in 1945. After his discharge, he began his employment with the Postal Service in June 1952 and later became active with the Union in Long Beach, California.

He was the Executive Vice President of the Long Beach Local in 1963 and became Executive Vice President of the California National Postal Union in 1964.

In 1964, Mr. Moore became the National Postal Union Regional Representative and held that position until 1971, while also serving as the Long Beach Local President between 1965 and 1971. In 1971, the American Postal Workers Union, AFL–CIO was formed and Mr. Moore was the APWU National Representative between 1971 and 1977. His position was to represent the union at regional level labor-management meetings and resolve disputes with the region on both contract interpretation and employee discipline.

In 1977, Mr. Moore was elected Western Regional Coordinator for the entire Western Region of APWU, the largest geographic area in the United States, representing 13 states and Pacific territories. Mr. Moore has been re-elected every election since then and is one of only 12 officers to serve on APWU's National Executive Board, the highest ranking authority of the APWU.

Mr. Moore has served APWU and its former unions for 35 years with distinction; one of the longest consecutive tenures in labor history. I am proud to salute him for his generous service to the union and the people of the western region of the United States.

MAJOR DRUG TRANSIT COUNTRY ACT OF 1999, H.R. 2608

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, a front page story in last Friday's Miami Herald indicates the Administration has launched a full scale review of the role of Cuba in the drug trade. It's a review that along with many others here in the Congress we fully welcome. We look forward to seeing the Administration's conclusions on Cuba's links to drug trafficking targeting the United States.

The Miami Herald also points out that as part of the State Department's review, lawyers are having a hard time sorting out what a ''major'' drug transiting nation may be under federal law, and whether the designation of a ''major'' transit nation should take into account drugs that may just pass over Cuban skies or through its territorial waters on the way to the USA.

While a common sense interpretation of the law should assume that these illicit drugs, either passing over the skies of Cuba or through its territorial waters should be considered a factor in determining whether a nation is a major drug transiting country that substantially impacts the U.S., there appears to be some confusion down at Foggy Bottom.

The bill I introduced today, H.R. 2608 along with Chairman BURTON is very simple, addressing this issue of the major transiting nation list determination under the Foreign Assistance Act Section 481(e) as relates to drugs headed for the USA. This bill merely clarifies that the term ''through which is transported'' in fact expressly includes drugs passing through the territorial airspace, land and water of a country on the way to our nation. There should be no need for any more legal resource time on this issue.

It will be my intention to move this simple, non-controversial clarification bill through the House International Relations Committee quickly.

There should be no further confusion on this matter, so that the full review of the Cuban illicit narcotics situation not be distracted by endless debate over something as obvious as drugs passing over the skies of Cuba or being dropped into or moving through Cuban waters on the way to our cities and local communities.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the full text of the bill to clarify this situation.

H.R. 2608

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.

Section 481(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''For purposes of paragraph (5)(B), the term 'through which are transported' includes the territorial airspace, land, and water of a country.''.

DON'T WRITE OFF RURAL AMERICA

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, rural America is hurting these days and the rest of the country should take notice. The current period of relative economic prosperity has abandoned most sectors of the agriculture economy, often because of deliberate decisions made at the White House.

For example, U.S. trade policy presently favors manufactured products, high tech equipment, and medical supplies in exchange for easy access to American markets for foreign farmers. Nor are trade policies fair for our farmers and ranchers, Mr. Speaker. Foreign growers enjoy far easier access to our markets than we do to theirs.

Westerners tend to be closely tied to agriculture. That's why so many of my rural constituents find it hard to believe there are actually people in Washington, D.C. who harbor hostility toward them.

Just last month, Mr. Speaker, after his party voted against several rural issues, the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee chairman told reporters Democrats have ''written off the rural areas.'' The DCCC Chairman Rep. PATRICK KENNEDY (R.I.) later admitted he shouldn't have said it. I agree, but he did, and in doing so illustrated the disdain with which some in Congress view rural America.

Coloradans understand America must count on rural areas, not dismiss them. Statistics confirm the importance of rural settings. Agriculture is still America's number one employer providing more jobs, more business transactions, more entrepreneurial opportunities, and more paychecks than any other sector of the economy.

In Colorado alone, agriculture accounts for over 86,000 jobs, resulting in over $12 billion of commerce. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, agriculture is integral to our economy and should not be ignored or ''written off.''

Colorado produces an impressive variety of commodities in addition to cattle, wheat, corn, potatoes, sugar beets and dairy products. Growers also raise pinto beans, peaches, carrots, mushrooms, barley, sunflowers, watermelon, oats, sorghum, quinoa and wine grapes. Our ranchers' expertise raising cattle, sheep, lambs, poultry and hogs, is expanding to include specialty livestock—bison, elk, emus, ostriches, and fish.

Agricultural products extend beyond food. Colorado is well-known for its production of fresh-cut flowers, sod and turf grass, and hay. Colorado's agricultural-based inputs also contribute vital components to the manufacturing of soaps, plastics, bandages, x-ray film, linoleum, shoes, crayons, paper, shaving cream, tires, and beer.

As consumers, rural Americans provide markets for goods and services, injecting much-needed capital into the marketplace. Rural purchases of trucks, tractors, houses, implements, fuel, computers, and other items have an enormous impact on the economy providing jobs and income for salespeople, waitresses, homebuilders, real estate agents, feed dealers, mechanics, and bank tellers just to name a few.

Still there are other reasons rural America matters. Colorado boasts over 24,000 farms and ranches, accounting for over half of our state's 66 million acres. People who live on the land are the best environmental stewards. Landowners work actively with soil conservation districts to protect water resources, manage wind erosion, reduce pollution, and control water runoff. In fact, Colorado's farmers are credited with saving an additional 51 million tons of topsoil annually for the past 10 years. They have also seeded 1.9 million acres of private land to permanent grassland under the Conservation Reserve Program, thereby producing thriving wildlife habitat.

Most of all, Mr. Speaker, America's soul is found in its rural communities. A nation launched by planters and preachers, America's founding strength was mustered and sustained by the moral character of rural people. Their values of hard work, honesty, integrity,

self-reliance and faith in God thrive in abundance today.

It is truly unfortunate anyone finds such attributes offensive. These are the very values our country needs if the new Millennium is to be as prosperous as the present.

Clearly, rural America is the bedrock of our Republic. Before more of Washington's elite determine otherwise, they would do well to check their facts, consider the farmer, and possibly even say a word of thanks before supper.

LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION BICENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. BARON P. HILL

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1999

Mr. HILL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my support for H.R. 1033, the Lewis and Clark Expedition Bicentennial Commemorative Coin Act.

This bill will authorize the Department of the Treasury to mint 500,000 one-dollar coins to commemorate the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

Mr. Speaker, many people don't realize it, but the expedition of these historic partners began at the Falls of the Ohio, in southern Indiana.

In October of 1803, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark joined with other explorers at the Falls of the Ohio to set off on their journey to explore the Louisiana Purchase. The crew departed on October 26, 1803, thus marking Clarksville, Indiana as the actual point of origin for the Lewis and Clark Expedition. From there, the Explorers' remarkable adventures spanned over 8,000 miles of unknown land.

Mr. Speaker, the residents of southern Indiana are proud of this heritage. Currently the three communities of Jeffersonville, Clarksville and New Albany are working together to build the Ohio River Greenway—an extensive project to revitalize the southern Indiana riverfront. The intended completion date for this project is set for 2003, just in time for these three communities to come together in celebration of the 200 year anniversary of the beginning of the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

This bill will help highlight the extraordinary expedition by Lewis and Clark and will provide support for the National Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Council and the National Park Service in efforts to plan and organize events to commemorate the bicentennial of this historic expedition.

And no commemoration would be complete without noting southern Indiana's part in the Lewis and Clark story. I encourage all Americans wishing to retrace the steps of the explorers or to learn more about the importance of the expedition to our nation, to visit the Falls of the Ohio and surrounding area.

I am proud that Congress is taking the initiative to promote and support the commemoration of such a remarkable piece of our American history.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 27, 1999 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 28

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 979, to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide for further self-governance by Indian tribes.

SR–485

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. Con. Res. 28, urging the Congress and the President to increase funding for the Pell Grant Program and existing Campus-Based Aid Programs; S. 976, to amend title V of the Public Health Service Act to focus the authority of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration on community-based services children and adolescents, to enhance flexibility and accountability, to establish programs for youth treatment, and to respond to crises, especially those related to children and violence; and S. 632, to provide assistance for poison prevention and to stabilize the funding of regional poison control centers, and pending nominations.

SD–430

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting to markup S. 25, to provide Coastal Impact Assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people; S. 244, to authorize the construction of the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System and to authorize assistance to the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System, Inc., a nonprofit corporation, for the planning and construction of the water supply system; S. 1330, to give the city of Mesquite, Nevada, the right to purchase at fair market value certain parcels of public land in the city; and S. 1329, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to Nye County, Nevada.

SD–366

Rules and Administration

To hold oversight hearings on the operations of the Smithsonian Institution.

SR–301

10 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the Monetary Policy Report to Congress pursuant to the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978.

SH–216

Judiciary

To hold hearings on how to combat methamphetamine proliferation in America.

SD–628

11 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Business meeting to markup S. 720, to promote the development of a government in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) based on democratic principles and the rule of law, and that respects internationally recognized human rights, to assist the victims of Serbian oppression, to apply measures against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and proposed legislation to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons; and to authorize appropriations for the provision of security assistance to certain foreign countries.

SD–419

2 p.m.

Foreign Relations

International Economic Policy, Export and Trade Promotion Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the activites of the Agency for International Development and United States climate change policy.

SD–419

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Water and Power Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 624, to authorize construction of the Fort Peck Reservation Rural Water System in the State of Montana; S. 1211, to amend the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act to authorize additional measures to carry out the control of salinity upstream of Imperial Dam in a cost-effective manner; S. 1275, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to produce and sell products and to sell publications relating to the Hoover Dam, and to deposit revenues generated from the sales into the Colorado River Dam fund; S. 1236, to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act for commencement of the construction of the Arrowrock Dam Hydroelectric Project in the State of Idaho; S. 1377, to amend the Central Utah Project Completion Act regarding the use of funds for water development for the Bonneville Unit; and S. 986, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Griffith Project to the Southern Nevada Water Authority.

SD–366

JULY 29

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia

Subcommittee

To hold hearings on total quality management, focusing on state success stories as a model for the Federal Government.

SD–342

Environment and Public Works

Clean Air, Wetlands, Private Property, and Nuclear Safety Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed sulfur standard for gasoline as contained in the proposed Tier Two standards for automobiles.

SD–406

Year 2000 Technology Problem

To hold hearings on year 2000 Information Cordination Center.

SD–192

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Oceans and Fisheries Subcommittee

To hold hearings on authorizing funds for programs of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act.

SR–253

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Employment, Safety and Training Subcommittee

To hold hearings on certain implications of the Fair Act on small businesses.

SD–430

10 a.m.

Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 1255, to protect consumers and promote electronic commerce by amending certain trademark infringement, dilution, and counterfeiting laws; S. 486, to provide for the punishment of methoamphetamine laboratory operators, provide additional resources to combat methamphetamine production, trafficking, and abuse in the United States; the nomination of Richard A. Paez, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit; and the nomination of Alejandro N. Mayorkas, of California, to be United States Attorney for the Central District of California.

SD–628

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Securities Subcommittee

To hold hearings on accounting for loan loss reserves.

SD–538

2 p.m.

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters.

SH–219

2:15 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 710, to authorize the feasibility study on the preservation of certain Civil War battlefields along the Vicksburg Campaign Trail; S. 905, to establish the Lackawanna Valley American Heritage Area; S. 1093, to establish the Galisteo Basin Archaeological Protection Sites, to provide for the protection of archaeological sites in the Galisteo Basin of New Mexico; S. 1117, to establish the Corinth Unit of Shiloh National Military Park, in the vicinity of the city of Corinth, Mississippi, and in the State of Tennessee; S. 1324, to expand the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include Wills House; and S. 1349, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct special resource studies to determine the national significance of specific sites as well as the suitability and feasibility of their inclusion as units of the National Park System.

SD–366

3 p.m.
Foreign Relations
European Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on prospects for democracy in Yugoslavia.
SD–419

JULY 30

10 a.m.
Foreign Relations
International Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on United States policy toward victims of torture.
SD–419

AUGUST 3

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 1052, to implement further the Act (Public Law 94–241) approving the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America.
SD–366

Armed Services
To hold hearings on the nomination of Charles A. Blanchard, of Arizona, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Army; and the nomination of Carol DiBattiste, of Florida, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.
SR–222

10 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to provide equitable compensation to the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe.
SR–485

10:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia
Subcommittee
To hold hearings on overlap and duplication in the Federal Food Safety System.
SD–342

2:30 p.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 692, to prohibit Internet gambling.
SR–485

AUGUST 4

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 299, to elevate the position of Director of the Indian Health Service within the Department of Health and Human Services to Assistant Secretary for Indian Health; and S. 406, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to make permanent the demonstration program that allows for direct billing of medicare, medicaid, and other third party payors, and to expand the eligibility under such program to other tribes and tribal organizations; followed by a business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SR–485

2:15 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to review the performance management process under the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act, by the National Park Service.
SD–366

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine fraud against seniors.
SR–253

SEPTEMBER 28

9:30 a.m.
Veterans Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the American Legion.
345 Cannon Building

POSTPONEMENTS

JULY 28

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine telecommunication mergers and consolidation.
SR–253

Daily Digest
Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S9171–S9314

Measures Introduced: Nine bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1429–1437, S. Res. 162–163, and S. Con. Res. 48. **Pages S9223–24**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1429, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 104 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2000. (S. Rept. No. 106–120)

Report to accompany S. 692, to prohibit Internet gambling. (S. Rept. No. 106–121) **Page S9223**

Measures Passed:

Enforcement of Senate Rule 16: By 53 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 222), Senate agreed to S. Res. 160, to restore enforcement of Rule 16, after taking action on the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S9171–74, S9176–90, S9192–96, S9199–S9209**

Rejected:

By 47 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 221), Daschle Amendment No. 1343, to provide that the presiding officer of the Senate shall apply all precedents of the Senate under Rule XXVIII in effect at the conclusion of the 103rd Congress. **Pages S9207–09**

Senate Legal Counsel: Senate agreed to S. Res. 162, to authorize testimony of employee of the Senate in *State of New Mexico* v. *Felix Lucero Chavez.* **Page S9304**

Federal Research Investment: Senate passed S. 296, to provide for continuation of the Federal research investment in a fiscally sustainable way, after agreeing to committee amendments, and the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S9304–09**

Gorton (for Frist) Amendment No. 1349, to provide certain technical changes. **Page S9307**

Veterans Benefits Improvement Act: Committee on Veterans' Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2280, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in rates of compensation paid for service-connected disabilities, to enhance the compensation, memorial affairs, and housing programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to improve retirement authorities applicable to judges of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, and the bill was then passed, after striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of S. 1393, Senate companion measure. **Page S9311**

Subsequently, S. 1393 was placed back on the Senate calendar. **Page S9311**

Educational Assistance Improvement: Senate passed S. 1402, to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance programs providing education benefits for veterans. **Page S9311**

Juvenile Justice: Senate began consideration of H.R. 1501, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide grants to ensure increased accountability for juvenile offenders; to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to provide quality prevention programs and accountability programs relating to juvenile delinquency, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S9209–11**

Pending:

Lott Amendment No. 1344, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S9209–11**

Lott Amendment No. 1345 (to Amendment No. 1344), to provide that the bill will become effective one day after enactment. **Pages S9209–11**

Lott Amendment No. 1346 (to Amendment No. 1345), to provide that the bill will become effective two days after enactment. **Pages S9209–11**

Lott Amendment No. 1347 (to the language proposed to be stricken), to provide that the bill will become effective three days after enactment. **Pages S9210–11**

Lott Amendment No. 1348 (to Amendment No. 1347), to provide that the bill will become effective four days after enactment. **Pages S9210–11**

A motion was entered to close further debate on Amendment No. 1344 (listed above) and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on the cloture motion will occur at 9:45 a.m., on Wednesday, July 28, 1999. **Page S9209**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on the cloture motion will occur at a time to be determined. **Page S9209**

Subsequently, the vote on the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to the bill was vitiated. **Page S9209**

Commerce/Justice/State Appropriations Amendments: By unanimous-consent, the following amendments to S. 1217, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000 (passed by the Senate on Thursday, July 22, 1999) were agreed to: **Pages S9309–11**

Gorton (for Gregg) Amendment No. 1350, to make certain technical corrections. **Pages S9309–11**

Gorton (for Leahy) Amendment No. 1351, to restore funding for United States Sentencing Commission. **Pages S9309–11**

Gorton (for Nickles) Amendment No. 1352, to modify the circumstances under which attorney's fees in Federal capital cases can be disclosed. **Pages S9309–11**

Gorton (for Durbin) Amendment No. 1353, to ensure that current Federal family violence prevention programs are sensitive to the needs of all Americans including seniors and the disabled. **Pages S9309–11**

Messages From the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting a report on progress toward achieving benchmarks in Bosnia; referred to the Committee on Armed Services. (PM–51). **Page S9216**

Transmitting reports entitled ''Motor Vehicle Safety'' and ''Highway Safety'' for calendar years 1996; referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. (PM–52). **Page S9216**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Routine list in the Navy. **Pages S9313–14**

Messages From the President: **Page S9216**

Communications: **Pages S9216–18**

Petitions: **Pages S9218–23**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S9223**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S9224–34**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S9234–36**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S9236–S9301**

Notices of Hearings: **Page S9301**

Authority for Committees: **Page S9301**

Additional Statements: **Pages S9301–03**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—222) **Page S9209**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 11 a.m., and adjourned at 7:10 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Tuesday, July 27, 1999. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S9313.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: On Friday, July 23, Committee concluded hearings on the nomination of Michael A. Sheehan, of New Jersey, to be Coordinator for Counterterrorism, Department of State, with the rank and status of Ambassador at Large, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

NOMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded hearings on the nomination of Evelyn Simonowitz Lieberman, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Biden, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 6 public bills, H.R. 2607–2612, were introduced. **Pages H6423–24**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

Filed on July 23, H.R. 850, to amend title 18, United States Code, to affirm the rights of United States persons to use and sell encryption and to relax export controls on encryption, amended (H. Rept. 106–117, Part 4);

Filed on July 23, H.R. 850, to amend title 18, United States Code, to affirm the rights of United States persons to use and sell encryption and to relax export controls on encryption, amended (H. Rept. 106–117, Part 5);

Filed on July 23, H.R. 2605, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal

year ending September 30, 2000 (H. Rept. 106–253);

Filed on July 23, H.R. 2606, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000 (H. Rept. 106–254);

H.R. 468, to establish the Saint Helena Island National Scenic Area, amended (H. Rept. 106–255);

H.R. 695, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to convey an administrative site in San Juan County, New Mexico, to San Juan College, amended (H. Rept. 106–256);

H.R. 841, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain works, facilities, and titles of the Gila Project, and designated lands within or adjacent to the Gila Project, to the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District, amended (H. Rept. 106–257);

H.R. 862, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to implement the provisions of the Agreement conveying title to a Distribution System from the United States to the Clear Creek Community Services District (H. Rept. 106–258);

H.R. 992, to convey the Sly Park Dam and Reservoir to the El Dorado Irrigation District, amended (H. Rept. 106–259);

H.R. 1019, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey lands and interests comprising the Carlsbad Irrigation Project to the Carlsbad Irrigation District, New Mexico (H. Rept. 106–260);

H.R. 2079, to provide for the conveyance of certain National Forest System lands in the State of South Dakota (H. Rept. 106–261);

H.J. Res. 57, disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China, Adverse (H. Rept. 106–262);

H. Res. 260, providing for consideration of H.R. 2587, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000 (H. Rept. 106–263); and

H. Res. 261, providing for consideration of H.R. 2605, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000 (H. Rept. 106–264); **Page H6423**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Gibbons as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6355**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:32 p.m. and reconvened at 2:00 p.m. **Page H6355**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Lake Oconee Land Exchange Act: S. 604, to authorize and direct the Archivist of the United States to make available for public use the records of the House of Representatives Select Committee on Missing Persons in Southeast Asia—clearing the measure for the President; **Pages H6356–58**

Export-Import Bank Board of Directors Quorum Requirement: H.R. 2565, as amended, to clarify the quorum requirement for the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States; **Pages H6358–59**

Records of the Select Committee on Missing Persons in Southeast Asia: H. Res. 172, to authorize and direct the Archivist of the United States to make available for public use the records of the House of Representatives Select Committee on Missing Persons in Southeast Asia; **Pages H6359–60**

Organ Donor Leave Act: H.R. 457, to amend title 5, United States Code, to increase the amount of leave time available to a Federal employee in any year in connection with serving as an organ donor; **Pages H6360–62**

Technical Corrections to Digital Copyright Law: S. 1260, to make technical corrections in title 17, United States Code, and other laws—clearing the measure for the President; **Pages H6362–63**

Trademark Amendments Act: S. 1259, to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 relating to dilution of famous marks—clearing the measure for the President; and **Pages H6363–64**

Patent Fee Integrity and Innovation Act: S. 1258, to authorize funds for the payment of salaries and expenses of the Patent and Trademark Office—clearing the measure for the President. **Pages H6364–65**

Recess: The House recessed at 4:45 p.m. and reconvened at 6:01 p.m. **Page H6377**

Regulatory Right-to-Know Act: The House passed H.R. 1074, to provide Governmentwide accounting of regulatory costs and benefits, by a recorded vote of 254 ayes to 157 noes, Roll No. 336. **Pages H6365–79**

Agreed to the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order by the rule. **Page H6378**

Agreed to the McIntosh en bloc amendment that makes technical corrections specifying that the OMB Director submits the reports; delays the requirement for the analysis of impacts on public health and safety, the environment, consumer protection, equal opportunity, and other public policy goals; and exempts any matter relating to monetary policy. **Pages H6373–74**

Rejected the Hoeffel amendment that sought to require an analysis on the extent to which costs imposed on incorporated entities by regulatory programs are offset by Federal subsidies, including grants and preferential loans; limits expenditures to carry out the act to $1 million; and sunsets the act at the end of 4 years, rejected by a recorded vote of 192 ayes to 217 noes, Roll No. 335. **Pages H6374–78**

H. Res. 258, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill was agreed to on July 23.

Presidential Messages: Read the following messages from the President:

Sustainable Peace Process: Message wherein he transmitted the 6-month periodic report on the progress made toward achieving benchmarks for a sustainable peace process—referred to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 106–155); and **Page H6379**

Department of Transportation Reports: Message wherein he transmitted 1996 calendar year reports prepared by the Department of Transportation—referred to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Commerce. **Page H6379**

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate appears on page H6355.

Amendments Ordered Printed: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H6424–25.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H6378 and H6378–79. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 11:25 p.m.

Committee Meetings

VA, HUD, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies approved for full committee action, the VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies appropriations for fiscal year 2000.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, an open rule providing 1 hour of debate on H.R. 2605, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000. The rule waives clause 4(a) of rule XIII (requiring a 3 day layover of the committee report) against consideration of the bill. The rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI (prohibiting unauthorized or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill) and clause 5(a) of rule XXI (prohibiting a tax or tariff provision in a bill not reported by a committee with jurisdiction over revenue measures) against provisions in the bill, except as otherwise specified in the rule. The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the Congressional Record. The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce voting time to five minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a fifteen minute vote. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Packard and Visclosky.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Rules: The Committee granted, by voice vote, an open rule providing 1 hour of debate on H.R. 2587, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000. The rule waives clause 4(c) of rule XIII (requiring a three-day availability of printed hearings on a general appropriations bill), section 306 (prohibiting consideration of legislation within the Budget Committee's jurisdiction, unless reported by the Budget Committee, and section 401 (prohibiting consideration of legislation providing new entitlement authority which becomes effective during the current fiscal year) of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill. The rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI (prohibiting unauthorized or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill) against provisions in the bill. The rule makes in order the amendments printed in the Rules Committee report which may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled between the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the Congressional Record. The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce voting time to five minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a fifteen minute vote. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. Testimony was

heard from Representatives Istook, Tiahrt, Barr of Georgia, Bilbray, Moran of Virginia and Norton.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D859)*

H.R. 4, to declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense. Signed July 22, 1999. (P.L. 106–38)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 27, 1999

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: to hold hearings on agricultural concentration and anti-trust issues, 9:30 a.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Communications, to hold hearings on privacy issues on the internet, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management, to hold hearings on S. 930, to provide for the sale of certain public land in the Ivanpah Valley, Nevada, to the Clark County, Nevada, Department of Aviation; S. 719, to provide for the orderly disposal of certain Federal land in the State of Nevada and for the acquisition of environmentally sensitive land in the State; S. 1030, to provide that the conveyance by the Bureau of Land Management of the surface estate to certain land in the State of Wyoming in exchange for certain private land will not result in the removal of the land from operation of the mining laws; S. 1288, to provide incentives for collaborative forest restoration projects on National Forest System and other public lands in New Mexico; S. 1374, to authorize the development and maintenance of a multiagency campus project in the town of Jackson, Wyoming; and S. 439, to amend the National Forest and Public Lands of Nevada Enhancement Act of 1988 to adjust the boundary of the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: business meeting to mark up S. 1090, to reauthorize and amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Liability, and Compensation Act of 1980, 9:30 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Health Care, to hold hearings on S. 662, to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide medical assistance for certain women screened and found to have breast or cervical cancer under a federally funded screening program, 2:30 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on African Affairs, to hold hearings to examine barriers to trade and investment in Africa, 2:15 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine innovations in child care programs, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Criminal Justice Oversight, to hold oversight hearings on activities of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, 2 p.m., SD–628.

House

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing on H.R. 623, to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to eliminate certain regulation of plumbing supplies, 2 p.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommitte on Finance and Hazardous Materials, hearing on the Impact of Market Volatility in Securities Transaction Fees, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health and Environment, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 2130, Hillory J. Farias Date-Rape Prevention Drug Act of 1999; and H.R. 2506, Health Research and Quality Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, hearing on Title I: What's Happening at the School District and School Building Level, 1:30 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on Census, hearing on Oversight of the 2000 Census: Examining the Bureau's Paid Advertising Campaign, 10 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Civil Service, hearing on Life Insurance: New Options for Federal Employees; and to mark up H.R. 915, to authorize a cost of living adjustment in the pay of administrative law judges, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1752, Federal Courts Improvement Act of 1999; H.R. 2112, Multidistrict, Multiparty, Multiforum Trial Jurisdiction Act of 1999; H.R. 2260, Pain Relief Promotion Act of 1999; and H.R. 1875, Interstate Class Action Jurisdiction Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, to consider H.R. 2606, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, 1 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Empowerment, hearing to discuss ''The Digital Divide: Bridging The Technological Gap'', 2 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Government Programs and Oversight, hearing on the burden that needless regulations and lack of common sense in enforcement of regulations place upon Small Businesses, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, Hazardous Materials and Pipeline Transportation, hearing on reauthorization of the Natural Gas and Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Program, 11 a.m., 2253 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Ground Transportation, hearing on TEA 21 Environmental Streamlining Provisions, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence, executive, hearing on Y2K, 10 a.m., H–405 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Tuesday, July 27

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 10 a.m.), Senate expects to begin consideration of S. 1292, Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations, and/or any other available appropriation bills.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m., for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Tuesday, July 27

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of H.J. Res. 57, Disapproving the Extension of Normal Trade Relations to the Products of the People's Republic of China (Unanimous Consent Agreement, Three Hours of General Debate);

Consideration of H.R. 2605, Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2000 (Open Rule, One Hour of General Debate); and

Consideration of H.R. 2587, District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2000 (Open Rule, One Hour of General Debate).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Andrews, Robert E., N.J., E1653
Bereuter, Doug, Nebr., E1652
Burton, Dan, Ind., E1648
Gilman, Benjamin A., N.Y., E1655
Hill, Baron P., Ind., E1656
Hobson, David L., Ohio, E1647
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E1654
McInnis, Scott, Colo., E1648, E1650, E1652
Matsui, Robert T., Calif., E1647, E1648
Millender-McDonald, Juanita, Calif., E1647
Miller, George, Calif., E1653
Ortiz, Solomon P., Tex., E1652
Porter, John Edward, Ill., E1654
Rohrabacher, Dana, Calif., E1650
Sanders, Bernard, Vt., E1649
Saxton, Jim, N.J., E1648, E1651
Schaffer, Bob, Colo., E1655
Shows, Ronnie, Miss., E1649, E1652
Stupak, Bart, Mich., E1654
Traficant, James A., Jr., Ohio, E1650
Waters, Maxine, Calif., E1655

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling Toll Free 1–888–293–6498 or (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $165.00 for six months, $325.00 per year, or purchased for $2.75 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (202) 512–1800, or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.