By Mr. COCHRAN:

S. 2482. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to designate certain entities organized to participate in States workmen's compensation assigned risk insurance plans as tax-exempt entities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 2483. A bill to establish programs regarding early detection, diagnosis, and interventions for newborns and infants with hearing loss; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BIDEN, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. REID, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. 2484. 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORTON:

S. 2485. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow States to use the funds available under the State children's health insurance program for enhanced matching rate for coverage of additional children under the medicaid program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KERREY:

S. 2486. A bill for the relief of Luis A. Gonzalez and Virginia Aguilla Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 2487. A bill to amend The Equal Access Act to provide equal access for elementary and secondary school groups to expense reimbursement and materials, and to provide equal access for community groups to meeting space; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 2488. A bill to establish the Northwest Straits Advisory Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DODD, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BOND, Mr. KERRY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, and Mr. REID):

S. Res. 278. A resolution designating the 30th day of April of 1999, as ''Dia de los Ninos: Celebrating Young Americans'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. Con. Res. 118. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Rotunda on September 23, 1998, for the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to Nelson Mandela; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCTED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 2477. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a program under which long-term care insurance may be obtained by Federal employees and annuitants; to the Committee on Government Affairs.

CIVIL SERVICE LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE BENEFIT ACT

• Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I introduce the Civil Service Long-Term Care Insurance Benefit Act. This legislation is an important first step in helping Americans prepare for their long-term care needs.

I am pleased to have my colleague Senator GRAHAM of Florida join me as a cosponsor of this legislation, which has also been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative JOHN MICA.

The Civil Service Long-Term Care Insurance Benefit Act will establish a program under which long-term care insurance may be obtained by current and former employees of the federal government. The premiums will not be subsidized by the government and will be paid for entirely by the employee or retiree. However, this legislation will make long-term care insurance more affordable to by using the government's purchasing power to negotiate volume discounts.

It is my belief that the participation of a large employer such as the federal government in the long-term care insurance market will act as a catalyst to encourage other large employers to offer similar plans. This legislation will establish a larger market for long-term care insurance and help ensure the availability of competitively priced, high quality insurance products.

This measure will encourage Americans to be pro-active and prepare for their long term care needs by making insurance more widely available and affordable. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

S. 2477

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 ''Civil Service Long-Term Care Insurance Benefit Act''.

SEC. 2. LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart G of part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''CHAPTER 90—LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE

''§ 9001. Definitions

''For purposes of this chapter:

''(1) EMPLOYEE.—The term 'employee' has the meaning given such term by section 8901, but does not include an individual employed by the government of the District of Columbia.

''(2) ANNUITANT.—The term 'annuitant' means—

''(A) a former employee who, based on the service of that individual, receives an annuity under subchapter III of chapter 83, chapter 84, or another retirement system for employees of the Government (disregarding title XVIII of the Social Security Act and any retirement system established for employees described in section 2105(c)); and

''(B) any individual who receives an annuity under any retirement system referred to in subparagraph (A) (disregarding those described parenthetically) as the surviving spouse of an employee (including an amount under section 8442(b)(1)(A), whether or not an annuity under section 8442(b)(1)(B) is also payable) or of a former employee under subparagraph (A);

but does not include a former employee of a Government corporation excluded by regulation of the Office of Personnel Management or the spouse of such a former employee.

''(3) ELIGIBLE RELATIVE.—The term 'eligible relative', as used with respect to an employee or annuitant, means each of the following:

''(A) The spouse of the employee or annuitant.

''(B) The father or mother of the employee or annuitant, or an ancestor of either.

''(C) A stepfather or stepmother of the employee or annuitant.

''(D) The father-in-law or mother-in-law of the employee or annuitant.

''(E) A son or daughter of the employee or annuitant who is at least 18 years of age.

''(F) A stepson or stepdaughter of the employee or annuitant who is at least 18 years of age.

''(4) GOVERNMENT.—The term 'Government' means the Government of the United States, including an agency or instrumentality thereof.

''(5) GROUP LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE.—The term 'group long-term care insurance' means group long-term care insurance purchased by the Office of Personnel Management under this chapter.

''(6) INDIVIDUAL LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE.—The term 'individual long-term care insurance' means any long-term care insurance offered under this chapter which is not group long-term care insurance.

''(7) QUALIFIED CARRIER.—A carrier shall be considered to be a 'qualified carrier', with respect to a State, if it is licensed to issue group or individual long-term care insurance (as the case may be) under the laws of such State.

''(8) QUALIFIED LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE CONTRACT.—The term 'qualified long-term care insurance contract' has the meaning given such term by section 7702B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(9) STATE.—The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

''§ 9002. Availability of insurance

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Office of Personnel Management shall establish and administer a program through which employees and annuitants may obtain group or individual long-term care insurance for themselves, a spouse, or, to the extent permitted under the terms of the contract of insurance involved, any other eligible relative.

''(b) GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.—Long-term care insurance may not be offered under this chapter unless—

''(1) the only insurance protection provided is coverage under qualified long-term care insurance contracts; and

''(2) the insurance contract under which such coverage is provided is issued by a qualified carrier.

''(c) REQUIREMENT THAT CONTRACT BE FULLY INSURED.—In addition to the requirements otherwise applicable under section 9001(8), in order to be considered a qualified long-term care insurance contract for purposes of this chapter, a contract must be fully insured, whether through reinsurance with other companies or otherwise.

''(d) COVERAGE NOT REQUIRED FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO WOULD BE IMMEDIATELY BENEFIT ELIGIBLE.—Nothing in this chapter shall be considered to require that long-term care insurance coverage be made available in the case of any individual who would be immediately benefit eligible.

''§ 9003. Participating carriers

''(a) IDENTIFICATION OF PARTICIPATING CARRIERS.—The Office of Personnel Management shall, before the start of each year—

''(1) identify each carrier through whom any long-term care insurance may be obtained under this chapter during such year; and

''(2) prepare a list of the carriers identified under paragraph (1), and a summary description of the insurance obtainable under this chapter from each.

''(b) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS, ETC.—In order to carry out its responsibilities under subsection (a), the Office shall annually specify the timetable (including any application deadlines) and other procedures that must be followed by carriers seeking to be allowed to offer long-term care insurance under this chapter during the following year.

''(c) INFORMATION TO PERMIT INFORMED DECISIONMAKING.—The Office shall in a timely manner before the start of each year—

''(1) publish in the Federal Register the list (and summary description) prepared under subsection (a) for such year; and

''(2) make available to each individual eligible to obtain long-term care insurance under this chapter such information, in a form acceptable to the Office after consultation with the carrier, as may be necessary to enable the individual to exercise an informed choice among the various options available under this chapter.

''(d) POLICY OR BENEFIT CERTIFICATE.—The Office shall arrange to have the appropriate individual or individuals receive a copy of any policy of insurance obtained under this chapter or, in the case of group long-term care insurance, a certificate setting forth the benefits to which an individual is entitled, to whom the benefits are payable, and the procedures for obtaining benefits, and summarizing the provisions of the policy principally affecting the individual or individuals involved. Any such certificate shall be issued instead of the certificate which the insurance company would otherwise be required to issue.

''§ 9004. Administrative functions

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 9003, the sole functions of the Office of Personnel Management under this chapter shall be as follows:

''(1) ENROLLMENT PERIODS.—To provide reasonable opportunity (consisting of not less than one continuous 30-day period each year) for eligible employees and annuitants to obtain long-term care insurance coverage under this chapter.

''(2) WITHHOLDINGS.—To provide for a means by which the cost of any long-term care insurance coverage obtained under this chapter may be paid for through withholdings from the pay or annuity of the employee or annuitant involved.

''(3) CONTRACT AUTHORITY RELATING TO GROUP LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE.—To contract for a qualified long-term care insurance contract (in the case of group long-term care insurance) with each qualified carrier that offers such insurance, so long as such carrier submits a timely application under section 9003(b) and complies with such other procedural rules as the Office may prescribe.

''(b) LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this chapter shall be considered to permit or require the Office—

''(1) to prevent from being offered under this chapter any individual long-term care insurance under a qualified contract therefor; or

''(2) to prescribe or negotiate over the benefits to be offered, or any of the terms or conditions under which any such benefits shall be offered, under this chapter.

''§ 9005. Coordination with State laws

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The provisions of any contract under this chapter for group long-term care insurance may include provisions to supersede and preempt any provisions of State or local law described in subsection (b), or any regulation issued thereunder.

''(b) DESCRIPTION.—This subsection applies with respect to any provision of law which in effect carries out the same policy as section 5 of the long-term care insurance model Act, promulgated by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (as adopted as of September 1997).

''§ 9006. Commercial items

''For purposes of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, a long-term care insurance contract under this chapter shall be considered a commercial item, as defined by section 4(12) of such Act.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The analysis for part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subpart G the following:

''90. Long-Term Care Insurance ..... 9001''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The Office of Personnel Management shall take such measures as may be necessary to ensure that long-term care insurance coverage under title 5, United States Code, as amended by this Act, may be obtained in time to take effect beginning on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after January 1, 2000.●

● Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, today in introducing legislation that will give many Americans a better chance of financial security in retirement, and make the Federal Government a role model for American companies.

The issue is long term care insurance. When starting to work on this legislation, several facts seemed most important:

In 1995 the average cost of nursing home care in the United States was $37,000 per year. In some urban areas of the country, that cost can reach $70,000 per year. Medicare provides short-term care coverage, but the average nursing home stay is two and one-half years. In fact, Medicare paid for only five percent of national nursing home costs.

Not all long term care occurs in nursing homes—85 percent of nursing home care is nonskilled care. Again, Medicare does not cover nonskilled care, so all of these costs must be covered by the patient and his or her family members.

Medicaid will provide nursing home and some nonskilled care coverage, but an individual must be extremely low income, or become low income, to qualify for Medicaid. This program currently pays for over half of nursing home expenses in the United States. But who wants to see their lifetime savings, and their children's inheritance, wiped out to pay for the cost of a catastrophic long term illness.

Unfortunately, many of us will face this circumstance. It is estimated that the majority of women and one-third of men who reach the age of 60 will need nursing home care before the end of their life. Many of the baby boom generation are already facing this issue as they deal with their parents' needs.

Long term care is one of the most important retirement security issues facing us today. According to a 1997 survey sponsored by the National Council on the Aging, more Americans (69 percent) were worried about how to pay for long term care than were worried about how they would pay for their retirement (56 percent). This level of concern was true for all age groups and income levels among those surveyed.

Although many companies are considering offering this insurance to their employees, as of 1996 only 13.2 percent of long-term care plans were employer-sponsored.

Today, Senator GRASSLEY and I are moving the Federal Government into a leadership role by creating a model long term care insurance program for Federal employees. I am very pleased to be working, once again, with Senator GRASSLEY to develop another proposal in our ongoing efforts to improve retirement security for all Americans.

We are introducing today the Civil Service Long-Term Care Insurance Benefit Act, a companion to the legislation by our colleague in the House, Representative JOHN MICA of Florida.

We will offer private companies the opportunity to compete to provide long-term care insurance to Federal employees. Our plan will not be at a high cost to taxpayers; premiums will be fully paid by Federal employees—however, by pooling the numbers of workers in the federal government, lower group rates are achieved.

Only plans qualified under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 may offer this insurance to Federal workers through our legislation, but beyond that, we will let the marketplace determine the cost and services of plans employees may purchase. Flexibility is important in this relatively young industry as insurance companies are still in the process of determining how to most effectively provide this product. Competition among the various carriers, group discounts and volume of sales will keep these premiums affordable.

Eleven million individuals, including employees and retirees, their spouses,

parents, and in-laws would be eligible under our proposal. This bill is just a first step, but an important one. In encourage your support as we continue to improve retirement security, in all of its aspects, for all Americans.●

By Mr. GORTON:

S. 2478. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to FERC permit holders; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MOUNT BAKER SNOQUALMIE NATIONAL FOREST LEGISLATION

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, in recent years, I have become increasingly frustrated with the inability of the Forest Service to complete work on several small hydroelectric projects located on the Mount Baker/Snoqualmie National Forest in my State. The Service's inability to make important decisions on these renewable energy resources is based on an inaccurate interpretation of the President's Northwest Forest Plan (''ROD'') which has stopped these projects from going forward.

The President's Northwest Forest Plan states clearly that multipurpose uses of the federal forests are not precluded, and that the plan must follow existing law applying to such uses. Yet, since its adoption in 1994, the Forest Service has and continues to paralyze the development of small hydroelectric projects by ignoring laws applying to multipurpose. This inaction has delayed and stifled review of such projects by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission—the agency responsible for issuing federal licenses for hydroelectric projects.

Forest Service interpretation of the ROD intrudes directly on the ability of the Commission to perform its hydroelectric licensing function of balancing development and nondevelopment issues. Both the Commission, when determining consistency with the purpose of a national forest under Section 4(e) of the Act, and the Forest Service, when determining whether to issue a special use permit, must apply existing law fairly. Forest Service inaction on pending projects (some of which have been under review for over a decade) prevents FERC from completing its licensing responsibilities.

In terms of federal forest management, the six small hydroelectric projects proposed for the Mount Baker/Snoqualmie National Forest are virtually inconsequential. All are located well above areas affecting anadromous fish, and would occupy a total of 10 to 40 acres each, with most of the sites being untouched except for the portions needed for project facilities. Adverse impacts to fish, wildlife or other environmental resources are subject to mitigation by FERC and the Forest Service.

Project proponents in my state have spent millions of dollars to secure approval of six projects located in the Mount Baker/Snoqualmie National Forest, including project design and environmental analysis necessary to gain approval from the Forest Service and FERC. In spite of the fact that the 1994 ROD instructs the Forest Service to use ''transition'' provisions to approve pending projects, it has not done so, and continues to add project review requirements not allowed by the ROD or existing law. As a result, the Forest Service is stopping FERC from making timely licensing decisions on these projects. Shifting standards of review an delay by the Forest Service have deprived project proponents of their right to rely upon clear standards for project approval before expending funds in reliance on such standards.

Many aspects of these projects were found to be in compliance with prior forest regulations and other environmental laws, and are being subjected to duplicative and inconsistent review. Provisions of the ROD developed for application to extremely large-scale timber harvest are not meant to impact small-scale hydroelectric projects. Timber management regulations are totally disproportionate with the scale of any potential environmental impacts of small-scale hydroelectric facilities. In fact, the ROD itself explicitly recognizes that uses other than timber harvest do not require the same level of restrictions.

The Forest Service continues to use the ROD as a reason for imposing new study requirements, increasing mitigation demands, and ignoring agreements on project compliance with forest plan standards and FERC requirements. Each new requirement adds onerous financial burdens on project proponents, delays project approval, and undermines the regulatory need for an end to project review so a final licensing decision can be made by FERC.

Actions by the Forest Service have placed that agency in direct conflict with FERC, a result not intended by the ROD. FERC's jurisdiction over hydroelectric project licensing is unaltered by the ROD, which itself calls for increased interagency cooperation, not confrontation.

Mr. President, I have tried in recent years through my position as Chairman of the Senate Interior Appropriations Subcommittee responsible for funding the Forest Service's annual budget to get some answers from this agency as to why it was holding up these hydroelectric projects. In 1995, I inserted language directing the Forest Service to ''conduct an expeditious review'' of projects covered by the ROD. In subsequent hearings, I have continued to ask agency witnesses for a status report. To date, none of the responses from the Forest Service have satisfied my concerns or adequately addressed this issue.

For this reason, I am introducing legislation today that would expedite the hydroelectric project review process. It will require the Forest Service to convey to permit holders and license applicants for these projects at fair market value the parcels of land necessary for development of these projects. While I would prefer and am still hopeful that this issue can be resolved in negotiations between the project proponents and the agency, clearly this process is broken and needs to be fixed. This legislation should serve as a catalyst for resolving outstanding hydroelectric project review issues. Project proponents deserve at least that much.●

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 2479. A bill to establish the Commission on the Advancement of Women in Science, Engineering, and Technology Development; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN AND MINORITIES IN SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT ACT

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to create a commission on the advancement of women and minorities in science, engineering and technology development. The House version, H.R. 3007, introduced by my good friend, Congresswoman MORELLA, passed the House under suspension of the rules on Monday.

Six years ago, I testified before the House Education and Labor Committee in support of this legislation, as co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues. It was a priority for the Caucus in 1992, and it remains one of the top seven priorities for the Caucus this year.

Since the 102d Congress, when Congresswoman MORELLA first introduced this bill on behalf of the Caucus, we have learned more about the barriers facing women and minorities when they try to enter nontraditional jobs, such as engineering and research, but unfortunately the general facts haven't changed much.

For example, the National Science Foundation's 1996 report, ''Women, Minorities and Persons with Disabilities in Science and Engineering,'' found that even those women who have obtained a degree and are teaching in science and engineering still face barriers to climbing up the ladder to success. The report found that a substantial salary gap exists between men and women with doctorates in science and engineering. It also found that among doctoral scientists and engineers, women are far more likely to be employed at 2 year institutions and, are far less likely to be employed in research universities, and are much more likely to teach part-time.

And the National Research Council's 1995 report, ''Women Scientists and Engineers Employed in Industry: Why so Few?,'' found that women are still facing paternalism, sexual harassment, allegations of reverse discrimination, lower salaries and different standards for judging the work of men and women.

The purpose of the 11 member Commission created under this bill is to review the information on the problems

facing women and minorities in moving into the areas of science and engineering and make recommendations for changes in policy that would remove these artificial barriers which currently prevent women and minorities from entering and excelling in these fields.

We are all aware of the important role that technology plays in our economy today, and for the nation, a workforce possessing technological skills is more than just an earnings issue—it's an issue of meeting national employment needs. Today, experts agree that more than half of the new jobs being created require some form of technology literacy. And by the year 2000, six out of every 10 new jobs will require computer and networking skills currently possessed by only 22 percent of the labor force. We must bridge the gap between ''skills demanded'' and ''skills known'' if our Nation is to even fill the jobs that will be available just four years from today.

In order to meet those demands—which are crucial to the future economic growth of our country—we must ensure that women and minorities have access to, and are not kept from, jobs in the science, engineering and technology fields. The bill I am introducing today will help us find ways to level the playing field and take down artificial barriers that are keeping women and minorities from careers in these areas.●

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 2480. A bill to prevent the introduction and spread of nonindigenous pests and pathogens through the importation of wood articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

THE INVASIVE PEST CONTROL ACT OF 1998

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I introduce legislation to prevent additional introductions of invasive pests. Last fall, the Northeastern states were startled by reports of an Asian longhorned beetle infestation in Brooklyn and Amityville, New York. This summer, we heard of additional infestations in Chicago and the beetle has been found in wood packing material in South Carolina, California, New Jersey and Texas. Although the beetle has been found primarily in port cities, the shipment of wood packing materials across state lines could lead to the spread of this insect into forested areas across the country.

This beetle is a serious pest of hardwood trees in its native environment in China, where it has few natural enemies. Here, it has none. If this pest becomes established in our forests, it could turn into the gypsy moth of the 21st century. And, as we learned from the spread of the gypsy month along the East Coast, repeated introductions of the Asian Long-Horned Beetle and its spread could have a staggering economic and ecological impact on our forests.

It also seems that the beetle has a sweet tooth—attacking mostly Norway and sugar maples. As Vermont and the Northeast begin the leaf peeping season this fall, the threat of an Asian longhorned beetle invasion has us all checking our trees for possible signs of the pest. Not only is the sugar maple the source of our world famous Vermont maple syrup, but it is also what turns our treasured Green Mountains brilliant yellow, orange and red each year. It is what attracts so many visitors to our state this time of year. The wood is also highly prized for furniture, paneling and wood flooring.

Without immediate attention, spread of this insect into forested areas of New York, Vermont and Massachusetts could threaten the important maple sugar and fall foliage industries of the Northeast. These things can chew trees into sawdust. The last thing I want to see in my backyard is one of these bark-eating, sap-sucking intruders from Asia.

What is even more alarming is that we do not yet have a way to treat this pest. The only way to get rid of it is by destroying all the infested trees. The best way to fight this pest, and similar non-native wood borers, is to make sure they do not get into our country in the first place. That is why I am introducing legislation today to prevent additional introductions of the beetle and other invasive pests into the United States.

The ''Invasive Pest Control Act'' will stiffen the requirements for treatment of imports that use solid wood products and wood packing material like pallets and crates. It will require that these imports either be debarked, kiln-dried or fumigated, depending on size, before they enter the United States. After five years, the use of these packing materials will be prohibited. This will give importers plenty of time to find alternative materials to ship their products. It will also give us a long-term insurance policy against future pest introductions.

I want to make clear that the Asian longhorned beetle is only one of many invasive pests that present a serious threat to our forests. Spruce bark beetle and Mediterranean pine engraver beetle are two other invasive pests that we should be concerned about. My legislation will help prevent all of these stowaways from sneaking into our ports and then into our forests.

This legislation is only a first step in preventing future introductions of these pests. We also need to increase funding for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service to increase the number of inspectors at our ports and improve shipping information on imports to track the source of these pests. We also need to launch a public awareness campaign to help detect any infestations within our country. In Vermont, we have beetle-identification cards to help the public spot the beetle in their backyards or sugarbushes. We need to do this in all the high-risk areas.

All of these steps will help protect our forests and forest economies from the Asian longhorned beetle and other pests that could wreak havoc if they get their antennas in the door.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows;

S. 2480

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 ''Invasive Pest Control Act of 1998''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the importation of unprocessed logs, lumber, and other unmanufactured wood articles into the United States may result in the introduction of nonindigenous pests and pathogens to native North American forests;

(2) when environmental conditions are favorable, nonindigenous pests and pathogens may prey on and devastate native North American tree species, devastate habitat, disrupt other native species and the environment, and disrupt the economy of affected forest areas;

(3) the Comptroller General of the United States has reported that the potential economic disruption to communities affected by nonindigenous pests and pathogens entering the United States, including forest pests, costs an estimated $41,000,000,000 annually in lost production and expenses for prevention and control;

(4) commercial forestry is estimated to lose forest products valued at $4,000,000,000 each year due to infestations of nonindigenous pests and pathogens;

(5) once introduced into the United States on unprocessed logs, lumber, and other unmanufactured wood articles, nonindigenous pests and pathogens are unintentionally or unknowingly transported and introduced into inland forests and habitats by truck transport and train shipment to mills, consumers, and producers and by a variety of other means, including wind, water, and wildlife;

(6) examples of nonindigenous pests and pathogens infesting forests of the United States that have caused or have the potential to cause adverse economic and ecological effects include—

(A) Dutch Elm disease, which—

(i) was introduced into the United States in the 1920's with a shipment of European logs delivered to the Port of New York and then forwarded to the Midwest by train;

(ii) has spread throughout the United States, now to an estimated 1,000,000 trees; and

(iii) has decimated the American and other native elm species;

(B) the Gypsy Moth, which—

(i) has no natural predators in the United States;

(ii) spread rapidly and now infests Northeast forest in approximately 200,000 square miles, with smaller infestations occurring in several other areas from the Carolinas to British Columbia; and

(iii) feeds on hundreds of different tree species and during outbreaks can defoliate many hardwood and shrub species in their path, seriously weakening trees and stunting the growth of, and eventually killing, many of the trees;

(C) the Asian Long-Horned Beetle, which—

(i) is a new exotic pest that has been discovered at ports across the United States;

(ii) has no natural enemies and has attacked mostly Norway and sugar maples,

some of the most valuable trees in the Northeast; and

(iii) is considered a serious threat to the maple sugar industry, lumber industry, homeowner property values, and tourism in the Northeast; and

(D) more recent nonindigenous pests and pathogens that have become established in the forests of the United States and are causing economic and ecological degradation with respect to the natural forest resources of the United States, including the Port Orford Cedar Root Rot, the Pine Wilt disease, the Eurasian poplar rust fungus (discovered on the West Coast), and the pine shoot beetle (introduced in the Great Lakes area); and

(7) if preventive management measures are not taken in a timely manner throughout the United States to prevent nonindigenous pests and pathogens from entering the United States on unprocessed wood products or to control their entry, further introductions and infestations of nonindigenous plants and pathogens will occur.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purpose of this Act are—

(1) to prevent the unintentional introduction and dispersion of nonindigenous pests and pathogens into forests of the United States through the importation of unprocessed logs, lumber, and other unmanufactured wood articles;

(2) to preserve and protect the health of the forests of the United States, the forest-dependent economy of the United States, native North American tree species, and irreplaceable habitat from the potentially devastating effects of nonindigenous pests and pathogens;

(3) to coordinate federally conducted, funded, or authorized research, prevention, control, information dissemination, and other activities regarding forest pests and pathogens; and

(4) to understand and minimize the economic and ecological impact of nonindigenous pests and pathogens.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

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

(2) TREATMENT.—The term ''treatment'' means—

(A) in the case of—

(i) a wood article that is greater than 14 centimeters in diameter at the broadest point; and

(ii) wood chips, sawdust, wood mulch, and wood shavings;

debarking and heating the wood article until the core reaches at least 71.1 degrees Celsius for at least 75 minutes; and

(B) in the case of a wood article that is less than 14 centimeters in diameter at the broadest point—

(i) fumigation with an effective fumigant;

(ii) kiln drying according to the Dry Kiln Operator's Manual, Agriculture Handbook No. 188; or

(iii) pressure treatment with an effective chemical preservative.

(3) WOOD ARTICLE.—The term ''wood article'' means a log, lumber, whole tree, cut tree or portion of a tree (not solely consisting of leaves), flower, fruit, bud, seed, bark, cork, lath, hog fuel, sawdust, painted raw wood product, excelsior (wood wool), wood chip, wood mulch, wood shaving, picket, stake, shingle, pallet, wood packing material, humus, compost, or litter, that is unprocessed or has received only primary processing.

SEC. 5. RESTRICTIONS ON MOVEMENT OF PLANTS, PLANT PRODUCTS, BIOLOGICAL CONTROL ORGANISMS, PLANT PESTS, NOXIOUS WEEDS, WOOD ARTICLES, AND MEANS OF CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary may prohibit or restrict the importation, entry, exportation, or movement in interstate commerce of a plant, plant product, biological control organism, plant pest, noxious weed, wood article, or means of conveyance if the Secretary determines that the prohibition or restriction is necessary to prevent the introduction into the United States or the interstate dispersion of a nonindigenous pest, pathogen, or noxious weed.

(b) IMPORTED WOOD ARTICLES.—Each wood article (other than a pallet, solid wood packing material, or dunnage) to be imported into the United States shall be—

(1) subject to treatment not more than 24 hours prior to importation, in the exporting country or a hold aboard a ship during transport; and

(2) subject to treatment not later than 24 hours after importation at the United States port of entry.

(c) PALLETS AND SOLID WOOD PACKING MATERIALS.—

(1) TREATMENT DURING INTERIM PERIOD.—During the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, each pallet, solid wood packing material, and dunnage composed of wood used to import an article into the United States shall be—

(A) subject to treatment in accordance with its dimensions prior to first importation into the United States; and

(B) marked with an international symbol designating the treatment method.

(2) PROHIBITION AFTER INTERIM PERIOD.—Effective beginning on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the importation into the United States of a pallet, packing material, or dunnage composed of wood is prohibited.

SEC. 6. PLANT HEALTH AND ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION TASK FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established a ''Plant Health and Ecosystem Protection Task Force''.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The membership of the Task Force shall consist of—

(1) the Secretary of Agriculture or a designee;

(2) the Administrator of the Animal and Plant and Health Inspection Service;

(3) a representative of each Federal agency with responsibility for managing natural resources (as determined by the President), appointed by the head of the agency, including—

(A) the Forest Service;

(B) the Bureau of Land Management;

(C) the National Park Service;

(D) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

(E) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(F) the Agricultural Research Service;

(G) the Agricultural Marketing Service;

(H) the Natural Resource Conservation Service; and

(I) the Environmental Protection Agency;

(4) a representative of the agency of each State responsible for managing natural resources in the State, appointed by the Governor of the State;

(5) a representative of each nongovernmental organization with an interest or expertise in plant health and ecosystem protection (as determined by the President), appointed by the head of the organization, including representatives of—

(A) public interest environmental groups;

(B) affected industry representatives;

(C) ecologists; and

(D) scientists in relevant disciplines.

(c) DUTIES.—The Task Force shall develop criteria for establishing precautionary phytosanitary procedures to minimize the likelihood of the introduction or dispersion of nonindigenous pests and pathogens in the course of international or interstate commerce or travel.

SEC. 7. FEES.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall—

(1) require a person that imports a wood article into the United States to obtain a permit before the article may be imported into the United States;

(2) require the person to pay an application fee for the permit, in an amount determined by the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(3) transfer all fees collected under paragraph (2) to the Fund established under section 8.

SEC. 8. PEST REDUCTION IN WOOD ARTICLES FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund, to be known as the ''Pest Reduction in Wood Articles Fund'', to be used in accordance with this section (referred to in this section as the ''Fund''), consisting of—

(1) such amounts as are appropriated to the Fund under subsection (b); and

(2) any interest earned on investment of amounts in the Fund under subsection (d).

(b) TRANSFERS TO FUND.—There are appropriated to the Fund amounts equivalent to amounts collected as fees and received in the Treasury under section 7.

(c) EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), on request by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the Fund to the Secretary of Agriculture such amounts as the Secretary of Agriculture determines are necessary to support the costs of certifying treatment facilities and conducting research to develop appropriate technology for the control of the importation of nonindigenous species on unprocessed logs, lumber, and other unmanufactured wood articles.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—An amount not exceeding 10 percent of the amounts in the Fund shall be available in each fiscal year to pay the administrative expenses necessary of carrying out this Act.

(d) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest such portion of the Fund as is not, in the judgment of the Secretary, required to meet current withdrawals. Investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States.

(2) ACQUISITION OF OBLIGATIONS.—For the purpose of investments under paragraph (1), obligations may be acquired—

(A) on original issue at the issue price; or

(B) by purchase of outstanding obligations at the market price.

(3) SALE OF OBLIGATIONS.—Any obligation acquired by the Fund may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury at the market price.

(4) CREDITS TO FUND.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the Fund shall be credited to and form a part of the Fund.●

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2481. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to improve the process of constructing, altering, and acquiring public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE PUBLIC BUILDINGS REFORM ACT OF 1998

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Public Buildings Reform Act of 1998. Let me start by expressing my thanks to the Chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator CHAFEE, and the Chairman of the relevant subcommittee, Senator WARNER, for their support of this bill.

Mr. President, the Public Buildings Reform Act will go a long way to helping Congress make wise decisions on public buildings construction. It will help Congress achieve some discipline with respect to the cost of new Federal buildings and courthouses. Specifically, the bill will bring some sanity to the Federal building and courthouse construction program.

I have been working on Federal building issues for a number of years. And the more I have learned about the issue, the more concerned I have become. It is very important that we reform the Federal building and courthouse construction program. This bill will do just that.

Why do we need reform? Because of the amount of funding that is devoted each year to new courthouse and other Federal building projects. We need to spend this money wisely and only on those projects that are truly needed.

The Public Buildings Reform Act will help do just that. It accomplishes two major goals—prioritization of courthouse projects and other Federal buildings projects; and gaining control of the courthouse construction design guide.

The Public Buildings Reform Act of 1998 is similar to legislation I introduced a few years ago. At that time, the Environment and Public Works Committee unanimously passed this legislation—which then went on to pass the entire Senate.

However, the House failed to act on this legislation. So we find ourselves in the position of trying again. I and my colleagues introduce this legislation at this time so that the debate on public buildings reform will continue.

I have been pleased that GSA and the Administrative Office of the Courts have made numerous improvements to the public building approval process since 1995. But these improvements must be codified so that there is no question that they will be continued in the future. Also, there are further steps that need to be taken in the area of Federal Government asset management.

It is my hope that in the coming months, Congress will look hard at the public buildings approval process and will prepare legislation that can be enacted in the next Congress.

Working with GSA, the Courts and others, I am confident we can take the steps necessary to assure the taxpayers that there are appropriate cost controls in place. That is our job.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2481

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 ''Public Buildings Reform Act of 1998''.

SEC. 2. SITE SELECTION.

Section 5 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 604) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) CONSIDERATION OF COSTS.—In selecting a site for a project to construct, alter, or acquire a public building, or to lease office or any other type of space, under this Act, the Administrator shall consider the impact of the selection of a particular site on the cost and space efficiency of the project.''.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 606) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking the last sentence;

(B) in the first sentence, by striking ''In order'' and inserting the following:

''(2) PREREQUISITES TO OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—

''(B) APPROVAL REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) CONSTRUCTION, ALTERATION, AND ACQUISITION.—In order'';

(C) in the second sentence, by striking ''No'' and inserting the following:

''(ii) LEASE.—No'';

(D) in the third sentence, by striking ''No'' and inserting the following:

''(iii) ALTERATION.—No'';

(E) by striking ''SEC. 7. (a)'' and inserting the following:

''SEC. 7. SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED PROJECTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) PUBLIC BUILDINGS PLAN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 days after the President submits to Congress the budget of the United States Government under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a public buildings plan (referred to in this subsection as the 'triennial plan') for the first 3 fiscal years that begin after the date of submission. The triennial plan shall specify such projects for which approval is required under paragraph (2)(B) relating to the construction, alteration, or acquisition of public buildings, or the lease of office or any other type of space, as the Administrator determines are necessary to carry out the duties of the Administrator under this Act or any other law.

''(B) CONTENTS.—The triennial plan shall include—

''(i) a 5-year strategic management plan for capital assets under the control of the Administrator that—

''(I) provides for accommodating the office space and other public building needs of the Federal Government; and

''(II) is based on procurement mechanisms that allow the Administrator to take advantage of fluctuations in market forces affecting building construction and availability;

''(ii) a list—

''(I) in order of priority, of each construction or acquisition (excluding lease) project described in subparagraph (A) for which an authorization of appropriations is—

''(aa) requested for the first of the 3 fiscal years of the triennial plan referred to in subparagraph (A) (referred to in this paragraph as the 'first year');

''(bb) expected to be requested for the second of the 3 fiscal years of the triennial plan referred to in subparagraph (A) (referred to in this paragraph as the 'second year'); or

''(cc) expected to be requested for the third of the 3 fiscal years of the triennial plan referred to in subparagraph (A) (referred to in this paragraph as the 'third year'); and

''(II) that includes a description of each such project and the number of square feet of space planned for each such project;

''(iii) a list of each lease or lease renewal described in subparagraph (A) for which an authorization of appropriations is—

''(I) requested for the first year; or

''(II) expected to be requested for the second year or third year;

''(iv) a list, in order of priority, of each planned repair or alteration project described in subparagraph (A) for which an authorization of appropriations is—

''(I) requested for the first year; or

''(II) expected to be requested for the second year or third year;

''(v) an explanation of the basis for each order of priority specified under clauses (ii) and (iv);

''(vi) the estimated annual and total cost of each project requested in the triennial plan;

''(vii) a list of each public building planned to be wholly vacated, to be exchanged for other property, or to be disposed of during the period covered by the triennial plan; and

''(viii) requests for authorizations of appropriations necessary to carry out projects listed in the triennial plan for the first year.

''(C) PRESENTATION OF INFORMATION IN PLAN.—

''(i) FIRST YEAR.—In the case of a project for which the Administrator has requested an authorization of appropriations for the first year, information required to be included in the triennial plan under subparagraph (B) shall be presented in the form of a prospectus that meets the requirements of paragraph (2)(C).

''(ii) SECOND YEAR AND THIRD YEAR.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a project for which the Administrator expects to request an authorization of appropriations for the second year or third year, information required to be included in the triennial plan under subparagraph (B) shall be presented in the form of a project description.

''(II) GOOD FAITH ESTIMATES.—

''(aa) IN GENERAL.—Each reference to cost, price, or any other dollar amount contained in a project description referred to in subclause (I) shall be considered to be a good faith estimate by the Administrator.

''(bb) EFFECT.—A good faith estimate referred to in item (aa) shall not bind the Administrator with respect to a request for appropriation of funds for a fiscal year other than a fiscal year for which an authorization of appropriations for the project is requested in the triennial plan.

''(cc) EXPLANATION OF DEVIATION FROM ESTIMATE.—If the request for an authorization of appropriations contained in the prospectus for a project submitted under paragraph (2)(C) is different from a good faith estimate for the project referred to in item (aa), the prospectus shall include an explanation of the difference.

''(D) REINCLUSION OF PROJECTS IN PLANS.—If a project included in a triennial plan is not approved in accordance with this subsection, or if funds are not made available to carry out a project, the Administrator may include the project in a subsequent triennial plan submitted under this subsection.'';

(F) in paragraph (2) (as designated by subparagraph (B))—

(i) by inserting after ''(2) PREREQUISITES TO OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—'' the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator

may not obligate funds that are made available for any project for which approval is required under subparagraph (B) unless—

''(i) the project was included in the triennial plan for the fiscal year; and

''(ii) a prospectus for the project was submitted to Congress and approved in accordance with this paragraph.''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) PROSPECTUSES.—For the purpose of obtaining approval of a proposed project described in the triennial plan, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a prospectus for the project that includes—

''(i) a brief description of the public building to be constructed, altered, or acquired, or the space to be leased, under this Act;

''(ii) the location of the building to be constructed, altered, or acquired, or the space to be leased, and an estimate of the maximum cost, based on the predominant local office space measurement system (as determined by the Administrator), to the United States of the construction, alteration, or acquisition of the building, or lease of the space;

''(iii) in the case of a project for the construction of a courthouse or other public building consisting solely of general purpose office space, the cost benchmark for the project determined under subsection (d); and

''(iv) in the case of a project relating to a courthouse—

''(I) as of the date of submission of the prospectus, the number of—

''(aa) Federal judges for whom the project is to be carried out; and

''(bb) courtrooms available for the judges;

''(II) the projected number of Federal judges and courtrooms to be accommodated by the project at the end of the 10-year period beginning on the date;

''(III) a justification for the projection under subclause (II) (including a specification of the number of authorized positions, and the number of judges in senior status, to be accommodated);

''(IV) the year in which the courthouse in use as of the date of submission of the prospectus reached maximum capacity by housing only courts and court-related agencies;

''(V) the level of security risk at the courthouse in use as of the date of submission of the prospectus, as determined by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts; and

''(VI) the termination date of any lease, in effect as of the date of submission of the prospectus, of space to carry out a court-related activity that will be affected by the project.''; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.—

''(A) OVERRIDING INTEREST.—If the Administrator, in consultation with the Commissioner of the Public Buildings Service, determines that an overriding interest requires emergency authority to construct, alter, or acquire a public building, or lease office or storage space, and that the authority cannot be obtained in a timely manner through the triennial planning process required under paragraph (1), the Administrator may submit a written request for the authority to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives. The Administrator may carry out the project for which authority was requested under the preceding sentence if the project is approved in the manner described in paragraph (2)(B).

''(B) DECLARED EMERGENCIES.—

''(i) LEASE AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Administrator may enter into an emergency lease during any period of emergency declared by the President pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) or any other law, or declared by any Federal agency pursuant to any applicable law, except that no such emergency lease shall be for a period of more than 5 years.

''(ii) REPORTING.—As part of each triennial plan, the Administrator shall describe any emergency lease for which a prospectus is required under paragraph (2) that was entered into by the Administrator under clause (i) during the preceding fiscal year.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''(b) The'' and inserting the following:

''(b) INCREASES IN COSTS OF PROJECTS.—

''(1) INCREASE OF 10 PERCENT OR LESS.—The''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) GREATER INCREASES.—If the Administrator increases the estimated maximum cost of a project in an amount greater than the increase authorized by paragraph (1), the Administrator shall, not later than 30 days after the date of the increase, notify the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives of the amount of, and reasons for, the increase.'';

(3) in subsection (c), by striking ''(c) In the case'' and inserting the following:

''(c) RESCISSION OF APPROVAL.—In the case''; and

(4) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

''(d) DEVELOPMENT OF COST BENCHMARKS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall develop standard cost benchmarks for projects for the construction of courthouses, and other public buildings consisting solely of general purpose office space, for which a prospectus is required under subsection (a)(2). The benchmarks shall consist of the appropriate cost per square foot for low-rise, mid-rise, and high-rise projects subject to the various factors determined under paragraph (2).

''(2) FACTORS.—In developing the benchmarks, the Administrator shall consider such factors as geographic location (including the necessary extent of seismic structural supports), the tenant agency, and necessary parking facilities, and such other factors as the Administrator considers appropriate.''.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 11 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 610) is amended—

(1) by striking ''SEC. 11. (a) Upon'' and inserting the following:

''SEC. 11. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

''(a) REPORTS ON UNCOMPLETED PROJECTS.—Upon''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''(b) The Administrator'' and inserting the following:

''(b) BUILDING PROJECT SURVEYS AND REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator'';

(B) in the second sentence of paragraph (1) (as so designated), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and shall specify whether the project is included in a 5-year strategic capital asset management plan required under section 7(a)(1)(B)(i) or a prioritized list required under section 7(a)(1)(B)''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) INCLUSION OF REQUESTED BUILDING PROJECTS IN TRIENNIAL PLAN.—The Administrator may include a prospectus for the funding of a public building project for which a report is submitted under paragraph (1) in a triennial public buildings plan required under section 7(a)(1).''.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 606) is amended by striking ''Committee on Public Works and Transportation'' each place it appears and inserting ''Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure''.

(2) Section 11(b)(1) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (as amended by subsection (b)(2)) is further amended by striking ''Committee on Public Works and Transportation'' and inserting ''Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure''.

SEC. 4. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ASSET MANAGEMENT.

Section 12 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 611) is amended—

(1) by striking ''SEC. 12. (a) The Administrator'' and inserting the following:

''SEC. 12. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ASSET MANAGEMENT.

''(a) DUTIES OF ADMINISTRATOR.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator'';

(2) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

''(2) REPOSITORY FOR ASSET MANAGEMENT INFORMATION.—The Administrator shall use the results of the continuing investigation and survey required under paragraph (1) to establish a central repository for the asset management information of the Federal Government.'';

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''(b) In carrying'' and inserting the following:

''(b) COOPERATION AMONG FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

''(1) BY THE ADMINISTRATOR.—In carrying'';

(B) by striking ''Each Federal'' and inserting the following:

''(2) BY THE AGENCIES.—Each Federal''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) IDENTIFICATION AND DISPOSITION OF UNNEEDED REAL PROPERTY.—

''(A) IDENTIFICATION.—Each Federal agency shall—

''(i) identify real property that is or will become unneeded, obsolete, or underutilized during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the identification; and

''(ii) annually report the information on the real property described in clause (i) to the Administrator.

''(B) DISPOSITION.—The Administrator shall analyze more cost-effective uses for the real property identified under subparagraph (A) and make recommendations to the Federal agency concerning the more cost-effective uses.'';

(4) in subsection (c), by striking ''(c) Whenever'' and inserting the following:

''(c) IDENTIFICATION OF BUILDINGS OF HISTORIC, ARCHITECTURAL, AND CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE.—Whenever''; and

(5) in subsection (d), by striking ''(d) The Administrator'' and inserting the following:

''(d) REGARD TO COMPARATIVE URGENCY OF NEED.—The Administrator''.

SEC. 5. ADDRESSING LONG-TERM GOVERNMENT HOUSING NEEDS.

(a) REPORT ON LONG-TERM HOUSING NEEDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and the end of each 2-year period thereafter, the head of each Federal agency (as defined in section 13(3) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 612(3))) shall review and report to the Administrator of General Services (referred to in this Act as the ''Administrator'') on the long-term housing needs of the agency. The Administrator shall consolidate the agency reports and submit a consolidated report to Congress.

(2) ASSISTANCE AND UNIFORM STANDARDS.—The Administrator shall—

(A) assist each agency in carrying out the review required under paragraph (1); and

(B) prepare uniform standards for housing needs for—

(i) executive agencies (as defined in section 13(4) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 612(4))); and

(ii) establishments in the judicial branch of the Federal Government.

(b) REDUCTION IN AGGREGATE OFFICE AND STORAGE SPACE.—By the end of the third fiscal year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal agencies referred to in subsection (a)(1) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, collectively reduce by not less than 10 percent the aggregate office and storage space used by the agencies (regardless of whether the space is leased or owned) on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. DESIGN GUIDES AND STANDARDS FOR COURT ACCOMMODATIONS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall submit a report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives that specifies the characteristics of court accommodations that are essential to the provision of due process of law and the safe, fair, and efficient administration of justice by the Federal court system.

(b) DESIGN GUIDES AND STANDARDS.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and after notice and opportunity for comment, shall develop design guides and standards for Federal court accommodations based on the report submitted under subsection (a). In developing the design guides and standards, the Administrator shall consider space efficiency and the appropriate standards for furnishings.

(2) USE.—Notwithstanding section 462 of title 28, United States Code, the design guides and standards developed under paragraph (1) shall be used in the design of court accommodations.

SEC. 7. DESIGN OF FEDERAL COURTHOUSES.

The Act entitled ''An Act establishing a Commission on Fine Arts'', approved May 17, 1910 (36 Stat. 371, chapter 243; 40 U.S.C. 104), is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: ''It shall be the duty of the commission, not later than 60 days after submission of a conceptual design to the commission for a Federal courthouse at any place in the United States, to provide advice on the design, including an evaluation of the ability of the design to express the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the American Government appropriately and within the accepted standards of courthouse design.''.●

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 2483. A bill to establish programs regarding early detection, diagnosis, and interventions for newborns and infants with hearing loss; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE EARLY HEARING LOSS DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS AND INTERVENTION ACT OF 1998

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, today I introduce the Early Hearing Loss Detection, Diagnosis and Intervention Act of 1998, which will serve as a companion bill to H.R. 2923, introduced in the House by Representative JIM WALSH. I am pleased to have, as the lead cosponsor, my colleague from Iowa, Senator HARKIN, who has long been a champion of the hearing impaired.

We have a tendency to associate hearing problems with the aging process, and it is true that the largest group of Americans suffering from hearing impairment are those in the 65 to 75 year age range. At the other end of the spectrum, however, approximately 1.5 to 3 out of every 1000 children—or as many as 33 children per day—are born with significant hearing problems. According to the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders, as many as 12,000 infants are born each year in the U.S. with some form of hearing impairment.

In the last several years, scientists have begun to tell us that the first years of a child's life are crucial to their future development. This makes early detection and intervention of hearing loss a necessity if we are to ensure that all our children get the strong start they deserve. Currently, the average age of diagnosis of hearing loss is close to three years of age. Yet it is believed that speech and oral language development can begin as early as 6 months of age. Without early diagnosis and intervention, these children are behind the learning curve—literally—before they have even started. They should not be denied a strong start in life simply for the lack of a simple screening test.

There are many causes of hearing loss, and in many states a newborn child is screened only if the physician is aware of some factor that puts that baby in a risk category. Our four states—Rhode Island, Hawaii, Colorado, and Mississippi—currently require the screening of all newborns. in 16 other states, babies are screened only if they are believed to be a risk. This screening process, while important, detects only 50 percent—or half—of the hearing problems in young children.

Universal screening is not a new idea. As early as 1965, the Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf, in a report of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, recommended the development and nationwide implementation of ''universally applied procedures for early identification.'' In 1989, former Surgeon General C. Everett Koop used this year 2000 as a goal for identifying 90 percent of children with significant hearing loss before they are one year old. And just last year, the National Institutes of Health convened an expert panel at the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders, and the panel made a recommendation that the first hearing screening be carried out before three months of age to ensure that treatment can begin before six months of age.

It is time to move beyond the recommendations and achieve the goal of universal screening. In addition to the four states that require screening, the Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, in conjunction with the Centers for Disease Control, is helping 17 states commit to achieving universal hearing screening by the year 2000. This plan will lead to the screening of more than 1 million newborns a year, but it still leaves more than half the states without universal screening programs.

The purpose of the bill I am introducing today is to provide the additional assistance necessary to help all the states in implementing programs to ensure that all our newborns are tested and to ensure that those identified with a hearing impairment get help. Specifically, the bill:

(1) Authorizes $5 million for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to work with the states to develop early detection, diagnosis and intervention networks;

(2) Authorizes $5 million for the Centers for Disease Control to provide technical assistance to State agencies and to conduct applied research related to infant hearing detection, diagnosis and treatment/intervention; and

(3) Authorizes $3 million for the National Institutes of Health to carry out research on the efficacy of new screening techniques and technology.

A baby born today will be part of this coutnry's future in the 21st century. Surely we owe it to that child to give them a strong start on that future by ensuring that if they do have a hearing impairment it is diagnosed and treatment started well before their first year of life is completed. I urge my colleagues to join me and Senator HARKIN in supporting the Early Hearing Loss Detection, Diagnosis and Intervention Act of 1998.●

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce, along with my colleague, Senator SNOWE, the ''Early Hearing Loss Detection, Diagnosis, and Intervention Act of 1998.''

The Early Hearing Loss Act would help States establish programs to detect and diagnose hearing loss in every newborn child and to promote appropriate treatment and intervention for newborns with hearing loss. The Act also would fund research by the National Institutes of Health to determine the best detection, diagnostic, treatment and intervention techniques and technologies.

Every year, about 12,000 children in the United States are born with a hearing impairment. Most of them will not be diagnosed as hearing imparied until after their second birthday. The consequences of not detecting early hearing impairment are significant, but easily avoidable.

Late detection means that crucial years of stimulating the brain's hearing centers are lost. It may delay speech and language development. Delayed language development can retard a child's educational progress, minimize his or her socialization skills, and as a result, destroy his or her self-esteem and confidence. On top of all that,

many children are diagnosed incorrectly as having behavioral or cognitive problems, simply because of their undetected hearing loss.

In 1988, the Commission on Education of the Deaf reported to Congress that early detection, diagnosis, and treatment were essential to improving the status of education for people who are deaf in the United States. This Act is our opportunity to finally implement that common-sense recommendation.

Mr. President, this Act would help states develop programs that many of them already are working on; it would not impose a single federal mandate. Eight states already have mandatory testing programs; nine others have legislation pending to establish such programs. Other states have achieved universal newborn testing voluntarily. These programs can work; they deserve federal help.

One of the highlights of my Congressional career, indeed, of my life, has been working on policies and laws to ensure that people with disabilities have an equal opportunity to succeed in our society. This is especially meaningful to me, because my brother Frank became deaf as a child.

I watched Frank grow up, and I saw how few options and support services were available for people who were deaf. I remember the frustrations and challenges Frank faced, and I told myself early on that I would do all I could to break down the barriers in our society that prevented people who were deaf from reaching their potential. By supporting early screening, diagnosis, and treatment programs, this Act would go a long way toward accomplishing that goal.

I would like to thank Senator SNOWE for her hard work and support of this Act, and I hope our colleagues will join us in this worthy effort.●

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BIDEN, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. REID, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. 2484. 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SAFE SCHOOLS, SAFE STREETS AND SECURE BORDERS ACT OF 1998

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, joined by Senators DASCHLE, BIDEN, MOSELEY-BRAUN, MURRAY, and other Democratic Senators, I am introducing comprehensive crime legislation, the Safe Schools, Safe Streets, and Secure Borders Act of 1998, to keep the crime rate in this country going down. Past Democratic anti-crime initiatives, such as the 1994 Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, have resulted in an historic decrease in crime rates in the United States. The FBI reports that violent crime in 1996 was at the lowest level since 1989, and that the overall crime rate was lower than any year since 1984. Preliminary figures for 1997 show that serious crime dropped an additional four percent last year. These are very good numbers.

Yet, according to recent reports in the Los Angeles Times, people still feel that crime is the number one public policy issue that needs attention. Americans still feel vulnerable to becoming crime victims, and want policy makers to do more. Thus, even with the decrease in crime rates, this is not the time to stop working on additional ways to reduce crime. Senate Democrats want to do more. We must do more to ensure that the crime rates continue their downward trend next year, the year after, and the years after that.

The Safe Schools, Safe Streets, and Secure Borders Act of 1998 builds on the successful programs we have implemented in the 1994 Crime Law and addresses emerging crime problems. The bill is comprehensive. It is realistic. It is fully funded, without reaching into any cookie jars. It is designed to be enacted, without partisan or ideological controversy. In fact, the bill contains a number of initiatives that enjoy bipartisan support. We have tried to avoid the easy rhetoric about crime that some have to offer in this crucial area of public policy. Here is a chance to actually make a difference. It is a ''Can Do'' Act.

The Safe Schools, Safe Streets, and Secure Borders Act targets violent crime in our schools, reforms the juvenile justice system, combats gang violence, cracks down on the sale and use of illegal drugs, enhances the rights of crime victims, and provides meaningful assistance to law enforcement officers in the battle against street crime, international crime and terrorism. The Act represents an important next step in the continuing effort by Senate Democrats to enact tough, commonsense and balanced reforms to our criminal justice system. That is why the International Brotherhood of Police Officers has endorsed this bill.

The bill has ten comprehensive titles to address crime in our schools, crime on our streets, and crime on our borders and abroad. I should note that the bill contains no new death penalties and no new or increased mandatory minimums. We can be tough without imposing the death penalty, and we can ensure certain punishment without removing all discretion from the judge at sentencing.

Title I of the bill deals with proposals for combating violence in schools and punishing juvenile crime. This title has four subtitles dealing with assistance to schools, reform of the federal juvenile system, assisting States on prosecuting and punishing juvenile offenders and reducing juvenile crime, and protecting children from violence, including violence from the misuse of guns.

Assistance to Schools. Americans are dismayed and grief-stricken at the recent shootings at schools across the country. While homicides at American schools have remained relatively constant in recent years, the number of students who have experienced a violent crime in school increased 23 percent in 1995 compared to 1989. We need to make sure our children attend school in a safe environment that fosters learning, not fear.

The bill would provide COPS grants for school-based partnerships between schools and law enforcement to combat school-related crime. It contains a proposal developed by Senator BINGAMAN to establish a School Security Technology Center using expertise from the Sandia National Labs, and provide grants from the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program enabling schools to access technical assistance for school security.

Federal Prosecution of Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders. The bill would also make important reforms to the federal juvenile system, without federalizing run-of-the-mill juvenile offenses and ignoring the traditional prerogative of the States to handle the bulk of juvenile crime. One of the significant flaws in the Republican juvenile crime bill, S. 10, is that it would—in the words of Chief Justice Rhenquist—''eviscerate this traditional deference to state prosecutions, thereby increasing substantially the potential workload of the federal judiciary.'' The Chief Justice has raised concerns about ''federalizing'' certain juvenile crimes and has urged that ''federal prosecutions should be limited to those offenses that cannot and should not be prosecuted in the state courts.'' The Democratic proposals for reform of the Federal juvenile justice system heed this sound advice and respect our Federal system.

Among other reforms, the Safe Schools, Safe Streets, and Secure Borders Act would allow federal prosecution of juveniles when the Attorney General certifies that the State cannot or will not exercise jurisdiction, or when the juvenile is alleged to have committed a violent, drug or firearm offense.

Prosecutors would be given sole, nonreviewable authority to prosecute as adults 16 and 17 year olds who are alleged to have committed the most serious violent and drug offenses. Limited judicial review is provided for prosecutors' decisions to try as adults 13, 14 and 15 year old juveniles, and 16 and 17 year olds, who are charged with less serious federal offenses. These juveniles are permitted under strict time limits to ask a judge for a ''reverse waiver'' and transfer to juvenile, rather than adult, status.

Assistance to States for Prosecuting and Punishing Juvenile Offenders, and Reducing Juvenile Crime. The bill would authorize grants to the States for incarcerating violent and chronic juvenile offenders (with each qualifying State getting at least one percent

of available money), providing graduated sanctions, reimbursing States for the cost of incarcerating juvenile alien offenders, and a pilot program to replicate successful juvenile crime reduction strategies.

Protecting Children from Violence. The bill contains important initiatives to protect children from violence, including violence resulting from the misuse of guns. Given the recent tragic shootings committed by children, Americans want concrete proposals to reduce the risk of such incidents recurring. At the same time, I certainly do not want to demonize guns or the legitimate use of guns for protection and security or for sport.

The bill would impose a prospective gun ban for juveniles convicted or adjudicated delinquent for violent crimes. It would require revocation of a firearms dealer's license for failing to have secure gun storage or safety devices available for sale with firearms. The bill would enhance the penalty for possessing a firearm during the commission of a crime of violence or drug offense and for violation of certain firearm laws involving juveniles. In addition, the bill would authorize competitive grant programs for establishment of juvenile gun courts and youth violence courts.

Title II of the bill addresses the problem of gang violence. We all share a concern about the growing gang problem in our cities and in rural areas of this country. More than 665,000 gang members belong to 23,000 youth gangs in the United States, and the numbers are growing.

This part of the bill would crack down on gangs by making the interstate ''franchising'' of street gangs a crime. It will also increase penalties for crimes during which the convicted felon wears protective body armor or uses ''laser-sighting'' devices to commit the crime. The bill also doubles the criminal penalties for using or threatening physical violence against witnesses and contains other provisions designed to facilitate the use and protection of witnesses to help prosecute gangs and other violent criminals. For example, the bill would clarify that the federal gratuity statute does not apply to cooperation agreements, contrary to the Tenth Circuit's recent Singleton decision. The Act also provides funding for law enforcement agencies in communities designated by the Attorney General as areas with a high level of interstate gang activity.

Title III of the bill would set forth a number of initiatives in nine subtitles to combat violence in the streets. The Safe Schools, Safe Streets, and Secure Borders Act continues successful initiatives in the 1994 Crime Act by putting more police officers on our streets, providing for the construction of more prisons, preventing juvenile felons from buying handguns, and increasing the security of women and children against domestic violence. Specifically, the bill would extend COPS funding into 2001 and 2002; increase the state minimum for Violent Offender Incarceration grants from .25 to .75 percent, establish a state minimum of .75 percent for Truth-in-Sentencing grants, and extend both these grant programs into 2001 and 2002; extend authorization for the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) funding and local law enforcement grant programs.

A significant problem that arose this year was the loss of confidentiality that had previously attached to the important work of the U.S. Secret Service. The Departments of Justice and Treasury and even a former Republican President advise that the safety of future Presidents may be jeopardized by forcing U.S. Secret Service agents to breach the confidentiality they need to do their job by testifying before a grand jury. I trust the Secret Service on this issue; they are the experts with the mission of protecting the lives of the President and other high-level elected officials and visiting dignitaries. I also have confidence in the judgment of former President Bush, who has written, ''I feel very strongly that [Secret Service] agents should not be made to appear in court to discuss that which they might or might not have seen or heard.''

The Safe Schools Act provides a reasonable and limited protective function privilege so that in the future Secret Service agents are able to maintain the confidentiality they say they need to protect the lives of the President, Vice President and visiting heads of state. This title of the bill includes a number of provisions to address the following matters:

Domestic violence: In addition to extending authorized funding for VAWA, the bill would punish attempts to commit interstate domestic violence, expand the interstate domestic violence offense to cover intimidation, and punish interstate travel with the intent to kill a spouse.

Protecting Law Enforcement and Judiciary: The Act recognizes that law enforcement officers put their lives on the line every day. According to the FBI, over 1,000 officers have been killed in the line of duty since 1980. The Safe Schools, Safe Streets, and Secure Borders Act contains provisions to protect the lives of our law enforcement officers by extending the Bulletproof Vest Partnership grant program through 2003. It also establishes new crimes and increases penalties for killing federal officers and persons working with federal officers, including in the prison context, and for retaliation against federal officials by threatening or injuring their family members. The Act enhances the penalty for assaults and threats against Federal judges and other federal officials engaged in their official duties.

Cargo/Property Theft: The bill also contains an important initiative proposed by Senator LAUTENBERG to deter cargo thefts.

Sentencing Improvements: This subtitle doubles the maximum penalty for manslaughter from 10 to 20 years, consistent with the Sentencing Commission's recommendation, applies the sentencing guidelines to all pertinent federal statutes (such as criminal prohibitions in statutes outside titles 18 and 21 of the United States Code), and other improvements.

Civil Liberties: The bill includes the ''Hate Crimes Prevention Act,'' which was originally introduced by Senator KENNEDY and has the strong bipartisan support of over twenty Members, and other initiatives designed to bolster support for enforcement of civil rights.

These program initiatives are funded by extending the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund for two more years—from downsizing the Federal Government and not from touching the projected Federal budget surplus.

Title IV of the bill outlines a number of prevention programs that are critical to reducing juvenile crime. These programs include grants to youth organizations and ''Say No to Drugs'' Community Centers, reauthorization of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, Anti-Drug Abuse Programs and Local Delinquency Prevention Programs. Additional sections include a program suggested by Senator BINGAMAN to establish a competitive grant program to reduce truancy, with priority given to efforts to replicate successful programs.

The bill would also reauthorize the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA) similarly to H.R. 1818, which passed the House by an overwhelming majority last year. This section creates a new juvenile justice block grant program and retains the four core protections for youth in detention, while adopting greater flexibility for rural areas and modifies the membership of the state advisory groups.

The Republican juvenile crime bill, S. 10, would gut these core protections for juveniles in detention. Republican sponsors of this bill have scrambled to change this bill since they refused to fix it during Committee mark-up, but even as revised this bill remains seriously flawed. A letter sent just last week from the National Collaboration For Youth (comprised of the American Red Cross, Big Brothers, Big Sisters, Boy and Girl Scouts of America, United Way, the YMCA and the YWCA, and other prominent voluntary health and social welfare organizations), criticized the revised S. 10 for being ''ill-conceived'' and for exposing youngsters ''to increased risk.'' According to these experts who work intensively with children, S. 10 as revised ''could ironically lead to more juvenile crime—not less—if enacted.'' The Democratic crime bill puts ideology aside, and follows the advice of these experts.

Title V of the bill contains six subtitles on combating illegal drug use. Illegal drugs are too often at the heart of crime. This Act would help break the cycle of drug use by criminals, requiring States to test prisoners for drugs

and to provide drug treatment programs, so that the convicts would not return to the streets still addicted, and still caught up in a cycle of crime. It would protect our children by increasing penalties for selling drugs to kids and drug trafficking in or near schools, and crack down on ''club drugs.'' It would go a step further and encourage pharmacotherapy research to develop medications for the treatment of drug addiction, a proposal Senator BIDEN has urged. It would fund drug courts, which subject eligible drug offenders to programs of intensive supervision. This title also would reauthorize the Drug Czar/Office of National Drug Control Policy, as Senator BIDEN has recommended in legislation he has introduced with bipartisan support.

Title VI of the bill deals with criminal history records and the use of new technologies for law enforcement purposes. We can not underestimate the usefulness of criminal history records, which can help solve crimes and help prevent crimes. The bill contains the ''Interstate Identification Index''(III) Compact to decentralize the FBI's maintenance of the national criminal history database and provide access to criminal history records for noncriminal justice purposes in accordance with state rules. This provision has bipartisan support and has already passed the Senate.

The compact is a reciprocal, voluntary system of sharing criminal history records (including juvenile records) for noncriminal justice purposes among the States and FBI that is efficient, more accurate than the current system, promises to save money, and allows each participating State to effectuate its own access policies.

In addition, this title contains the ''Crime Identification Technology Act,'' to provide $250 million each year for five years in grants to States for identification and communications systems and forensic labs. This legislation has strong bipartisan support and has also already passed the Senate and is pending in the House.

Title VII of the bill is intended to increase the right of victims who unfortunately become involved in the criminal justice system. The criminal is only half of the equation. We would guarantee the rights of crime victims. All States have some victims' rights laws on the books, but they lack the training and resources to make those rights a reality. This bill provides a model Bill of Rights for crime victims in the federal system, and makes available to the States grants to fund the hiring of State and Federal victim-witness advocates, training, and the technology necessary for model notification system. This bill would make victims' rights a reality.

Specifically, this title reforms federal law and evidence to enhance victims' participation in all stages of criminal proceedings by giving victims a right to notice of detention hearings, plea agreements, sentencing, probation revocations, escapes or releases from prison, and to allocution at hearings, as well as grants for obtaining state-of-the-art systems for providing notice. In addition, this title would provide grant programs to study effectiveness of restorative justice approach for victims and to study crimes against persons with developmental disabilities and for development of strategies to combat such crimes.

Title VIII of the bill details provisions for combating money laundering. Crime increasingly has an international face, from drug kingpins to millionaire terrorists, like Usama bin Laden. The money laundering provisions of this bill hit these international criminals where they live - in the pocketbook.

These provisions would prove to be a key tool in winning the war on drugs. We must have interdiction; we must have treatment programs; we must tell kids to say ''No'' to drugs. But we have to do more, and taking the profit away from the drug lords is an effective weapon. This Democratic crime bill would strengthen these laws.

FBI Director Freeh recently testified at a hearing before the Judiciary Committee that enhanced money laundering provisions would be an important tool against the likes of international terrorists, such as bin Laden. FBI Director Freeh praised the following provisions set forth in this title of the bill.

Fugitive Disentitlement to stop drug kingpins, terrorists and other international fugitives from using our courts to fight to keep the proceeds of the very crimes for which they are wanted. Criminals should not be able to use our courts at the same time they are evading our laws.

Immediate seizure of U.S. assets of foreign criminals, so terrorists and drug lords will not be able to keep their money one step ahead of the law enforcement.

Limits on Foreign Bank Secrecy to stop criminals from hiding behind foreign bank secrecy laws while they use U.S. courts.

These and other money laundering provisions in the bill should find bipartisan support for quick passage before the end of this Congress.

Title IX sets forth important proposals for combating international crime. In particular, the bill would punish violent crimes or murder against American citizens abroad, deny safe havens to international criminals by strengthening extradition, promote cooperation with foreign governments on sharing witnesses and evidence, and streamline the prosecution of international crimes in U.S. courts. Provisions include: giving the FBI authority to investigate and prosecute the murder or extortion of U.S. citizens and state and local officials involved in federally-sponsored programs abroad; providing for extradition under certain circumstances for offenses not covered in a treaty or absent a treaty; giving the Attorney General authority to transfer and share witnesses with foreign governments, and obtain and use foreign evidence in criminal cases; prohibiting fugitives from benefitting from time served abroad fighting extradition; adding serious computer crimes as predicate offenses for which wiretaps may be authorized; and providing court order procedures for law enforcement access to stored information on computer networks.

Finally, Title X contains provisions to strengthen the air, land and sea borders of this country. The bill would punish violence at the borders, increase authority of maritime law enforcement officers at the borders, increase penalties for smuggling contraband and other products, strengthen immigration laws to exclude foreign fleeing felons, and persons involved in racketeering and arms trafficking. Specific sections include: punishing ''port-running,'' which is driving or crashing through Customs entry ports; sanctions for not cooperating with maritime law enforcement officers by obstructing lawful boarding requests and commands to ''heave to''; and denying admission into the U.S. of persons whom consular officials have reason to believe are involved in RICO acts, arms trafficking, or alien smuggling for profit, or are fleeing foreign prosecution.

The Safe Schools, Safe Streets, and Secure Borders Act is a comprehensive Act. Nothing in this bill is just for show or rhetorical flourish. Keeping our schools safe, keeping our streets safe, keeping our citizens safe when they go abroad, and keeping our borders secure are matters on which we can and should make progress. I look forward to working for passage of as many parts of this bill as possible in this Congress.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today Democrats in the Senate are introducing a bill—The Safe Schools, Safe Streets, and Secure Borders Act of 1998, which builds on a legacy of success Senate Democrats have had in the area of anti-crime legislation.

The Safe Schools, Safe Streets, and Secure Borders Act of 1998 continues successful initiatives in the 1994 Crime Act, reforms the juvenile justice system, combats gang violence, cracks down on the sale and use of illegal drugs, ensures the rights of crime victims, and provides valuable tools to law enforcement officers as they battle international crime and terrorism.

While this bill goes a long way to fight crime in our communities and protect our borders, today I want to speak about the horrific and tragic acts of violence that have occurred in no less than 14 of our nation's schools over the past 18 months, most recently as schools were preparing to close for summmer recess, less than 100 miles from our Nation's Capitol—in Richmond, Virginia—and how this bill targets this school-based violent crime.

Over the past 18 months, 18 children and four adults have been killed as a result of school shootings.

When is it going to stop? The nation had seen enough when two students in Jonesboro, Arkansas, ages 11 and 13, began shooting during a false fire alarm. Four girls and one teacher died on that terrible day in March. Since then, 8 more have fallen prey to these school killings.

The number of students who have experienced a violent crime in school continues to rise, with a 23 percent increase between 1989 and 1995.

Mr. President, if we are looking for reasons why our schools erupted in gunfire this year, we need only look at the annual survey released recently by the PRIDE organization, a respected non-profit group that works with young people and their families and communities to create drug-free and safe environments. Their annual PRIDE surveys have been used by 5,500 schools, the Office of National Drug Control Policy's Performance Measures of Effectiveness, and this Congress to monitor student drug use.

The results of the latest PRIDE survey are appalling. Almost a million students—some as young as 10—carry guns to school.

Even worse, half the students carrying guns are also carrying grudges—over half said they had threatened a teacher, and almost two-thirds had threatened to harm another student.

What's more, these students are bringing other problems.

Nearly two-thirds are monthly users of illicit drugs, such as cocaine, heroin, marijuana, and methamphetamine. According to Dr. THOMAS J. Gleaton, one of the authors of the study, this means that, on average, for every classroom in every school building in America, one student showed up with a gun this year. Out of these students, two-thirds were using drugs regularly and carrying grudges. Add together this volatile mix of drugs, guns, and hostility, and the result is what we have seen this year.

If you are not moved by the statistics, look at the shootings. Look at the horror visited on those school children in Rhode Island, Oregon, Washington, Arkansas, Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee. Look at Texas, or Mississippi, Missouri or California, or the tragic events last year in Alaska. This is a national plight afflicting all our communities. As leaders of our nation, we should all be saddened and discouraged by our lack of attention to this critical problem.

How many more children must die before we face up to this crisis?

How can we provide our children with hope for tomorrow if they fear for their life today?

I can think of no other issue closer to the hearts and minds of the American people than the safety of our children.

Mr. President, we know some things work to prevent youth violence, and we have included these measures in our bill.

This bill will establish partnerships between schools and local law enforcement agencies to put specially trained community-oriented officers in schools. We know from the success of the COPS Program that a positive relationship between the community and law enforcement is critical to successful crime prevention. This approach will also benefit schools by providing additional protection and adult supervision to curb violence in schools. In addition, this bill creates a School Security Technology Center to serve as a national resource to local schools trying to make their schools as safe as possible for students.

The PRIDE survey contained some hopeful news as well, Mr. President. While drug use is still dangerously high, this past school year, for the first time in seven years, the use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs by young people decreased across the board. Students who were heavily involved in after-school activities were more than twice as likely to stay away from drugs than students who never participated in these activities.

Mr. President, we should support after-school programs. Let's give our kids coaches and mentors now—and they won't need wardens and judges later.

Our bill will protect children from becoming crime victims by providing additional funding for proven prevention programs in crime-prone areas and creating after school ''safe havens'' where children are protected from drugs, gangs and crime with activities including drug prevention education, academic tutoring, mentoring, and abstinence training.

We recognized the importance of community involvement when we passed a bill that I joined my colleagues in introducing—the Drug-Free Communities Act. That bill recognized that the entire community must become involved to prevent the proliferation of drugs.

This year, let's increase our support and encouragement for prevention programs that include parents and children, law enforcement and teachers, mentors and coaches.

I wish the events of the last 18 months told a different story, but unfortunately it has become evident that some safeguards are needed. If you doubt that, look at what happened in Greensboro, North Carolina, just four months ago when Carlos Gilmer was accidentally shot and killed at his sixth birthday party after he and his four-year-old playmate found a loaded gun in a purse.

No new crime bill program, by itself, will solve this problem of youth violence. But, we can do something. We know some things that work.

How will we feel if there is another Jonesboro, or Springfield? How will we look at ourselves if we have not done everything in our power to prevent such a tragedy? Let us act now, so we won't have to face those questions. The Safe Schools, Safe Streets, and Secure Borders Act of 1998 will go a long way to prevent future acts of school violence.

There is much that divides our two parties. But the issue of our children's safety is—or should be—one area on which we can agree. We must protect our children from violence and prevent our children from becoming violent.

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I want to voice my strong support for the tough, common sense approach to fighting crime that is embodied in the ''Safe Schools, Safe Streets, and Secure Borders Act of 1998''. I want to urge every one of my colleagues—Democrat and Republican—to stand behind this bill and in the closing weeks of this Congress to pass these measures to protect Americans from the crime in our streets, in our schoolyards, and around the world. With lives on the line, there is no time to wait, no time to hesitate, and no time to be partisan.

Four years ago we came together and passed a crime bill that was tough on crime and smart on prevention. I am proud to have helped lead the fight four years ago to put 100,000 cops on the street, and now it's working. Crime is down 22% in Massachusetts and communities tell you it's because we've restored the notion of community policing. In Boston, juvenile crime is down to levels we haven't seen since the 1950's—and Mayor Tom Menino is proving that a combination of tough punishment and outreach to at-risk young people is a prescription for safety, a prescription for crime prevention. None of this would have been possible if this Senate hadn't come together to get serious about crime. Now in America we need to get serious again about crime prevention.

This crime bill continues to build on the achievements of the 1994 Crime Bill, focusing on the new epidemic of crime in our schools, flaws in the juvenile justice system, the crisis of gang violence, and the sale and use of illegal drugs. We wrote this bill keeping in mind both those we are fighting for and those who lead the fight in our streets—that's why it enhances the rights of victims and gives more tools to law enforcement officers as they take on international crime and terrorism.

From expanding the COPS Program, providing additional funds for prisons and jails, helping the fight against violence against women, and creating partnerships between schools and law enforcement agencies, this bill targets resources on the ground where they're needed the most. This bill is smart and tough when it comes to building a better juvenile justice system—giving federal prosecutors the authority to prosecute some juvenile criminals as adults when they commit the most heinous of crimes; banning gun purchases by juveniles who have been convicted of violent crime; and providing the badly needed funds for youth violence courts. These measures respond to the demand from those brave social workers, prosecutors, and police working on juvenile

crime at ground zero with inadequate resources.

This bill also represents a critical response to the crisis of international crime and terrorism. Mr. President, we are facing a threat that is global in nature: transnational crime organizations that closely resemble multinational corporations; terrorist organizations that have pledged to send more and more Americans home in bodybags. This bill does more than send the message that we won't tolerate terrorism—it makes it clear that we're going to give our law enforcement personnel the tools to stop terrorists dead in their tracks.

Mr. President, the clock is ticking on this Congress. But even louder is the ticking time-bomb of crime in our schools, violence in our streets, and terrorism abroad. This Senate has the chance to act decisively to pass the ''Safe Schools, Safe Streets, and Secure Borders Act'' to fight crime, to defuse the threats before this nation. We have no reason to stall. The time is now to move forward with measures that are smart, tough, and effective.●

● Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues, Senators DASCHLE, BIDEN and LEAHY, in introducing the Safe Schools, Safe Streets, and Secure Borders Act of 1998. This comprehensive legislation, which will add to the success of the 1994 Crime Bill, is based on a tough, common-sense strategy: Put more police officers on the street, build more prisons for violent offenders, take guns out of the hands of felons, and protect families from the scourge of domestic violence.

In the wake of the historic 1994 Crime bill, we have seen a dramatic decline in crime rates across the nation. In 1996, we experienced the lowest violent crime rate since 1989. On the whole, the overall crime rate was lower than any year since 1984. And it appears that we will continue in this success: Preliminary figures released by the Federal Bureau of Investigation show that nationwide, serious crime dropped an additional four percent in 1997.

While these numbers are impressive, recent events have shown that there is still much that must be done in order to equip our nations law enforcement agencies and local communities with the tools they need to address the latest scourge of violence in our schools, in our nation's embassies around the world, and at our borders. This multifaceted legislation has many well-written, well-thought out proposals which I believe greatly help our nation continue winning the fight against crime and terrorism in our ever-changing world.

Among the many parts of this legislation, I am most excited about additional funding for continuing the fight against domestic violence. We first took up this issue with the historic passage of the Violence Against Women Act. This legislation, which improves on our commitment to fighting against violence against women, will provide additional grants dedicated to the arrest and prosecution of batterers, shelter for 400,000 abused women and their children, and continued access to the National Domestic Violence Hotline. These initiatives are paramount in ensuring safety from crimes committed within the home.

And there are other parts of this legislation that I believe are especially poignant given the latest outbreak of violence in our nation's schools. This legislation finally brings the juvenile justice system up to date with the juvenile crime of the day, by giving Federal prosecutors sole, nonreviewable authority to prosecute 16 and 17 year olds as adults when they are alleged to have committed the most serious federal violent and drug offenses. It would also provide grants to States to incarcerate violent juvenile offenders, establish graduated sanctions, and encourage pilot programs to replicate successful juvenile crime reduction strategies. A proposal to further curb the threat of gang violence and crime and to reduce the drug-related crime has also been included in this bill. Finally, this legislation would provide grants for juvenile gun and youth violence courts, and for truancy prevention and comprehensive delinquency prevention activities.

I am most pleased, however, that this legislation contains two provisions that were included in my Safe Communities and Schools Act, which I introduced early this month. That legislation, which has been incorporated into this bill, will help put an additional 25,000 police officers on the street and create new grants under the COPS program for school and local law enforcement efforts against school-yard violence.

As you know, the COPS program has played a vital role in reducing our nation's crime rate. Since inception of the program in 1994, the Department of Justice has authorized an additional 76,000 police officers to walk the beat. These additional police officers have been instrumental in helping reduce crime and making people feel safe in their communities.

For example, in my home state of Illinois, the COPS program, which has put 4,113 police officers on streets across the state, has been extremely effective. Between the time that the Crime Bill was passed and the end of last year, serious crime fell by 17 percent. Recent statistics show that for the first six months of 1998, serious crime throughout Illinois is down 2.8 percent over 1997.

Despite the positive gains that have been made in the wake of the 1994 Omnibus Crime bill, the latest influx of violence in our nation's schools is evidence that their is still much work to be done. Although we are seeing record reductions in the incident of youth-on-youth crime, the extremely violent nature of crimes now being committed by juveniles is nothing short of stunning. Extending the COPS program and making more funds available to communities to combat school violence will free the hands of local law enforcement and give them the opportunity to develop new and innovative ways of reducing youth crime.

Finally, this legislation seeks to place reasonable, Constitutional restrictions on gun purchases and gun ownership. It would ban prospective gun purchases by juveniles who have been adjudicated delinquent or convicted of violent crimes and would require gun dealers to make gun safety devices available for sale or have their licenses revoked. It would also impose tougher penalties for possession of guns during the commission of a crime of violence or drug offense.

Overall, this bill provides a holistic response to the varied nature of crime being committed at home and abroad against American citizens. It is a sensible approach to a devastating problem. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and to push for its immediate passage.●

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Safe Schools, Safe Streets, and Secure Borders Act of 1998 introduced by my colleague, Senator LEAHY. I urge all my Senate colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. President, there no doubt are many issues that are on the minds of Americans. Certainly, crime, particularly juvenile crime, delinquency and drug and alcohol abuse, are issues that I hear most about when I am in my home state of New Mexico. Although recent crime statistics shows a clear downward trend in crime on our nation's streets, crime reduction must remain a priority at the federal level.

This bill comprehensively addresses the problem of juvenile crime, and it strikes a balance between the need to deal with serious juvenile offenders in a swift and meaningful way and the clear, practical necessity to prevent our youth from getting in trouble in the first place.

I am delighted that the managers of this bill have included two separate bills which I previously introduced, and I thank Senator LEAHY for his accommodation. The first, my Truancy Prevention and Juvenile Crime Reduction Act, deals with the problem of truancy, which long has been neglected as a root cause of juvenile crime. The second, my Safe Schools Security Act of 1998, addresses the problem of school violence and provides resources, such as technical expertise and security technology, to schools that are experiencing the most serious problems in their schools.

I first want to discuss truancy, which not many people realize is the top-ranking characteristic of criminals. High rates of truancy directly are linked to high daytime crime rates, including violence, burglary and vandalism. As much as 44 percent of violent juvenile crime takes place during school hours, and as much as 75 percent

of children ages 13 to 16 who are arrested and prosecuted for crimes are truants. It is startling to know that some cities report as many as 70 percent of daily student absences are unexcused, and the number of absences in single city can reach 4,000

Moreover, society pays a very heavy social and economic price due to truancy. Only 34 percent of inmates have completed high school education, and we all are well aware of the staggering costs associated with incarcerating an individual. Sadly, as many as 17 percent of youth under the age of 18 that enter adult prisons have not completed eighth grade, 75 percent have not completed 10th grade.

Most studies indicate that when parents, schools, law enforcement and community leaders all work together to prevent truancy, to intervene at its early stages, and to create meaningful accountability, we can increase school attendance and reduce daytime crime rates.

One such program is the Daytime Curfew Program in Roswell, New Mexico, and the Truancy Intervention Project in Fulton County, Georgia, administered by Judge Glenda Hatchett. Another successful program included in this Act is the Grade Court, which is Farmington, New Mexico, administered by Judge Paul Onuska. All of these programs integrate parental involvement with schools, law enforcement, judiciary, and other community stakeholders in a collaborative effort to reduce truancy and juvenile crime. These are the kinds of programs I believe we should be encouraging, but unfortunately we in the Congress have not yet met the challenge.

This Act authorizes $25 million per year targeted at building upon integral partnerships between local government, schools, law enforcement, and the courts. Without a doubt, $25 million is a very small price to pay when you consider the dividends we expect when young people stay in school and out of trouble.

The Youth Law Center, the Children's Defense Fund, and the National Network for Youth, which has more than 500 community youth-serving organizations and personnel nationwide all agree with the importance of combating truancy and enthusiastically have voiced their support for this initiative.

The second provision of this bill I would like to discuss deals with the safety of our public schools. We spend a great deal of time here talking about improving academic achievement of our nation's school children, and I believe we are making great progress. I also believe, however, that we cannot expect a child to perform up to his or her potential in an environment in which they cannot feel safe and secure. Obviously, a learning environment has to be a safe environment. However, recent tragedies in Mississippi, Arkansas, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and Oregon, for example, strongly suggest that we can and should do much more to keep our school safe.

Recently, the Department of Education released the results of a comprehensive study called Violence and Discipline Problems in U.S. Public Schools: 1996–97. The study shows that 10 percent of schools surveyed had at least one serious violent crime during the 1996–97 school year. Also, during the 1996–97 school year, approximately 4,000 incidents of rape or other types of sexual battery were reported in public schools across the country. Additionally, there were approximately 11,000 incidents of physical attacks or fights in which weapons were used and approximately 7,000 robberies in schools that year.

As grim as the statistics are, we also must recognize the emotional effect that school crime has on our children. According to a separate study, 29 percent of elementary, 34 percent of junior high, and 20 percent of high school students say they are worried about becoming victims of crime at school. Seventy-one percent of children ages 7 to 10 say they worry they might get shot or stabbed at school. I cannot imagine how a child can be expected to achieve up to his or her potential if they are worried about their physical safety. Clearly, we must respond, and I believe this is an area in which we can make a significant difference, and we should take advantage of the resources we presently have to address this problem.

Many people are familiar with the fine work of our National Laboratories, which for decades have been leaders in energy and defense research and development. These Labs have many years of experience supporting and helping to protect high-risk facilities and assets for the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and many other federal agencies in some capacity, through the use of security technology. The result of this capability is that our nation's government facilities enjoy some of the finest security and safety programs in the world. This expertise should be fully utilized to improve the safety of our schools.

Alreacy Sandia Laboratories has taken the initiative. Two years ago Sandia began a pilot project at Belen High School in New Mexico, whereby Sandia security experts implemented a security regimen and installed a variety of security technology. Sandia is the first to admit that they do not know the first thing about running a public school, and Belen readily will admit to a lack of expertise in security. Nevertheless, the match was perfect. Working together, Sandia and Belen high school officials changed the school by utilizing a comprehensive security design and technology, including cameras, metal detectors, and sensors.

The results are very impressive. Since the pilot project was implemented at the school, on-campus violence is down 75 percent, truancy is down 30 percent, theft from vehicles parked in the school parking lot is down 80 percent, vandalism is down 75 percent. These statistics are compelling, and with this level of success already demonstrated, the effort should be expanded to allow more schools to access the expertise and technology.

This technology is not cheap, and schools already are challenged to purchase basic educational materials and equipment. However, I believe that with the right technical assistance and technology, not only will this help schools become safe for the children, but schools will save money. Incredibly, the Belen school principal, Ron Marquez, reported to me that before the pilot went into effect, Belen high school had approximately $50,000 per year in losses due to stolen school property. One year after the pilot, Belen has had only $5,000 in insurance claims. The savings translates into, for example, less cost to repair vandalized property, or property that has been defaced by graffiti.

We must take advantage of this success and put this expertise to use where it certainly will have very positive results.

One other provision in this bill that I believe will make a tremendous difference to communities that are struggling to reduce juvenile crime is the provision that allows communities to replicate proven juvenile crime reduction strategies. Specifically, this bill provides resources to communities that collaborate with local, state, and federal agencies to address the juvenile crime problem. In my state of New Mexico, we are helping bring together community leaders, schools, judges, law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and grass-roots community organizations in order to develop and implement the Boston Strategy to Reduce Juvenile Violence. As anyone would agree, when community leaders work and communicate with one another on a common problem, usually good things. The City of Boston has had great success in reducing its violent crime rate. For example, after being at or near the top of the list among cities in terms of homicide, Boston's juvenile homicide rate dropped to zero, and its overall homicide rate dropped by sixty percent between 1995 and 1997.

There is clear value to helping communities do the same kinds of things, and this bill helps in a substantial way.

I thank Senator LEAHY for his hard work to craft this important legislation and Senator DASCHLE for his leadership, and I am very pleased to support it.●

By Mr. GORTON:

S. 2485. A bill to amend the title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow States to use the funds available under the State children's health insurance program for enhanced matching rate for coverage of additional children under the medicaid program; to the Committee on Finance.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH EQUITY ACT

• Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, last year, Congress and the President agreed to provide $48 billion over the next 10 years as an incentive to states to provide health care coverage to uninsured, low-income children. To receive this money, states must expand eligibility levels to children living in families with incomes up to 200% of the federal poverty level.

Washington State has a strong record of ensuring that its low-income kids have access to health care. Four year ago, my state decided to do what Congress and the President have just last year required other states to do. In 1994, Washington expanded its child Medicaid eligibility level to 200% of the federal poverty level (FPL) all the way through to the age of 18.

During the negotiations of the 1997 Balanced Budget Act (BBA), Congress and the Administration recognized that certain states were already undertaking Medicaid expansions up to or above 200 percent of FPL, and that they should be allowed to use the new SCHIP funds. Unfortunately, this provision was limited to those states that enacted expansions on or after March 31, 1997 and disallowed Washington from accessing the $230 million in SCHIP funds it had been allocated through 2002. As a result, Washington State cannot use its SCHIP allotment to cover the 90,000 children currently eligible, but not covered for health care at or below 200 percent of poverty. Exacerbating this inequity is the fact that many states have begun accessing their SCHIP allotments to cover kids at poverty levels far below Washington's current or past eligibility levels.

The bill I am introducing today, along with Senator MURRAY, corrects this technicality and is a top priority for the Washington State delegation as we near the end of the 105th Congress. Congresswoman DUNN has also introduced a companion measure in the House of Representatives that is cosponsored by the entire Washington delegation.

This bipartisan, bicameral initiative represents a thoughtful, carefully-crafted response to the unintended consequences of SCHIP and brings much-needed assistance to children currently at-risk. Rather than simply changing the effective date included in the BBA, this initiative includes strong maintenance of effort language as well as incentives for our state to find those 90,000 uninsured kids because we feel strongly that they receive the health coverage for which they are eligible.

This bill does not take money from other states nor does it provide additional federal subsidies for children the state is now covering, it simply allows Washington to continue to do the good work they have already started by focusing on new, uninsured children at low income levels first.•

• Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague Senator GORTON in introducing legislation to improve access to health insurance for low income children in Washington State. This bill would amend the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) to allow our State access to their allotment of federal funds to provide health coverage to an additional 90,000 eligible children.

This is not an effort to supplant state funds. This does not take funds from other states. It simply allows Washington to access their allotment of SCHIP funds to cover those children who currently lack any health security. Because of their lack of access to health insurance, these children have little or no access to health care and no access to preventive services.

These are children whose parents work hard but do not have access to health insurance or cannot afford the cost of premiums. These parents work hard and pay taxes, unfortunately they have little discretionary income to provide important health security for their children.

Last year, this Congress made a commitment to cover the 10 million uninsured children in this country. The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 included an expansion in children's health insurance benefits as a down payment on meeting the needs of these 10 million vulnerable children. This Congress took the right step in working to achieve the goal of guaranteeing every child in this country a healthy childhood. What we are attempting to do in this legislation that we are introducing today, is to honor this commitment to the children in Washington State.

In 1994 Washington State stood up for our vulnerable children. We implemented an expansion in our Medicaid program to cover children up to 200% of poverty. We knew at the time that it was a huge undertaking, but we recognized that investing in our children's health was a wise investment. Because of the final language adopted in the Balanced Budget Act, Washington could not access their SCHIP funds to cover newly enrolled children below the 200% of poverty threshold and above the federal Medicaid requirement.

As a result, Washington State was penalized for being a leader in children's health. We are here today proposing a technical fix that rewards Washington State and allows them to cover an additional 60,000 to 90,000 children. This is not done at the expense of other States, but rather by using Washington's existing allotment.

I can assure my colleagues that Washington State will honor our commitment to our children. But without access to these funds, enrolling these children will be almost impossible. If we all share the same goal of insuring these 10 million children, we must enact this legislation. The health care needs of low income children in Washington are just as great and just as important as they are for low income children in other states.

I am hopeful that we can act on this legislation. This technical remedy will go a long way in meeting our shared goal of guaranteeing access to quality, and affordable health care for all children.•

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 2487. A bill to amend the Equal Access Act to provide equal access for elementary and secondary school groups to expense reimbursement and materials, and to provide equal access for community groups to meeting space; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EQUAL ACCESS IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that furthers an important object of government—promoting religious liberty and the free exercise of religion. Specifically, I rise to introduce the Equal Access Improvement Act, a bill that would ensure that benefits currently provided to non-curricular school groups and community groups be extended on a non-discriminatory basis to all groups without regard to the religious nature of the organization.

This bill reflects and reinforces an important principle that pervades the Supreme Court's decisions concerning religious liberty—the principle of non-discrimination. The Supreme Court has recognized again and again that neutral laws that provide benefits without regard to the religious nature of recipients do not run afoul of our constitutional traditions. What is more, laws that specifically exclude religious entities from a class of beneficiaries are inconsistent with our Constitution's guarantee of the free exercise of religion. Laws that discriminate against specific religions or against religious organizations in general are incompatible with our nation's founding document and with a fundamental respect for people of faith.

The bill would ensure that student prayer clubs are provided the same access to school facilities as other non-curricular school clubs. Our schools reflect many of the problems that plague our larger culture. Just as in the larger culture, prayer can play an inimitable role in dealing with violence, drugs, and the other challenges in the schools. Denying access to school facilities for student prayer groups, while similar groups are granted access, sends precisely the wrong message. Prayer is an answer. Prayer is not the problem. There is no reason to deny benefits to a group because they engage in prayer or because they have some other religious component.

Nothing in this bill provides any special treatment to religious groups. The bill removes discrimination against religious groups and religious activities. It does not introduce any new discrimination in favor of religious groups. The bill enshrines the principal of neutrality that is at the heart of the Constitution's guarantees of religious liberty.

The Equal Access Improvement Act builds on the work of the 98th Congress, which passed the original Equal

Access Act. The bill extends those provisions to reflect subsequent Supreme Court and lower court decisions and to reflect the experience we have had with the Equal Access Act in the last fourteen years. I have consulted with organizations and individuals who have litigated cases under the Equal Access Act and incorporated many of their suggestions for improving the law.

Specifically, the bill extends the existing law's provision ensuring equal access to meeting space to include equal access to school facilities, including expense reimbursement. Just as a school prayer club should not be denied access to a class room when it is open to the chess club, so too if the school pays to print a newsletter or pays for refreshments for one club, it should not discriminate on the basis of the religious content of the group's speech or activities. In the same way that the original Equal Access Act extended and reinforced the Supreme Court's decision in *Windmar* v. *Vincent*, 454 U.S. 263 (1981), beyond the public university context, this legislation would extend and reinforce the Supreme Court's decision in *Rosenberger* v. *Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia*, 515 U.S. 819 (1995).

The legislation also guarantees students a right to distribute literature without regard to the religious content of the literature. It guarantees access to community groups to school facilities on an equal basis without regard to the religious character of the group. Finally, the legislation extends equal access guarantees to intermediate school students.

Let me emphasize that this bill, like the original Equal Access Act, creates no obligation for a school to provide meeting space or other facilities to any non-curriculum based group or any community group. The legislation simply provides that if a school does make its facilities available to non-curriculum based groups or to community groups, then the school cannot discriminate against other groups on the basis of the religious content of their speeches or activities. What is more, the legislation expressly preserves the ability of schools to enforce content-neutral policies denying or limiting access to all groups.

Passage of this legislation would have many benefits. However, none more important than to reinforce the principle that nothing in the Constitution requires—or permits—the government to discriminate against groups on the basis of the religious nature of their speech or activities. As the Supreme Court recognized long ago, when the government accommodates religious practice and eliminates discrimination based on religion ''it follows the best of our traditions.'' *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, 314 (1952). I believe this bill also follows the best of our traditions, and I look forward to working toward its enactment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2487

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 ''Equal Access Improvement Act''.

SEC. 2. EQUAL ACCESS TO EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 802 of The Equal Access Act (20 U.S.C. 4071) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d) through (f) as subsections (g) through (i), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c), the following:

''(d)(1) Subject to subsection (i), it shall be unlawful for any public intermediate school or secondary school that—

''(A) receives Federal financial assistance;

''(B) maintains a limited open forum as described in subsection (b); and

''(C) provides for the reimbursement of the expenses of one or more noncurriculum-related student groups or students pursuing noncurriculum-related activities;

to deny equal treatment, to any student group or student, respectively, seeking reimbursement for similar expenses, on the basis of the religious, political, philosophical, or other content of the speech or activity engaged in by such student group or student, respectively.

''(2) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent a public intermediate school or secondary school from granting or denying a reimbursement request pursuant to a neutral policy administered without regard to the religious, political, philosophical, or other content of the speech or activity engaged in by the student group or student seeking the reimbursement.''.

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Subsection (g) of section 802 of The Equal Access Act (20 U.S.C. 4071), as amended in subsection (a), is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by inserting after ''beyond'' the following: ''the reimbursement of expenses on a nondiscriminatory basis as provided for in subsection (d), and payment of'';

(2) in paragraph (4), by inserting ''or activity'' after ''meeting'' each place it appears; and

(3) in paragraph (5), by inserting ''or activities'' after ''meetings''.

SEC. 3. EQUAL ACCESS FOR DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS.

Section 802 of The Equal Access Act (20 U.S.C. 4071) is amended by inserting after subsection (d), as added by section 2, the following:

''(e)(1) Subject to subsection (i), it shall be unlawful for any public intermediate school or secondary school that—

''(A) receives Federal financial assistance;

''(B) maintains a limited open forum as described in subsection (b); and

''(C) permits one or more noncurriculum-related student groups or students pursuing noncurriculum-related activities to distribute newsletters or other written materials;

to deny equal treatment, to any student group or student, respectively, seeking a similar opportunity to distribute newsletters or other written materials, on the basis of the religious, political, philosophical, or other content of the speech or activity engaged in by such student group or student, respectively.

''(2) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent a public intermediate school or secondary school from granting or denying a request to distribute newsletters or other written materials pursuant to a neutral policy that—

''(A) is administered without regard to the religious, political, philosophical, or other content of the speech or activity engaged in by the student group or student making the request; and

''(B) imposes reasonable time, place, and manner restrictions on the distribution of newsletters or other written materials consistent with the first and 14th amendments to the Constitution.''.

SEC. 4. EQUAL ACCESS FOR COMMUNITY GROUPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 802 of The Equal Access Act (20 U.S.C. 4071) is amended by inserting after subsection (e), as added by section 3, the following:

''(f)(1) Subject to subsection (i), it shall be unlawful for any public elementary school, intermediate school, or secondary school that—

''(A) receives Federal financial assistance; and

''(B) has a limited community forum with respect to noncurriculum-related community groups or individuals from the community pursuing noncurriculum-related activities as described in paragraph (2);

to deny equal access to, or discriminate against, any community group or any individual from the community, respectively, who desires to conduct a meeting, or otherwise use school facilities, within that limited community forum, on the basis of the religious, political, philosophical, or other content of the speech or activity engaged in by such community group or individual, respectively.

''(2) In this subsection, a public elementary school, intermediate school, or secondary school has a limited community forum if such school grants an offering to or opportunity for one or more noncurriculum-related community groups or individuals from the community pursuing noncurriculum-related activities to meet on school premises or otherwise use school facilities during noninstructional time.

''(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent a public elementary school, intermediate school, or secondary school from granting or denying a request by a community group or individual from a community to meet on school premises or otherwise use school facilities pursuant to a neutral policy administered without regard to the religious, political, philosophical, or other content of the speech or activities engaged in by the community group or individual.

''(4) In this subsection, the term 'elementary school' means a school that provides elementary education, as defined by State law.''.

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Subsection (g) of section 802 of The Equal Access Act (20 U.S.C. 4071), as amended in section 2, is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''or meetings initiated by a community group or individual from a community'' after ''student-initiated meetings''; and

(2) in paragraph (6), by inserting ''or community groups'' after ''groups of students''.

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF EQUAL ACCESS GUARANTEES TO PUBLIC INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 802 of The Equal Access Act (20 U.S.C. 4071) is amended by striking subsections (a) through (c) and inserting the following:

''(a) Subject to subsection (i), it shall be unlawful for any public intermediate school or secondary school that receives Federal financial assistance and that has a limited

open forum with respect to noncurriculum-related student groups or students pursuing noncurriculum-related activities to deny equal access or a fair opportunity to, or discriminate against, any student group or student, respectively, who wishes to conduct a meeting, or otherwise use school facilities, within that limited open forum, on the basis of the religious, political, philosophical, or other content of the speech or activity at such meetings.

''(b) In this subsection, a public intermediate school or secondary school has a limited open forum if such school grants an offering to or opportunity for one or more noncurriculum-related student groups or students pursuing noncurriculum-related activities to meet on school premises or otherwise use school facilities during noninstructional time.

''(c) Schools shall be deemed to offer a fair opportunity to student groups and students who wish to conduct a meeting, or otherwise use school facilities, within its limited open forum if such school uniformly provides that—

''(1) the meeting or use of facilities is voluntary and student-initiated;

''(2) there is no sponsorship of the meeting or use of facilities by the school, the government, or its agents or employees;

''(3) employees or agents of the school or government are present at religious meetings or activities involving the use of facilities only in a nonparticipatory capacity;

''(4) the meeting or use of facilities does not materially and substantially interfere with the orderly conduct of educational activities within the school; and

''(5) nonschool persons may not direct, conduct, control, or regularly attend activities of student groups or students.''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 803 of the The Equal Access Act (20 U.S.C. 4072) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) The term 'intermediate school' means a public school that provides education to students in grade 6 or higher and that does not provide education to students in grade 5 or lower.''.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 2488. A bill to establish the Northwest Straits Advisory Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE NORTHWEST STRAITS MARINE CONSERVATION INITIATIVE ACT

• Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague in the House, Representative JACK METCALF, to introduce the Northwest Straits Marine Conservation Initiative Act.

Mr. President, I have always believed that the best way to solve problems is to bring people together and find consensus on an issue. The Northwest Straits Marine Conservation Initiative Act is the direct outgrowth of just such an approach.

The Northwest Straits include the marine waters of the Strait of Juan de Fuca, the San Juan Islands, and the northern portion of Puget Sound. It is a scenic and unique ecosystem critical to a broad array of sensitive fish and wildlife, including orcas, sea birds, salmon, bottom fish, and bald eagles.

Recognizing the importance of this precious marine ecosystem, the Northwest Straits were proposed for inclusion in the National Marine Sanctuaries program in some capacity as far back as 1979 when the National Marine Sanctuary Program was in its infancy. Although the Northwest Straits lie entirely within state waters, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) spent the next seventeen years evaluating the inclusion of this special area into the marine sanctuary program. This process involved substantial public participation. In recent years, it became clear there was insufficient local support to move forward with a Northwest Straits Marine Sanctuary designation for the area.

In response to these local concerns, Rep. METCALF and I included a provision in the 1996 reauthorization of the Marine Sanctuaries program barring final designation of a Northwest Straits Marine Sanctuary without Congressional approval. Having thus put the marine sanctuary process on hold, in the Spring of 1997 we established a Citizen's Advisory Commission (the Commission) to identify the key marine resources and values of the Northwest Straits, as well as the threats to them, and recommend appropriate protective measures and a means of coordinating related federal, state, and local actions. The Commission is broadly representative of local interests including County and Port Commissioners, environmental and conservation groups, shipping interests, academics, and Indian Tribes.

The Commission met diligently for eighteen months to fulfill their mission. In addition to the Commission members, a representative of Governor Gary Locke participated in meetings and federal, state, and local agencies provided information and technical assistance. All Commission meetings have been open to the public and interested parties. The Commission has researched and reviewed the issues surrounding the Northwest Straits exhaustively and presented their formal recommendation to Representative METCALF and myself on August 20.

The Commission has concluded that the very fabric of the Northwest Straits is unraveling, manifesting problems and trends that cross geographic and jurisdictional lines. While the ecosystem is complicated, the trends are simple: bottom fish, sea birds, invertebrates, salmon, and even some marine mammals have declined precipitously since 1980. This depletion of marine resources has hurt economies and communities around the Northwest Straits and further degradation portends far more serious impacts in the future. Existing management schemes, while sufficient in terms of legal authority, have failed to achieve the coordination and focus to change these trends.

While the Commission has not reached a consensus to endorse or reject any future alternative management scheme, the Commission recommends a set of steps that would not displace current management responsibilities but seek to compliment them by supplying key missing ingredients for success: sound science and broad support for solutions. These steps include the establishment of a network of local, county-based Marine Resources Committees (MRCs) committed to making all possible progress at the local level to protect and conserve the resources of the Northwest Straits using existing state and local authorities, and based on sound scientific information and the overall needs of the Northwest Straits ecosystem. The MRCs will coordinate activities through a Northwest Straits Commission consisting of representatives of the MRCs, Indian Tribes, the scientific community, and state agencies. The Commission will provide technical assistance, integrate science, develop an ecosystem-level coordination, and coordinate funding.

In addition, the Commission will assess the performance of the MRCs against a series of benchmarks. These Benchmarks of Performance shall include the assessment and establishment of a scientifically-based regional system of Marine Protected Areas, the assessment and establishment of a scientifically-based regional system to protect nearshore habitat, a net gain in open shellfish harvest areas, and discernable increases in bottom fish and other key marine indicators. Should these benchmarks fail to be met, further consideration of alternative approaches, including a marine sanctuary designation may be resumed.

In addition, this bill calls for a review of the effort after 5 years by the National Research Council, with particular emphasis on the achievement of the Benchmarks of Performance. With the authorization for this ''Local Marine Conservation Initiative'' expiring in 6 years, this NRC report will help us assess the accomplishments of this effort to determine whether it should be continued.

Mr. President, the Northwest Straits Marine Conservation Initiative Act represents the right way to address environmental challenges. By pulling all of the interested parties together to analyze and research not only the issue, but each other's perspectives, partnerships can be forged that will provide long-term benefits. This pragmatic and achievable proposal will truly improve resource protection in the Northwest Straits. It is an innovative, exciting way to address the marine conservation challenges before us. I am excited about this approach and the way it empowers local communities and local citizens to take the initiative to protect their home waters. In many ways, this approach is a test or experiment. The local leaders have the next several years to demonstrate that a coordinated, informed, and empowered local decision-making process can provide true protection for the Northwest Straits. I believe they can meet this challenge. I look forward to Congress' timely consideration of this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of commission members

and a letter from Governor Gary Locke be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MURRAY/METCALF NORTHWEST STRAITS LOCAL CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMISSION MEMBERS

Lew Moore, co-facilitator.
Dan Evans, co-facilitator.
Brain Calvert, Friday Harbor Port Commissioner.
Donn Charnley, former State Legislator.
Dwain Colby, former County Commissioner.
Jim Darling, Executive Director, Port of Bellingham.
Kathy Fletcher, People for Puget Sound.
Dave Fluharty, University of Washington/School of Marine Affairs.
Don Hopkins, Port of Everett Commissioner/Longshoreman.
Harry Hutchins, Steam Ship Operators.
Cheryl Hymes, former State Legislator/Evergreen Freedom Foundation.
Phill Kitchel, Clallam County Commissioner.
Mac McDowell, Island County Commissioner.
Andrew Palmer, local marine conservationist.
Doug Scott, Friends of the San Juans.
Terry Williams, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission/Tulalip Tribes.
Dennis Willows, University of Washington/Friday Harbor Marine Labs.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT

Kelly Balcomb, Center for Whale Research.
Tom Cowen, Puget Sound Water Quality Action Team.
Daniel Farber, WA State Parks and Recreation Commission.
Todd Jacobs, NOAA—Olympic Coast Marine Sanctuary Manager.
Dan James, Pacific Northwest Waterways Association.
Eric Johnson, WA Public Ports Association.
Bob Nichols, Governor Gary Locke's Office.
Lisa Randlette, WA State Dept. of Natural Resources.
Terry Swanson, WA State Dept. of Ecology.
Kathy Soudere, Naval Air Station—Whidbey Island.
Shirley Waters, Office of Clallam County Commissioners.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Olympia, WA, August 20, 1998.

Hon. PATTY MURRAY,
Hon. JACK METCALF,
Northwest Straits Citizens Advisory Commission, Padilla Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve, Mount Vernon, WA.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY, CONGRESSMAN METCALF, AND ADVISORY COMMISSION MEMBERS: I am writing to congratulate you on your success in developing a thoughtful, broadly-supported framework for restoring the marine resources of northern Puget Sound and the Strait of Juan de Fuca—the regional gem we call the Northwest Straits. I also want to express my appreciation for your willingness to dedicate so much of your time and talent over the last year-and-a-half to this effort.

This Commission's report has special credibility and value because its preparation engaged high-level community leaders representing a wide spectrum of interests. In joining forces across the political aisle to solve pressing regional problems, the convenors have followed the highest and best tradition of the Washington Congressional delegation.

I am pleased to see that the Commission has approached the problems of the Northwest Straits in a thoughtful and strategically targeted manner. Instead of proposing a new regulatory authority or layer of bureaucracy, you have wisely sought to complement the roles of existing federal, state, and local authorities by bringing in additional science and creating a forum to build the broad support necessary to advance resource protection.

Again, I want to commend you for your work in developing this proposed partnership to restore and protect the magnificent marine resources of the Northwest Straits. My administration and I look forward to working with you as you develop a congressional proposal and work to implement the report's recommendations.

Sincerely,

GARY LOCKE,
Governor.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 361

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 361, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to prohibit the sale, import, and export of products labeled as containing endangered species, and for other purposes.

S. 769

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 769, a bill to amend the provisions of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To- Know Act of 1986 to expand the public's right to know about toxic chemical use and release, to promote pollution prevention, and for other purposes.

S. 842

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 842, a bill to provide for the immediate application of certain orders relating to the amendment, modification, suspension, or revocation of certificates under chapter 447 of title 49, United States Code.

S. 852

At the request of Mr. MACK, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 852, a bill to establish nationally uniform requirements regarding the titling and registration of salvage, nonrepairable, and rebuilt vehicles.

S. 1180

At the request of Mr. KEMPTHORNE, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1180, a bill to reauthorize the Endangered Species Act.

S. 1459

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1459, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 5-year extension of the credit for producing electricity from wind and closed-loop biomass.

S. 2180

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) were added as cosponsors of S. 2180, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to clarify liability under that Act for certain recycling transactions.

S. 2190

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2190, a bill to authorize qualified organizations to provide technical assistance and capacity building services to microenterprise development organizations and programs and to disadvantaged entrepreneurs using funds from the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 2202

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. D'AMATO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2202, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to ensure that all dogs and cats used by research facilities are obtained legally.

S. 2263

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 2263, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the expansion, intensification, and coordination of the activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to research on autism.

S. 2291

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2291, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to prevent the misappropriation of collections of information.

S. 2295

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2295, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations of appropriations for that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2296

At the request of Mr. FAIRCLOTH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2296, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on the amount of receipts attributable to military property which may be treated as exempt foreign trade income.

At the request of Mr. MACK, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) were added as cosponsors of S. 2296, supra.

S. 2364

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) and the Senator from