

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. KOHL):

S. 2494. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) to enhance the ability of direct broadcast satellite and other multichannel video providers to compete effectively with cable television systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself and Mr. D'AMATO):

S. 2495. A bill to establish the Kate Mullany National Historic Site in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 2496. A bill to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Aspinwall, Pennsylvania, as the "H. John Heinz III Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center"; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DASCHLE, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. HARKIN):

S. Res. 279. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate supporting the right of the United States citizens in Puerto Rico to express their desires regarding their future political status; considered and agreed to.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WELLSTONE:

S. 2489. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish and improve programs to increase the availability of quality child care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

##### CHILD DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, right now in our country there are about 10 million children—of course, when I talk about children, I am talking about their parents as well—who are eligible for good developmental child care opportunities. As it turns out, we provide assistance to 1.4 million out of this 10 million. In other words, fully 86 percent of children who are eligible to receive some assistance so that they will get better child care in those critical early years receive no assistance at all.

I introduce today this piece of legislation, which I have called the Child Development Act. I have been working on it for the last year and a half. Altogether, over the next 5 years, it calls for \$62 billion, about \$12 billion—less than 1 percent of the budget—to be invested in the health, skills, intellect and character of our children.

About \$37.5 billion just increases funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant Program (CCDBG), which has been a proven success in providing more money so that we can expand child care in our States and provide help to many working families that need this help.

In addition, the bill provides funding for improving afterschool programs. We have funds that are set aside to improve the quality of child care. Children Defense Fund studies have shown that six out of seven child care facilities in this country provide only poor-to-mediocre service, and one out of eight centers actually put children at risk.

There is additional funding for professional training, for new construction, and I say to my colleagues, there is also funding for loan forgiveness, which is the effort that I have been working on with my colleague, Senator DEWINE from Ohio, so that those men and women who do their undergraduate work and receive training in early childhood development, where the wages are so low, at least will receive loan forgiveness which will help them. Finally, there is some \$13 billion in tax credits for low- and middle-income working parents to help them afford child care.

Research has shown that much of what happens in life depends upon the first three years of development. The brain is so profoundly influenced during this time that the brain of a three-year-old has twice as many synapses (connections between brain cells) as that of her adult parents. The process of brain development is actually one of "pruning" out the synapses that one does not need (or more accurately, does not use) from those that become the brains standard "wiring." This is why the first three years of development are so important—this is the time that the brain must develop the wiring that is going to be used for the rest of one's life. According to a report on brain development published by the Families and Work Institute, "Early care and nurture have a decisive, long lasting impact on how people develop, their ability to learn, and their capacity to control their own emotions." If children do not receive proper care before the age of three, they never receive the chance to develop into fully functioning adults.

We are not allowing our children a chance in life when we do not provide them with proper care in their early years. If America is to achieve its goal of equal opportunity for our children, we need to start with proper care in their early years. It is a painful statistic then that our youngest citizens are also some of the poorest Americans. One out of every four of our country's 12 million children under the age of three live in poverty. It becomes very difficult to break out of the cycle of poverty if poor children are not allowed to develop into fully functioning adults.

Yet many parents in America do not have the option of providing adequate care for their children. For parents who can barely afford rent it is nearly impossible to take advantage of the Family Medical Leave Act, and sacrifice 12 weeks of pay in order to directly supervise a child. Many mothers need to return to work shortly after giving birth and find that the only options open to them are to place their children in care that is substandard, even potentially dangerous—but affordable. According to the Children's Defense Fund, six out of seven child care centers provide only poor to mediocre care, and one in eight centers provide care that could jeopardize children's safety and development. The same study said that one in three home-based care situations could be harmful to a child's development. How can we abide by these statistics?

This is a serious problem, and frighteningly widespread. The eligibility levels set for receiving child care aid through the federal Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) is 85 percent of a state's median income. Nationally, this comes out to about \$35,000 for a family of three in 1998. However, according to the Children's defense fund, fully half of all families with young children earn less than \$35,000 per year. Half! A family that has two parents working full time at minimum wage earns only \$21,400 per year. This is not nearly enough to even dream of adequate child care.

Child care costs in the United States for one child in full day care range from \$4,000 to \$10,000 a year. It is not surprising that, on average, families with incomes under \$15,000 a year spend 23 percent of their annual incomes on child care. And in West Virginia, if a family of three makes more than that \$15,000, they no longer qualify for child care aid! In fact, thirty-two states do not allow a family of three which earns \$25,000 a year (approximately 185 percent of poverty) to qualify for help. Only four states in our nation set eligibility cut offs for receiving child care assistance at 85 percent of median family income, the maximum allowed by federal law. There is obviously not enough funding to support the huge need for child care assistance in our nation, and that is why I am proposing the Child Care Development Act.

There is widespread support for expanded investments to improve the affordability and quality of child care. A recent survey of 550 police chiefs found that nine out of ten police chiefs surveyed agreed that "America could sharply reduce crime if government invested more in programs to help children and youth get a good start" such as Head Start and child care. Mayors across the country identified child care, more than any other issue, as one of the most pressing issues facing children and families in their communities in 1996 survey. A recent poll found that a bipartisan majority of those polled

support increased investments in helping families pay for child care—specifically, 74% of those polled favor a bill to help low-income and middle-class families pay for child care, including 79% of Democrats, 69% of Republicans, and 76% of Independents.

It is clear that many like to talk about supporting our children, and many are in favor of supporting our children, but what action is actually taken? Yes, the addition of new child care dollars in 1996 has helped welfare recipients, but it has done nothing for working, low-income families not receiving TANF. The Children's Defense Fund recommends that Congress pass comprehensive legislation that guarantees at least \$20 billion over five years in new funding for the Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG). My Child Care Development Act goes beyond this, yet even my bill is just a first step. This bill is designed to provide affordable, quality child care to half of the ten million American children presently in need of subsidized care. It will provide \$62.5 billion over 5 years—\$12.5 billion a year—nearly three times the amount proposed in the President's most ambitious, and still unprosecuted, proposal. In 1997 the President proposed extending care to 600,000 children from poor families, leaving fully 80% of eligible children without aid. That was the last we heard of it. And it wasn't good enough, anyway.

If we are serious about putting parents to work and protecting children, we need to invest more in families and in child care help for them. Enabling families to work and helping children thrive means giving states enough money so that they can set reasonable eligibility levels, let families know that help is available, and take working families off the waiting lists.

The Child Care Development Act will require \$62.5 billion over five years. There will be several offsets necessary if we are serious about giving children in this country the type of care they need and deserve. Shifting spending from these offsets demonstrates that our true national priority is children, not wasteful military spending and corporate tax loopholes.

The offsets that will be necessary are as follows. If we repeal the reductions in the Corporate Minimum Tax from the 1997 Budget Bill, we create \$8.2 billion. The elimination of the Special Oil and Gas Depletion Allowance will make room for and additional \$4.3 billion. An offset of \$.575 billion will come from a repeal of the Enhanced Oil Recovery Credit and an offset of \$13.767 billion will come from the elimination of exclusion for Foreign-Earned Income. From these four different offsets in tax provisions a sub total amount of \$26.835 is created to spend on child care.

Defense Cuts will also be necessary in the amount of \$24.4 billion. This will come from canceling the F-22, a plane plagued with troubles, which will free

up \$19.29 billion, and \$5.11 billion will come from a reduction in Nuclear Delivery Systems Within Overall Limits of START II.

The remaining offsets can be made by reducing the Intelligence Budget by 5 percent, which would save \$6.675 billion; by reducing Military Export Subsidies by \$.85 billion; and by canceling the International Space Station, which costs \$10.045 billion. All of which, when added together, allows for an additional \$68.805 billion to be used to support our children.

This is, finally, a child care bill on the same scope as the problem itself. We as a nation are neglecting the most vulnerable and important portion of our society—our children. Here is an ambitious solution to this vast problem that has been plaguing our country. So that we don't have to be a country that just talks about putting our children first.

Mr. President, I want to speak a little bit from the heart. We are now at a point in our session where we have maybe 2½, 3 weeks to go. I think it is a tragedy that, in many ways, we are not involved in the work of democracy. From my point of view as a Senator from Minnesota, the work of democracy is to try to respond and speak to the concerns and circumstances of people's lives.

As I travel around Minnesota and travel around the country, I believe that, more than anything else, what families are saying to us is, "We want to do our very best by our kids, because if we as parents," or a single parent, "can do our best by our kids, we will do our best by our country."

One of the reasons we—I am talking about the people now in the country—are so disillusioned about our political process, above and beyond all that they hear about every day, which I hate, is that all that is happening is no good for our country. I think the polls show this as well, people are saying, "Get on with your governing, too; please govern; please be relevant and important to our lives." People feel like we are not doing that.

I have to say that if we can respond to what most people are talking about, which is how we earn a decent living and how do we give our children the care we know they need and deserve, we will be doing well by people. If we can do everything that we can do as Senators, Democrats and Republicans, and if the private sector plays its role and we also engage in voluntarism and a lot of good things happen at the community level and non-Government organizations, and nonprofits play their role, and I say to Rabbi Shemtov, our guest chaplain today, the religious community needs to play their role: if we all do everything we can to enable parents or a parent to do their best by their kids, then that is the best single thing we can do.

What saddens me and also angers me is that all of a sudden, the focus on children is just off the table. We have

lost it. It wasn't that many months ago that we were having conferences and we were talking about reports that were coming out and we couldn't stop discussing the development of the brain; how important it is to make sure that we get it right for our children because by age 3, if we don't get it right for them, they are never going to be ready for school and never be ready for life.

What happened? What happened to our focus? We have lost our focus. We have lost our way. We are talking a lot about values, and we are talking a lot about moral issues and we should—we should. But isn't it also a moral question or a moral issue that one out of every four children under the age of 3 is growing up poor in America today, and one out of every three children of color under the age of 3 is growing up poor in America today?

With our economy still humming along, how can it be that we cannot do better? I don't understand that. I say to the Rabbi and Chaplain, in the words of Rabbi Hillel, "If not now, when?"

Here we are with 3 weeks to go to this Congress, and we haven't done anything to help families, to help children, to fill their void so that we make sure that every child who comes to kindergarten comes to kindergarten ready to learn. If we are going to talk about education, and we are going to have a discussion about education—maybe we won't on the present course—I think we have to focus on the learning gap.

The truth of the matter is, we do quite well for kids in our public schools if they come to kindergarten ready to learn. It is the kids who come to kindergarten not ready to learn for whom we don't do well.

I am not trying to take K-12 off the hook. We need to do much better. But couldn't we say that as a national goal we want to make sure that every child who comes to kindergarten comes to kindergarten ready to learn? So that she knows the alphabet. He knows colors and shapes and sizes. She knows how to spell her name. They have been read to widely and they come with the readiness to learn.

The Presiding Officer, Senator DEWINE, is as committed to children as any Senator in the Senate. He knows what I am saying.

This is a cost-neutral bill. I will not go on about this bill's offsets. I cut into some tax loopholes and some subsidies that go to some of the largest corporations in America that do not need it. I raise some questions about whether we need some additional missiles and additional bombers. I redefine national security, and say, yes, we need a strong defense, but we need to take some of the money and invest for children. People can agree or disagree about where I get the money for this. Can't we agree that we take 1 percent of our budget and invest it in the

health and skills and character and intellect of our children? They are 100 percent of our future.

I must repeat this point. I cannot believe that not that many months ago we were all talking about development of the brain, early childhood development. We were all talking about legislation—we were all talking about how we were going to do something to help parents do better by their kids, and we are not doing that.

That is why I introduce this legislation today. I do not think it is a cry in the wilderness, because I hope next year we are going to get this bill enacted. I am going to fight for this. And maybe, if I have a chance—I don't know that I will, given the next 3 weeks—I will bring some of it up as amendments. But we have to start speaking out about this, Mr. President. I say to Senator DEWINE, the Presiding Officer, we have to start speaking out about this because we should be doing better.

By Mr. FAIRCLOTH:

S. 2490. A bill to prohibit postsecondary educational institutions from requiring the purchase of goods and services from on-campus businesses, intentionally withholding course information from off-campus businesses, or preventing students from obtaining course information or materials from off-campus businesses; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE COLLEGE COSTS SAVINGS ACT OF 1998

• Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, this fall millions of college students are returning to campus. Today I introduce legislation that will ease the financial burden for these students, and reduce the costs of student financial aid on the taxpayers.

My bill seeks to inject some good, old-fashioned competition in the market for the purchase of college textbooks. Every student knows that the costs of textbooks can run into hundreds of dollars. It has become a major expense for most college students. My bill would bar financial aid to any university or any student attending a university that, directly or indirectly, requires students to purchase textbooks exclusively on campus. Further, the legislation would require that non-campus businesses have reasonable access to the textbook requirements of college courses, so that they too could stock textbooks and have them available to students at a more competitive price.

Regrettably, the way aid is currently disbursed by the Department of Education is artificially raising costs for students throughout the country. There is a nationwide use of financial aid to, in effect, channel funds exclusively to college "business-like" enterprises. These funding methods prevent financial aid from being spent at small businesses attempting to compete in the campus area marketplace.

Through the use of Department of Education-permitted "student ac-

counts," colleges are creating their own dominance in such areas as college bookstores. Off-campus choice is virtually unavailable, even if off-campus stores offer students a less-expensive alternative. With the development of "campus cards," aid is even more captive to the on-campus economy.

I raised this issue with Secretary Riley at a hearing this spring and through a subsequent letter. The Department claims such distribution of aid funds is voluntary. The Department of Education stated in its June 22nd response that off-campus businesses can accept these campus cards only if an institution "wishes to establish a business relationship with an off-campus business." In most cases, that is not their wish. In most cases, only on-campus enterprises benefit. The Congress never intended financial aid funds—or any other funds—to be used for purposes of monopolization on college campuses. Competition in the campus-area marketplace is being restricted—and in many cases—eliminated. Students have little to no choice in shopping for books and materials.

The net result is that students are often paying higher costs for these goods and services, like textbooks. And, the federal government, providing student aid, is paying the higher price too.

There isn't a college student in this country that does not think that textbooks cost too much. Buying course books has become a major expense for the vast majority of students.

Evidence shows that off-campus bookstores are generally less-expensive if students receiving financial aid had full access to them. A recent report of the National Association of College Stores ("NACS") reports that each student spends an average of \$300 for new textbooks at an on-campus bookstore compared with less than \$200 for textbook purchases at an off-campus bookstore.

Additionally, another unfair practice that I have been informed about is that some institutions refuse or obstruct access by off-campus college bookstores to the titles of textbooks required by the teaching staff. This legislation addresses both of these problems.

Further, I believe we should be taking any reasonable steps that we can to reduce the cost of attending college. A 1998 Congressional Commission on the Cost of Higher Education Report tells us that America has a "college cost crisis." It found that 71 percent of the public believes that a four-year education is not affordable for most Americans. Clearly, people are concerned about the ever-growing costs of higher education.

This legislation could save every student hundreds of dollars a year in college costs, if we can promote greater free market competition in the sale of college textbooks. As for financial aid, if this legislation can only save one percent of the amount that is spent on financial aid, it would approximate a \$500 million savings.

Clearly parents, students and the federal government could use this kind of financial relief. Mr. President, I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation. •

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 2491. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect children from sexual abuse and exploitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTECTION OF CHILDREN FROM SEXUAL PREDATORS ACT OF 1998

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce S. 2491 the Hatch-Leahy-DeWine "Protection of Children from Sexual Predators Act of 1998." I want to especially thank Senators LEAHY and DEWINE for their cooperation in drafting this exemplary piece of legislation. S. 2491 strengthens the ability of law enforcement and the courts to respond to high-tech sexual predators of children. Pedophiles who roam the Internet, purveyors of child pornography, and serial child molesters are specifically targeted.

The Internet is a wonderful creation. By allowing for instant communication around the globe, it has made the world a smaller place, a place in which people can express their thoughts and ideas without limitation. It has released the creative energies of a new generation of entrepreneurs and it is an unparalleled source of information.

While we should encourage people to take full advantage of the opportunities the Internet has to offer, we must also be vigilant in seeking to ensure that the Internet is not perverted into a hunting ground for pedophiles and other sexual predators, and a drive-through library and post office for purveyors of child pornography. Our children must be protected from those who would choose to sexually abuse and exploit them. And those who take the path of predation should know that the consequences of their actions will be severe and unforgiving.

How does this bill provide additional protection for our children? By prohibiting the libidinous dissemination on the Internet of information related to minors and the sending of obscene material to minors, we make it more difficult for sexual predators to gather information on, and lower the sexual inhibitions of, potential targets. And by requiring electronic communication service providers to report the commission of child pornography offenses to authorities, we mandate accountability and responsibility on the Internet.

Additionally, law enforcement is given effective tools to pursue sexual predators. The Attorney General is provided with authority to issue administrative subpoenas in child pornography cases. Proceeds derived from these offenses, and the facilities and instrumentalities used to perpetuate these offenses, will be subject to forfeiture. And prosecutors will now have the power to seek pretrial detention of sexual predators prior to trial.

Federal law enforcement will be given increased statutory authority to assist the States in kidnaping and serial murder investigations, which often involve children. In that vein, S. 2491 calls for the creation of the Morgan P. Hardiman Child Abduction and Serial Murder Investigative Resources Center. That center will gather information, expertise and resources that our nation's law enforcement agencies can draw upon to help combat these heinous crimes.

Sentences for child abuse and exploitation offenses will be made tougher. In addition to increasing the maximum penalties available for many crimes against children and mandating tough sentences for repeat offenders, the bill will also recommend that the Sentencing Commission reevaluate the guidelines applicable to these offenses, and increase them where appropriate to address the egregiousness of these crimes. And S. 2491 calls for life imprisonment in appropriate cases where certain crimes result in the death of children.

Protection of our children is not a partisan issue. We have drawn upon the collective wisdom of Senators from both sides of the aisle to draft a bill which includes strong, effective legislation protecting children. I call upon my colleagues to support this bill and speed its passage.●

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:

[The bill was not available for printing. It will appear in a future edition of the RECORD.]

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I know everyone is concerned about protecting this country's children from those who would prey upon them. Those concerns have intensified in recent years with the growing popularity of the internet and the world wide web. Cyberspace gives users access to a wealth of information; it connects people from around the world. But it also creates new opportunities for sexual predators and child pornographers to ply their trade. The challenge is to protect our children from exploitation in cyberspace while ensuring that the vast democratic forum of the Internet remains an engine for the free exchange of ideas and information.

The bill that we are introducing today meets this challenge. While it is not a cure-all for the scourge of child pornography, it is a good step toward limiting the ability of cyber-pornographers and predators from harming children.

This bill differs markedly from H.R. 3494, the child protection and sexual predator bill that the House passed last June. I should note that this bill mirrors a Hatch-Leahy-DeWine substitute to H.R. 3494, which passed the Judiciary Committee by unanimous consent this afternoon.

I thank the Chairman for working with me to fix the many problems in

H.R. 3494, and to make this bill more focused and measured. Briefly, I would like to highlight and explain some of the differences between the bills.

As passed by the House, H.R. 3494 would make it a crime, punishable by up to 5 years' imprisonment, to do nothing more than "contact" a minor, or even just attempt to "contact" a minor, for the purpose of engaging in sexual activity. This provision does not appear in the Hatch-Leahy-DeWine bill. The act of making contact is not very far along the spectrum of an overt criminal act: it is only the expression of a criminal intention without follow through. A simple "hello" in an internet chat room, coupled with bad intentions, would expose the speaker to severe criminal sanctions. Targeting "attempts" to make contact would be even more like prosecuting a thought crime.

Another new crime created by the House bill prohibited the transmittal of identifying information about any person under 18 for the purpose of encouraging unlawful sexual activity. In its original incarnation, this provision would have had the absurd result of prohibiting a person under the age of consent from e-mailing her own address or telephone number to her boyfriend. We fixed this problem by making it clear that a violation must involve the transmission of someone else's identifying information. In addition, to eliminate any notice problem arising from the variations in state statutory rape laws, we lowered the age of the identified minor from 18 to 16—the federal age of consent. Finally, we clarified that the defendant must know that the person about whom he was transmitting identifying information was, in fact, under 16. This change was particularly important because, in the anonymous world of cyberspace, a person may have no way of knowing the age of the faceless person with whom he is communicating.

I had many of the same concerns regarding another provision of the House bill, which makes it a crime to transfer obscene material to a minor. Again, the Hatch-Leahy-DeWine bill lowers the age of minority from 18 to 16 and provides that the defendant must know he is dealing with someone so young. I would add that this provision of the bill applies only to "obscene" material, that is, material that enjoys no First Amendment protection whatever—material that is patently offensive to the average adult. The bill does not purport to proscribe the transferral of constitutionally protected material that may, however, be unsuitable for minors. Besides raising serious constitutional concerns, such a provision would also have the unacceptable consequence of reducing the level of discourse over the Internet to what would be suitable for a sandbox.

The original House bill would also have criminalized certain conduct directed at a person who had been "represented" to be a minor, even if that

person was, in fact, an adult. The evident purpose was to make clear that the targets of sting operations are not relieved of criminal liability merely because their intended victim turned out to be an undercover agent and not a child. The new "sting" provisions addressed a problem that simply does not currently exist: no court has ever endorsed an impossibility defense along the lines anticipated by the House bill. The creation of special "sting" provisions in this one area could lend credence to impossibility defenses raised in other sting and undercover situations. At the same time, these provisions would have criminalized conduct that was otherwise lawful: it is not a crime for adults to communicate with each other about sex, even if one of the adults pretends to be a child. Given these significant concerns, the "sting" provisions have been stricken from the Hatch-Leahy-DeWine bill.

Another major problem with the House bill is its modification of the child pornography possession laws. Current law requires possession of three or more pornographic images in order for there to be criminal liability. Congress wrote this requirement into the law as a way of protecting against government overreaching. By eliminating this numeric requirement, the House bill puts at risk the unsuspecting Internet user who, by inadvertence or mistake, downloads a single pornographic image of a child. The inevitable result would be to chill the free exchange of information over the web. I was unwilling to accept this possibility; the Hatch-Leahy-DeWine bill keeps current law in place.

Unlike H.R. 3494, the bill we are introducing today contains no new mandatory minimum sentences. I oppose the use of mandatory minimums because they take away the discretion of the sentencing judge, which can result in unjust sentences and can also induce defendants who would otherwise have pled guilty, hoping to obtain some measure of leniency from the court, to proceed to trial.

Another problematic provision of the House bill gives the Attorney General sweeping authority to subpoena records and witnesses in investigations involving crimes against children. We should be extremely wary of further extending the Justice Department's administrative subpoena power. The use of administrative subpoenas gives federal agents the power to compel disclosures without any oversight by a judge, prosecutor, or grand jury, and without any of the grand jury secrecy requirements. That being said, the secrecy requirements may pose a significant obstacle to the full and efficient cooperation of federal/state task forces in their joint efforts to reduce the steadily increasing use of the Internet to perpetrate crimes against children, including crimes involving the distribution of child pornography.

In addition, it appears that some U.S. Attorneys Offices are reluctant to open

a grand jury investigation when the only goal is to identify individuals who have not yet, and may never, commit a federal (as opposed to state or local) offense. The Hatch-Leahy-DeWine bill accommodates all the competing interests by granting the Department a narrowly drawn authority to subpoena only the information that it most needs: routine subscriber account information from Internet service providers. Importantly, subscribers may obtain notice from their service provider.

The new reporting requirement established by H.R. 3494 is also troubling. Under current law, Internet service providers are generally free to report suspicious communications to law enforcement authorities. Under H.R. 3494, service providers would be required to report such communications when they involve child pornography; failure to do so would be punishable by a substantial fine.

Of course, we are all committed to eradicating the market for child pornography. Child pornography is inherently harmful to children. Service providers that come across such material should report it, and, in most cases, they already do. We must tread cautiously, however, before we compel private citizens to act as good Samaritans or to assume duties and responsibilities that are better left to law enforcement.

Working with the service providers, we have refined the House bill in various ways.

First, we raised the bar for the reporting duty; a service provider has no obligation to make a report unless it has "probable cause" to believe that the child pornography laws are being violated. By setting such a high standard, we intended to discourage service providers from erring on the side of over-reporting every questionable image. This would also overwhelm the FBI and law enforcement agencies.

Second, we provided that there is no liability for failing to make a report unless the service provider knew both of the existence of child pornography and of the duty to report it (if it rises to the level of probable cause).

Third, we made clear that we are not imposing a monitoring requirement of any kind: service providers must report child pornography when they come across it or it is brought to their attention, but they remain under no obligation to go out looking for it.

Fourth, we added privacy protections for any information reported under the bill.

Fifth, we lowered the maximum fine for first offenders to \$50,000; a second or subsequent failure to report, however, may still result in a fine up to \$100,000.

Thus improved, I am confident that the reporting requirement will accomplish its objectives without unduly burdening the service providers or violating the privacy rights of internet users.

Beyond this, the Hatch-Leahy-DeWine bill strips the House bill of various other extraneous or improvident

provisions. Our bill is also free of certain add-ons that appeared in the original version offered by Senator HATCH. In particular, the original version would have opened the floodgates of federal inchoate crime prosecutions by creating a general attempt statute—making it a crime to commit each and every offense in title 18—and by making the penalty for its violation as well as for violation of the general conspiracy statute (which is now capped at 5 years) equal to the penalty for the offense that was the object of the attempt or conspiracy. The Chairman's original bill also created a new rule of criminal procedure requiring defendants to provide notice of their intention to assert an entrapment defense.

I think there are good reasons why these ideas have been rejected in the past, both by the Congress and by the Federal Judicial Conference, and why they are opposed by business and civil liberties groups alike. At the very least, we should not usher in such radical changes to the federal criminal law without more careful consideration, after proper hearings.

In conclusion, I commend Senators HATCH and DEWINE for their efforts to address the terrible problem of child predators and pornographers. I am glad that we were able to join forces to construct a bill that goes a long way towards achieving our common goals.●

●Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to express my outrage at the depraved criminals who are using the Internet to exploit children.

Recently, the United States Customs Service, in cooperation with authorities in fourteen other nations, conducted successful raids on an extensive Internet child pornography ring. The ring, called the Wonderland Club, had been distributing more than 100,000 pornographic photographs of children. Some of the children were as young as 18 months. I am deeply disturbed, and disgusted, that people would victimize innocent children in this way.

I want to commend the Customs Service and the other international law enforcement agencies involved on their successful effort. They made 46 arrests worldwide and there may be hundreds more after all the evidence is analyzed. The raids also covered 22 states, including one location in my home state of New Jersey.

While this raid has put this one ring of Internet pedophiles out of business, I am concerned that there may be others. Many law enforcement officials are concerned that the advancements in Internet technology are making it that much easier for pedophiles to conduct their sickening schemes. Additionally, the anonymity of the Internet makes it easier for these criminals to evade detection.

Clearly, we must fight back against these cyberspace criminals. One step that we can take is to ensure strong penalties for those who use the Internet for these horrible purposes. That is why I support the Child Protection and

Sexual Predator Punishment Act of 1998. This measure would double the maximum penalty for sexual abuse of a child under twelve—from ten years to twenty years. It would also increase the prison terms and fines for anyone using the Internet, or the mail, to contact a minor for the purpose of engaging in sexual activity or transferring obscene material.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I hope it will pass the Senate before we adjourn this year. We must act quickly to help prevent another generation of children from suffering.●

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

S. 2492. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for the long-term care insurance costs of all individuals who are not eligible to participate in employer-subsidized long-term care health plans; to the Committee on Finance.

LONG-TERM CARE AND RETIREMENT SECURITY ACT

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I introduce the Long-Term Care and Retirement Security Act. This bill is an important first step in helping Americans prepare for their long-term care needs. A companion bill to the Long-Term Care and Retirement Security Act has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative NANCY JOHNSON.

Longer and healthier lives are a blessing and a testament to the progress and advances made by our society. However, all Americans must be alert and prepare for long-term care needs. The role of private long-term care insurance is critical in meeting this challenge.

The financial challenges of health care in retirement are not new. Indeed, too many family caregivers can tell stories about financial devastation that was brought about by the serious long-term care needs of a family member. Because increasing numbers of Americans are likely to need long term care services, it is especially important to encourage planning today.

Most families are not financially prepared when a loved one needs long-term care. When faced with nursing home costs that can run more than \$40,000 a year, families often turn to Medicaid for help. In fact, Medicaid pays for nearly two of every three nursing home residents at a cost of more than \$30 billion each year for nursing home costs. With the impending retirement of the Baby Boomers, it is imperative that Congress takes steps now to encourage all Americans to plan ahead for potential long-term care needs.

The Long-Term Care and Retirement Security Act will allow Americans who do not currently have access to employer subsidized long-term care plans to deduct the cost of such a plan from their taxable income. This bill will encourage planning and personal responsibility while helping to make long-

term care insurance more affordable for middle class taxpayers.

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

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:

[The bill was not available for printing. It will appear in a future edition of the RECORD.]

• Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today, along with Senator GRASSLEY, to introduce legislation designed to protect our nation's families hard-earned savings and ensure quality long-term care.

Our nation has achieved great strides in the 20th century in delivering quality health care and improving the standards of living of its citizens. Just last year Congress added preventive benefits to the Medicare program, thereby ensuring that Americans will have longer, more productive lives. In fact, thanks to these developments life expectancy has increased from 47 years in 1900 to 68 years in 1950, and has steadily increased to 76 years in 1991. These tremendous advances in medicine have also produced challenges because as more and more people live longer, chances increase that they will experience chronic illnesses and disability.

A three-year stay in a nursing home can cost upwards of \$125,000. As a result, nearly half of all nursing home residents who enter as privately-paying patients exhaust their personal savings and lose health insurance coverage during their stay. Medicaid becomes many retirees' last refuge of financial support.

Another challenge facing America in the future will be the aging of the "baby boomers." Unfortunately, many "baby boomers" are not planning for the future because they are preoccupied with more immediate concerns. This portion of our population represents more than half of all workers and are the parents of 75% of the nation's children under age 18. Child care, housing expenses and saving for their children's college education tend to dominate their budgets.

Many Americans mistakenly believe that Medicare will pay for their long-term care needs. "Baby boomers" need to understand the limitations of government programs with regard to long-term care. In reality, this program primarily focuses on hospital stays and physician visits. Without adequate private insurance a significant number of retirees are likely to deplete their assets in order to receive essential long-term care.

Insurance products are available to ensure that an individual's long-term care needs are met. However, current tax law establishes several obstacles to

purchasing long-term care insurance. First, most Americans purchase health insurance through their employer. Over sixty-five percent of 235 million individuals, under age 65, purchase their health insurance through their employer or union. However, tax law prohibits an employer from offering employer subsidized long-term care insurance products through its employee benefits plans.

Since the enactment of the Kennedy-Kassebaum legislation of 1996, purchasers of qualified long-term care insurance policies are permitted to deduct the premiums as part of their medical expenses. However, for taxpayers other than the self-employed, the tax code restricts the medical expense deduction to the portion of expenses exceeding 7.5 percent of their income—a threshold that bars the deduction for 95 percent of non-self employed people.

Kennedy-Kassebaum also precluded employees from purchasing long term care insurance on a pre-tax basis through their employer. Specifically, the legislation prohibited the inclusion of long-term care insurance in employer-sponsored cafeteria plans and flexible spending accounts. Only if the employer actually pays for the insurance can the employee obtain the coverage on a tax-free basis, but few employers currently are willing to pay for the coverage. The result is that only a small percentage of purchasers of long-term care insurance can obtain the insurance on a pre-tax basis.

Second, long-term care insurance paid directly by the taxpayer is only deductible if the individual both itemizes his or her deductions and already has deductible medical expenses in excess of 7.5 percent of their adjusted gross income.

Suppose Mr. and Ms. Jones earn \$40,000 per year and want to purchase long-term care insurance. Under current law, health and medical expenses are not deductible unless they exceed 7.5 percent of \$40,000, which is \$3,000.

Suppose the premiums for long-term care insurance totaled \$1,000. The Joneses would get no tax benefit from the deduction of the premiums unless they already had \$2,000 in other qualified medical expenses, and would not get the full benefit of the deduction unless they had \$3,000 in other qualified expenses.

Even if they meet this threshold, the Joneses still will not benefit from the current deduction unless their total itemized deductions—health and non-health—exceed the standard deduction, currently \$6,900 for a married couple.

It becomes clear that the current deduction for long-term care insurance premiums is not providing a very strong incentive to prepare for one's health retirement. A recent survey shows that premium deductibility was cited most frequently as the action that would make non-buyers more interested in long-term care insurance.

Looking into the future, there are two key goals for retirement security:

(1) saving enough money for retirement, and (2) protecting against life's uncertainties, including long-term care costs. An unanticipated nursing home stay can deplete hard-earned savings and threaten a family's financial future. This situation could be especially difficult for the surviving spouse of someone who has had a long-term care stay and depleted all of their retirement savings. The widow or widower can have many years left to live and no remaining retirement assets.

A recent study by the American Council for Life Insurance indicates that long-term care insurance has the potential to significantly reduce future out-of-pocket and Medicaid expenditures for long-term care. If individuals are covered by long-term care insurance, they are less likely to become Medicaid beneficiaries, thus preserving the individual's savings and decreasing government spending. This would also reinforce Medicaid's intent of serving as a safety net for those who are most needy.

With the provisions in this legislation, Americans can be more assured of a financially secure retirement. •

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 2493. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a tax credit for the nutrient management costs of animal feeding operations; to the Committee on Finance.

THE ANIMAL AGRICULTURE ENVIRONMENTAL INCENTIVES ACT OF 1998

• Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, recently we have seen growing concerns around the country about the environmental problems associated with livestock, dairy and poultry production. Continued reports of manure spills, evidence of water pollution from manure runoff, and ongoing complaints about odor and air pollution are creating increasing pressure on the livestock and poultry industry.

Last year, I introduced the Animal Agriculture Reform Act, the first legislation of its kind to call for national environmental standards for animal feeding operations. Just this week, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced what they call a Draft Unified National Strategy for Animal Feeding Operations. That is a big title, but what it boils down to is a comprehensive, national plan for tackling the environmental problems of the livestock and poultry industry.

The Administration's Strategy looks a lot like my bill, so I think it is a good start. The Strategy calls for mandatory nutrient management plans for larger operations and restrictions on manure application to protect the environment—those provisions are at the heart of my bill and also are the focus of the EPA/USDA Strategy.

However, the Administration's plan is only a strategy and it must be implemented. We will still see manure spills, runoff and threatened waterways

around the country until we have better management and better controls at animal feeding operations.

One of the keys to getting this job done, and to helping producers comply with EPA regulations, is finding solutions rather than imposing sanctions. That is why today I am introducing a bill that would provide a 25 percent tax credit to livestock producers to purchase equipment for new and innovative ways to process and use manure.

The aim of my bill is to help producers help themselves when it comes to manure management, particularly in circumstances where too much manure is generated to be safely applied to land.

The tax credit would cover equipment that allows farmers to carefully apply only as much manure as their crops need, and equipment that processes manure for safer handling, better nutrient value, or alternative uses like energy generation. This is the kind of equipment that producers need to comply more easily with nutrient management plans, move manure more economically to areas where crop land is available, or adopt alternative uses for manure.

The bottom line as I see it is that livestock, dairy and poultry producers in this country are going to face limits on manure application. These limits are going to have a serious effect on some operations, and particularly in certain regions of the country.

Of course, there are all kinds of operations that make up our livestock, dairy and poultry industry, and each producer needs an environmental solution that makes sense for that individual operation.

Some producers have enough land to apply all of their manure. For these producers, up to date facilities and careful management should be sufficient. For other producers, simple composting or efficient solid liquid separation may be the solution, so that solids can be transported more economically for off-site land application. In still other situations, particularly for very large operations or in regions with intensive production, we may need to adopt more advanced technology.

I believe that the bill I am introducing today is just a first step along the way to making the adoption of better technologies, whether low-tech composting or high-tech processing, more affordable for any size producer.

I want to thank the National Pork Producers Council for its support of this tax credit initiative. The National Pork Producers have been far in front of the crowd in engaging policy makers at the national level and in working with pork producers to address environmental problems. I look forward to continuing to work with them on these issues.

Let me be clear that I want the livestock industry to thrive in both Iowa and across the United States. But for our industry to flourish, we need to get

our environmental house in order. I do believe that we can have both a healthy livestock industry and a sound environment, and I hope that the Congress will act quickly to enact this tax credit to help producers get the tools they need to reach this goal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a letter of endorsement from the NPPC be printed in the RECORD.

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

[The bill was not available for printing. It will appear in a future edition of the RECORD.]

NATIONAL PORK  
PRODUCERS COUNCIL

Washington, DC, September 16, 1998.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,  
U.S. Senate, Hart Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HARKIN: I'm writing on behalf of the members of the National Pork Producers Council (NPPC) to express our support for allowing livestock producers to claim an income tax credit for innovative environmental management equipment. We believe the goal of any tax credit for livestock manure handling practices and equipment should be to enhance the quality of surface and ground water and the air. The focus should be on those practices which are an alternative to traditional storage and handling practices or which significantly improve the function of traditional storage and handling methods.

Pork producers have been very aggressive in the development of new regulations for their operations through the National Environmental Dialogue on Pork Production recommendations. We recognize that sound environmental management and compliance with new regulations will, in many cases, require producers to adopt and pay for new equipment. In an increasingly competitive world pork industry, such a tax credit will provide U.S. producers an important advantage in the rapid development of sustainable, affordable production systems.

We look forward to working with you to enact this important initiative.

Sincerely,

DONNA REIFSCHNEIDER,  
President. •

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. KOHL):

S. 2494. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) to enhance the ability of direct broadcast satellite and other multichannel video providers to compete effectively with cable television systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE MULTICHANNEL VIDEO COMPETITION ACT OF  
1998

• Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I introduce legislation that will address two problems confronting the millions of Americans who subscribe to satellite TV service. I am delighted to have Senators HATCH, LEAHY, DEWINE and KOHL as original co-sponsors.

These two problems involve the legal and practical difficulties satellite TV providers currently face in providing network TV stations as part of their service package.

The first problem is that the law effectively prevents satellite TV companies from providing local network stations to their subscribers. That hampers the ability of satellite TV to compete effectively with cable TV and, by doing so, to check cable rate increases.

The second problem is that existing law also forbids satellite TV providers from offering distant network stations unless the subscriber happens to be located beyond the reach of local network stations. But the satellite companies and their subscribers claim that the law's definition of what constitutes decent off-air TV reception is too narrow. This has resulted in many situations in which consumers who cannot receive local network stations as a practical matter, are nevertheless regarded as being able to receive them, as a legal matter. In many cases, satellite TV providers are offering distant network signals even though it's actually illegal. This has led to litigation and a court order that could cause more than a million satellite TV subscribers throughout the country to lose their network TV within the next several weeks.

Mr. President, we need to fix these problems, and we need to fix them quickly. No satellite TV company should be forced to suddenly discontinue any customer's network TV service, and satellite TV companies should be able to provide their subscribers with local network TV stations, just as cable TV companies can.

The legislation being introduced today is intended to strike a reasonable balance between the competing interests of cable operators, broadcasters, and satellite TV providers, to enable satellite TV providers to offer network stations, to assure that no satellite TV subscriber is unfairly deprived of network TV service, to assure local broadcasters are not deprived of the support of their local audience, and to make satellite TV a more effective competitive alternative to cable TV.

This legislation will also require changes to the Copyright Act, the Satellite Home Viewers Act, and the Communications Act. The distinguished Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator HATCH, has developed legislation to give satellite TV providers a compulsory copyright license enabling them to offer local TV stations. I am also cosponsoring this legislation.

The bill I am introducing today will be merged with Senator HATCH's legislation to provide a comprehensive and workable solution to all these problems. Let me briefly describe what my bill provides.

My bill directs the Federal Communications Commission to straighten out the rules governing satellite TV companies' carriage of distant network TV stations, and provides guidelines for the Commission's decision. It will also guarantee that no satellite TV subscriber loses network stations before the FCC issues revised rules next

February. It will require that satellite TV companies carry all local TV stations, just as cable systems must, when it becomes feasible for them to do so. In the interim it will allow them to carry fewer than all local stations as long as they compensate any local stations that are not carried for any loss of revenue the stations will suffer as a result.

During the last several weeks the Majority Leader, Senator LOTT, and the Ranking Member of the Commerce Committee, Senator FRITZ HOLLINGS, have worked tirelessly with the broadcast and satellite industries to develop a compromise that will avoid the disruption of satellite TV subscribers network TV service until this legislation can be enacted into law. I would like to recognize them for their efforts on behalf of every member of the public who subscribes to multichannel video service, whether by satellite or by cable. All of us should be grateful for their leadership on this issue.

I intend to hold hearings on the status of the parties efforts to reach a compromise, and on the legislation sponsored by Senator HATCH and myself, next week. It is my hope that broadcasters and satellite TV providers can reach a mutually-acceptable temporary agreement that will enable Senator HATCH and myself to enact our comprehensive legislation as soon as possible, and in any event no later than early in the next Session of Congress. ●

●Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I support this measure, which will help create competition between satellite and cable television. Read in tandem with our Judiciary Committee proposal, it offers the promise of a comprehensive solution that removes some of the roadblocks to true video competition. Let me commend Senators MCCAIN, HOLLINGS, HATCH, LEAHY, DEWINE and LOTT for their efforts, all of which were instrumental in the creation of a comprehensive package with a real chance to be enacted this year.

Mr. President, let me explain why we need to move on these measures before the opportunity passes us by. Consumers want real choices. But they won't have a fair opportunity to choose between cable, satellite or other video systems if their network signals are, in essence, separate and unequal.

The legislation that the Judiciary and Commerce Committees have been working on together would eliminate this problem. They extend the Satellite Home Viewer Act, give satellite carriers the ability to provide local television broadcast signals (while appropriately phasing in must-carry), reduce the royalty fees for these signals, give the FCC time to take a much-needed second look at the definition of "unserved households," and make sure no one—no one—is terminated before February 28th of next year.

Mr. President, these bills are not perfect pieces of legislation. And we invite the interested parties to work with us to improve them. But the overall pack-

age is a fair and comprehensive one. If we continue to work together, then consumers will have real choices among video providers, and that television programming will be more available and affordable for all of us. In addition, we will help to preserve local television stations, who provide all of us with vital information like news, weather, and special events—especially sports.

I urge my colleagues to support these bipartisan bills, which will move us toward video competition in the next millennium, and I hope we can enact them as one before this Congress adjourns in October. ●

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself and Mr. D'AMATO):

S. 2495. A bill to establish the Kate Mullany National Historic Site in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE KATE MULLANY NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ACT

●Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, it is with great pride, with my distinguished colleague Senator D'AMATO, I introduce the "Kate Mullany Historic Site Act," a bill to designate the Troy, New York home of pioneer labor organizer Kate Mullany as a National Historic Site. A similar measure introduced in the House of Representatives this year by Congressman MICHAEL R. MCNULTY has engendered a great deal of support and cosponsorship by over 100 members.

Like many Irish immigrants settling in Troy, Kate Mullany found her opportunities limited to the most difficult and low-paying of jobs, the collar laundry industry. Troy was then known as "The Collar City"—the birthplace of the detachable shirt collar. At the age of 19, Kate stood up against the often dangerous conditions and meager pay that characterized the industry and led a movement of 200 female laundresses demanding just compensation and safe working conditions. These protests marked the beginning of the Collar Laundry Union, which some have called "the only bona fide female labor union in the country."

Kate Mullany's courage and organizing skills did not go unnoticed. She later traveled down the Hudson River to lead women workers in the sweatshops of New York City and was ultimately appointed Assistant Secretary of the then National Labor Union, becoming the first woman ever appointed to a national labor office.

On April 1, 1998, Kate Mullany's home was designated as a National Historic Landmark by Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt and on July 15 First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton presented citizens of Troy with the National Historic Landmark plaque in a celebration. Given the recent attention to the contributions of Kate Mullany, I am quite pleased to introduce this bill with my colleague Senator D'AMATO today. ●

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 2496. A bill to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Aspinwall, Pennsylvania, as the "H. John Heinz III Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. JOHN HEINZ III VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to honor the memory of Senator John Heinz by designating the Veterans Medical facility in Aspinwall, Pennsylvania, as the H. John Heinz III Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

Recognition of the distinguished work of Senator Heinz has been memorialized in a variety of ways. This designation of the Veterans Center pays tribute to his outstanding work for America's veterans. Senator Heinz, a veteran himself, made many contributions to this nation and to America's veterans.

H. John Heinz III was born on October 23, 1938 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. While he grew up in San Francisco, California, he spent many summers in Pittsburgh with his father who was chairman of the H.J. Heinz Company founded in 1869 by the Senator's great-grandfather. John graduated from Yale University with honors in 1960 and piloted a single-engine plane through Africa and the Middle East, ending up in Sydney, Australia working as a salesman for a truck company. He entered Harvard Business School in 1961 and the following year worked for the summer with the Union Bank of Switzerland in Geneva. While in Switzerland he met his future wife, Teresa Simoes Ferreira, who was attending graduate school in Geneva. He received his Master's degree in Business Administration from Harvard in 1963.

After enlisting in the U.S. Air Force Reserve, John Heinz served on active duty in 1963 at Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio, Texas. For the remainder of his enlistment, he served with the 911th Troop Carrier Group based at the Greater Pittsburgh Airport. As an Airman Third Class, he received a U.S. Department of Defense citation for suggestions to improve the management of parts and supplies, saving the Air Force \$400,000 annually. With the rank of staff sergeant, he received an honorable discharge from the Air Force Reserves in 1969.

In 1964, John Heinz served as a special assistant to Senator Hugh Scott (R-PA) in Washington, D.C. and as assistant campaign manager in Senator Scott's successful reelection bid. Returning to Pittsburgh, he was employed in the financial and marketing divisions of the H.J. Heinz Company from 1965 to 1970. He married Teresa in 1966, and they subsequently had three sons: Henry John IV, Andre, and Christopher. He taught at the Graduate School of Industrial Administration at Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh during the 1970-71 academic year.

Senator Heinz was a stalwart of the Republican Party, contributing generously of his time, talents and efforts by campaigning for others. He was active in the campaigns of Governor William Scranton for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1964, Judge Maurice B. Cohill for Juvenile Court in 1965, Richard L. Thornburgh for Congress in 1966, Robert Friend for County Controller in 1967, and John Tabor for Mayor in 1969. He chaired the Pennsylvania Republican platform committee hearings in 1968, won election as a delegate at the Republican National Convention in the same year (and again in 1972, 1976, and 1980), and chaired the Pennsylvania Republican State Platform Committee in 1970.

Upon the sudden death in April 1971 of Congressman Robert J. Corbett (R-PA), John Heinz pursued the unexpired term and won, making him the youngest Republican member of the U.S. House of Representatives at 33 years old. In November 1972 and 1974, John Heinz was re-elected to the House.

When Senator Hugh Scott announced his retirement in December 1975, Senator Heinz, George Packer and I ran for the Republican nomination for U.S. Senate in the April 1976 primary. After Senator Heinz won that primary contest, I endorsed him at a major rally in September 1976 in Delaware County at the kick off of his campaign in Southeastern Pennsylvania. Senator Heinz defeated Congressman William J. Green III and took his seat in the United States Senate on January 3, 1977.

In his capacity as Chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, Senator Heinz gave me tremendous support and was instrumental in my election to the United States Senate in November 1980.

Thereafter, Senator Heinz and I established a very close friendship and working relationship. Although I cannot personally attest to all other Senate relationships, I believe that our cooperation and coordination was as close as any two Senators from the same state in the Senate's history.

When one of us was unable to attend a specific event, the other was always ready, willing and able to take his place. We discussed the pending international, national and state issues incessantly. On the late night sessions, and there were many, I would drive John home in my aging Jaguar leaving him off in the alley behind his home in Georgetown.

On one occasion in 1982 we had a lengthy discussion about the upcoming vote the next day on a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget. I laid out my reasons for opposing the amendment and John gave me his reasons for supporting it. I found his arguments so persuasive that I voted for the constitutional amendment for the balanced budget the next day. I was surprised to find that he voted against it. We had a good laugh on that exchange of views and our reciprocal change of positions.

Senator Heinz and I made it a practice to inform and invite the other to all of our events. On April 3, 1991, our paths crossed in Altoona, Pennsylvania, where he had scheduled a meeting with a group of doctors. I accepted his invitation and recall his warm greeting when Joan and I arrived to join the discussion. He kissed Joan on the cheek and joked with me about calling her "blondie." We parted that day and that was the last time I saw John Heinz because he had the fatal air crash the next day, April 4, 1991, in a small plane from Williamsport, Pennsylvania, to Philadelphia.

Senator Heinz was an extraordinary man and a great Senator. The designation of the Veterans Medical Center in Aspinwall, Pennsylvania, is an appropriate additional tribute to his memory.

Senator Heinz' work on behalf of the citizens of Pennsylvania, young and old, will long be remembered. He was a tireless advocate for seniors, working to ensure the long-term viability of the Social Security system. He fought to protect Medicare and Medicaid patients. He authored the Age Discrimination and Employment Amendments of 1985, protecting the employment rights of our nation's seniors. He authored a bill to strengthen the U.S. job training program for displaced veterans in the work force. For military families, he worked to ensure that the children of service members were adequately cared for. He worked on behalf of U.S. workers and businesses in an increasingly international marketplace. He also played an important role in ensuring appropriate environmental protections in Pennsylvania and across the nation. John Heinz had a remarkable career of public service.

As Chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I ask my colleagues to support this measure naming the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Aspinwall, Pennsylvania, after our departed colleague, Senator H. John Heinz III.

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. 2496

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

**SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF H. JOHN HEINZ IN DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER, ASPINWALL, PENNSYLVANIA.**

The Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Aspinwall, Pennsylvania, is hereby designated as the "H. John Heinz III Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center". Any reference to such medical center in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the "H. John Heinz III Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center".

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 852

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 852, a bill to establish nationally uniform requirements regarding the titling and registration of salvage, non-repairable, and rebuilt vehicles.

S. 1805

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1805, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the Federal minimum wage.

S. 1976

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1976, a bill to increase public awareness of the plight of victims of crime with developmental disabilities, to collect data to measure the magnitude of the problem, and to develop strategies to address the safety and justice needs of victims of crime with developmental disabilities.

S. 2022

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2022, a bill to provide for the improvement of interstate criminal justice identification, information, communications, and forensics.

S. 2041

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2041, a bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Willow Lake Natural Treatment System Project for the reclamation and reuse of water, and for other purposes.

S. 2148

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2148, a bill to protect religious liberty.

S. 2233

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2233, a bill to amend section 29 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the placed in service date for biomass and coal facilities.

S. 2323

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2323, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to home health services under the medicare program.

S. 2346

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2346, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand S corporation eligibility for banks, and for other purposes.