

qualified transit system, or a qualified employee shall be as follows:

(1) in the case of a Senator's office from the SOP&OEA as an "other official expense" (discretionary expense).

(2) in the case of a Senate committee or administrative office as an "Other" expense.

#### SEC. 9. SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

Any circumstances not covered under these regulations shall be considered on application to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

#### SEC. 10. EFFECTIVE DATE

These regulations shall take effect on the first day of the month following date of approval.

Approved by Chairman and Ranking Member.

Date: September 30, 1998.

#### ATTACHMENT C

#### REGULATIONS FOR THE DISPLAY OF FLAGS AND STATE SENATE SEALS IN THE HALLWAYS OUTSIDE SENATOR'S OFFICES

(Adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, October 21, 1987; Amended on September 30, 1998)

1. Two wooden flagpoles, 8 feet in height by 1-5/32" in diameter, mounted in bright brass finished stands weighing at least 15 pounds, for flying 3 foot by 5 foot state and United States flags, at the Senator's option, are permitted in the hallway outside a Senator's office. The flagpoles and stands must be placed inside the office at night.

2. One state seal in cast bronze, or other acceptable material, not less than 14 inches nor more than 15 inches in diameter, may be mounted on the wall to the right or left of the main entrance to the suite, at a height of 5 feet above the floor. The state seal may not be mounted on the entrance door.

3. Artifacts are not permitted on the walls, doors, and in the corridors outside Senator's offices.

Approved by Chairman and Ranking Member.

Date: September 30, 1998.

#### ATTACHMENT D

#### REGULATIONS GOVERNING ADVANCE PAYMENT

(Adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, October 30, 1997; Amended on September 30, 1998)

Under the authority granted by Sec. 1(b) for P.L. 105-55, the FY98 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill and using these regulations—

The term "advance payment" means any expense authorized, by the Committee on Rules and Administration, pursuant to P.L. 105-55.

By the above definition of advance payment and following the enactment of the FY98 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill, in addition to subscriptions, the following items are for advance payment:

(a) Rental of water coolers (cooler units only/not for water)

(b) monthly maintenance on equipment that is either non-standard and/or above the \$500 limit

(c) cable TV services (including basic satellite service where needed)

(d) online services (for official use by the Senator only)

(e) rental booths at State Fairs, rent for space to be use during town hall meetings and associated costs (not to include insurance)

(f) conference and seminar fees (not to include meals charged separately)

(g) payments on leased equipment

(h) paging service

(i) clipping services

(j) yellow page listings (not to include the classified yellow pages)

(k) State office rents, up to 1 year in advance.

With respect to charges for on-line services, paging services, clipping services, and equipment maintenance, advance payment shall only be made in the cases of "flat fee services." Also, no advance payment will be allowed in instances where cancellation fees may be incurred. Time limitation on the obligation of funds is restricted to a Member's six-year term of office and a Committee's biennial funding period.

Approved by Chairman and Ranking Member.

Date: September 30, 1998.●

#### BREAST AND CERVICAL CANCER TREATMENT ACT

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, in the remaining days of this Congress, we can make a profound difference in the lives of American women. The Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act, S. 2017, would ensure that women whose cancer is diagnosed through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's screening program have access to the medical care they need. It would give states the option of extending Medicaid coverage to low-income, uninsured women who have been diagnosed with breast or cervical cancer through the CDC program.

Federal legislation is needed because the patchwork of state laws does not ensure women the treatment they need. In California, the health care community and breast cancer activists mobilized behind a bill to provide breast cancer treatment to uninsured and underinsured women. The California legislature passed the bill and sent it to the Governor for his signature. Despite the bill's widespread popularity, the Governor vetoed it a few days ago.

If we care enough about women's health to provide coverage for screenings, then we should care enough to provide treatment when those screenings find cancer. The last thing a woman should have to worry about when she is diagnosed is how she will pay for her treatment.

The heart wrenching experience of one of my constituents shows us how important the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act is.

Two and a half years ago, Edna Harris of Imperial Beach, California felt a lump in her breast. Like so many other women in her position, she feared it was cancerous. But Edna had another reason to worry. She was uninsured, and neither she nor her husband were employed.

Under the CDC's Early Detection program, Edna underwent a mammogram, a fine needle biopsy, and then a full biopsy. When the results came in, her worst fear had come true: she was diagnosed with breast cancer, and told she needed surgery. The CDC program that had diagnosed her did not cover the costs of treatment. Edna was told that unless she would come up with nearly \$4,000, she could not receive treatment.

Edna's experience reveals a fatal flaw in one of our best-intentioned, and indeed most successful, programs. Low income and uninsured women who are diagnosed with cancer under the CDC program must scramble to find the money for treatment. Edna was fortunate; she ultimately was able to come up with the resources to fund her treatment. But others are not so fortunate. I have heard from women who have had to mortgage their homes or hold bake sales to pay for cancer treatment. This is unacceptable.

The Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act will help ensure that all our mothers, daughters, and sisters receive the treatment they need at one of the most vulnerable times of their lives. I urge our leadership to bring the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act to the floor this session. We owe it to the women of this country to pass this legislation before Congress adjourns.●

#### ONE GUN A MONTH FORUM

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to inform my colleagues of a forum I held on September 2 on the deadly problem of gun trafficking. I am pleased that Senator ROBB and Senator SARBANES were able to join me at the forum.

As my colleagues know, I have introduced S. 466, the Anti-Gun Trafficking Act. The Judiciary Committee has not held hearings on this legislation, and I thought it was important to gather expert testimony on the issue. The testimony I heard at the forum has made me even more determined to pass this sensible legislation and make it more difficult for gun traffickers to obtain and sell their deadly merchandise on our streets.

The witnesses at this forum included: Philadelphia Mayor Ed Rendell, who is also the chair of the Conference of Mayor's Task Force on Gun Violence; James and Sarah Brady; Captain R. Lewis Vass of the Virginia State Police, and Captain Thomas Bowers of the Maryland State Police.

We also heard from a panel of youth from right here in our nation's capital who live with gun violence everyday in their communities. They were John Schuler, Kenisha Green and Quanita Favorite.

In this statement I will summarize what happened during the forum. But I will also be including, during the next few days, testimony from the witnesses so that my colleagues and the public will have a record of their views.

Mr. President, as a result of the Brady Act, we have helped prevent thousands of guns from getting into the hands of the wrong people. Since the Brady Act went into effect in 1994, more than 242,000 handgun purchases have been denied to convicted felons, fugitives, drug addicts and other dangerous persons. The Domestic Violence Gun Ban in the Brady Act, which I sponsored and which went into effect in

1996, has prevented more than 6,800 firearms sales to people convicted of abusing a spouse or child.

However, the Brady Law has not completely stopped the flow of handguns to those who should not have them. Gun traffickers continue to supply an illegal gun market by buying large quantities of guns in states with lax gun laws and then reselling them on the streets—often in cities and states with strict gun laws.

If these traffickers can not legally buy a gun themselves, or if they do not want to have their name turn up if the gun is later found at a crime scene, they find others to make the purchases for them. The trafficker pays a straw purchaser, in money or drugs, to buy 25, 50 or more handguns at a time and then resells the guns to those who otherwise could not buy them—such as convicted felons, drug addicts, or children.

In fact, the Maryland State Police official testified that multiple guns purchased by straw purchasers were the source of the majority of firearms used in the commission of violent crime.

My bill would make it far more difficult and less profitable for traffickers to conduct their deadly business, by prohibiting an individual from buying more than one handgun a month. We know this approach works because three states—Virginia, Maryland, South Carolina—have passed one-gun-a-month laws and the results have been dramatic. Gun trafficking from these states has plunged.

For instance, officers from the Virginia State Police testified that after Virginia passed its one-handgun-a-month limit in 1993, the number of crime guns traced back to Virginia from the Northeast dropped by nearly 40 percent. Prior to one-gun-a-month, Virginia had been among the leading supplier of weapons to the so-called "Iron Pipeline" that feed the arms race on the streets of Northeastern cities.

In 1995, the Virginia Crime Commission conducted a comprehensive study of the one-handgun-a-month limit to determine if the law had achieved its purpose. That study found, and I quote, "Virginia's one-gun-a-month statute . . . has had its intended effect of reducing Virginia's status as a source state for gun trafficking."

Maryland and South Carolina showed similar results. In South Carolina, according to the same Crime Commission report: "Prior to the passage of the one-gun-a-month law, South Carolina was a leading source state for guns traced to New York City, accounting for 39% of guns recovered in criminal investigations. Following the implementation of the law, South Carolina virtually dropped off of the statistical list of source states for firearms trafficked to the northeast."

Maryland—the most recent state to pass a limit on handgun purchases—passed its law in 1996 and has already seen the results. According to testimony from the Maryland State Police:

"In 1991 Maryland was nationally ranked second in terms of suppliers of crime guns to the City of New York. By 1997, one year after the passage of Maryland's one gun a month law, Maryland moved out of the top ten suppliers of crime guns to New York City."

And most significant is the drop in crime that has followed enactment of limits on handgun sales. For example, in Virginia, the number of murders, robberies and aggravated assaults committed with a firearm significantly dropped after 1993 when the limit went into effect. Of course it should not come as a surprise to anyone that violent crime would drop when it becomes more difficult for criminals to get a handgun. Handguns are the gun of choice for criminals—they are cheap and concealable. Of all murders committed with firearm, about 80% are committed with a handgun.

Limits on handgun purchases, while disrupting gun traffickers, have little or no effect on the sportsman or law abiding citizen because a very small percent of all handgun purchases involve multiple sales. For example, in 1991, Virginia State Police reported only 6% of handgun purchases were multiple sales. But of these, nearly 75% were semi-automatic weapons, the weapon of choice among gun traffickers. Mayor Rendell testified that less than 1% of handgun purchasers in Philadelphia bought more than 12 handguns in a twelve month period.

Let me put some human faces on this issue. As I said earlier, kids from the District of Columbia testified at my forum. And what they had to say was terrifying. Guns were an every day part of their lives. For these kids, D.C. does not stand for District of Columbia. It stands for Dodge City.

These young people told us that guns are easy to get in their neighborhoods and schools. They call it getting strapped. And if you do not get strapped you might not make it through the day, they said.

One young woman put it eloquently: "It's not fair," she said. "Other kids get to go to college. We get to go to funerals. These people who sell guns are the real predators. They feed off our pain."

We must shut these predators down.

Most sane people would ask, who could possibly need more than one handgun a month? The testimony at my forum gave the clear and obvious answer. Someone who should not have any at all. The only people who would "need" more than one gun a month are gun traffickers. It is the only way to make their deadly business profitable.

The need for a national limit on handgun sales is clear. I hope this Congress has the courage to act in the interests of law abiding Americans. But I have my doubts. This Congress has defeated sensible proposals to try to make guns safer through mandated safety locks. This Congress has defeated legislation that would require

adults to keep their guns locked and out of reach of children.

I look forward to the day when this Congress listens to the American people instead of the gun lobby and the National Rifle Association. Poll after poll shows that Americans, including gun-owning Americans, want tougher controls on guns. A University of Chicago study in 1996 found 85% support legislation mandating that all new handguns must be childproof, and 80% favors limiting handgun sales to one a month.

We have heard a lot from Charlton Heston lately now that he is president of the National Rifle Association. But I sometimes think Mr. Heston forgets he is only an actor—not Moses—when he uses that superb voice of his in the service of the National Rifle Association.

I would like to remind Mr. Heston of one of the last things Moses said to the children of Israel before he died.

"I have put before you life and death, blessing and curse. Choose life if you and your offspring would live."

Well, Mr. Heston, we choose life—for ourselves and our children. And we are going to fight the curse that gun traffickers have wrought upon cities, our schools and our streets.

I urge my colleagues to listen to the American people; stop turning a blind eye to the daily destruction caused by guns in America. I urge my colleagues to have the will to do something to help the youth of America live without the daily sound of gunshots in their lives. I ask my colleagues to support this common sense approach to keep handguns out of the hands of criminals.

Mr. President, I ask that the testimony of Mayor Edward Rendell be printed in the RECORD.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF MAYOR EDWARD G. RENDELL, FORUM ON HANDGUN VIOLENCE AND S. 466, "THE ANTI-GUN TRAFFICKING ACT"—TALKING POINTS

#### I. THE SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

We have a crisis in Philadelphia: Gun violence is out of control, and the carnage it has created is unprecedented in our City.

The statistics are chilling: Between 1985 and 1995, deaths by firearm rose 66 percent in Pennsylvania, and by 102 percent in Philadelphia. In 1995 there were 432 total homicides in Philadelphia, and gun homicides represented a staggering 77 percent of that number. In 1996, there were 414 total homicides, and killings by gun represented 81 percent of that number. And last year, the gruesome trend continued: of the 410 total homicides in Philadelphia, 339 of them—almost 83 percent—were due to gun violence. These numbers are the highest of any city in the nation.

For the City, there is one particularly horrifying element to the growing plague of gun violence: More and more, kids are doing the killing. In almost 15 percent of all Philadelphia gun homicides over the last three years, a child under age 18 was arrested for pulling the trigger. And worst of all, kids are the victims, too: in 1995, 24 children were shot to death; in 1996, the number was 25; and last year, 26 kids were killed by gunfire. Ladies and gentlemen, homicide is now the leading cause of death among youths ages 16 to 21 in

Philadelphia. Compare this Boston, where no kids—zero—under the age of 18 were killed by gunfire during the same period.

The carnage caused by gun violence in Philadelphia doesn't just show up in the murder statistics, either: More than half of all robberies committed in Philadelphia are robberies at the point of a gun. In Philadelphia last year, there were 11,938 robberies, and 53.7 percent were gun robberies. Almost one-third of those arrested for these crimes were under the age of 18.

Of the 6,198 aggravated assaults in Philadelphia last year, more than 36 percent involved a gun—a total of 2,279 shootings in one year. Almost 17 percent of those arrested for these crimes were juveniles.

In one bloody week earlier this year, our newspaper headlines recorded the shooting deaths of eight people in Philadelphia—five in one weekend alone. Among the victims: a 22-year-old man killed in a gun battle that erupted outside the Palestra at the University of Pennsylvania after a high-school basketball championship game. Three others were wounded in the melee, which took place in the middle of 33rd Street as the crowd was leaving the game. In other cases, two owners of a neighborhood pizzeria were gunned down in their store; an elderly woman was shot to death during a robbery in her own home; and a lawyer and his assistant were robbed and executed in their Center City office.

Though that week was particularly grim, it was by no means one-of-a-kind. In fact, the situation is so bad that an absence of murder actually became news last spring: In a story about the Philadelphia murder rate, one local newspaper reported that Philadelphia went 12 days without a homicide, from April 24th to May 5th. As the paper noted: "There had not been a comparable killing-free stretch for at least 10 years. The next longest streak on record was eight days, in 1988."

## II. WE HAVE TRIED TO ADDRESS THE PROBLEM IN MANY WAYS

Having been a prosecutor for most of my professional career—I was the elected District Attorney of Philadelphia from 1978 to 1986, and before that, I served as the Chief of the Homicide Unit in the DA's office—I know a fair amount about crime and the fear that it generates among good and decent people in our communities. This is not an argument about whether people have the right to own guns or not. Rather, this is about stopping guns from getting into the wrong hands, particularly criminals and children.

I understand the need for comprehensive solutions to fighting crime involve more than controlling the flow of handguns in our City. For example, in my first term as District Attorney of Philadelphia, I authored the death penalty law in Pennsylvania, which withstood legal challenge and today is being used with increasing frequency.

In 1982, during my second term as DA, I authored Pennsylvania's current mandatory sentencing law, which created tough new mandatory jail terms for criminal offenders, including a flat five-year mandatory sentence for anyone convicted of using a firearm during the commission of a felony.

The results have meant longer sentences are being served in Pennsylvania. Last year alone, the number of convictions for gun offenses in Philadelphia almost doubled, and the number of jail terms meted out for these convictions jumped by more than 120 percent. Overall, the number of inmates in Pennsylvania prisons has increased by almost 30 percent since 1993 (26,060 inmates statewide in 1993, up to 34,534 inmates statewide by 1996.)

We have tried through the enactment of state legislation in Pennsylvania as recently

a 1995. The Pennsylvania Uniform Firearms Act (18 Pa.C.S. §611(g)(5)) makes it a felony to "knowingly and intentionally" sell or deliver a gun if he or she has "reason to believe" that the gun is intended to be used in the commission of a crime. But the problem has been in proving that the seller acted "knowingly or intentionally," with reason to believe that the firearm was intended for use in a crime. Proving intent is always difficult; proving that someone acted knowingly, intentionally and with reason to believe is practically impossible. As a result, a law meant to limit a criminal's access to guns in reality is used only very rarely, and as such has had no practical effect on the effort to keep guns out of the hands of criminals.

## III. AND WE'RE STILL TRYING

The statistics show the grim toll of gun violence in Philadelphia, and these facts can be repeated in cities all over America. They can be measured in starkly human terms: the number of lives lost to gun violence, and the number of lives ruined by it, either through injury (victims and families) or incarceration (the perpetrators). But for cities like Philadelphia, the cost of gun violence can be quantified in dollars and cents too; Taking into account the enormous burden that guns place on our health services, courts, prisons, police, sheriffs, fire, pension, workers compensation, our public schools, and social services, the City estimates the cost of gun violence in Philadelphia is \$58.8 million a year.

These statistics underscore the critical importance of doing all we can to eliminate the flow of guns to the wrong people: criminals, children, and those "straw purchasers" who sell to them. That is why we pushed for tougher sentences, for the death penalty, and for the construction of new prisons to house those sentenced to longer jail terms.

But the grim gun violence statistics keep climbing, showing that what we've done hasn't been nearly enough.

That's why we continue to do all that we can to stop the violence, with initiatives like the successful effort to win agreement with gun manufacturers to provide a child safety lock with every handgun they sell. The industry is to be commended for its willingness to act affirmatively to provide child safety locks. They are an easy, affordable way to reduce gun violence, and they are helping.

That is why we also have launched a comprehensive public education campaign in Philadelphia, targeting youngsters with a message that focuses on violence reduction (I Can End Violence) and specifically on carrying and using guns. These messages are aimed for distribution through churches, rec centers, and youth centers. In addition, we have launched a public service ad campaign—"What Are You Shooting For?"—that sends that same message throughout the Greater Philadelphia region, and we have garnered the assistance of the local media in supporting this effort by broadcasting these messages.

The Philadelphia Police Department has changed the way it does business with respect to handguns. A whole new series of initiatives have been introduced to control the damage done by criminals with handguns. These initiatives include: Standard Interview Protocol for all gun offenders to determine the origin of guns used in crimes; streamlining all gun issues in the Police Department under one command; aggressively serving warrants; zero tolerance for gun offenders in high violent-crime areas; and more aggressively tracing guns used in crimes, and cracking down on second sales, with the help of the ATF.

Working together, the ATF and the Philadelphia Police Department have made ter-

rific progress in tracking the origins of guns used in the commission of crimes. Initially, the joint ATF-PPD task force traced firearms recovered in major crimes. Today, they trace all firearms linked to an arrest, and soon, they will have the capability to trace all firearms recovered in Philadelphia.

As a result of these initiatives, the task force has increased the number of arrests for gun violation prosecutions by 25 percent, and that number continues to rise. But again, to be successful in prosecuting those who sell guns to criminals, we must prove that the seller "knowingly or intentionally" sold the gun to someone he knew was going to use it to commit a crime. In practice, it is a difficult EGR standards to meet, especially since neither the seller nor the buyer has any incentive to testify to that effect. The seller clearly has no interest in testifying that he knowingly sold a gun to a criminal, or that he had reason to expect that it would be used in a crime. And the criminal likewise has little incentive to volunteer any incriminatory evidence whatsoever.

As a result, despite the success of these efforts, we must all do more.

## IV. WHAT THE GUN INDUSTRY CAN DO

Gun manufacturers can help, too. Child safety locks were a great move, but more must be done. I have asked the industry to:

(1) increase internal security—14,000 guns were stolen from one manufacturer's plant in Southern California;

(2) stop selling guns that are attractive to criminals but have no legitimate use except to kill people: Saturday night specials, armor piercing bullets, military assault weapons;

(3) stop advertising that incorrectly suggests that people are safer for having a gun in their homes; the New England Journal of Medicine reports that bringing a gun into the home leads to a three-fold increase in risk of homicide in the home;

(4) take the lead and oppose senseless restrictions that impede investigation of gun crimes, such as obstruction of the Brady form and multiple purchase form in 20 days, making tracking infinitely more difficult. NOTE: even Ron Stewart of Colt recently called for federalization of state laws requiring a second set of serial numbers on weapons because, as he said, "isn't that a protective measure that prevents illegal ownership of a firearm?"

(5) A 1994 federal law banned further manufacture for civilian use of clips or magazines holding more than 10 rounds of ammunition. Stop producing guns that accept "grandfathered" magazines;

(6) Develop technology to make illegal use almost impossible, such as the production of "personalized" handguns that can only be fired by their rightful owners. This is the ultimate weapon against illegal use of handguns. Last year, Colt unveiled a prototype personalized handgun for police to prevent them from being shot with their own weapons. This system should be developed ASAP for everyone, police and civilians alike.

The gun industry, working with the American Shooting Sports Council, has agreed to join mayors from a variety of cities, including Philadelphia, Chicago, Dallas, and St. Louis, in the formation of a joint task force to come with initiatives, by the fall of this year, to reduce handgun violence in American cities. That is the kind of partnership we need to substantively address the problem of handgun violence in our cities.

That is why I also urge federal support for Project Exile, a partnership we have created with the National Rifle Association in which Philadelphia would be used as a test city to gauge the impact of federalizing every violation of existing handgun laws. The idea is

simple: federally prosecute all handgun violations, and mete out tough federal prison sentences for all convictions. It has shown dramatic results in Richmond, Va., and I have no doubt that it will reduce gun violence and the carnage that accompanies it on the streets of Philadelphia. People on both sides of the age-old gun debate have criticized this partnership, but again, this is not about the Second Amendment. This is not about the right to bear arms. We're talking about stemming the flow of guns into the inner city, where they are used by criminals and children to commit crimes and destroy families. Thanks to the support of Sen. Lautenberg and Sen. Specter, Congressional support for this initiative will help us obtain the federal resources needed to make the program a success. I have already been to the White House to discuss Administration support for the initiative, and I believe that it will be successful in that regard.

We are engaged in a war to reduce the carnage caused by gun violence. And we must fight this fight on many fronts, and sometimes with unusual allies. We have worked with the gun industry, the NRA and its representatives, for one simple reason: We need their help to reduce gun violence. And we are still considering litigation to force gun manufacturers to join the fight against gun violence if they do not do so willingly.

#### V. THE NEED FOR FEDERAL ONE GUN A MONTH LEGISLATION

If these initiatives are critical to our fight, then the enactment of legislation is no less essential in the effort to reduce gun violence. And that is why today's forum is critically important: Whatever other initiatives are implemented, we must develop Congressional support for S. 466, the federal Anti-Gun Trafficking Act sponsored by Sen. Lautenberg. Because gun trafficking knows no state lines, federal legislation—a uniform national standard limiting handgun purchases—is the only effective way to combat this problem.

I have long advocated support for One Gun a Month, because it is a matter of basic common sense. One Gun a Month deals only with handguns, and does not interfere at all with a citizen's right to maintain a firearm for home or personal protection. Instead, One Gun a Month focuses on stopping multiple purchases of handguns, because these are the guns that ultimately wind up being resold on the streets of our cities to criminals and children.

Look at the statistics on gun sales in Pennsylvania. In 1996, there were 150,000 handgun sales statewide. During roughly the same period, there were 38,338 guns sold in the Philadelphia region alone. Of that number, roughly nine percent of the purchasers bought nearly 30 percent of the guns.

What that means is that small numbers of people are buying lots of guns, and our experience shows that is for only one reason: to resell them on the street to people who use them in the commission of crimes.

One Gun a Month would limit purchasers to buying 12 guns a year. I also support the so-called "Collector's Exception," which would permit bona fide gun collectors from the legislation. As a result, for the overwhelming majority of gun purchasers, only the 13th gun would be prohibited. Ladies and gentlemen, legislation that proposes to ban handgun sales only at the purchase of 13 guns a year does not affect the average citizen—or the average gun purchaser. As the New York Times pointed out in a recent editorial supporting a federal limit, those who argue that One Gun a Month would limit a citizen's right to bear arms should be forced to "explain to crime-fearing Americans why a 12-gun-per-year limit would impose any offensive burden on law-abiding users who may

want a weapons for target shooting or for personal protection."

Instead, the federal standard proposed in S. 466 simply limits the ability of those who resell guns on our streets. Again, look at just the Pennsylvania numbers. Of the 25,510 purchasers of guns in 1996, One Gun a Month would affect only 103 Pennsylvania purchasers (those who bought more than 12 guns in a 12-month period.) That's .4 percent of all purchasers of guns in Philadelphia, and only a total of 5,000 guns out of the 38,000 sold in 1996 in the Philadelphia region.

And while One Gun a Month does little to limit purchases by law-abiding citizens in Pennsylvania, it has the potential to crack down on the sales to those who sell to criminals and children. In other words, it has the ability to go after the gun sales that none of us want: not the City of Philadelphia, not any member of Congress, and not even the gun manufacturers or the NRA.

The grim reality of these types of sales is inescapable. FACT: At least 20 percent of all multiple gun purchasers can be linked to guns used in the commission of crime, particularly violent crime, in Philadelphia. FACT: A total of 608 handguns that were purchased in multiple purchase transactions have been directly linked to a homicide or other violent crime in Philadelphia. And as the tracing of these guns continues, these numbers undoubtedly will continue to rise. FACT: Under One Gun a Month, the sale of guns to "suspect purchasers" (those whose purchases suggest involvement in street resale of guns) could be reduced by as much as 54 percent.

States have taken the lead in the effort to limit purchases to one gun a month. And as Sen. Lautenberg has made clear, the good news is that One Gun a Month is working in Virginia, South Carolina and Maryland, where it was most recently enacted. In Virginia, the odds of a handgun seized in a crime anywhere along the East Coast has dropped 66 percent since One Gun a Month was enacted in 1993. In Maryland, handgun sales dropped more than 25 percent last year, and as the Washington Post noted sarcastically, that in turn "is threatening Maryland's position as a leading supplier of handguns seized by police at crime scenes up and down the East Coast."

I urge members of Congress to follow the lead of Sen. Lautenberg and support S. 466, the "Anti-Gun Trafficking Act." I have also urged the gun industry and the NRA to support this important legislation, together with my fellow mayors from cities all over the nation. Again, this is not about whether people have the right to bear arms or purchase weapons. This legislation does not affect them. This is about keeping guns out of the hands of criminals, and out of the hands of children. Gun violence is out of control in Philadelphia, and this legislation can help to stop it. I urge your support.

Several years ago, a Florida-based manufacturer of assault pistols which at that time were with a 32-round magazine, said: "I know some of the guns going out of here will end up killing people, but I'm not responsible for that." He was wrong then, and that attitude is wrong now. It is my responsibility, and it is everyone's responsibility, including mayors, state legislators, members of Congress, and indeed, especially the gun industry itself.

Back in April, I came to Washington to speak directly to gun manufacturers, thanks to the invitation of the American Shooting Sports Council. It was, I might add, not the greatest reception I've ever gotten. But they were at least willing to listen, and I told them that we very much wanted to be their allies in fighting the growing plague of gun violence. That remains true, but understand,

one way or another we will try anything and everything—whether it is partnering with the gun industry or the NRA, or suing gun manufacturers—to end the terrible consequences of gun violence on the streets of Philadelphia. ●

#### THE CALENDAR

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, for the leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the following bills, en bloc:

Calendar Nos. 494, S. 890; 525, S. 1398; 527, S. 2171; 528, H.R. 449; 529, H.R. 2886; 530, H.R. 3796; 541, S. 1016; 542, S. 1408; 543, S. 1990; 546, S. 2232; 550, S. 1333; 551, S. 1665; 552, S. 2129; 561, S. 469; 565, S. 2272; 571, S. 1718; 573, S. 2106; 579, H.R. 3903; 598, H.R. 3381.

Further, I ask unanimous consent that any committee amendments be agreed to, the bills be read the third time and passed, as amended, if amended, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bills appear at the appropriate point in the RECORD, with the above occurring en bloc.

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

#### DUTCH JOHN FEDERAL PROPERTY DISPOSITION AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1998

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 890) to dispose of certain Federal properties located in Dutch John, Utah, to assist the local government in the interim delivery of basic services to the Dutch John community, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Dutch John Federal Property Disposition and Assistance Act of 1998".*

##### SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1)(A) Dutch John, Utah, was founded by the Secretary of the Interior in 1958 on Bureau of Reclamation land as a community to house personnel, administrative offices, and equipment for project construction and operation of the Flaming Gorge Dam and Reservoir as authorized by the Act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105, chapter 203; 43 U.S.C. 620 et seq.); and

(B) permanent structures (including houses, administrative offices, equipment storage and maintenance buildings, and other public buildings and facilities) were constructed and continue to be owned and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior;

(2)(A) Bureau of Reclamation land surrounding the Flaming Gorge Reservoir (including the Dutch John community) was included within the boundaries of the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area in 1968 under Public Law 90-540 (16 U.S.C. 460v et seq.);

(B) Public Law 90-540 assigned responsibility for administration, protection, and development of the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area to the Secretary of Agriculture and provided that lands and waters needed or used for the Colorado River Storage Project would continue to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior; and