of early detection of prostate cancer and certain drug treatment services under part B of the medicare program, to amend chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for coverage of such early detection and treatment services under the programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and to expand research and education programs of the National Institutes of Health and the Public Health Service relating to prostate cancer; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GREGG:

S. 692. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to preserve family-held forest lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOLLINGS (by request):

S. 693. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KYL:

S. 694. A bill to prevent and punish crimes of sexual and domestic violence, to strengthen the rights of crime victims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM (for herself and Mr. DOLE):

S. 695. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve in Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 696. A bill to assist States and secondary and postsecondary schools to develop, implement, and improve school-to-work opportunities systems so that all students have an opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to meet challenging State academic standards and industry-based skill standards and to prepare for postsecondary education, further learning, and a wide range of opportunities in high-skill, high-wage careers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BRADLEY, and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN):

S. 697. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the training of health professions students with respect to the identification and referral of victims of domestic violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 698. A bill to designate the Federal building at 33 College Avenue in Waterville, Maine, as the ''George J. Mitchell Federal Building'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 699. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Office of Government Ethics for seven years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 700. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to revise the tax rules on expiration, to modify the basis rules for nonresident aliens becoming citizens or residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SIMON:

S. 701. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the interest deduction allowed corporations and to allow a deduction for dividends paid by corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 702. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain private foundations in the same manner as educational institutions and pension trusts for purposes of the unrelated debt- financed income rules; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOLLINGS (by request):

S. 703. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to simplify and improve the organization of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SIMON:

S. 704. A bill to establish the Gambling Impact Study Commission; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 705. A bill to combat crime by enhancing the penalties for certain sex crimes against children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HEFLIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 706. A bill to prohibit the importation of goods produced abroad with child labor and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM (for herself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 707. A bill to shift financial responsibility for providing welfare assistance and medical care to welfare-related medicaid individuals to the States in exchange for the Federal Government assuming financial responsibility for providing certain elderly low-income individuals and nonelderly low-income disabled individuals with benefits under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act and long-term care benefits under a new Federal program established under title XIX of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NICKLES:

S. 708. A bill to repeal section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOND (for himself and Mr. BRYAN):

S. 709. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KERREY:

S. 710. A bill to promote interoperability in the evolving information infrastructure maximum competition, innovation, and consumer choice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S.J. Res. 32. A joint resolution expressing the concern of the Congress regarding certain recent remarks that unfairly and inaccurately maligned the integrity of the Nation's law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DOLE (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. Res. 106. A resolution to authorize testimony by former Senate employee and representation by Senate Legal Counsel; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. Res. 107. A resolution to commend the Huskies of the University of Connecticut for capping a perfect season by winning the 1995 NCAA Women's Basketball Championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. REID, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. Res. 108. A resolution designating July 16, 1995, as ''National Atomic Veterans Day''; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATFIELD (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SIMON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KERREY, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 684. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for programs of research regarding Parkinson's disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE MORRIS K. UDALL PARKINSON'S RESEARCH ASSISTANCE AND EDUCATION ACT OF 1995

● Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, if you want to know more about Parkinson's disease all you have to do is read the newspaper or watch the nightly news. You don't even have to read the whole paper, the information is usually on page 1. Prestigious and international papers such as the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal believe that the news is worthy of front page coverage. ''Prime Time'' had a feature on Parkinson's, and our very own Washington Post devoted three pages to promising new developments. What has caused the media fervor is the exciting new and dramatic medical discoveries in the field of neurology and neurosurgery. As I speak, scientists are uncovering new important data on nerve cell function and repair. Our biomedical research teams are on the cusp of breaking the code to nerve regeneration.

In these times of exciting new developments, we are unfortunately encountering a financial impediment. Last year, the Federal funding for Parkinson's disease at the NIH was $26 million. To put that number in prospective, the annual Federal budget for Alzheimers is $300 million, $1 billion each for cancer and heart disease. Our commitment to eradicating Parkinson's disease is minuscule in comparison. I cannot understand the lack of financial support for a disease that affects over 1 million Americans and costs our society over $6 billion a year. This disease is so widespread that each one of us has a close friend or loved one who is facing the challenge of life with Parkinson's. We must change our message to the American public and declare that increased Federal funding for Parkinson's disease research is a worthy investment in the future health of our Nation.

Today, I am pleased to reintroduce legislation that accomplishes that goal. The Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research, Assistance, and Education Act of 1995, increases the Federal investment in Parkinson's research to $100 million for fiscal year 1996. The bill establishes an Interagency Coordinating Council, composed of representatives from the relevant agencies and NIH, which will develop a strategic plan for Parkinson's research.

At the heart of the bill is the funding of Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Centers which will conduct basic and clinical research and patient care. Having these three individual areas of research and treatment linked in a center will assure that the research developments will be coordinated and the quality of patient care will be greatly improved. In addition, the centers may develop teaching programs for health professionals and dissemination programs for public information. To compile necessary data on patients and their families a clearinghouse will be established. Morris K. Udall Leadership and Excellence Awards will be granted to scientists who excel in Parkinson's research. Finally, a national Parkinson's Disease Education Program will be established to provide technical assistance to advocacy groups and facilitate public understanding of Parkinson's.

This important legislation honors Mo Udall, a dedicated Congressman from the Second District in Arizona. For 30 years, Mo represented his constituents with integrity, compassion, and humor. He is remembered for his stewardship of the public lands by setting aside millions of acres of wilderness. He also championed civil rights and political reform. In 1980, Congressman Udall was diagnosed with Parkinson's disease, and struggled with the neurologic decay for years. He resigned from Congress in 1991, his career prematurely and tragically ended. Other famous individuals such as Mohammed Ali and Harry S Truman have all succumbed to this disease which knows no boundaries and strikes without warning.

For Mo Udall and the millions of Americans who suffer from Parkinson's, we must enact this legislation now. By uniting the advocacy groups, the scientists, the caregivers, the patients and their families, we can become a solidified and cohesive group dedicated to alleviating the hardship of Parkinson's. We must give our world-respected researchers the funding and the time to combat this and other neurological diseases, and improve the future health of all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill, a section-by-section summary, various letters of support, and two newspaper articles appear in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 684

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research, Assistance, and Education Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) Findings.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Parkinson's disease and related disorders (hereafter referred to in this Act as ''Parkinson's'') is a neurological disorder affecting as many as 1,500,000 Americans.

(2) Approximately 40 percent of persons with Parkinson's are under the age of 60.

(3) While science has yet to determine what causes the disease, research has found that cells that produce a neurochemical called dopamine inexplicably degenerate, causing uncontrollable tremors, muscle stiffness, and loss of motor function.

(4) Eventually, Parkinson's renders the afflicted individuals incapable of caring for themselves. In addition to causing disability and suffering for the afflicted individuals, Parkinson's places tremendous and prolonged physical, emotional, and financial strain on family and loved ones.

(5) It is estimated that the disease costs society nearly $6,000,000,000 annually.

(6) To date, the federally funded research effort has been grossly underfunded. Only $26,000,000 is allocated specifically for research on Parkinson's, or only about one dollar for every $200 in annual societal costs.

(7) In order to take full advantage of the tremendous potential for finding a cure or effective treatment, the Federal investment in Parkinson's must be expanded, as well as the coordination strengthened among the National Institutes of Health research institutes.

(b) Purpose.—It is the purpose of this Act to provide for the expansion and coordination of research concerning Parkinson's, and to improve care and assistance for afflicted individuals and their family caregivers.

SEC. 3. BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH ON PARKINSON'S DISEASE.

Part B of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 284 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following section:

''PARKINSON'S DISEASE

''Sec. 409B. (a) In General.—The Director of NIH shall establish a program for the conduct and support of research and training, the dissemination of health information, and other programs with respect to Parkinson's disease.

''(b) Interagency Coordinating Committee.—

''(1) In general.—The Director of NIH shall establish a committee to be known as the Interagency Coordinating Committee on Parkinson's Disease (in this subsection referred to as the 'Coordinating Committee').

''(2) Duties.—With respect to Parkinson's, the Coordinating Committee shall—

''(A) provide for the coordination of the activities of the national research institutes; and

''(B) coordinate the aspects of all Federal health programs and activities relating to Parkinson's in order to assure the adequacy, effectiveness, and technical soundness of such programs and activities and in order to provide for the full communication and exchange of information necessary to maintain adequate coordination of such programs and activities.

''(3) Composition.—The Coordinating Committee shall be composed of—

''(A) the directors of each of the national research institutes and other agencies involved in research with respect to Parkinson's;

''(B) one representative of the relevant Federal departments and agencies whose programs involve health functions or responsibilities relevant to such disease;

''(C) individuals with the disease and individuals who have a family history with the disease; and

''(D) health professionals or allied health professionals.

''(4) Chair.—The Coordinating Committee shall be chaired by the Director of NIH (or the designee of the Director). The Committee shall meet at the call of the chair, but not less often than once each year.

''(5) Annual report.—Not later than 120 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Coordinating Committee shall prepare and submit to the Secretary, the Director of NIH, and the directors specified in paragraph (3)(A) a report detailing the activities of the Committee in such fiscal year in carrying out paragraph (2).

''(c) Morris K. Udall Research Centers.—

''(1) In general.—The Director of NIH shall award Core Center Grants to encourage the development of innovative multidisciplinary research and provide training concerning Parkinson's. The Director shall award not more than 10 Core Center Grants and designate each center funded under such grants as a Morris K. Udall Center for Research on Parkinson's Disease.

''(2) Requirements.—

''(A) In general.—With respect to Parkinson's, each center assisted under this subsection shall—

''(i) use the facilities of a single institution or a consortium of cooperating institutions, and meet such qualifications as may be prescribed by the Director of the NIH; and

''(ii) conduct basic and clinical research and provide patient care services.

''(B) Discretionary requirements.—With respect to Parkinson's, each center assisted under this subsection may—

''(i) conduct training programs for scientists and health professionals;

''(ii) conduct programs to provide information and continuing education to health professionals;

''(iii) conduct programs for the dissemination of information to the public; and

''(iv) develop and maintain, where appropriate, a brain bank to collect specimens related to the research and treatment of Parkinson's.

''(3) Stipends regarding training programs.—A center may use funds provided under paragraph (1) to provide stipends for scientists and health professionals enrolled in training programs under paragraph (2)(C).

''(4) Duration of support.—Support of a center under this subsection may be for a period not exceeding five years. Such period may be extended by the Director of NIH for one or more additional periods of not more than five years if the operations of such center have been reviewed by an appropriate technical and scientific peer review group established by the Director and if such group has recommended to the Director that such period should be extended.

''(d) Data System; Information Clearinghouse.—

''(1) Data system.— The Director of NIH shall establish the National Parkinson's Disease Data System for the collection, storage, analysis, retrieval, and dissemination of data derived from patient populations with such disease, including, where possible, data involving general populations for the purpose of detection of individuals with a risk of developing the disease.

''(2) Information clearinghouse.—The Director of NIH shall establish the National

Parkinson's Disease Information Clearinghouse to facilitate and enhance knowledge and understanding of such disease on the part of health professionals, patients, and the public through the effective dissemination of information.

"(e) Morris K. Udall Leadership and Excellence Awards.—The Director of NIH shall establish a grant program to support scientists who have distinguished themselves in the field of Parkinson's research. Grants under this subsection shall be utilized to enable established investigators to devote greater time and resources in laboratories to conduct research on Parkinson's and to encourage the development of a new generation of investigators, with the support and guidance of the most productive and innovative senior researchers.

"(f) National Parkinson's Disease Education Program.—The Director of NIH shall establish a national education program that is designed to foster a national focus on Parkinson's and the care of those with Parkinson's. Activities under such program shall include—

"(1) the bringing together of public and private organizations to develop better ways to provide care to individuals with Parkinson's, and assist the families of such individuals; and

"(2) the provision of technical assistance to public and private organizations that offer support and aid to individuals with Parkinson's and their families.

"(g) Authorization of Appropriations.—

"(1) In general.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for fiscal year 1996, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1997 through 2000.

"(2) Availability.—Of the amount appropriated under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall make available not to exceed $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1996, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1997 through 2000, to establish Morris K. Udall Centers under subsection (c).".

The Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research, Education and Assistance Act of 1995—Section-by-Section Summary

Section 1—Short Title: Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research, Assistance and Education, Act of 1995.

Section 2—Findings and Purpose: Parkinson's disease and related disorders affect as many as 1.5 million Americans, with costs to society of nearly $6 billion annually. To date, the federal research effort has been grossly underfunded, providing about $26 million a year for research on Parkinson's. It is the purpose of this Act to provide for the expansion and coordination of research concerning Parkinson's, and to improve care and assistance for the afflicted individuals and family caregivers.

Section 3—Biomedical Research on Parkinson's Disease: Amends Title IV, Part B of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 284 et seq.) with a new Section 409B—Parkinson's Disease Research—

A. EXPANSION OF BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH

1. Interagency Coordinating Committee—The Director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) will establish a committee to coordinate Parkinson's research, composed of the directors of each of the national research institutes, representatives of other agencies, and patients and their families.

2. Annual Report—Not later than 120 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Coordinating Committee shall prepare and submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), and the directors of appropriate Federal programs a yearly report detailing the activities of the Committee.

3. Morris K. Udall Research Centers—The Director of NIH shall award Core Center Grants to provide funding for not more than 10 Parkinson's Research Centers, which will conduct basic and clinical research, and patient care. The Centers may disseminate clinical information, provide training for health care personnel, develop and maintain brain banks, and enhance community awareness concerning Parkinson's. Not more than $10 million.

Data System; Information Clearinghouse: The Director of NIH shall establish a clearinghouse for collecting patient and family data.

Udall Leadership and Excellence Awards: The Director of NIH shall establish grants for scientists who excel in Parkinson's research.

Natl. Parkinson's Disease Education Program: The Director of NIH shall establish a national education program to provide technical assistance to advocacy groups, establish a clearinghouse to disseminate information, and facilitate public understanding of Parkinson's Disease.

Authorization of Appropriations: The bill establishes a five-year authorization, and authorizes appropriations beginning in fiscal year 1996. Overall funding authorizations are: $100 million for FY1996, and such sums as necessary for FY1997 through FY2000. Not more than $10 million will be allocated in FY1996 for the funding of the Centers.

Parkinson's Action Network,
Washington, DC, April 5, 1995.

Re Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research and Education Act.

Hon. Mark Hatfield,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Hatfield: Thank you from the bottom of our hearts for your great leadership in authoring the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research and Education Act.

The impact of Parkinson's disease on its victims and their loved ones is devastating. As Parkinson's neurologic devastation progresses, it leaves its targets with increasing difficulty with every simple motor function. That process changes forever the lives, the careers and the dreams of the million Americans who suffer from Parkinson's, and millions more loved ones.

Moreover, it causes Parkinson's victims and their families to drop out of public life, so consumed are they with the struggle to survive.

Scientists promise that the cure of Parkinson's is very near—as long as adequate support for research is available. Unfortunately, this great need for research support has been neglected by our government in the past.

Your legislation can end this deadlock, by giving the research community the support they need to deliver our cure.

Words are inadequate to express our profound gratitude for this bill. Equally profound is our determination to do whatever it takes to ensure swift enactment of this legislation, so that our suffering community can be rescued. We commit to you that we no longer will be an invisible community, so that our suffering will be recognized and ended.

Sincerely,

Anne J. Udall,
Chair.
Joan I. Samuelson,
President.

The American Parkinson Disease Association, Inc.,
Washington, DC., April 1, 1995.

Hon. Mark O. Hatfield,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Hatfield: The American Parkinson Disease Association and the more than 1 million people with Parkinson's and their families, commend and enthusiastically support the introduction of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research, Education & Assistance Act to the 104th Congress.

Your introduction of this bill; the first legislative initiative to strengthen the federal Parkinson's research program, will ensure proper funding and coordination of Parkinson's research. The current science gives us hope that major breakthroughs are within reach. We can no longer ignore the tremendous scientific potential.

The Udall Bill will assure that scientific advances are able to move to the stage of treating and curing people with Parkinson's.

Thank you for your leadership and initiative embodied in this legislation, as we work together to achieve the ultimate goal—a cure for Parkinson's.

Sincerely,

Salvatore J. Esposito, Jr.,
President, Board of Directors.
Frank L. Williams,
Executive Director.

Oregon Health Sciences University,
Parkinson Center of Oregon,
Portland, OR, April 3, 1995.

Hon. Mark Hatfield,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Hatfield: Your introduction of the "Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Assistance and Education Act" could not have come at a more opportune time. Medical scientists need support to follow up on some very important clues into the cause and treatment of Parkinson's disease and related neurodegenerative disorders. We have a greater understanding of Parkinson's disease in comparison to other neurodegenerative disorders; medical scientists are closer to breakthroughs in the understanding of the cause and treatment of Parkinson's disease, which could serve as a model for similar approaches in the other disorders such as Alzheimer's disease and Lou Gehrig's disease.

I am particularly pleased that not only does the bill fund research centers but also productive biomedical researchers with good ideas who can train younger, promising investigators to continue the work. The data system and information and clearing house provided in the bill will be a valuable tool for facilitating the work of the scientists.

Because Parkinson's disease is a chronic disorder that consumes valuable family and community resources, the education program is also extremely important. We need to facilitate the delivery of education and assistance to the families and communities struggling with this debilitating disease.

Thank you again for providing the leadership to provide the much needed support to conquer Parkinson's disease and related degenerative disorders.

Sincerely yours,

John P. Hammerstad, M.D.,
Professor of Neurology.

WILL–COPE
(WILLIAMETTE COLUMBIA
PARKINSONIAN SOCIETY),
April 5, 1995.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: We are delighted to learn of your intention to introduce a revised version of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research and Education Act.

Parkinson's disease steals the golden years from many of us and is taking away the economic productive lives of younger-onset Parkinsonians. We know what causes our tremors and makes our bodies freeze but research has not yet provided the cause. Without this needed research, many fine people are trapped in bodies that limit their potential.

Nationwide there are approximately one million Parkinson's patients. U.S. support for research for research of this condition amounts to less than $30.00 per patient which is far less than the help other diseases receive.

Please continue with whatever actions are needed to secure additional Federal funds for continued research towards finding an early cure for this dreaded condition.

Our thanks for your attention, efforts and support.

Sincerely,

L.R. GREGER,
President.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER,
Denver, CO, March 29, 1995.

Hon. MARK HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: I wish you well with your bill, the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research and Education Act, which you will reintroduce to the Senate on April 6th. As a physician and scientist who has spent the last 20 years trying to improve the treatment of Parkinson's disease, I am delighted to see a proposal which recognizes that Parkinson's disease may be cured if adequate resources are devoted to the problem for the next few years.

Even with the current low level of Federal research support for Parkinson's disease, this disease is still the neurologic disorder most likely to be cured in the next decade. While neural transplantation with fetal tissue has already been shown to produce substantial clinical benefit in some patients, genetically engineered alternatives to fetal cells offer promise to supply a limitless amount of tissue for brain repair. These and other fundamental breakthroughs will certainly occur with accelerated research.

Your bill recognizes this unusual opportunity. If we can cure Parkinson's disease, the lessons that we learn will apply to many other disorders such as Alzheimer's disease, Huntington's disease, and epilepsy. Research in other areas such as diabetes will also be benefited.

Although we live in a time of fiscal constraint, I can assure you that money spent on research for Parkinson's disease will be repaid many times over by increased productivity and reduced medical costs. Research success will take people who are frozen invalids and give them back the freedom to move.

Yours sincerely,

CURT R. FREED, M.D.,
Professor and Head, Division of Clinical Pharmacology and Toxicology.

SPRINGFIELD, MO,
April 3, 1995.

Hon. MEL HANCOCK,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HANCOCK: On July 19, 1994 Senator Mark O. Hatfield and Congressman Henry Waxman introduced the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research, Education and Assistance Act of 1994. (S. 2294 & H. 4789) This bill is critical to the Parkinson's community. We are seeking strong support for this bill and would like your cosponsorship.

The Udall Bill would establish research and education centers, promote a coordinated research agenda, establish research and training grants and establish a national education program.

More than 1 million Americans are afflicted with Parkinson's disease. Approximately 50,000 Americans are diagnosed with Parkinson's each year. Parkinson's disease is estimated to cost the U.S. $6 billion a year in direct health-related expenses, lost productivity and indirect disability costs.

I am able to speak in regard to this matter with authority and experience. Three years ago my family was virtually torn apart when I received the diagnosis of Parkinson's Disease at the early age of 37. Four years prior to my diagnosis, I went through many emotional ups and downs, expensive tests and 4 different doctors. I was a hard-working career mom with two teenage daughters and a 10 year old son. Two weeks after my diagnosis my oldest daughter ran away. With increasing disability, I had to leave my job at the Prosecuting Attorneys Office 8 months ago which I truly loved and still miss every day. In a year and a half I will lose my benefits with my previous job and my family will be responsible to pick up the costs of skyrocketing prescription costs. At the present time my health care pays $418 for my drug treatment which will only increase with progression. We are scared, really scared and no longer make plans for our future. Do we even have a future?

I urge you to co-sponsor the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research, Education and Assistance Act of 1994 to give my family and so many families HOPE! I look forward to hearing your views on this subject.

Sincerely,

KAREN KIDWELL.

THE PARKINSON'S INSTITUTE,
Sunnydale, CA, March 29, 1995.

Hon. MARK HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: I strongly support and applaud your re-introduction of the ''Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research and Education Act'' to the U.S. Senate. I am a neurologist who treats a large number of patients with Parkinson's disease and I know first hand of their suffering. In my view, passage of this bill would greatly bolster promising research efforts that are now in limbo because of reduced funding by NIH and others.

A few areas of research that would benefit if this bill were to pass include: 1) a project testing several compounds that have been shown to revive damaged dopamine producing neurons in several models of Parkinson's disease, 2) a project aimed at testing the possibility of inducing certain brain cells to produce dopamine by directly injecting specific genes into the brain, 3) several projects investigating possible genetic factors that might predispose to the disease, 4) a project aimed at discovering the underlying mechanisms of neuronal degeneration in Parkinson's disease. All of these projects are very promising, but are suffering because of insufficient funding.

I do hope that Congress will recognize the compelling arguments for this legislation. I commend your efforts as well as those of Ms. Samuelson and all who have supported this bill.

Sincerely,

JAMES W. TETRUD, M.D.

AMERICAN PARKINSON
DISEASE ASSOCIATION,
Salisbury, MD, March 30, 1995.

Hon. MARK HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE SENATE: We, the Parkinsonians and the caregivers of the Delmarva Chapter/Support Group of the American Parkinson Disease Association, strongly support and encourage passage of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research, Assistance, and Education Act of 1995 and hope that adequate funding will follow.

Parkinson's disease is stealing the ''golden years'' from many in our group, and, increasingly, is taking away the economic productive life of the young-onset Parkinsonians and many caregiver children. We know the thief who causes our tremors and makes our bodies writhe or freeze, but we do not know where he comes from or how to rid ourselves of him. Research does not guarantee our finding the cause or the cure, but, without medical research, we can be sure we will never know where Parkinson's disease comes from.

We want to help ourselves, but we can do only so much. I give financially in spite of an early unplanned Parkinson's induced retirement. I give my time as a local hospital volunteer worker; as president of the Delmarva Pakinson's chapter/support group; and as writer, editor, printer, and circulation manager of the monthly Parkinson's Newsletter with a complimentary circulation of 483 [March 1995] which carries chapter news, hints for coping with Parkinson's, and a synopsis of research. I give myself. Since 1991 I have been a ''guinea pig'' in two double blind Parkinson's experimental drug tests at Robert Wood Johnson Medical School in New Brunswick, New Jersey; been a subject in a PET scan Parkinson's diagnosis experiment at Johns Hopkins in Baltimore which resulted in a medical journal article; and participated in a Parkinson's olfactory test experiment at Graduate Hospital in Philadelphia. It is not enough.

We need help. A national investment now in finding the cause and cure for Parkinson's should pay off in better and more productive lives for us and future Parkinsonians.

Sincerely,

WILL JOHNSTON,
President,
Delmarva Chapter/Support Group.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
Minneapolis, MN, March 29, 1995.

Hon. MARK HATFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: I have recently learned that you will re-introduce the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research and Education Act. I am writing to show my strong support for this bill.

I am a Ph.D. candidate in Neuroscience at the University of Minnesota. My research work for my thesis is on the cellular mechanisms involved in the death of brain cells and novel protective therapies that can be utilized to prevent cell death. As you know, the hallmark of Parkinson's disease is the death of the dopamine-producing cells (neurons) in the brain.

This is an extremely exciting time in neuroscience research. Breakthroughs in our understanding of how the brain functions in normal and diseased states as well as new therapies to treat neurological disorders are occurring at an unprecedented pace. Research relating to Parkinson's disease (PD) is at an especially exciting crossroads, since we understand more about PD than many other neurological disorders. Novel therapies, such as neural tissue transplantation, selective neural ablation techniques, and protective drug therapies, are being aggressively studied in laboratories at the University of Minnesota, as well as in laboratories across the country. These important studies hold hope and promise for the more than 1 million people in the United States who have Parkinson's disease, as well as the many more people in the next generation destined to be struck down with this devastating disease.

I would like to make one additional point about this type of neuroscience research. The death of neurons in Parkinson's disease undoubtedly employs cellular mechanisms similar to that which occurs in many other neurodegenerative diseases. Therefore, advances made in Parkinson's disease research today will be applicable to many, many other neurological diseases. The knowledge gained will advance the research on diseases such as Alzheimer's and Huntington's diseases, as well as stroke and cerebral palsy, to name just a few. This bill promises to give a boost to so many areas of neuroscience research which affect each and every one of us.

Thank you for your attention and your support of these important efforts. Please contact me if there is anything that I might do to answer questions or to help facilitate the passage of this bill.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH M. JANSEN.

AXION RESEARCH FOUNDATION,
Hamden, CT, April 4, 1995.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: The Axion Research Foundation, its supporters, and researchers are most grateful to you and other supporters for the re-introduction of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research and Education Act.

Our Foundation has played an important role in carrying out and funding important breakthroughs related to cellular and genetic brain circuit restorations as possible treatments for Parkinson's disease. We have recently helped to develop the first practical diagnostic test for Parkinson's disease, which should dramatically facilitate studies aimed at determining its cause. Other research areas also offer great promise at the present time. But it is clear that the combined efforts of the private sector and the federal government must increase to produce clinical benefits for patients and the reduction of health care costs which would result from a cure.

The Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research and Education Act is a great step in the right direction and will be eagerly supported by patients, their families, and neuroscience researchers.

Sincerely,

D. EUGENE REDMOND, Jr., M.D.,
President.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
New Haven, CT, April 3, 1995.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: As director of the Neural Transplant Program at Yale University, I am writing to thank you and other supporters for re-introducing the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research and Education Act to the 104th Congress.

This is a particularly exciting period of research in which novel treatments for Parkinson's disease are being developed and evaluated, and research is progressing to determine the cause of the disease. Although there is potential for incredible breakthroughs, such progress is not inevitable. Without funding, the breakthroughs might never happen. Techniques for cellular and genetic reconstruction of neural circuits which are being developed in our research and elsewhere may some day be applicable to other neurological and medical diseases as well.

I hope that you will be able to explain to your colleagues in the Congress that this investment in research will save money on health care and increase productivity from people who now become incapacitated over a period of many years.

This excellent legislation will not be helpful unless it actually adds dollars to the funding relevant to this disease, and does not shift funding from investigator-initiated basic science projects.

Sincerely,

D. EUGENE REDMOND, Jr., M.D.,
Director.

PARKINSON'S DISEASE FOUNDATION,
New York, NY, March 31, 1995.

Re Morris K. Udall Parksinson's Research and Education Act.

The Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: On behalf of my fellow directors of the Parkinson's Disease Foundation (PDF), I am writing to thank you and to support your introduction of this bill.

The authorization of funds to launch a Parkinson's research initiative, coordinating between the several institutes now conducting research in Parkinson's disease, would give added impetus to the efforts of scientists to improve their understanding of this debilitating illness. Although PDF scientists are working to improve our understanding of the brain, we still do not know what causes people to develop the illness, so we cannot develop a cure. The boost to the research effort that the establishment of the Morris K. Udall Research Centers would provide would allow for additional resources toward our goal: to find the cause and then the cure.

As our population ages, there is no doubt that the prevalence of Parkinson's disease will increase. It is, therefore, imperative to work together towards a breakthrough in Parkinson's disease. Only the federal government can provide sufficient financial support and leadership to sustain a coordinated approach to the search for the cause and cure.

Your leadership, and that of your Congressional supporters, are deeply appreciated by all of us who seek to improve the quality of life of those afflicted with Parkinson's and related disorders.

Most sincerely,

PAGE MORTON BLACK,
Chairman of the Board.

MOVERS & SHAKERS, YOUNG
PARKINSON'S SUPPORT NETWORK,
San Diego, CA, April 4, 1995.

The Morris K. Udall Parkisnon's Research and Education Act.

Senator MARK HATFIELD,
Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: Parkinson's disease and related neurological disorders are said to cost society $6 billion annually. This monetary cost, although staggering, is minuscule when compared to the human suffering these disorders inflict on the patient and family. Research is needed to push ever closer to finding the cause and the cure for these disorders. In the mean time quality of life can be raised through education of patients, care givers and community support services.

The Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research and Education Act allows Congress to embark on a major effort to increase the knowledge of the causes, treatments and cures for these disorders. It further sets patient, care giver, support services and community understanding as a priority in raising the quality of life of those affected by these disorders. The 1990's form the Decade of the Brain. It is only fitting that Congress move swiftly to enact this important legislative initiative for it symbolizes hope of major breakthroughs for the millions of Americans affected by these disorders.

I commend you for your leadership in this very important legislative initiative. Your leadership is much appreciated and supported by the Young Parkinson's Support Network of California.

Sincerely,

TOM G. BROWN,
President.

Sincerely,

ALAN L. BONANDER,
Past President.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 4, 1995]

DISEASES THAT ATTACK THE BRAIN

(By Rick Weiss)

She was a retired Swedish lawyer, 69, and during the past eight years she had sunk into the foggy oblivion of Alzheimer's disease. Long gone were the details of case law and logic upon which she had built her career. Now she was housebound and confused, unable to survive without round-the-clock care.

He was a 45-year-old high school teacher and basketball coach in Wisconsin who began to notice a loss of strength in his hands—some difficulty unscrewing jars or turning house keys. Then he watched in despair over a period of months as the muscles in his arms and neck grew flaccid and weak. The diagnosis: amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, or Lou Gehrig's disease, the paralytic syndrome that stole the strength and ultimately the life of the baseball great.

The alzheimer analogy is apt. Viewed under a microscope, nerve cells look a lot like trees and shrubs, with bifurcating roots and boughs sprouting from either end of a stem or trunk. As every gardener knows, fertilizer is the key to growth, and scientists have long assumed that the body makes its own neural nutrients—in great quantities, no doubt, during embryo development, but perhaps in smaller maintenance doses throughout life.

The challenge faced by neuroscientists pursuing nerve regeneration was to identify those naturally occurring products and mass produce them in the laboratory so they could be given as drugs.

In their quest to discover such substances, researchers have gone to great and gory lengths.

Figuring the best place to look for a nerve nurturing compound was around nerve cells themselves, one team ground up 100 pig brains. They distilled from that mass less than a drop of a rare brain chemical called BDNF, which does indeed now show promise as drug to protect nerves in patients with Lou Gehrig's disease.

Another team teased thousands of sciatic nerves from the legs of rats, then ground the nerves up to get a smidgen of something they call CNTF, which is also now in clinical trials in Lou Gehrig's patients.

Yet another group isolated a potent nerve growth factor from the juices of hundreds of mouse salivary glands. Saliva, it turns out, is rich in natural healing compounds—a fact that may explain the propensity of animals to lick one's wounds. The salivary substance, known as NGF, is now being tested in diabetics with peripheral neuropathy and in a handful of patients with Alzheimer's disease.

Then there was the 63-year-old woman from Stockholm with Parkinson's disease. For the past 19 years her condition had gradually worsened, despite treatment with the best available drugs, like L-dopa. At times now her entire body would suddenly freeze up, becoming so rigid she would crash to the floor. At other times her hands trembled so severely and her head shook so much that she felt as though the whole world were crumbling.

Three patients with three very different diseases. But all of them have one thing in common: They are among the first to enter a radical new field of medicine, in which doctors are using a novel class of drugs to regenerate dying nerve cells in the brain and spinal cord.

No one can say yet whether the treatments will work. Preliminary results from about 1,000 patients getting a handful of different compounds for various neuro-degenerative diseases are a mix of encouragement and disappointment. In some cases, patients' symptoms subsided but were replaced by worrisome side effects.

But for each of these diseases the prognosis is so poor that even a sliver of improvement—or a brief reprieve from the otherwise inevitable decline—would be welcome.

''We are dealing with diseases that are uniformly fatal,'' said Ted Munsat, a neurologist and professor of neurology at Tufts University in Boston, ''so the hope and anticipation is more heightened than ever.''

It's almost impossible to get ailing nerve cells to grow, or to get injured ones to sprout new parts. Unlike most peripheral neuropathy (the painful nerve irritation that afflicts many people with advanced diabetes and some patients getting cancer chemotherapy), Huntington's disease (the dementia-inducing brain disease that strikes by surprise in the prime of life) or the paralysis that results from serious injuries to the spine or head.

But everyone has grown nerve cells at least once before. The central nervous system, which includes the brain and spinal cord, is one of the first organ systems to develop in a fertilized egg, its rudimentary structure already evident in the third week of gestation when the embryo is still less than 3 millimeters long. Nine months later more than a trillion neurons have settled into position, some of them almost six feet long.

If we can do it once, why not again?

For decades, the common wisdom was that it can't be done. But with a little help from some compounds called nerve growth factors, scientists are changing their minds.

''These are nerve fertilizers,'' said Steven Ringel, a professor of neurology at the University of Colorado Medical Center in Denver. ''We can make these neurons grow like grass. It's a remarkable tool and incredibly exciting.''

''Until growth factors were discovered there was no molecule known that could rescue dying neurons. When neurons died, they were gone forever,'' said Frank Baldino, president and CEO of Cephalon, a biotech company in West Chester, PA. ''When growth factors were discovered, everyone was thrilled.''

The newest nerve growth factor, recently purified from rat brain cells, may be the most promising of them all. The substance is called glial cell line-derived neurotrophic factor, or GDNF. In experiments with brain-injured animals published in January, researchers documented its ability to spur regeneration of the types of nerve cells that disappear in people with Parkinson's and Lou Gehrig's diseases.

''You can really get substantial regeneration of nerve fibers,'' said Frank Collins, a neuroscientist at Amgen in Thousand Oaks, Calif., speaking of GDNF's effects in animals. ''It suggests that the benefits in early-stage patients may be very profound. And that's very exciting.''

Exciting, yes, except for one problem: It's almost impossible to get GDNF—or any of the other nerve growth compounds—into the human brain, where the compounds are needed.

DELIVERY PROBLEMS

It turns out that every nerve growth factor so far discovered is, to put it plainly, a big fat protein. Proteins tend to break down quickly when taken as pills or injected into the blood. And even if these particular proteins could survive in the bloodstream and make it to a person's head, they are too large to diffuse through blood vessel walls and make their way into the brain.

This may not be a serious problem when it comes to treating peripheral neuropathy, where the problem is mostly limited to nerve cells in the fingers and toes that can be treated with injections beneath the skin. Simple injections may also work for Lou Gehrig's disease, since the motor neurons that are affected extend out from the brain, down the spine and all the way to every extremity. Studies have shown that CNTF and BDNF injected into the thigh, arm or elsewhere in the body are absorbed by nerve endings and travel up those cells into the spinal cord.

But when it comes to the most common and serious neurological diseases—Alzheimer's and Parkinson's—the neurons that are dying are deep within the brain, where no nerve growth factor can get on its own. So with the physiological potency of growth factors now well established, the challenge of making these compounds into useful drugs is actually more a problem of engineering and delivery than of medicine or biology.

In animal experiments, scientists have gotten around this problem by injecting doses directly into the creatures' brains. And though most researchers have been reluctant to try this in people, one team of scientists in Sweden is doing so.

The first patient to get such a treatment was the retired lawyer with Alzheimer's disease. Lars Olson and his colleagues at the Karolinska Institute in Stockholm surgically implanted a pump the size of a hockey puck into the woman's abdomen. They ran a thin plastic tube from the pump up through her torso and neck, all within her body, and underneath her scalp to the crown of her head. There they drilled a hole through her skull and fed the hidden tube through the opening and into a space in her brain near the area that degenerates in Alzheimer's patients. For three months, the pump supplied a constant low dose of NGF, the nerve growth factor isolated from mouse salivary glands.

It is still not clear whether the approach is worth the trouble. The researchers did note an increase in blood flow in the brain, a more normal electroencephalogram (EEG) and improvement in a word recognition test that is used to measure cognitive function. But the woman also experienced serious back pain, anxiety, sleeplessness and weight loss—symptoms the scientists think may be due to an unintended activation of nearby nerves in the brain. She also had a painful outbreak of shingles, which indicated that a herpes virus that normally stays dormant inside nerve cells had for some reason ''woken up.'' And in every cognitive test other than the word recognition test, the woman's performance stayed the same or declined.

The Swedish team is trying the technique on a few other patients, and researchers in the United States have proposed doing essentially the same thing, using plastic tubes, or cannulas, to get NGF into the brain. The Food and Drug Administration officials have so far rejected the approach, in part because animal studies suggest that the procedure can itself cause brain damage.

''Cannulas in the brain may be fine for animals, but not for 4 million Alzheimer's patients,'' said Baldino of Cephalon. ''It's a great way to show proof of concept—to show that growth factors can have an effect in the brain. But practically speaking, I don't think patients are going to be lining up at the clinic.''

MINI-FACTORIES

Another way to get bulky proteins into a person's gray matter is to first give a drug that temporarily pokes holes in the brain's blood vessels—that is, make those vessels leaky—and then infuse the nerve growth factor into such a vessel. Some scientists are already using this technique to get cancer drugs, some of which are molecular mammoths, to brain tumor. But the approach makes it difficult to aim the shot of growth factor to the precise part of the brain where it is needed, and so risks stimulating ''innocent bystander'' neurons better left alone.

''A good drug in the wrong place can give serious side effects,'' said Fred Gage, a neuroscientist at the University of California-San Diego.

Gage and others suggest that the best way to give the brain a healthy dose of growth factors is to arrange for those factors to be made on-site, in the brain itself. ''Instead of giving a drug,'' Gage said, ''you engineer some cells to make what's needed.''

The idea of implanting robust, hormone-secreting cells into the brain to nurse ailing nerve cells back to health has its roots in an older and more controversial strategy for Parkinson's disease. In the original approach, scientists took cells from the brains of aborted fetuses and transplanted them into the brains of people with Parkinson's disease. Fetal cells produce copious quantities of dopamine, the brain chemical lacking in Parkinson's patients.

Such transplants do seem to hold some potential. More than 40 patients with Parkinson's disease have been treated that way in the United States, and some patients are showing modest improvement. But 95 percent or more of the transplanted fetal cells generally die in the weeks or month after transplantation.

Olson and his colleagues in Sweden recently used nerve growth factors to better those odds. After transplanting healthy dopamine-producing cells into the brain of a patient with Parkinson's, they drenched the transplanted cells with NGF for 23 days, dripping the liquid fertilizer through a plastic tube inserted directly into her brain. Preliminary results suggest that the patient became less rigid and more mobile than did patients who got cell transplants without NGF, though it's difficult to tell much from a single patient. Two others have since been treated but results have not been published.

Gage, however, proposes a more elegant means of getting growth factors into the brain—a method that would make plastic tubes and fetal transplants completely unnecessary. He and others have put the genes for nerve growth factors like NGF into hardy, laboratory-reared skin cells, instantly endowing those ordinary cells with the specialized ability to churn out the therapeutic factors. They have transplanted those cells into the brains of rodents with a condition resembling Alzheimer's disease, with the hope that these growth-factor mini-factories might revitalize failing nerve cells nearby.

Sure enough, the animals began to spout new and healthy neurons in the area around the nutrient-spewing transplants. While highly experimental, the approach is about to get its clinical debut. This month, Swiss researchers will insert CNTF genes into cells and inject the cells into the spines of patients with Lou Gehrig's disease, marking the first human test of cells engineered to produce a nerve growth factor. They hope that the locally made CNTF will revive ailing motor neurons there more effectively than if the substance were injected into the skin.

AVENUES OF HOPE

Even if researchers find a good way to administer nerve growth factors, there is no guarantee that patients will be able to tolerate the drugs. CNTF injections already have run into trouble in preliminary experiments in Lou Gehrig's patients, causing flu-like symptoms and weight loss serious enough to convince one company to give the research up. Another company is now trying smaller doses, and others are testing BDNF. Though side effects have been rare in these latter studies, it's too soon to say whether the more mellow regimens will be potent enough to stem the disease's progress.

Similarly, some of the early tests of NGF injections for peripheral neuropathy have been plagued by a serious side effect: A super-sensitivity to pain that makes normally innocuous stimuli unbearable. A lukewarm shower, for example, can become an excruciatingly painful experience in which drops of water feel like little burning arrows.

Ultimately, scientists said, a cocktail of different nerve growth factors—perhaps delivered by a variety of different routes—may work best of all. ''We now have a number of molecules looking good,'' said Ronald Lindsay, a neuroscientist at Regeneron, a Tarrytown, N.Y., biotech company developing nerve growth factors. ''It doesn't make sense to bet on a single horse.''

Unfortunately, the race is still far from the home stretch, and that's disappointing news for people already suffering from nervous system diseases. The lawyer with Alzheimer's disease, for example, has continued down the path of senility since receiving her experimental drizzle of nerve growth factor. And her counterpart with Parkinson's is again subject to freeze-ups and jitters.

On the other hand, the basketball coach with Lou Gehrig's disease has improved since getting treated with CNTF. ''He has more neck strength and breathing strength,'' said Benjamin Brooks, a professor of neurology and director of the University of Wisconsin's ALS Clinical Research Center in Madison. ''Now he's back at work one hour a day, which is something we never would have expected with this disease.''

BRAIN AND NERVE DISEASES FOR WHICH NERVE GROWTH FACTORS MAY HELP

Alzheimer's Disease—4 million patients in the United States.

Nerve growth factor (NGF) is being infused directly into the brains of a few patients in Sweden; potentially serious side effects have been reported, including extreme sensitivity to pain. NGF is also being given by injections under the skin in the United States as an experimental treatment for peripheral neuropathy, a loss of sensation in the extremities common among diabetics and patients getting cancer chemotherapy.

Parkinson's Disease—1 million patients in the United States.

One patient in Sweden has received brain infusions of NGF to enhance survival of healthy neurons that researchers had previously transplanted into his brain, with some possible benefits. A newly discovered nerve growth factor, called glial cell line-derived neurotrophic factor (GDNF), looks promising in animal studies and may enter human trials in the next year or two.

Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (Lou Gehrig's disease) 5,000 new cases a year in the United States.

A nerve growth factor called ciliary neurotrophic factor (CNTF) is being injected into the skin, where it can be absorbed by nerves. Doses have recently been lowered, however, because of side effects. Swiss researchers are about to transplant the first genetically engineered versions of CNTF-secreting cells into the spines of ALS patients. Another growth factor, brain derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF), is also in clinical trials with apparently fewer side effects, Insulin-like growth factor-1 (IGF–1) is an injectable cell growth factor not specific for nerve cells but now being tested in patients with ALS. Results are expected this year.

SCIENCE CLOSER TO A TREATMENT FOR PARKINSON'S

(By Michael Waldholz)

Researchers say experiments involving a powerful substance discovered in the human nervous system may lead to new drugs to slow the progress of Parkinson's disease and Lou Gehrig's disease.

Four separate research teams are reporting test-tube and animal experiments showing the new substance acts as a biological shield, protecting crucial nerve cells from damage that normally kills them. Death of these cells is the hallmark of Parkinson's and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, also known as ALS or Lou Gehrig's disease.

The substance is perhaps most potent of a series of human proteins—discovered in recent years by scientists at biotechnology companies—that the body uses to spur nerve-cell growth. The new growth factor was uncovered by researchers working separately at Synergen Corp., now owned by Amgen Inc., a biotech company in Thousand Oaks, Calif.; and by scientists at Genentech Inc., of South San Francisco, Calif. All four research teams conducted their experiments in association with one of the two biotechnology companies.

It is unclear whether ownership rights for the substance will be disputed between Amgen and Genentech. But officials at both companies say that because of the promising results of the new experiment, they have decided to move forward to develop the substance as a potential treatment against Parkinson's and other nerve disorders.

The new factor is called glial cell-line derived neurotrophic factor, or GDNF. Its discovery is so recent that scientists don't know exactly how GDNF spurs cell growth, or how it protects neurons from lethal damage. But the new experiments provide persuasive evidence that the factor plays an important role in the life cycle of neurons, and that scientists may be able to exploit that role in their search for new medicines against degenerative nerve diseases.

GDNF ''is by far the most powerful nerve-growth factor we have tested yet,'' says Ronald Oppenheim, of Bowman Gray School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, N.C., who led one of the research teams. Dr. Oppenheim's experiments in laboratory mice showed the GDNF kept alive almost all the cells that normally would have died within three weeks after researchers damaged them. ''We were surprised because none of the other factors we've tested were that protective,'' he says.

Still, the researchers emphasize that the new results are preliminary, suggesting that many years of work will be needed before they know GDNF or some related chemical will be helpful.

Researchers say experiments involving a powerful substance discovered in the human nervous system may lead to new drugs to slow the progress of Parkinson's disease and Lou Gehrig's disease.

Four separate research teams are reporting test-tube and animal experiments showing the new substance acts as a biological shield, protecting crucial nerve cells from damage and normally kills them. Death of these cells in the hallmark of Parkinson's and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, also known as ALS or Lou Gehrig's disease.

The substance is perhaps most potent of a series of human proteins—discovered in recent years by scientists at biotechnology companies—that the body uses to spur nerve-cell growth. The new growth factor was uncovered by researchers working separately at Synergen Corp., now owned by Amgen Inc., a biotech company in Thousand Oaks, Calif.; and by scientists at Genentech Inc., of South San Francisco, Calif. All four research teams conducted their experiments in association with one of the two biotechnology companies.

It is unclear whether ownership rights for the substance will be disputed between Amgen and Genentech. But officials at both companies say that because of the promising results of the new experiments, they have decided to move forward to develop the substance as a potential treatment against Parkinson's and other nerve disorders.

The new factor is called glial cell-line derived neurotrophic factor, or GDNF. Its discovery is so recent that scientists don't know exactly how GDNF spurs cell growth, or how it protects neurons from lethal damage. But the new experiments provide persuasive evidence that the factor plays an important role in the life cycle of neurons, and that scientists may be able to exploit that role in their search for new medicines against degenerative nerve diseases.

GDNF ''is by far the most powerful nerve-growth factor we have tested yet,'' says Ronald Oppenheim, of Bowman Gray School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, N.C., who led one of the research teams. Dr. Oppenheim's experiments in laboratory mice showed that GDNF kept alive almost all the cells that normally would have died within three weeks after researchers damaged them. ''We were surprised because none of the other factors we've tested were that protective,'' he says.

Still, the researchers emphasize that the new results are preliminary, suggesting that many years of work will be needed before they know GDNF or some related chemical will be helpful to patients.

Indeed, a similar kind of nerve-growth factor called CNTF, developed by the biotech company Regeneron Pharmaceuticals Inc., Tarrytown, N.Y., produced troubling side effects when tested last year in ALS patients. Regeneron, Amgen, Genentech and several other biotech companies are researching other promising nerve-growth factors.

Even so, the new experiments, published today in the British journal Nature, provide several hints that in uncovering GDNF, scientists have found a new doorway to the treatment of nerve diseases that continue to defy adequate treatment. ''It's a fairly exciting set of results,'' says Ronald Lindsay, vice president for neurobiology research at

Regeneron, noting that "it provides strong competition for the [factors] we've been working with."

In several experiments using GDNF developed by Synergen and now owned by Amgen, researchers used the substance to protect nerve cells from destruction caused by a toxic substance called MPTP. When given to mice, MPTP produces symptoms similar to the debilitating muscle tremors caused by Parkinson's disease in humans.

In one surprising experiment by scientists at Karolinska Institute in Stockholm and at Synergen in Boulder, Colo., GDNF restored nerve activity to cells already damaged by the MPTP toxin.

GDNF was first isolated in 1990 by Frank Collins, a biologist working at Synergen. He identified it in glial cells, which provide nutrients to neurons. Dr. Collins didn't publish the discovery until 1993, when Synergen received a patient. About the same time, Dr. Collins was hired by Amgen. In an interview, Dr. Collins said that acquiring the rights to GDNF was one of the reasons Amgen bought Synergen several months ago.

"I've been given the green light to go full steam ahead in developing GDNF for use against Parkinson's disease," says Dr. Collins, senior director of neuroscience research at Amgen. He said it may be possible to begin testing the substance in humans within a year or two.

Currently, the symptoms of Parkinson's disease can be treated with several medicines, but their effectiveness wears off after time. Amgen hopes GDNF can protect nerve cells being relentlessly killed by the disease, thereby prolonging the existing treatments' usefulness. But GDNF will do nothing to stop the underlying cause of the illness, which is still unknown.

A significant hurdle facing GDNF is that cells under attack by Parkinson's are located in the brain. Because GDNF is a large molecule that can't get into the brain if ingested or injected into the bloodstream, it will have to be infused directly.●

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 685. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lighthouses located in the State of Maine; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

LIGHTHOUSE CONVEYANCE LEGISLATION

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation that would help to preserve historic lighthouses in the State of Maine and ensure that future generations will be able to appreciate these treasured landmarks.

The legislation, also known as the Maine Lights Program, authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to convey four lighthouses in Maine to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and (29) others to the Island Institute of Rockland, ME. Founded in 1983, the Island Institute is a nationally recognized nonprofit organization dedicated to the preservation and protection of Maine's coastal lights. This legislation was crafted in close coordination with the Island Institute, and it is an extraordinary opportunity to preserve the most obvious symbols of Maine's living maritime heritage.

The Maine Lights Program is strongly supported by the U.S. Coast Guard. The Coast Guard currently owns each of these lighthouses, and it is a strong proponent of preserving their historic character. But the cost of maintaining these historic structures is becoming particularly difficult for the Coast Guard in these times of tight budgetary constraints. These lighthouses were built in an age when they had to be manned continuously. Today's advanced technology has made it possible to build automated aids to navigation that do not require around-the-clock manning, and this technology has made these historic lighthouses expensive anachronisms for the Coast Guard. The Maine Lights Program would relieve the Coast Guard of the financial burden of maintaining these lighthouses.

The program also mandates continued Coast Guard maintenance of the active aids to navigation in these lighthouses—the lights and horns—and it ensures that each lighthouse will remain an effective marine navigational aid despite the conveyance. Maritime safety will not be sacrificed in the name of saving money. The Coast Guard will still be responsible for maintaining the aids to navigation themselves. Only the lighthouses and structures associated with them are impacted by this program.

By conveying these lighthouses to the Island Institute, the program ensures that the lighthouses will be preserved as an important part of our coastal maritime heritage. The Island Institute will never be allowed to sell these properties. The institute would be required to transfer the lighthouses to third parties without any compensation to itself within a 3-year period beginning on the date of the conveyance of the lighthouse to the institute by the Coast Guard. The Island Institute would be required to identify appropriate nonprofit corporations, educational agencies, community development organizations, and any Federal, State, or local government or other eligible entity that would assume responsibility for the lighthouse.

This legislation sets specific eligibility requirements for organizations and entities that wish to take the responsibility of a lighthouse. They must be financially able to maintain the lighthouse, and they must agree to regular inspections by the State historic preservation officer of the State of Maine in order to ensure that the lighthouses are being properly maintained in a manner that preserves their historic characteristics. Moreover, those receiving a lighthouse must also assure continued public access to the lighthouse.

This legislation also provides that if the Secretary of Transportation determined at any time that a lighthouse is not being used or maintained as required by the law, that the lighthouse would revert to the United States and then be transferred to other institutions or entities according to existing law.

Finally, the legislation requires the Secretary to report to Congress after 5 years about the effectiveness of the program in maintaining, preserving, and repairing historic lighthouse properties, maintaining public access, and finding and transferring lighthouse property to appropriate third parties.

The Island Institute has already identified suitable candidates for receiving many of these lighthouses. For example, the town of Camden will receive the Curtis Island Light, which is located in Camden Harbor. The town already owns Curtis Island and all of the buildings on it except for the light tower itself, and this program will appropriately convey the light tower to the town of Camden.

The Maine Lights Program is an innovative approach to historic maritime preservation. It will become a model for the conveyance of other lighthouses for historic preservation all across the country. At the same time it will save the Coast Guard hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars a year in maintenance costs. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 685

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

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LIGHTHOUSES LOCATED IN MAINE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (3) and (4), the Secretary of Transportation may convey, without consideration, to the Island Institute, Rockland, Maine (in this section referred to as the "Institute"), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any of the facilities and real property and improvements described in paragraph (2).

(2) COVERED FACILITIES.—Paragraph (1) applies to lighthouses, together with any real property and other improvements associated therewith, located in the State of Maine as follows:

(A) Whitehead Island Light.
(B) Deer Island Thorofare (Mark Island) Light.
(C) Burnt Island Light.
(D) Rockland Harbor Breakwater Light.
(E) Monhegan Island Light.
(F) Eagle Island Light.
(G) Curtis Island Light.
(H) Moose Peak Light.
(I) Great Duck Island Light.
(J) Goose Rocks Light.
(K) Isle au Haut Light.
(L) Goat Island Light.
(M) Wood Island Light.
(N) Doubling Point Light.
(O) Doubling Point Front Range Light.
(P) Doubling Point Rear Range Light.
(Q) Little River Light.
(R) Spring Point Ledge Light.
(S) Ram Island Light (Boothbay).
(T) Seguin Island Light.
(U) Marshall Point Light.
(V) Fort Point Light.
(W) West Quoddy Head Light.
(X) Brown's Head Light.
(Y) Cape Neddick Light.
(Z) Halfway Rock Light.
(AA) Ram Island Ledge Light.
(BB) Mount Desert Rock Light.
(CC) Whitlock's Mill Light.

(3) Limitation on conveyance.—The Secretary shall retain all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any historical artifact, including any lens or lantern, that is associated with the lighthouses conveyed under this subsection, whether located at the lighthouse or elsewhere. The Secretary shall identify any equipment, system, or object covered by this paragraph.

(4) Deadline for conveyance.—The conveyances authorized by this subsection shall take place, if at all, not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(5) Additional conveyances to United States Fish and Wildlife Service.—The Secretary may transfer, in accordance with the terms and conditions of subsection (b), the following lighthouses, together with any real property and improvements associated therewith, directly to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service:

(A) Two Bush Island Light.

(B) Egg Rock Light.

(C) Libby Island Light.

(D) Matinicus Rock Light.

(b) Conditions of Conveyance.—The conveyance of a lighthouse, and any real property and improvements associated therewith, under subsection (a) shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) That the lighthouse and any such property and improvements be used for educational, historic, recreational, cultural, and wildlife conservation programs for the general public and for such other uses as the Secretary determines to be not inconsistent or incompatible with such uses.

(2) That the lighthouse and any such property and improvements be maintained at no cost to the United States in a manner that ensures the use of the lighthouse by the Coast Guard as an aid to navigation.

(3) That the use of the lighthouse and any such property and improvements by the Coast Guard as an aid to navigation not be interfered with, except with the written permission of the Secretary.

(4) That the lighthouse and any such property and improvements be maintained in a manner consistent with the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

(5) That public access to the lighthouse and any such property and improvements be ensured.

(c) Reservations.—In the conveyance of a lighthouse under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall reserve to the United States the following:

(1) The right to enter the lighthouse, and any real property and improvements conveyed therewith, at any time, without notice, for purposes of maintaining any aid to navigation at the lighthouse, including any light, antennae, sound signal, and associated equipment located at the lighthouse, and any electronic navigation equipment or system located at the lighthouse.

(2) The right to enter the lighthouse and any such property and improvements at any time, without notice, for purposes of relocating, replacing, or improving any such aid to navigation, or to carry out any other activity necessary in aid of navigation.

(3) An easement of ingress and egress onto the real property conveyed for the purposes referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(4) An easement over such portion of such property as the Secretary considers appropriate in order to ensure the visibility of the lighthouse for navigation purposes.

(5) The right to obtain and remove any historical artifact, including any lens or lantern that the Secretary has identified pursuant to paragraph (3) of subsection (a).

(d) Maintenance of Aids to Navigation.—The Secretary may not impose upon the Institute, or upon any entity to which the Institute conveys a lighthouse under subsection (g), an obligation to maintain any aid to navigation at a lighthouse conveyed under subsection (a)(1).

(e) Reversionary Interest.—All right, title, and interest in and to a lighthouse and any real property and improvements associated therewith that is conveyed to the Institute under subsection (a)(1) shall revert to the United States and the United States shall have the right of immediate entry thereon if—

(1) the Secretary determines at any time that the lighthouse, and any property and improvements associated therewith, is not being utilized or maintained in accordance with subsection (b); or

(2) the Secretary determines that—

(A) the Institute is unable to identify an entity eligible for the conveyance of the lighthouse under subsection (g) within the 3-year period beginning on the date of the conveyance of the lighthouse to the Institute under subsection (a)(1); or

(B) in the event that the Institute identifies an entity eligible for the conveyance within that period—

(i) the entity is unable or unwilling to accept the conveyance and the Institute is unable to identify another entity eligible for the conveyance within that period; or

(ii) the committee established under subsection (g)(3)(A) disapproves of the entity identified by the Institute and the Institute is unable to identify another entity eligible for the conveyance within that period.

(f) Inspection.—The State Historic Preservation Officer of the State of Maine may inspect any lighthouse, and any real property and improvements associated therewith, that is conveyed under this section at any time, without notice, for purposes of ensuring that the lighthouse is being maintained in the manner required under subsections (b)(4) and (b)(5). The United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Institute, and any subsequent conveyee of the Institute under subsection (g), shall cooperate with the official referred to in the preceding sentence in the inspections of that official under this subsection.

(g) Subsequent Conveyance.—

(1) Requirement.—

(A) In general.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Institute shall convey, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the Institute in and to the lighthouses conveyed to the Institute under subsection (a)(1), together with any real property and improvements associated therewith, to one or more entities identified under paragraph (2) and approved by the committee established under paragraph (3) in accordance with the provisions of such paragraph (3).

(B) Exception.—The Institute, with the concurrence of the committee and in accordance with the terms and conditions of subsection (b), may retain right, title, and interest in and to the following lighthouses conveyed to the Institute:

(i) Whitehead Island Light.

(ii) Deer Island Thorofare (Mark Island) Light.

(2) Identification of eligible entities.—

(A) In general.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Institute shall identify entities eligible for the conveyance of a lighthouse under this subsection. Such entities shall include any department or agency of the Federal Government, any department or agency of the Government of the State of Maine, any local government in that State, or any nonprofit corporation, educational agency, or community development organization that—

(i) is financially able to maintain the lighthouse (and any real property and improvements conveyed therewith) in accordance with the conditions set forth in subsection (b);

(ii) agrees to permit the inspections referred to in subsection (f); and

(iii) agrees to comply with the conditions set forth in subsection (b) and to have such conditions recorded with the deed of title to the lighthouse and any real property and improvements that may be conveyed therewith.

(B) Order of priority.—In identifying entities eligible for the conveyance of a lighthouse under this paragraph, the Institute shall give priority to entities in the following order, which are also the exclusive entities eligible for the conveyance of a lighthouse under this section:

(i) Agencies of the Federal Government.

(ii) Entities of the Government of the State of Maine.

(iii) Entities of local governments in the State of Maine.

(iv) Nonprofit corporations, educational agencies, and community development organizations.

(3) Selection of conveyees among eligible entities.—

(A) Committee.—

(i) In general.—There is hereby established a committee to be known as the Maine Lighthouse Selection Committee (in this paragraph referred to as the ''Committee'').

(ii) Membership.—The Committee shall consist of five members appointed by the Secretary as follows:

(I) One member, who shall serve as the Chairman of the Committee, shall be appointed from among individuals recommended by the Governor of the State of Maine.

(II) One member shall be the State Historic Preservation Officer of the State of Maine, with the consent of that official, or a designee of that official.

(III) One member shall be appointed from among individuals recommended by State and local organizations in the State of Maine that are concerned with lighthouse preservation or maritime heritage matters.

(IV) One member shall be appointed from among individuals recommended by officials of local governments of the municipalities in which the lighthouses referred to in subsection (a) are located.

(V) One member shall be appointed from among individuals recommended by the Secretary of the Interior.

(iii) Appointment deadline.—The Secretary shall appoint the members of the Committee not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(iv) Membership term.—

(I) Members of the Committee shall serve for such terms not longer than 3 years as the Secretary shall provide. The Secretary may stagger the terms of initial members of the Committee in order to ensure continuous activity by the Committee.

(II) Any member of the Committee may serve after the expiration of the term of the member until a successor to the member is appointed. A vacancy in the Committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(v) Voting.—The Committee shall act by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Committee.

(B) Responsibilities.—

(i) In general.—The Committee shall—

(I) review the entities identified by the Institute under paragraph (2) as entities eligible for the conveyance of a lighthouse; and

(II) approve one such entity, or disapprove all such entities, as entities to which the Institute may make the conveyance of the lighthouse under this subsection.

(ii) Approval.—If the Committee approves an entity for the conveyance of a lighthouse, the Committee shall notify the Institute of such approval.

(iii) Disapproval.—If the Committee disapproves of the entities, the Committee shall notify the Institute and, subject to subsection (e)(2)(B), the Institute shall identify other entities eligible for the conveyance of the lighthouse under paragraph (2). The Committee shall review and approve or disapprove of entities identified pursuant to the preceding sentence in accordance with this subparagraph.

(C) Exemption from FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Committee, however, all meetings of the Committee shall be open to the public and preceded by appropriate public notice.

(D) Termination.—The Committee shall terminate 8 years from the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) Conveyance.—Upon notification under paragraph (3)(B)(ii) of the approval of an entity for the conveyance of a lighthouse under this subsection, the Institute shall, with the consent of the entity, convey the lighthouse to the entity.

(5) Responsibilities of conveyees.—Each entity to which the Institute conveys a lighthouse under this subsection, or any successor or assign of such entity in perpetuity, shall—

(A) use and maintain the lighthouse in accordance with subsection (b) and have such terms and conditions recorded with the deed of title to the lighthouse and any real property conveyed therewith; and

(B) permit the inspections referred to in subsection (f).

(h) Description of Property.—The exact acreage and legal description of any lighthouse, and any real property and improvements associated therewith, conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by the Secretary.

(i) Report.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for the next 7 years, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the conveyance of lighthouses under this section. The report shall include a description of the implementation of the provisions of this section, and the requirements arising under such provisions, in—

(1) providing for the use and maintenance of the lighthouses conveyed under this section in accordance with subsection (b);

(2) providing for public access to such lighthouses; and

(3) achieving the conveyance of lighthouses to appropriate entities under subsection (g).

(j) Additional Terms and Conditions.—The Secretary may require any additional terms and conditions in connection with a conveyance under subsection (a) that the Secretary considers appropriate in order to protect the interests of the United States.●

By Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. McCain):

S. 686. A bill to establish a Commission to examine the costs and benefits, and the impact on voter turnout, of changing the deadline for filing Federal income tax returns to the date on which Federal elections are held; to the Committee on Finance.

THE VOTER TURNOUT ENHANCEMENT STUDY COMMISSION ACT

● Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I introduce the Voter Turnout Enhancement Study [VoTES] Commission Act, a bill to establish a temporary Commission to consider whether the deadline for filing Federal income tax returns should be changed to the date on which Federal elections are held.

Our constituents demonstrated last fall that they want real change. I can't think of anything that would change the Congress more than to move tax day to election day so the American people could vote as they pay. It would not only enhance voter turnout rates, but also give the American people an opportunity to vote at the same time they pay their taxes, thus holding politicians accountable to the people on the day they are most focused on the cost of their Government.

While just about every day of the year is celebrated by special interest groups around the country for the Government largesse they receive, the taxpayers—the silent majority—have only one day of the year to focus on what that largesse means to them—how much it costs them—and that is tax day.

The Voter Turnout Enhancement Study [VoTES] Commission Act would provide for a thoughtful and thorough analysis of the date change, its potential impact on voter turnout, as well as any economic impact it might have. The bill explicitly requires that an independent Commission conduct a cost-benefit analysis—a requirement that Congress would be wise to impose routinely on legislative initiatives to separate good ideas from the bad, and save taxpayers a lot of money in the process. A number of other cost-limiting provisions have been included to protect taxpayers' interests.

I invite my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation.

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

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

S. 686

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Voter Turnout Enhancement Study Commission Act''.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the right of citizens of the United States to vote is a fundamental right;

(2) Federal, State, and local governments have a duty to promote the exercise of the right to vote to the greatest extent possible;

(3) the power to tax is only guardedly granted to Federal, State, and local governments by the citizens of the United States;

(4) the only regular contact that most Americans have with their government consists of filing personal income tax returns and voting in Federal, State, and local elections;

(5) in 1992, almost 115,000,000 Federal income tax returns were filed by individuals and couples, but only approximately 104,000,000 votes were cast in the year's presidential election;

(6) an estimated 116 million Federal income tax returns will be filed by individuals and couples for 1994, but only about half that number of votes were cast in that year's congressional elections; and

(7) more closely tying the rights of individuals as voters to their obligations as taxpayers will provide additional incentives for individuals to both participate in the electoral process and scrutinize the costs and benefits of government policies.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is established a commission to be known as the Voter Turnout Enhancement Study Commission (in this Act referred to as the ''Commission'').

SEC. 4. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) Number and Appointment.—The Commission shall be composed of 9 members appointed as follows:

(1) 3 members appointed by the President.

(2) 3 members appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, upon the joint recommendation of the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate.

(3) 3 members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, upon the joint recommendation of the Speaker and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(b) Political Affiliation.—Not more than 2 of the 3 members of the Commission appointed under any 1 paragraph of subsection (a) may be of the same political party.

(c) Time of Appointment.—Members of the Commission shall be appointed not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) Terms.—Members of the Commission shall be appointed to serve for the life of the Commission.

(e) Vacancies.— Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(f) Compensation.—

(1) Rate of pay.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), members of the Commission shall serve without pay.

(2) Travel expenses.—Each member of the Commission shall be entitled to receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service.

(g) Quorum.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold a hearing.

(h) Chairperson and Vice Chairperson.—The Commission shall select a Chairperson and Vice Chairperson from among its members.

(i) Meetings.—

(1) In general.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairperson or a majority of its members.

(2) Initial meeting.—The Commission shall hold its initial meeting not later than 30 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed.

SEC. 5. DUTIES.

(a) Study.—The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study of all matters relating to the possibility of changing the filing date for Federal income tax returns to the 1st Tuesday after the 1st Monday in November. The study shall include an analysis of—

(1) the costs and benefits of the change in filing date; and

(2) the likelihood that establishment of a single date on which individuals can fulfill obligations of citizenship as both electors and taxpayers will increase participation in Federal, State, and local elections.

(b) Consultation.—The Commission shall consult with Governors, Federal and State election officials, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and any other person, agency, or entity that the Commission determines to be appropriate.

SEC. 6. POWERS.

(a) Hearings.—The Commission may hold the hearings, sit and act at the times and places, take the testimony, and receive the information that the Commission considers advisable to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) Mails.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as any other Federal department or agency.

(c) Powers of Members and Agents.—Any member or agent of the Commission may, if authorized by the Commission, take any action that the Commission is authorized to take under this section.

(d) Requests for Official Information.—The Commission may request from a Federal department or agency information necessary to enable the Commission to carry out this Act. The head of the department or agency shall provide the information to the Commission unless release of the information to the public by the agency is prohibited by law.

SEC. 7. STAFF ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Upon the request of the Commission or the Chairperson of the Commission, the head of any Federal department or agency may detail any of the personnel of the department or agency to the Commission to assist the Commission to carry out this Act.

SEC. 8. REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress a report that contains—

(1) a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the study required by section 5; and

(2) recommendations of the Commission regarding any legislation or administrative action the Commission considers appropriate.

SEC. 9. TERMINATION.

The Commission shall terminate upon the submission of the report required by section 8.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.●

By Mr. PRYOR:

S. 687. A bill to improve and strengthen child support enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1996

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Child Support Enforcement Act of 1995. This bill is modeled after the bipartisan approaches contained in child support enforcement legislative proposals of last year.

The problems that we currently face in this area have been well researched and analyzed in a recently released report, written at my request, by the General Accounting Office [GAO]. One of the most telling facts in the GAO report is that the national child support enforcement caseload grew 180 percent between 1980 and 1992. This statistic speaks volumes. In 1994, the 15 million support cases nationwide represent a significant portion of our neediest families. If the estimated $34 billion that is owed these families could be collected, the taxpayers would receive some much needed relief as a result of the corresponding reductions that would be possible in many welfare programs.

Mr. President, I held a hearing on child support enforcement last July to try to better understand why this money is not being collected. This hearing lead me to conclude that until we improve the way the system works at the local, State, and Federal levels we will never be able to ensure that children receive the financial support from their respective families to which they are entitled.

There were many issues raised in the hearing that are worthy of attention, but one I wish to especially highlight is the caseload of most of the State workers who are trying to help custodial parents collect their payments.

One witness, a caseworker from Virginia, testified that she could only spend about 12 minutes a month with any one client. Mr. President, 12 minutes a month is simply not enough time to effectively deal with all of the complex issues involved in these cases.

Another witness was Ms. Judy Jones Jordan, the administrator of the Child Support Enforcement Program in Arkansas. My State is indeed fortunate to have an outstanding administrator of such a critical program. She testified that the system had bogged down. Rather than having a clear mission, the State programs are subject to so much Federal oversight that getting the job done has become almost impossible. She said:

> The program has changed from one designed to assist families and reduce the cost of public assistance programs to one focused on passing audits and avoiding Federal penalties.

Mr. President, the legislation I am introducing today is an attempt to address the problem identified by Ms. Jordan. In a country where the default rate on used car loans is 3 percent and the default rate on child support orders is nearly 50 percent, we need to greatly improve the way that the partnership between the Federal Government and the States works.

This legislation that I am introducing addresses the key issues that I think will make a significant difference in the operation of the child support system. First, the Federal audit requirements will be revised so that they become a far less onerous burden on the States. In fact, I believe the new procedures will transform this process into a helpful and necessary evaluation that will provide the States with useful information on the effectiveness of their program while ensuring accountability of Federal dollars.

The second thing that my legislation would do, is the funding system will be modified to address the GAO's finding that the present system does not provide incentives to States for improving the performance of the program.

Third, the legislation will require States to suspend drivers licenses and other licenses, both professional and recreational, of parents who are delinquent in their child support payments. My State of Arkansas has found that this program is very effective in encouraging noncustodial parents to promptly pay their child support obligations.

Finally, the legislation attempts to address the difficult issue of the overburdened case workers in of the State child support offices. The Department of Health and Human Services and the States will sit down together and determine the level of staffing necessary for each State to effectively carry out its child support program. It is my hope that with the benefit of this joint effort, the State programs will then be able to at least partially address this critical area.

Mr. President, while personal responsibility is the key to taking care of children, it is my belief the Government has a limited but important role to ensure that it is easy for noncustodial parents to fulfill their duties, and difficult for them to avoid it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that additional material be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Title I—Eligibility and Other Matters Concerning Child Support Enforcement Program Clients

Sec. 101. Cooperation requirement and good cause exception

Section 101 amends the CSE, AFDC, and Medicaid statutes to require that, effective 10 months after enactment (or earlier, at State option)—

The State CSE agency (rather than the AFDC and Medicaid agencies, as under current law) will make determinations of whether applicants for AFDC and Medicaid are cooperating with efforts to establish paternity and obtain child support, or have good cause not to cooperate;

The AFDC and Medicaid agencies must immediately refer applicants needing paternity establishment services to the CSE agency, and the CSE agency must make an initial cooperation or good cause determination within 10 days of such referral;

The mother or other custodial relative of a child born 10 months or more after enactment of these amendments will not be found to cooperate with efforts to establish paternity unless that individual names the putative father and supplies information that could assist the IV–D agency to identify him; and

Cooperation with initial efforts to establish paternity (except where good cause is found) is a precondition to eligibility for program benefits, except where the applicant is eligible for emergency assistance under title IV–A or is a pregnant woman presumptively eligible for Medicaid, where an appeal of a finding of lack of good cause is pending, or where the CSE agency has not made a timely determination.

Sec. 102. State obligation to provide paternity establishment and child support enforcement services

Section 102 requires State laws to require that—

Every child support order established or modified in the State on or after October 1, 1998 be entered in a central case registry to be operated by the IV–D agency (see section 301 of the bill);

Child support be collected (except where parents agree to opt out under limited circumstances) through a centralized collections unit to be operated by the IV–D agency or its contractor (see section 302 of the bill)—

On and after October 1, 1998, in all cases being enforced under the State plan; and

On and after October 1, 1999, in all cases entered in the central case registry.

Section 102 amends the IV–D State plan requirements to eliminate distinctions between welfare recipients and other applicants for IV–D services with respect to services available and fees for such services. Under these amendments—

No fees may be imposed on any custodial or noncustodial parent—

After September 30, 1998, for application for IV–D services; or

At any time, for inclusion in the central state registry;

No other fees (other than those specified in current law for genetic testing and tax refund offset) may be imposed on the custodial parent; and

Any other costs or fees may be imposed on the noncustodial parent (but any fees for support collections through the centralized collections unit must be added to and not deleted from the support award).

Sec. 103. Distribution of payments

Section 103 amends the provisions of title IV–D concerning the order of priority for distribution of child support collections, to provide that—

A family not receiving AFDC shall be paid the full amount of current support, plus arrearages for any period after the family ceased to receive AFDC, before any amount is retained by the State to reimburse AFDC;

The State would have the option, in the case of a family receiving AFDC, either to make distribution as under current law or to pay the family the full amount of current support due before retaining any amount to reimburse the AFDC agency;

Where the parent owing support marries (or remarries) the custodial parent, and the parents' combined income is less than twice the Federal poverty line, the State must, upon application by the parents, suspend or cancel any debts owed the State on account of AFDC paid to the family.

This section also requires the Secretary to promulgate regulations—

Under title IV–D, establishing a uniform national standard for distribution where a parent owes support to more than one family; and

Under title IV–A, establishing standards for States choosing the alternative distribution formula, to minimize irregular monthly payments to AFDC families.

Finally, this section, together with the corresponding amendment to title IV–A in title VII of this bill, increases the amount of monthly support to be paid to the family by the CSE agency and disregarded for purposes of AFDC eligibility and benefits. The new ''passthrough and disregard'' amount would be the current $50 increased by the CPI, or such greater amount as the State may choose.

Sec. 104. Due process rights

Section 104. requires State IV–D plans, effective October 1, 1997, to provide for procedures to ensure that—

Parties to cases in which IV–D services are being provided receive notice of all proceedings in which support obligations might be established or modified, and of any order establishing or modifying a support obligation within 10 days of issuance; and

Individuals receiving IV–D services have available to them fair hearing or other formal complaint procedure.

Sec. 105. Privacy safeguards

Section 105 requires State IV–D plans, effective October 1, 1996, to provide for safeguards to protect privacy rights with respect to sensitive and confidential information, including safeguards against unauthorized use of disclosure of information relating to paternity and support proceedings, and prohibitions on disclosing the whereabouts of one individual to another person who is subject to a protective order, or convicted of criminal assault or abuse against such individual, or against whom a proceeding is pending seeking such a protective order or conviction.

Sec. 106. Requirement to facilitate access to services.

Section 106 requires State IV–D plans, effective October 1, 1996, to include outreach plans to increase parents' access to CSE services, including plans responding to the needs of working parents and parents with limited proficiency in English.

TITLE II—PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND FUNDING

Sec. 201. Federal matching payments

Section 201 increases the basic eral matching rate for State IV–D programs (currently 66 percent) to 69 percent for FY 1997, 72 percent for FY 1998, and 75 percent for FY 1999 and thereafter.

Section 201 also adds a maintenance of effort requirement that—

Total State expenditures (other than for automated data processing systems development), after deducting Federal matching payments (but not incentive payments) not be less than such expenditures for FY 1996, and

Total State expenditures for FY 1997 and 1998, after deducting Federal matching payments and incentive payments, not be less than such expenditures for FY 1996.

Sec. 202. Performance-based incentives and penalties

Section 202 replaces the system of incentive payments to States under section 458 of the Act with a new program of incentive adjustments to the Federal matching rate. Under this program, States could receive increases of up to 5 percentage points based on Statewide paternity establishment, and increases of up to 10 percentage points based on overall CSE performance.

Section 202 also makes amendments (effective with respect to quarters beginning on and after the date of enactment) providing for a penalty reduction of AFDC matching payments where a State's CSE program does not meet specified performance standards:

Section 452(g) is amended to make minor and technical amendments to the formula for determining the paternity establishment percentage under the IV–D program (the amendments correct errors introduced by OBRA 1993).

Section 403(h) is amended (effective with respect to calendar quarters beginning one year or more after enactment) to simplify the penalty reduction procedure. The penalty is to be deferred for one year pending State corrective action, and to be canceled if all deficiencies are eliminated by the end of that year.

The Secretary would specify in regulations the levels of accomplishment (or improvement) needed to qualify for each incentive adjustment rate. States would report performance data after the end of FY 1995 and each succeeding year; the Secretary would determine the amount (if any) of adjustment due each State, based on State data determined by the Secretary to be reliable, and would apply the adjustment to matching payments for the succeeding fiscal year (beginning with FY 1997).

Sec. 203. Federal and State reviews and audits

Section 203 makes amendments, effective beginning one year after enactment, shifting the focus of title IV–D audits from the manner in which activities are conducted to performance outcomes, as follows:

A new State plan element requires the States annually—

To determine, and report to the Secretary concerning, conformity with State plan requirements; and

To extract from their ADP systems, and transmit to the Secretary, data and calculations concerning their compliance with Federal performance requirements.

The Secretary's responsibilities are revised to require—

Annual review of the State reports on plan conformity; determinations of amounts of penalty adjustments to States; and provisions of comments, recommendations, and technical assistance to the States);

Evaluation of elements of State programs in which significant deficiencies are indicated by the State reports; and

Triennial audits of State reporting systems and financial management, and for other purposes the Secretary finds necessary.

Sec. 204. Automated data processing

Section 204 recognizes and clarifies title IV–D State plan requirements concerning automated data processing, and adds requirements that the State agency ADP system (1) be used to calculate the State's performance for purposes of the incentive and penalty adjustments under sections 403(h) and 458; and (2) incorporate safeguards on information integrity and security.

This section also revises the statutory provisions for State implementation of all Federal ADP requirements (currently required by October 1, 1995), to provide that:

All requirements enacted on or before enactment of the Family Support Act of 1988 are to be met by October 1, 1996; and

All requirements (including those enacted in OBRA 1993 and this bill) are to be met by October 1, 1999.

Ninety percent Federal matching for ADP start-up costs remains available through FY 1996. For the next 5 years, the match rate for startup costs is the higher of (i) 80 percent or (ii) the matching rate generally applicable to the State IV–D program (including any incentive increases); total Federal payments to States are limited to $260,000,000, to be distributed among States on a formula set in regulations which takes into account the relative size of State caseloads and the level of automation needed to meet applicable ADP requirements.

Sec. 205. Director of CSE Program; training and staffing

Section 205—

Eliminates the requirement that the individual responsible for day-to-day operation of the Federal CSE program report directly to the Secretary;

Requires the Secretary to develop a national training program for State IV–D directors, and a core curriculum and training standards for State agencies, and authorizes the Secretary to charge States fees for such programs;

Requires State IV–D agencies to have training programs consistent with the national standards and curriculum, and to provide for initial standards and curriculum, and to provide for initial and ongoing training of all staff, and permits use of IV–D funds (with the Secretary's approval) for training of non-agency personnel with related responsibilities (including judges, law enforcement personnel, and social workers); and

Requires the Secretary to study and report to Congress on the staffing of each State's

CSE program (including a review of needs created by requirements for ADP systems, central case registries, and centralized support collections).

Sec. 206. Funding for secretarial assistance to State programs

Section 206 makes available to the Secretary, from annual appropriations for payments for State programs under title IV–D for FY 1995 and succeeding years—

An amount equal to 1 percent of the Federal share of child support collections on behalf of AFDC recipients for the preceding fiscal year, for use for assistance to State IV–D agencies through technical assistance, training, and related activities; projects of regional or national significance; and

An amount equal to 2 percent of the Federal share of such collections, for operation of the FPLS and the National Welfare Reform Information Clearinghouse established by section 305 (to the extent such costs are not recovered in user fees.)

Sec. 207. Data collection and reports by the Secretary

Section 207 amends data collection and reporting requirements, effective with respect to FY 1994 and succeeding fiscal years, to conform the requirements to the changes made by the bill, and to eliminate requirements for unnecessary or duplicative information.

Sec. 208. Coordination with income eligibility verification system

Section 208 amends the authority for the Income Eligibility Verification System (IEVS)—

To permit IEVS information furnished to state CSE programs to be used to assist in carrying out any title IV–D program purpose (rather than only for income eligibility verification); and

To require the state CSE agency to make information in the central State case registry available to State agencies administering the AFDC, Medicaid, Food Stamp, and unemployment compensation programs.

TITLE III—LOCATE AND CASE TRACKING

Sec. 301. Central State case registry.

Section 301 requires the State IV–D agency's ADP system—

To perform the functions of a single central registry containing records with respect to each case in which services are being provided by the State agency (including each case in which an order has been entered or modified on or after October 1, 1998);

For each case, to maintain and regularly update a complete payment record of all amounts collected and distributed; amounts owed or overdue (including interest or late payment penalties and fees); and the termination date of the support obligation;

Regularly to update and monitor case records on the basis of information on judicial and administrative actions, proceedings, and orders relating to paternity and support; information from data matches; information on support collections and distributions; and other relevant information; and

To extract data for purposes of sharing and matching with Federal, in-State, and interstate data bases and locator services, including the FPLS, the data bases created by this bill, other State IV–D agencies, and State agencies administering AFDC, Foster Care, and Medicaid.

Sec. 302. Centralized collection and disbursement of support payments

Section 302 requires State IV–D agencies, on and after October 1, 1997—

To operate a centralized, automated unit for collection and disbursement of child support which—

Is operated directly by the State IV–D agency or by a contractor responsible directly to the State agency;

Collects and disburses support in all cases being enforced by the State agency (including all cases under orders entered on or after October 1, 1998);

Uses automated procedures, electronic processes, and computer-driven technology to the maximum extent feasible, efficient, and economical; and

Is coordinated with the State agency's ADP system;

To use the State agency ADP system to assist and facilitate the operations of the centralized collections unit, through functions including—

Generation of wage withholding notices and orders to employers;

Ongoing monitoring to promptly identify nonpayment; and

Automatic use of administrative enforcement mechanisms; and

To have sufficient State staff (including State employees and contractors) to carry out these monitoring and enforcement responsibilities.

Sec. 303. Amendments concerning income withholding

Section 303 requires State laws concerning income withholding to provide—

That all child support orders issued or modified before October 1, 1995, which are not otherwise subject to income withholding, will become subject to income withholding immediately if arrearages occur, without need for a judicial or administrative hearing;

That employers withholding wages must forward payments to the State centralized collections unit within 5 working days after the amount withheld would otherwise have been paid to the employee;

That the notice from the State to employers directing wage withholding must be in a standard format prescribed by the Secretary;

For the imposition of fines against employers who fail to withhold support from wages, or to make appropriate and timely payment to the State collections unit.

This section also makes amendments—

Conforming the income withholding requirements to the requirement for a centralized State collections unit; and

Requiring the Secretary to promulgate regulations defining income and other terms for purposes of title IV–D.

Sec. 304. Locator information from interstate networks and labor unions

Section 304 adds a requirement for State laws providing—

That the State will neither finance nor use any automated interstate locator system network for purposes relating to (i) motor vehicles or (ii) law enforcement unless all Federal and State IV–D agencies (including the FPLS and the new Federal data matching services) have access on the same basis as any other user of the system or network (but only, in the case of law enforcement data, where such access is otherwise allowed by State and Federal law); and

Requiring labor unions and their hiring halls to furnish to the IV–D agency, upon request, locator information (relating to residence and employment) on any union member against whom a paternity or support obligation is sought to be established or enforced.

Sec. 305. National Child Support Information Clearinghouse

Section 305 amends title IV–D to require the Secretary to establish and operate a National Child Support Information Clearinghouse (NCSIC).

The NCSIC would include Federal Parent Locator Service under section 453 of the Act, The Secretary is also required to establish within the NCSIC, by October 1, 1998, two new automated data matching services designed to locate individuals (and their assets) for CSE purposes:

The National Child Support Registry would contain minimal information (including names, social security numbers or other uniform identification numbers, and State case identification numbers) on each case in a State central case registry, based on information furnished and regularly updated by State IV–D agencies.

The National Directory of New Hires would contain identifying information—

Supplied by employers, within 10 business days of hiring (or, if the employer makes automated reports, 10 business days after the close of the corresponding payroll period), on each individual hired on or after October 1, 1998, and

Consisting of extracts from reports to the Secretary of Labor under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, supplied by States either quarterly or on such more frequent basis as such reports are supplied to the Secretary of Labor, in such format and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(An employer failing to make a timely report concerning an employee would be subject to a civil money penalty of the lesser of $500 or 1 percent of the wages paid to the employee.)

The Secretary is required to disclose or match data in the Clearinghouse as follows:

Data are to be shared with the Social Security Administration for the purpose of verifying the accuracy of identifying information reported.

The New Hire Directory and Child Support Registry are to be matched every 2 working days, and resulting information to be reported to State CSE agencies.

Other Clearinghouse registries are to be matched against each other, and resulting information is to be reported to State CSE and AFDC agencies, to the extent found effective.

Data in Clearinghouse registries are to be disclosed through the IEVS system to the AFDC, Medicaid, unemployment compensation, food stamp, and territorial cash assistance programs, for income eligibility verification and any other purpose permitted under section 1137 of the Act.

Registry data are to be disclosed to the Social Security Administration for use in determining the accuracy of supplemental security income payments under title XVI and in connection with benefits under title II of the Act.

Data in the New Hire Directory are to be disclosed—

To the Secretary of the Treasury, for administration of the earned income tax credit program and for verification of claims concerning employment on tax returns; and

To State agencies administering unemployment compensation and workers compensation programs, to assist determinations on the allowability of claims.

The Secretary may disclose Clearinghouse data, without personal identifiers, for research serving the purposes of specified programs under title IV of the Act.

This section provides for reimbursement by the Secretary to SSA and to State employment security agencies (SESAs) for their costs of carrying out this section; and for reimbursement to the Secretary by State and Federal agencies receiving information from the Clearinghouse. This section also include provisions designed to safeguard information in the Clearinghouse from inappropriate disclosure or use.

This section makes related amendments to the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and title III of the Social Security Act, requiring

SESAs to furnish wage and unemployment compensation information to the Directory of New Hires.

Sec. 306. Expanded locate authority

Section 306; makes various amendments to remove legal barriers and otherwise increase the effectiveness of electronic data matches for CSE purposes. The FPLS authority is amended—

To broaden the purpose of the FPLS to include locating information on wages and other employment benefits, and on other assets (or debts), for purposes of establishing or setting the amount of support obligations;

To require the FPLS to obtain information from consumer reporting agencies; and

To authorize the Secretary to set reasonable rates for reimbursement to other Federal agencies, State agencies, and consumer reporting agencies for the costs of providing information to the FPLS.

This section also makes complementary amendments to other laws, as follows:

Section 608 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act is amended to make available to the FPLS all information on individuals in the files of consumer reporting agencies (rather than only locate information, as under current law).

Section 6103(1) (6) and (8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (providing for IRS and Social Security Administration disclosures of tax return information to Federal, State, and local CSE agencies) are amended—

To eliminate the restriction that IRS may disclose return information only if the information is not reasonably available from any other source; and

To permit disclosures by the Social Security Administration to OCSE.

Sec. 307. Studies and demonstrations concerning parent locator activities

Section 307 requires the Secretary—

To study, report, and make recommendations to the Congress concerning issues involved in (1) making FPLS information available to noncustodial parents, and (2) operating electronic data interchanges between the FPLS and major consumer credit reporting bureaus; and

To fund State demonstrations testing automated data exchanges with other State data bases (using funds available to the Secretary for technical assistance to States under the provision added by section 616 of the bill).

Sec. 308. Use of Social Security numbers

Section 308 requires State laws requiring the recording of social security numbers of the parties on marriage licenses and divorce decrees, and of parents on birth records and child support and paternity orders.

This section also makes an amendment to title II of the Act, to clarify that social security numbers of parents must be recorded on children's birth records, but that this requirement authorizes release of social security numbers only for purposes related to child support enforcement.

TITLE IV—STREAMLINING AND UNIFORMITY OF PROCEDURES

Sec. 401. Adoption of uniform State laws

Section 401 requires States, by January 1, 1996, to adopt in its entirety the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act, with the following modifications and additions:

The State law is to apply in any case (1) involving an order established or modified in one State and for which a subsequent modification is sought in another State; or (2) in which interstate activity is required to enforce an order;

The State law shall provide that a tribunal in the State with jurisdiction over a child who is a resident of the State has jurisdiction over both parents;

The State law shall provide that the State may modify an order issued in another State if (1) all parties do not reside in the issuing State, and either reside in or are subject to the jurisdiction of the State in question; and (2) (if any other State is exercising or seeks to exercise jurisdiction), the conditions applicable to simultaneous proceedings are met to the same extent as required for proceedings to establish orders;

The State law shall permit consenting parties to permit the State which issued an order to retain jurisdiction which it would otherwise lose because the parties are no longer present in that State;

The State law shall recognize as valid service of process upon persons in the State by any means acceptable in the State which is the initiating or responding State in a proceeding;

The State must have procedures requiring all public and private entities in the State to provide promptly, in response to the request of the IV–D agency of that or any other State, information on employment, compensation, and benefits of any employee or contractor of such entity.

Section 401 provides for expedited appeal to the Supreme Court of any district court ruling on the constitutionality of the above provision concerning long-arm jurisdiction based on the child's residence.

This section also makes conforming amendments to authorities requiring States to give full faith and credit to other States' child support orders.

Sec. 402. State laws providing expedited proceedings

Section 402 requires State laws to give the State IV–D agency the authority (and recognize and enforce the authority of State agencies of other States), to take the following actions relating to establishment of paternity and establishment and enforcement of support orders without obtaining an order from a separate judicial or administrative tribunal (but subject to due process safeguards):

To establish the amount of support in any case being enforced by the State agency, and to modify any support order included in the central case registry, based on State guidelines;

To order genetic testing for paternity establishment where appropriate preconditions are met;

To enter a default order—

Establishing paternity (where a putative father refuses to submit to genetic testing); and

To establish or modify a support obligation, where an obligor or obligee fails to respond to notice to appear;

To subpoena financial or other information needed to establish, modify, or enforce an order, and to sanction failure to respond to a subpoena;

To obtain access (including automated access, if available), subject to appropriate safeguards, to—

Records of other State and local government agencies, including records on vital statistics; tax and revenue; real and titled personal property; occupational and professional licenses; ownership and control of corporations and other business entities; employment security; public assistance; motor vehicles; and corrections;

Customer records of public utilities and cable television companies; and

Information held by financial institutions on individuals who owe or are owed support (or against or with respect to whom a support obligation is sought);

To order wage or other income withholding;

To direct that the payee under an order be changed (in cases being enforced by the State agency) to the appropriate government entity;

For the purpose of securing overdue support—

To intercept and seize any payment to the obligor by or through a State or local government agency;

To attach and seize assets of the obligor held by financial institutions;

To attach retirement funds (where permitted by the Secretary);

To impose liens and, in appropriate cases, to force sale of property and distribution of proceeds; and

To increase monthly support payments to include amounts for arrearages.

To suspend drivers' licenses of individuals owing past-due support.

Section 402 also requires State laws to provide for the following substantive and procedural rules and authority, applicable to all proceedings to establish paternity or to establish, modify, or enforce support orders:

Procedures permitting presumptions of notice in child support cases, under which parties to a paternity or child support proceeding must file with the tribunal, and update, information on location and identity, which may be relied on in any subsequent child support enforcement action between the same parties for purposes of providing notice and service of process (if due diligence has otherwise been exercised in attempting to locate such party);

Procedures ensuring Statewide jurisdiction in child support cases, under which the IV–D agency and tribunals hearing child support and paternity cases have Statewide jurisdiction; their orders have Statewide effect; and (where orders in such cases are issued by local jurisidictions) a case may be transferred within the State without loss of jurisdiction.

This section would bar the Secretary from granting States exemptions from State law requirements under section 466 of the Act concerning procedures for paternity establishment; modification of orders; recording of orders in the central State case registry; recording of social security numbers; interstate enforcement; or expedited administrative procedures.

Finally, this section requires the IV–D agency's ADP system to be used, to the maximum extent feasible, to implement the above expedited administrative procedures.

TITLE V—PATERNITY ESTABLISHMENT

Sec. 501. State laws concerning paternity establishment

Section 501 amends the provisions concerning State laws on paternity establishment to require such laws—

To permit the initiation of proceedings to establish paternity before the birth of the child concerned;

To provide authority to order genetic testing upon request of a party when such request is supported by a sworn statement establishing a reasonable possibility of parentage;

To require the IV–D agency, when it orders genetic testing, to pay the costs (subject (at State option) to recoupment from the putative father if paternity is established), and to obtain additional testing (upon advance payment) where test results are disputed;

To require the State to admit into evidence results of any genetic test that is of a type generally acknowledged by accreditation bodies designated by the Secretary as reliable evidence of paternity, and performed by a laboratory approved by such an accreditation body;

To make cooperation by hospitals and other health care facilities in voluntary paternity acknowledgment procedures a condition of Medicaid participation;

To require any State that treats a voluntary acknowledgment as a rebuttable presumption to provide that the presumption becomes conclusive within one year (unless rebutted or invalidated);

To provide (at State option, notwithstanding the preceding provision) for vacating an acknowledgement of paternity, upon the request of a party, on the basis of new evidence, the existence of fraud, or the best interest of the child; and

To provide that no judicial or administrative proceedings are required or permitted to ratify an unchallenged acknowledgement of paternity;

To provide that parties to a paternity proceeding are not entitled to jury trial;

To require issuance of an order for temporary support, upon motion of a party, pending an administrative or judicial determination of parentage, where paternity is indicated by genetic testing or other clear and convincing evidence;

To provide that bills for pregnancy, childbirth, and genetic testing are admissible without foundation testimony;

To grant discretion to the tribunal establishing paternity and support to waive rights to amounts owed to the State (but not to the mother) for costs relating to pregnancy, childbirth, genetic testing, and child support arrears, where the father cooperates or acknowledges paternity;

To ensure that putative fathers have a reasonable opportunity to initiate paternity actions.

Sec. 502. Outreach for voluntary paternity establishment

Section 502 requires State IV–D plans, effective October 1, 1996, to provide that the State will publicize the availability and encourage the use of procedures for voluntary establishment of paternity and child support through a variety of means, which—

Will include distribution of materials at health care facilities and other locations, such a schools; and follow-up on each child for whom paternity has not been established discharged from a hospital after birth; and

May include programs to educate expectant couples on rights and responsibilities relating to paternity, in which all expectant IV-A recipients may be require to participate).

90 percent Federal matching would be available for the above outreach activities in quarters beginning on and after October 1, 1996.

Sec. 503. Penalty for failure to establish paternity promptly

Section 503 provides for reduction of Federal matching otherwise payable to a State IV-A program, for quarters beginning 10 months or more after enactment of this bill, for failure to establish paternity for children born 10 months or more after enactment who are receiving public assistance, whose mothers or custodial relatives have cooperated with State agency efforts for the entire preceding year, but for whom paternity has not been established. The reduction formula would be establish in regulations; it would equal the product of (1) the number of such children in the State (after making allowance for a tolerance level of a percentage of such children, ranging from 25 percent for FY 1998 to 10 percent for FY 2004 and succeeding fiscal years); (2) the average monthly AFDC payment; and (3) one-half the applicable Federal matching rate under title IV-A.

Sec. 504. Incentives to parents to establish paternity

Section 504 authorizes the Secretary to approve IV-D State plan amendments providing for incentive payments to families to encourage paternity establishment. State payments for this purpose would be matched as ordinary IV-D expenditures.

This section also requires the Secretary to authorize up to 3 States to conduct demonstrations providing financial incentives to families for establishment of paternity. 90 percent Federal matching would be available under title IV-D for State payments to families under these demonstrations, up to a $1 million cap on Federal expenditures.

TITLE VI—ESTABLISHMENT AND MODIFICATION OF SUPPORT ORDERS

Sec. 601. National Commission on Child Support Guidelines

Section 601 authorizes the Secretary to establish a National Commission on Child Support Guidelines to consider the advisability of a national child support guideline (or parameters for State guidelines) and, if appropriate, to develop a proposed guideline for congressional consideration. The Commission is to consider matters including the adequacy of State guidelines; the definition of income and circumstances under which income should be imputed; tax treatment of support; cases in which parents have obligations to more than one family, treatment of expenses for child care, health care, and special needs; the appropriate duration of support, and issues raised by shared custody.

The Commission would have 2 members appointed by the Chairman and 1 by the Ranking Minority Member of the Senate Finance Committee; 2 appointed by the Chairman and 1 by the Ranking Minority Member of the House Ways and Means Committee; and 6 appointed by the Secretary. Members would be appointed by March 1, 1996, and would make a final report to the President and the Congress within 2 years after appointment.

Appropriations are authorized of $1 million for each of FYs 1996 and 1997, to remain available until expended.

Sec. 602. State laws concerning modification of child support orders

Section 602 requires States, effective October 1, 2000, to have in effect laws concerning modification of child support order under which—

The IV–D agency modifies all support order (including judicial orders) included in the central case registry, in accordance with State guidelines on award amounts;

All orders in the central case registry are revised and adjusted at least every 36 months unless adjustment is not in the child's best interests, or unless both parents decline modification in writing.

Support orders must be reviewed upon the request of either parent whenever either parent's income has changed by more than 20 percent, or other substantial changes in circumstances have occurred, since the order was established or most recently reviewed.

This section also amends current due process provisions to eliminate specific Federal timetables and to require instead application of State due process safeguards.

Sec. 603. Study on use of tax return information for modification of child support orders

Section 603 requires the Secretaries of HHS and Treasury to conduct a study to determine how tax return information might be used to facilitate the process of modifying child support awards.

Sec. 604. Cost-of-living adjustment of child support awards

This section directs the States to include in their State plan procedures to ensure that child support orders shall be adjusted an annual basis in line with the Consumer Price Index.

TITLE VII—ENFORCEMENT OF SUPPORT ORDERS

Sec. 701 Revolving loan fund for program improvements to increase collections

Section 701 authorizes appropriation of a total of $100 million ($10 million each for FYs 1999 and 2000, and $20 million each for FYs 2001 through 2004), to establish in title IV-D a revolving fund for loans by the Secretary to States for short-term projects making operational improvements in State and local IV-D programs with the potential for achieving substantial increases in child support collections.

Loans from the fund could not exceed $5 million per State or $1 million per project (or $5 million for a single Statewide project in a large State); loan durations could not exceed 3 years. Loans would be repaid through offsets against the increase in State incentive payments, plus additional offsets against State IV-D payments as necessary to ensure full repayment in 3 years. Loan funds received by a State could be used by the State as the non-Federal share of expenditures under the State IV-D program.

Sec. 702. Federal income tax refund offset

Section 702 makes amendments, effective January 1, 1997, relating to the authority to offset child support arrearages against Federal income tax refunds, as follows:

The Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to provide that offsets of child support arrears (whether owed to the family or assigned to the State) against income tax overpayments would take priority over debts owed Federal agencies (other than debts owed to HHS or the Department of Education for student loans);

Title IV-D is amended—

To eliminate disparate treatment of families not receiving public assistance, by repealing provisions (applicable only to support arrears not assigned to the State) that—

Make the offset available only for minor or disabled children who are still owed current support;

Set a higher threshold amount of arrears before tax offset is available; and

Permit higher fees to be charged for the offset service.

Sec. 703. Internal Revenue Service collection of arrears

Section 703 amends the provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which provides authority to collect child support arrears as if they were a tax owed by the obligor, upon certification of arrears by the Secretary of HHS, to bar imposition by IRS of additional fees for adjustment to the amount of arrears previously certified with respect to the same obligor.

Sec 704. Authority to collect support from employment-related payments by the United States

Section 704 amends title IV–D, effective 6 months after enactment, to eliminate the separate rules for withholding of child support from wages, pensions, and other employment-related compensation of Federal employees. These amendments treat U.S. employment income the same as income from any other employer for purposes of the income withholding provisions of title IV–D.

This section also amends 10 U.S.C. to remove barriers to availability of military retirees' compensation for payment of child support, by making clear that these funds can be reached by administrative as well as judicial orders, and to provide for payment through a designated governmental entity.

Sec. 705. Motor vehicle liens

Section 705 amends the title IV–D requirements for State laws concerning liens with respect to child support arrears to require that States have and use procedures to place liens on titled motor vehicles owned by individuals owing child support arrears equal to two months of support. Such liens would take precedence over all other encumbrances on a vehicle title, other than a purchase money security interest, and could be used to force seizure and sale of the vehicle.

Sec. 706. Voiding of fraudulent transfers

Section 706 requires States to have in effect the Uniform Fraudulent Conveyance Act of 1981, the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act of 1984, or an equivalent law providing for voiding of transfers of income or property made to avoid payment of child support.

Sec. 707. State law authorizing suspension of licenses

Section 707 requires enactment of laws giving the State authority to withhold, suspend, or restrict use of driver's licenses, professional and occupational licenses, and recreational licenses of individuals owing overdue child support or failing to respond to subpoenas or warrants relating to paternity or child support proceedings.

Sec. 708. Reporting arrearages to credit bureaus

Section 708 amends the requirement for a State law providing for the reporting of child support arrears to consumer credit bureaus (which currently must permit such reporting) to require such reporting when payment is one month overdue.

Sec. 709. Extended statute of limitation for collection of arrearages

Section 709 requires that State law provide a statute of limitations on child support arrears extending at least until the child reaches age 30. (This amendment would not require a State to revise any payment obligation which had lapsed on the effective date of the State law.)

Sec. 710. Charges for arrearages

Section 710 requires State laws to provide, not later than October 1, 1998, for assessment of interest or penalties for child support arrearages.

Sec,. 711. Visitation issue barred

Section 711 requires State laws to provide that failure to pay child support is not a defense to denial of visitation rights, and denial of visitation rights is not a defense to failure to pay child support.

Sec. 712. Denial of passports for nonpayment of child support

Section 712 amends 4 U.S.C., effective October 1, 1996, to provide that the Secretary of State, upon a certification by a State IV–D agency that an individual owes child support arrears of over $5,000, must refuse to issue a passport to the individual and may revoke or restrict a passport already issued.

Sec. 713. Denial of Federal benefits, loans, and guarantees

This section provides that no Federal agency may make a loan to, or provide any guarantee for the benefit or, or provide any benefit to any person who has a child support arrearage exceeding $1,000 and who is not in compliance with a plan or an agreement to repay this obligation. This provision is designed to elevate the issue of child support in the operations of the Federal government. The Federal agencies determine, for example, if a contractor is on the suspension and debarment list before the agency awards a contract to the company. The purpose of this section is to create this type of screening system for child support obligations.

Sec. 714. Seizure of lottery winnings

This section provides that the distributor of lottery winnings, insurance settlements, judgments, and/or property seizures shall first seek a determination from the State child support enforcement agency as to whether the person owes a child support arrearage. If there is an arrearage, then there shall be a withholding of that amount which shall be sent to the Child Support agency for distribution.

Sec. 801. Child support enforcement and assurance demonstrations

Section 801 requires the Secretary to fund grants to 3 States for demonstrations, beginning in FY 1998 and lasting from 7 to 10 years, providing assured levels of child support for children for whom paternity and support have been established. The projects would be administered by the State IV-D agency or the State department of taxation and revenue. Annual benefit levels set by States could range from $1,500 to $3,000 for a family with one child, and from $3,000 to $4,500 for a family with four or more children. States could require absent parents with insufficient income to pay support to work off support by participating in work programs.

Ninety percent Federal matching would be available from appropriations for payments to States under title IV-D, but total Federal funds available for these demonstrations would be capped at $27,000,000 for FY 1998; $55,000,000 for FY 1999; $70,000,000 for each of FYs 2000 through 2003; and $55,000,000 for FY 2004. This section authorizes appropriation of $10 million for FY 1998, to remain available until expended, for the Secretary's costs for evaluating demonstrations under this section.

Sec. 802. Social Security Act demonstrations

Section 802 amends section 1115(c) of the Act (which currently requires that IV-D demonstrations not result in increased costs to the Federal Government under AFDC) to require instead that such demonstrations not result in an increase in total costs to the Federal Government.

TITLE IX—ACCESS AND VISITATION GRANTS

Sec. 901. Grants to States for access and visitation programs

Section 901 adds a new section 469A of the Act providing a new capped entitlement program of grants to States for programs to support and facilitate noncustodial parents' access to and visitation of their children. The program would be funded at $5 million for each of FYs 1997 and 1998, and $10 million per year thereafter; Federal funding would be available to match 90 percent of a State's expenditures up to the amount of its allotment under a formula based on the numbers of children living with only one biological parent. State programs could be administered by the CSE agency either directly or through courts, local public agencies, or nonprofit private entities, and could be Statewide or geographically limited.

TITLE X—EFFECT OF ENACTMENT

Sec. 1001. Effective dates

Section 1001 provides that, except as otherwise specified—

Provisions of this title requiring enactment of State laws or revision of State IV-D plans shall become effective October 1, 1996; and

All other provisions of this title become effective upon enactment,

subject to provisos—

Affording a State until after the end of the next State legislative session beginning after enactment, in the case of any provision of this title requiring enactment or amendment of State laws; and

Affording a State up to 5 years to comply if a State constitutional amendment is required to permit compliance.

Sec. 1002. Severability

Section 1002 provides that the provisions of this title are severable, and that any provision found invalid will not affect the validity of any other provision which can be given effect without regard to the invalid provision.

OFFICE OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION,
Little Rock, AR, March 30, 1995.
Hon. DAVID PRYOR,
U.S. Senator, Russell Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR PRYOR: We share your concern regarding the future of the children and families of Arkansas and the nation. Congress is considering sweeping changes to reform the welfare system that will affect families struggling to support their children. An effective child support enforcement program is a essential part of that reform. Regular child support payments must be ensured if single parent families are to have financial security necessary for children to thrive and to be successful citizens and relieve the burden of taxpayers.

As child support enforcement professionals, we support the efforts of congress to improve the present program. We realize the importance of our role in empowering individuals to become self-sufficient and we embrace the challenges ahead. Our mission is to provide assistance to children and families in obtaining financial and medical support through locating parents, establishing paternity and support obligations, and enforcing those obligations. Our vision for the future is to put children first by helping parents assume responsibility for the social and economic well-being and health of their children.

To accomplish these goals we must have improved and uniform enforcement remedies that reach across state lines. We must also have improved operational support from both the state and federal government and increased funding. While other programs may lend themselves to block grants, nonpayment of child support transcends state lines and requires some uniformity in enforcement. Competing state interests affect state legislation more readily than at the federal level. Many state child support programs welcome federal mandates of proven enforcement and operational remedies to assist them in acquiring effective collection tools. Not all mandates are bad. Much of the progress in child support has come about through federal mandates and the resulting uniformity from state to state has been most beneficial.

Child support advocates and professionals agree on much of what is needed to improve the program nationwide. They include the following:

1. Central Registry of Child Support Orders—States should be required to develop and implement a central registry of all child support orders. State central registries should be formatted similarly to form a national central registry of child support orders.

2. Central Collection Systems—It is difficult to enforce child support orders because of the variety of collection points. To enforce an order, payments made or not made must be accounted for to determine past due support. With child support payments being paid directly to custodial parents, court clerks or local agencies it becomes a time consuming process to collect payment records from different sources in order to determine past due arrears. Central payment processing has proven to be effective and efficient where implemented. Central processing enables IV–D agencies to monitor delinquencies in child support cases and allows